
DURBAN – GAC meeting with ccNSO
Tuesday, July 16, 2013 – 14:00 to 15:30
ICANN – Durban, South Africa

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Good afternoon, everyone, and welcome to our session with the Country Code Name Supporting Organization. We have a few items that we will hear from the ccNSO on and this will really, I hope, help the GAC refocus on some of the issues that are under discussion and development within the ccNSO. There are a number of things that are of interest to us governments, and so welcome. It's nice to have the ccNSO back. We've had to put a lot of our joint efforts with other parts of the community on hold to work on gTLDs. So this is a welcomed return to our former way of working together. So again, welcome, and I will turn over to my co-chair for this session, Lesley Cowley, who is the chair of the ccNSO. So, Lesley.

LESLEY COWLEY:

Thank you, Heather, and we're very pleased to be back with you. Before we go into our agenda, let me just make a pleasurable announcement to say that this meeting is the tenth anniversary of the ccNSO. So it's a major milestone for us that we are celebrating, and I hope you will have heard already that we are celebrating this evening and GAC members have an invitation to join us. And in fact, I am told we have a GAC bus that will be leaving this venue at 7:15 or thereabouts, depending on when you are ready, for any of you that would like to join us this evening.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

So the main business with you today, we thought it would be very helpful to give you an update on the Internationalized Domain Names Policy Development Process which if I slip into acronyms will now be the IDN ccPDP, and also to touch on, at your request, the panel addition to the fast track that I know a number of GAC colleagues are interested in. After that we plan to move on to an update on the Framework of Interpretation Working Group, and that one especially is very important for us to have GAC attention, for want of a better phrase, but most certainly GAC attention and inputs to that work. And I know several GAC colleagues have been doing their best to be involved in that, if I can put it as politely as possible, while still been dealing with other things.

Then we move on quickly to the study group on the use of country names, and if we have time at the end of our hour we'd like to briefly talk about how we could work better together in terms of our -- both our interactions and bringing value to our engagement.

Anyway, to begin, we'll give you the IDN ccPDP update of which I'll hand over to Bart.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Thank you, Lesley. I hope everybody is awake now after this slight interruption. Next slide, please. Just to brief you on the current status of the IDN ccTLD Policy Development Process, in Beijing the council adopted the recommendations that came through the working groups with proposals for the selection of country -- of IDN ccTLD strings and on the inclusion of IDN ccTLDs in the ccNSO. As a result, just prior to the council meeting, the GAC has been formally asked for advice or opinion and that was on the 3rd of April and this is part -- this is part of the

Policy Development rules for the ccNSO as defined in Annex B of the bylaws. And currently we're in the process of a ccNSO members vote. Unfortunately, we had a first round of member -- of members vote that failed due to lack of voting. According to the rules, we have -- at least 50% of the members need to vote and we came three votes short. So 50% means 68 ccNSO members, and we were stuck with 65. So this method -- so this round of voting will not be deployed or employed and we are now into our second and final -- we will start a second and final round of voting that will start on the 24th of July until the 13th of August, and the quorum rule doesn't apply but we hope we will get more votes than the 50%. Next slide, please.

As I said, part of -- say the GAC has been asked for advice or opinion according to the Policy Development rules. Just for your information, the -- if you look at the -- the document itself, it consists, in fact, of three sections of recommendations or proposals. One, as I said, for the selection of IDN ccTLD strings. Secondly on the inclusion of IDN ccTLD strings in the IDN ccTLD managers in the ccNSO and some miscellaneous ones. I will briefly touch upon all of them. What you have to keep in mind is that in due course, when the board adopts the policy or the recommendations of the ccNSO the overall policy will replace the current fast track methodology. Next slide, please.

The structure of the policy itself, recommendations, as I said, on the selection of IDN ccTLD strings, more in detail, there are overarching principles that will guide the interpretation and implementation of the criteria and the procedures and document required and some miscellaneous recommendations, and if you look on the recommendations on inclusion, again overarching principles,

recommendations, and proposed changes to Article IX of the ICANN bylaws and Annex B Article IX deals specifically with the ccNSO.

You will find some notes and comments in the Final Report as well, but they're not part of the policy but assist the interpretation of the -- the statements of the policy itself. So that's explicitly noted. But it's helpful with the next steps of implementation in future. Next slide, please.

Main points of the policy for the selection of IDN ccTLD strings itself, the proposed policy will build on the fast track methodology. And it will address only a few issues and some substantive changes. First of all, the -- to date, under the fast track, the non -- non-ASCII -- the string had to be completely non-ASCII and the new -- in the new -- under policy itself, you'll see that the requested string needs to contain at least one non-ASCII character. So this would enable, for example, Espana with the tilde on the N, I believe it is, to become an IDN ccTLD string because the N with the tilde is a non-ASCII character. The confusing similarity issues that were -- that we saw our address probably. There was the two-panel structure, there is a placeholder on the IDN variant management issues, so that means in future time when the issues have been resolved around what is IDN variants and the policy issues are more clearer, that we will need to revisit it and add this to the policy itself, and there is an updated clarification of processes. Next slide, please.

The miscellaneous ones, and again, this is probably innovative in the sense of if you compare it with other policies. There is an explicit proposal and that the policy needs to be reviewed in five years after implementation, so as of the moment it becomes effective. There is the advice or recommendation to create an advisory group to assist staff

with the implementation itself, and after implementation, even during the execution. So -- and the recommendation is that this advisory group will be cross-constituency. So not just the ccNSO but also the recommendation to include one or two GAC members, maybe members of the GNSO and at-large, in order to look at the -- the scope of the policy and to assist the board and staff on -- with implementations if they have any questions. And finally, the final recommendation is to avoid any doubt or to clear -- clarify the role of the ccNSO with regard to the implementation plan is that the ccNSO council in effect, therefore the ccNSO community, monitors the implementation planning and adopts it, so there is a clear interaction between staff and the ccNSO as well with regard to implementation. And this is based on some of the experience we had with other policies. Next slide, please.

Inclusion of IDN ccTLDs in the ccNSO, the major overarching principle that is also for this -- with regard to the selection is that IDN ccTLDs and ASCII ccTLDs, so the current ccTLDs, should be treated similar and that's an overarching principle throughout both the -- both sections of, say, the recommendations. What it means, and if you look at what needs to be done to include IDN ccTLDs in the ccNSO, the membership definition needs to be adjusted. A principle choice and proposal from the working group and, say, endorsed by the council is there will be one vote per territory. In some cases -- and there are examples already -- you have 11 ccTLDs according, say, if you take into account the definition of the overarching principle for one territory or for one country. In this specific case this is India, and it's run by one entity. In that case the whole balance in the ccNSO would be distorted if all of them would become members and, say, on the other hand, because some countries

do just have one language, they could only be member through their ccTLD, current ccTLD. So the proposal is one vote per -- the main choice was one vote per territory, and there are some mechanisms proposed to make this -- to ensure this.

Again, a little -- a small adjustment on the initiation of PDPs. And the -- that surround it and no further changes. Next slide, please.

Now, as you may have noted in one -- say, when I gave you an update on the current status of the PDP, the ccNSO council had adopted the Final Report coming out of the Policy Development Process. At the same time, and because that was stable, the -- say that meant that the policy was stable, the ccNSO council proposed to the board to implement and experiment with the two-panel solution under the fast track methodology. This was done in order to ensure a couple of things. First of all, because it's a change in the way we're dealing with it and we want to make sure -- we wanted to make sure, say, from the CC side, that, say -- that we really addressed the issues that we've encountered with the confusingly similarity review. So therefore, it is done on an experimental basis under the fast track process to test the two-panel situation, especially -- and especially the methodology.

So on the 27th of June the board adopted the fast track -- and updated and amended fast track process implementation plan. And the -- with the amendment the -- the two-panel process, two-panel process for string similarity review is included in the implementation plan. So that was the first part of it. And at the same time it was clear the methodology still needs to be solidified, et cetera. And the second major change -- or the second request from the ccNSO, and that's been

implemented as well, is that all pending requests for IDN ccTLD strings under the fast track process should be given the opportunity to request a review by the second panel. And the implementation plan will become effective once the second panel is comprised. That means once it's been appointed and adopted, that is the end of -- by that time the methodology and the criteria, et cetera, will be solidified as well. That was my update.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you very much for that update, Bart.

For GAC colleagues, first of all, we do have a long-standing lead on this issue, Manal Ismail from Egypt. Unfortunately, she's not at the meetings today. So we appreciate your coming to brief us on that and to remind some of our more experienced colleagues and to inform some of our newer representatives, there have been two major activities regarding IDN or non-ASCII country code top-level domains. So many of you will know that there was a fast track put in place with very specific rules because it was expected to be just that, a fast track and not a long-standing policy in the area of introducing top-level domains that are country codes and again IDNs, not ASCII top-level domain country codes. And so that was put in place. And in the meantime, a Policy Development Process was initiated over the longer term, and that's what's being worked on and that's what we have just been updated about, is that longer term process. So we have not been commenting as a GAC on that longer term process. But it is important because it will replace the fast track once it is agreed. And so for any of you that are looking for -- or looking to introduce country code top-level

domains in IDNs in the future, then this is the policy that would apply once it has all been agreed.

So one point about the fast track that Bart just updated us about is the creation of a second review panel as part of the fast track. And I know this is significant for some of you because you had been seeking reconsideration in terms of the fast track because of results that you had received regarding a country code IDN request that you had made, and that has been discussed in the GAC before. So I think it's relevant to receive an update on that particular point as well. So I do thank you for that, Bart.

Germany, do you have a question?

GERMANY:

Yes. Thank you. I have a question regarding string similarity testing. We learned that there's an additional panel for defining or finding out string similarities as there is some kind of -- as far as I know, some kind of algorithm that has been developed for defining or finding out whether there are string similarities for this fast track process. And I just wanted to know whether this method, this criteria are exactly the same as the criteria now, used also for the gTLD process where we also introduce different scripts and also have the questions, as you may know between whether -- to what extent plurals and singulars are confusingly similar. It would be important that the criteria and the algorithm used for this would be the same ones and I just wanted to verify whether this is the case.

BART BOSWINKEL:

What you will see, say the criteria under the fast track and the new gTLD process will be the same. And are the same. And nothing has changed there. What has remained the same as well is that the first panel.

What has remained the same as well is the first panel under the fast track will be the same panel. So they will use the current methodology they have always been using.

The second panel, what it will do is we'll use the current state of, say, cognitive sciences regarding script recognition, et cetera, as a methodology to refine the findings of the first panel.

So it's another way of looking at the results and at the confusing similarity.

And the second panel, a second panel has not been introduced in the new gTLD process.

So in that sense, it is really experimental, and it's a real novelty.

For the -- I'm sorry, I can't tell you whether the algorithms and criteria for the current first panel and the new gTLD process are the same. I assume, and this is my assumption being a policy support that, that the algorithm will be the same, but as the two panels are different, they use a different methodology. Because they have -- If you look at it, the first -- the new gTLD panel doesn't have to look at the confusing similarity, for example, between -- with two-letter codes. And that's some of the issues we've encountered in the fast-track process; that some requested string were considered to be confusingly similar with two-letter codes.

That's one thing the new gTLD process doesn't do because you can't apply for a two-letter code under the new gTLD process.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, Bart.

Germany, does that answer your question?

You look like you might have a follow-up comment.

GERMANY: Yes. Because I think it's important that we really use the same methodology for both approaches. And I'm a bit surprised that, yes, there may be differences. And maybe also having a second panel could also be a proposal that we may use for further discussion. But this is something we need to go further for when we discuss the gTLD process.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, Germany.

Sri Lanka, you are next.

SRI LANKA: Thank you, Chair.

A brief comment. Sri Lanka, as you know, has benefited from the IDN ccTLD fast-track process, so in that context we value the work that's been done and welcome the interim report that has come out, and

recognize the fact that you are setting up an advisory group to assist in the implementation and other related work.

What is the time frame for comment on the report that has come out? Because we intend submitting comments, having not participated in the Beijing meeting. So this was a question I had in mind.

Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL:

This is a final report, as I said. It's already been adopted by the Council, and it is now for membership vote.

In that sense, there is no more, from a PDP point of view, policy development process point of view, there is no more public comment period.

As I said in my introduction, and if you look at the current state, the GAC has been asked for advice and opinion. And I don't know the status about -- of that one. But I assume that is the channel for you to comment upon, say, the final outcome of, say, the policy development process. Because that's the status right now.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you, Bart.

So because the GAC has not been following this as a whole, it may be the case that we would want to comment on the final report, or whatever has been agreed by the ccNSO Council. So I would just like to put down a marker there that we should allow for that opportunity and

take note of it as a GAC that this is an issue, I think, of importance to us in the GAC.

So let's not forget that and put down a marker that that is something that we should look at.

Okay.

Are there any other questions or comments?

EU Commission, please.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Yeah, just on your marker, Chair, I accept that point that GAC might want to further consider this but I would not wish to delay the process, and I just would like to be very clear.

CHAIR DRYDEN: On the IDN PDP? Yeah. Okay.

I have United States.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Madam Chair, and thank you all for the update. And my apologies for not having read the report in detail, so there may be an answer in the document.

But what you have talked about the second panel I think is very consistent with what the GAC submitted to ICANN after its Toronto meeting.

There was another element, and I'm just curious if that has worked into the proposed approach, which is an appeal process. And I was just curious to know if there was something like that in the proposal.

Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL:

The second panel, in that sense, is -- Now I have to be very careful. The second panel is to reconsider strings that did not pass the first panel.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you, Bart. And that is part of the IDN fast track, which is separate from the long-term policy development process where there is now a final report. And the long-term process will replace the fast track.

So you have been informed about two things: the status of the long-term policy development process that's been under way for some time, as well as a change to the fast track, while we still have it, to add a second panel that allows for reconsideration of decisions made by the first panel.

All right. So I think we can move on to the next. I don't see any more questions.

So we're going to look at the Framework of Interpretation Working Group. And, Keith, you're going to take us through that? Okay.

And again, for the GAC, this is a working group that is looking at providing further depth and color to existing documents, one of them

being GAC principles related to delegation and redelegation of country codes as well as the other relevant key documents on the same topic.

So, Keith, if you could update us. And I'll add as well that Frank March from New Zealand, who is our GAC lead, is also not here, so we're again going to look to the ccNSO to help us there. And I know the U.S., as well, has been involved in that working group.

So, Keith, please.

KEITH DAVIDSON:

Thank you, Heather. My name is Keith Davidson for those of you who don't know me, and I see a lot of unfamiliar faces in the room, And to my left is Bernie Turcotte, who is from ICANN -- or providing support contracted by ICANN. And I chair -- I have the joy of chairing the FOI working group.

And this might be best put as an attempt -- or this working group is attempting to avoid a policy development process, so the opposite of what has just been discussed.

This follows on from, as your chair was saying, from the work of the Delegations and Redelegations Working Group who reviewed all of the delegations and redelegations of Country Code Top Level Domains as decided by the ICANN Board since ICANN's inception, and from the outputs of that review, was charged with the development of a Framework of Interpretation, which is required to provide the color and depth to understand the policies and guidelines that are in existence.

Next slide, please.

So the working group itself comprises of mainly members from the ccNSO, but there are cross-constituency members from the GNSO, from At Large and from the GAC, and we appreciate that.

The scope of -- What I'll run through today is what the scope of the working group is, the processes we've used, the topics that we are interpreting, our activities since the last ICANN meeting, the topic of consent, the topic of significantly interested parties, and the topic of revocation. And they're really three of the four major aspects of our work.

Next slide, please.

So the scope of this working group was to examine RFC 1591 and the GAC principles of 2005, being the policies and guidelines that apply to the delegations and redelegations of ccTLDs. There are other documents that have asserted themselves to be policies and guidelines, but they've never met our threshold of support from the community. So we've confined ourselves to looking at these two documents and, from them, trying to provide, without going through a PDP, using those documents to provide a clear framework and predictable decision-making matrix.

Out of scope for the working group is a change in the applicable policy or guideline and also anything to do with the IANA functions contract, including the contract implementation issues or procedures.

Next slide.

The process is quite simple. We prepare a draft set of interpretations on each of our topics. We then undertake a public consultation. We

review the comments and input from that consultation and we prepare a final report.

Next slide.

The GAC and ccNSO -- since we started work, we've always anticipated that the best way that we could avoid having to do a policy development process would be to have GAC support for the final Framework of Interpretation. That way we can take a joint submission from the GAC and the ccNSO to the ICANN Board, confirming that support. And using the GAC vehicle of binding advice to the Board, it would become essentially the policy for following in the future.

Next slide, please.

The topics that we thought were most critical from the delegations/redelegations work that we did was the topic of consent and what consent by an existing manager might mean and how that might be implied consent or consent under duress and all of those issues.

There was also the issue about significantly interested parties, which might also sometimes be referred by some communities as the local Internet community, and what that might mean to -- you know, and who should be contacted and how to engage in support for the delegation holder.

And then there's the difficult topic, the most difficult topic we faced: The concept of revocation or unconsented redelegation. So RFC 1591 specifically provides a methodology by which a ccTLD might be revoked and may be again redelegated. And this has been a point of

considerable contention for our working group. In fact, from before Toronto, ICANN, through to now, this has been an absolute fixation for us, and I'm really pleased to advise that we have finally developed not just a consensus within the working group but a unanimous agreement about the aspects of revocation we have been trying to cover.

So after a long time struggling with this topic, we've got there and it's quite timely that we can now bring that back to the GAC.

I think our GAC colleagues on the working group haven't been following our debates very much over the past six months to a year because we've been bogged in our own detail on this, but we are pleading that they are reengaged from here on and as we get very close to finalizing our work.

Next slide, please.

And then at the end of our topics for interpretation, we intend producing a comprehensive glossary of terms so that we will see consistent terms used in every delegation/redelegation.

And then recommendations for IANA reports on the delegation and redelegation.

Next slide, please.

The activities we've had since the last ICANN meeting. We've met by five times -- five times by teleconference. We've just published a progress report on our activities, and you can pick that up from the ccNSO's part of the ICANN Web site. And as I've said, we're currently concluding the topic of revocation.

Next slide.

So the status on the consent topic, the final report is located at that link. And that will be included as the topic of consent in the final framework. And I think the GAC has already given its implied consent or agreement with that topic subject to final review in the full framework.

Next slide, please.

And the status on the significantly interested parties topic. We've concluded a round of public consultation and we will return to this topic, and it's due to come to the GAC for its consideration as one of the topics.

Next slide, please.

And on revocation, yes, we've done an analysis on the topic of revocation, but we are yet to finesse the final text on that, which we are doing on a face-to-face meeting here, and we aim to have an interim report on this topic for the B.A. meeting.

Next slide.

Probably the issues of interest on revocation, the concept of revocation of a delegation of a ccTLD could occur where the designated manager has substantially misbehaved, and we're providing some color and depth to what that substantial misbehavior might comprise of. And also the revocation could occur where there are persistent problems with the proper operation of a domain. So that's within the operation of the DNS.

And the other important aspect is that RFC 1591 provides a vehicle for appeal should the manager feel that the revocation was not appropriate, and it should be to an independent body rather than to the ICANN Board.

Next slide, please.

We are meeting here in Durban on Thursday for three hours in Hall 4D. And as always, observers are most welcome at that meeting, and we -- if we have time, we generally allow observers the opportunity to speak or participate in our discussions.

Next slide, please.

And there's the link to the actual working group pages, so you can look back through our history and our documents, and contact information for myself and Bernie.

And with that, I'll conclude my report and see if there's any questions.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you, Keith.

Are there any questions from the GAC?

Any comments?

Okay. Iran.

IRAN: Thank you, Madam Chairman, and thank you for the presentation.

Just a very small question for clarification.

What does it mean "implied consent"? Does it mean tacit agreement?

And the follow-up question or continuation of that, is it in this very area, tacit agreement is a proper way of proceeding? Or we need always specific agreement?

Thank you.

KEITH DAVIDSON: Good questions, and they're covered in considerable detail in the actual report. But essentially, the need -- the desire is to have consent properly recorded, and understanding that consent is not forced or that the person is giving their consent under free will and not with a gun held to their head and those sorts of issues.

So there needs to be a checking mechanism to go back and say, "Now, you really did mean yes" later, and so on.

So I think if you're interested in the topic, I'd be happy to discuss it, or read the report.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, Keith.

Yes, it's Nauru. Yes.

NAURU: Thank you, Keith. And -- for the update.

I'm just curious to find out whether there will be any conflict between these recommendations and RFC 1591.

KEITH DAVIDSON: No conflict at all. This is purely to add depth to it.

It's worth noting that RFC 1591 was created and published in 1994, and it does contain some factual errors today, like you should register with INTERNIC, and there's no such body called INTERNIC anymore, and so on. So it's not to try and clarify the redundant aspects of 1591 but purely to assert greater clarity over what is there.

So no conflict whatever.

CHAIR DRYDEN: United States, please.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, again. And thank you, Keith, for the overview and the update.

And as one of your GAC colleagues who has sort of volunteered to monitor this, Frank and I have fallen a bit behind, so we frankly will admit to that. It's the focus on new gTLDs.

But I would note that the GAC has actually provided comments to you on the first chapter on consent and the second chapter. So would you

be looking for us to provide comments on the revocation chapter and then we will have an exchange on the whole composite text? And we can sort of better assess how you have taken comments into account?

Thank you.

KEITH DAVIDSON: For the record, yes.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Okay. Thank you.

Are there any other questions?

Iran.

IRAN: Yes, Madam Chairman. Just now I take the other side. Is there any other area that you are seeking clarification from GAC that you are not clear? That you need further either clarification or confirmation or description, explanations and so on and so forth? Just I want to take the other side; that you raise the question to see whether we are in a position to answer, or whether we have to think of that.

Thank you.

KEITH DAVIDSON: A very good question. I think, no, nothing at this stage.

As we publish the reports, I'm sure New Zealand and U.S. will alert the GAC to the public consultation process, so individual governments may wish to make submissions or the GAC as a whole. So any individual can make submissions, too. So it's an open consultation process, but you'll know at that point that it is in a published form.

And hopefully before the Buenos Aires meeting.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Okay. Thank you. And thank you for pointing out the timing that that opportunity might come up before we meet next. So that will allow us to track it.

Okay. All right.

So let's move to the next topic. And, Lesley, if you can.

LESLEY COWLEY:

Okay. So the next topic is the study group on the use of country names.

The presenter portion, who chairs this working group is here with us but I'm afraid he is unwell, so he has asked Bart to give the GAC colleagues an update.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Thank you, Lesley.

Just this will be a very brief update.

The working -- or the study group, and the full name is the Study Group on the Use of Country and Territory Names as TLDs. So it is -- in its

name you already see it's providing -- this is the mandate of the group. It has provided an overview of all relevant current and future policies with respect to the use of country and territory names. as a TLD. So it's not just ccTLD. It's also gTLD related policies.

The second task I had is to develop a typology of country names. One of the reasons was, if you look at the applicant guidebook, it has a list of what are considered country and territory names, although they're excluded from the first round. And in the ccTLD world there are different definitions. And probably there are other definitions out there as well. So it developed a typology of country names. And, based on the typology, it looked at the policies again and tried to identify issues, if any, when, say, these -- with regard to these different types of country names. And, finally, if it found reasons to, it could recommend any further action to the ccNSO council.

Participants in this working group were from the ccNSO, GNSO, at large. And we had assistance from UNESCO. And we had one or two of your members as observers on the working group as well but really as observers.

So, as I said, the draft final report is now out for public comment. And I will just focus on the main observations of this study group and then on the two recommendations of this study group to the ccNSO council. Major observations was that the typology in the working group or the study group has developed, has been validated through a UNESCO survey. The UNESCO kindly sent out a survey to 39 of its member states and checked whether these different categories of country names were

meaningful to the relevant governments who were involved in that survey.

So that was -- there's no statistical significance or anything. But they were meaningful. And, as such, the study group considers them validated. There is a description of the process in the report.

Secondly, as I said, and you're probably all aware, it's a very, very complex area, especially in light of the multitude of languages and scripts. As soon as you start talking about differences in languages, you come into what is -- how many languages are there. Depending on the issue you use, you might end up with 7,000 living languages. And, if you would apply this to all country names and territory names, you come up with an endless list. So, clearly, then, there needs to be a framework around this. Unfortunately, and based on this one, there is no authoritative list that captures all the nuances regarding country and territory names.

And, finally -- and this is probably going back to the mandate of the working group and the main observation, there is no consistent treatment of country and territory names across the ccNSO and GNSO policy. So it depends very much on which path you take or can take how the country or territory name will be treated and whether or not it may be delegated.

So, going to the recommendations, the current draft recommendations to the ccNSO council -- and please note we had participants from the GNSO as well. This was a unanimous recommendations to the ccNSO council to set up a cross-community working group to review the

current definitions and propose a consistent framework across the different policies.

So -- and as it is so complex area and as it touches upon so many interests of the different stakeholders, the working group recommended it to be a cross community. And the GAC and other SOs and ACs will be invited as part of that cross-community working group.

But that's next stage. But that is at least a draft recommendation.

And the second draft recommendations under this tied to the first one - - and please recall the applicant guidebook. Under the first round of the new gTLD round, country names and territory names in all languages were excluded as new gTLDs.

The ccNSO council is recommended to request the board to extend this rule under the new -- in the applicant guidebook until such time that the first -- that this cross-community working group comes up with the framework how to deal with the country and territory names under the different policies.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you, Bart. Are there any questions on this topic? Iran.

IRAN:

Thank you, Madam Chairman. Again, thanks for the presentation. You said that you go to the UNESCO. Do you go to the Secretariat of UNESCO, or is it member states or member of UNESCO that replied to that? Because there's a difference between the Secretariat, which has

limited responsibility and mandate, and with the replying entity. That is question number one.

Question number two: You said that up to 7,000 different languages and so on and so forth. Is -- when I look into the countries and territories name, so on and so forth in other fora, I see that there are other policies due to the same difficulties you mentioned. There are limitations and sometimes, not always, but sometimes limited to specific limitations that make it clear for the people or the countries -- not people, governments, so on and so forth. So I didn't quite grasp your idea about the number of languages used for these country names and so on and so forth and how you are going to build up that and finish that. And you said that the principles in the guidebook will not be updated until you have -- can come up to a reasonable solution. Could you please further clarify the situation with respect to the languages? I can give you one example. For instance, in one organization, we have 6 languages so on and so forth but not more than that. So I would like to have more information about that. Perhaps I have not properly -- yes, thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Do you mind, Heather, that I answer? Let me start with the second question.

If you look at -- and that's the reason why it was included. And that's why I use it as an example. In the applicant guidebook, there is a footnote rule that under the first round of new gTLD applications, country and territory names will be excluded in all languages. In all languages. If you do not have definitions in the languages you use, you

could end up -- that's why I used the example of 6,000. It's not what this study group is thinking of. It is currently part of the applicant guidebook. Is that you could end up, if you go to the -- I think it's the ISO 639-3, there are 7,000 languages listed. So, if you do that -- multiply that by all country and territory names, you end up with an enormous list. And that's currently policy. So it's -- yeah, in fact, the other way around. That's why this study group said there needs to be consistency. In the way it's currently framed, yeah, it's unworkable. And your example of six languages, et cetera, yeah, then the whole mathematical issue or the scalability of that rule becomes completely different.

Going back to your first question regarding UNESCO, there is an MoU between UNESCO and ICANN. Under that MoU, the UNESCO as such has kindly assisted the study group. And what they've done -- and that is documented in this interim report. They took on to send out a survey to its member states. And this survey -- so the member states responded. And the Secretariat of UNESCO collected the data and provided this to us. And that was clearly stated in the survey, et cetera. So it's not -- it is the response of the member states -- 39 member states that say that's a sample just to test the typology. Does this answer your question?

CHAIR DRYDEN: Iran?

IRAN: Not exactly. But I would be happy to talk to you outside the meeting because of the limitation of the time that we have.

But, with respect to the MoU, at least in some international organizations, the issue of MoU was discussed. And one of the distinguished governments present of this meeting -- I don't want to name anybody -- raised the question that the validity of this MoU is based, whether it is approved by the council or by the highest organ of that unit. Otherwise, the simple MoU of the Secretariat or outside organization may not warrant it. So we have to be careful. And that suggestion of that country recently is now under discussion in that organization. And they're going to come back and to review all Memorandum of Understanding and to see which one missed the criteria for validity of that Memorandum of Understanding. Because that Memorandum of Understanding has been signed with that head of the organization which has the authority but under certain conditions and criteria. Just as explanatory reasons why I have mentioned it. But for the second questions, I will be happy to talk to you. Because still I'm not very clear about the languages. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you. I have Italy next.

ITALY:

Thank you, Chair. It is well-known that the country codes have a margin of organization and policy and so forth protecting territory names in particular, because this is the working group we are discussing right now. So, certainly, if one tried to make a -- an inquiry and then a report on what are the expectations or the actually protected names in the frame of the single country code. We certainly find a lot of variety. And

so I can understand that finding general criteria for approaching this problem within ccNSO is not easy.

But what I would like to know, since you say that the GNSO is participating actively in the working group, what is the scope of this representation of GNSO is to do something that is useful for even the new gTLDs in this direction and to understand better a general policy concerning country names? So I would like to know which is their contribution, their expectation from?

BART BOSWINKEL:

The GNSO participated and, hence, it was called a study group in understanding the scope of the issues. The GNSO, as I said, this report and all the final report will be submitted to the ccNSO council. The GNSO has been kept abreast of the developments. And members of the GNSO, so not the GNSO itself, but the individual members participating in this working group unanimously agreed with the recommendations. And whether -- I can't speak on behalf -- nor can I speak on behalf of the ccNSO is -- how this GNSO as a whole will react on the draft recommendations is up to the GNSO. At the end of the day it will be a recommendation to the ccNSO council. And, based on that recommendation, the ccNSO council needs to adopt it and send it to the ICANN board and send out -- and create that cross-community -- invite other SOs and ACs to participate in that cross-community working group.

So that is the mandate. So it was really to -- and this was really to understand the issues involved without going into actions or come up with an alternative whatsoever. That needs to develop -- be developed

in the consistent manner across and with the assistance and participation of the GNSO and other SOs and ACs. Hopefully -- does it answer your question?

ITALY: Yes, thank you. And I add simply that you said you know that your protection of geographic names is one of the priorities that GAC has also in discussion on new gTLDs. So the -- an exchange between this activity is certainly more than welcome. And you say that there are already a couple of observers from the GAC. Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you. Okay. And let's move to our last item for today. Okay.

LESLEY COWLEY: Thank you, Heather. So our last item for today is an open question. How can we work more effectively together? And that is a question for both GAC and ccNSO colleagues in the room. So we interestingly have some ccNSO members who have been on the GAC. And vice versa.

And it is interesting that, over the years that they have been involved, they would observe that sometimes there are great interactions between the GAC and the ccNSO. Sometimes we go away maybe feeling there's something we haven't quite achieved.

Certainly, I think in recent times it's fair to say that it feels as though we are reporting in often at quite a late stage perhaps having not been engaged or been able to engage with you as much as we both would like.

We have also had occasions where we have shared experiences. Colleagues who are present may remember that we shared -- we had the Netherlands government and registry sharing experiences of implementing DNSSEC. So there is a suggestion that, in order to make our time together mutually beneficial, we might think about whether we would want to do more of that.

So this is an open question. We'd be really happy to hear your views, or maybe that's something the GAC would separately like to take away and think about. How do we both get more value from this meeting and our interaction?

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you. Okay. So we have a question from the ccNSO to all of us. Thoughts, Argentina. Please.

ARGENTINA:

Thank you, Chair.

And thank you, Lesley. And thank you all, ccNSO, for being with us today.

I want to make a question.

Have we, as GAC, ever had a sort of liaison with the ccNSO or something similar to that? Is it possible to have it?

KEITH DAVIDSON:

Yes, there used to be a functioning liaison group between the GAC and the ccNSO for a few years back on the previous chair's watch. And it --

you know, there were five members from each of the GAC and ccNSO. Each had appointed a chair, and those chairs would work together on the agenda for the joint meetings. That was working with some success sometimes but not always fully successful. But it may be a liaison exercise that's worth doing. I think the real benefit from such a group would be that that group continues to swap information all the time, all the relevant information as it comes to them and, therefore, feeling informed and informing the communities along the way. So it does take significant effort to do. It's not a simple task. It does require dedicated resource. And that's probably the main reason why it didn't always work well.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you. Are there any other comments? Okay.

So a suggestion to look at a liaison arrangement.

The Netherlands, please.

NETHERLANDS:

Yes, thank you, Lesley, for the question. I think what we had in the past sometimes was very good and very productive and sometimes was all due to other more important -- well, let's say more time-consuming issues, we were not so directly in contact with the ccNSO on CC matters. What I think is -- I think it's a valid question. One of the things which we could do, and I think we also have internal discussions with GAC members to improve our working methods is, for example, to -- in anticipation of every session we have together, ccNSO, GAC, but also GAC with other, that we formulate some questions already to be tackled

that we maybe already share our presentations that we can prepare ourselves. So this -- I think there's plenty room of improvement. So thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, Netherlands. Italy, please.

ITALY: Okay. First of all, an historical note. Today ccNSO has ten years anniversary. The GAC produced two versions of country code management principles. The first one before ccNSO existed and it was not so well appreciated by the community of country code at that time. Someone recalled that. Then we -- as soon as we established links with the ccNSO the relation improved a lot and in our second version of this country code management we interacted consistently. So another thing to say is that except the number of GAC representatives have direct links with the government -- with the country codes but a certain percentage, not so many. In any case, the relation is important because we are part of the same organization and then also with the new gTLDs there would be elaborations and impacts on the market, let's say, of the domain name as a whole and there is another value of this interaction that we might have. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, Italy. I think this is a good place to begin to close the session, but I see the U.K. Okay.

UNITED KINGDOM:

Are you allowing me to speak? Okay, thanks. I mean, just a thought partly prompted by Italy was that the membership of our two entities, ccNSO and the GAC, in terms of nation states probably doesn't match up. And there may be some joint working we could do in terms of promoting membership of our respective organizations. You know, the CC registry and the country where there's no GAC representation. You know, there's probably some joint effort we could construct for promoting the model engagement.

And secondly, a joint project may be one way of triggering some close bonding interaction. I don't have a suggestion for subject matter of a joint project, but maybe we can think about that. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you, U.K. I know the ccNSO has approached us a few times to work with us to increase the membership of both our respective parts of the community. So I'm sure that's welcome news, that there is still interest in working together in that way.

So to come back to the good news that I think our Italian colleague has helped us move into regarding the tenth anniversary and this history of work that has been demonstrated between the ccNSO and the GAC, there will be a party tonight to celebrate the tenth anniversary. And so let's all join that celebration where we can, and as well, I think it's quite appropriate to acknowledge Lesley's efforts as chair of the ccNSO for this period. This will be Lesley's last meeting in the chair role of the ccNSO so it's quite appropriate for us, I think, to thank Lesley and to acknowledge those efforts.

[Applause]

LESLEY COWLEY: Thank you very much, Heather. Don't worry, I'm not going too far. Thank you. Okay. On that note we close?

CHAIR DRYDEN: Yes. So for the GAC, let's have our coffee break, 30 minutes. And a smartphone was left in the room from our last session in the GAC, so it is at the back table and I -- I guess if you can do an accurate description of what it is, we will hand it back to you. Okay.

LESLEY COWLEY: So for ccNSO colleagues left in the room, we're going to take our coffee and then be back in our main room in 15 minutes. Thank you.

[END OF AUDIO]