BUENOS AIRES – GAC Plenary 10 (with ccNSO)
Tuesday, November 20, 2013 – 14:00 to 16:00
ICANN – Buenos Aires, Argentina

CHAIR DRYDEN: Good afternoon, everyone. Let's get started with our joint session of the GAC and the ccNSO. And let me introduce my co-chair for this session, Byron Holland, who is incoming or now the chair of the ccNSO. What is the --

BYRON HOLLAND: Brand-new.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Brand-new. Okay.

So welcome. We have a few agenda topics to go over today. From the GAC point of view, I think some of the things that we've identified as a priority is to have a bit of an update on the framework of interpretation working group which looks at delegation and redelegation issues associated with country codes using existing documents including the GAC principles regarding delegation and redelegation.

And we have a lead in the GAC from New Zealand, Frank March, who may want to relate some of that information to GAC colleagues. And we have a short summary as well that's been circulated by New Zealand. So that should be in your materials to refer to.

In addition, an update regarding the IDN policy development process, something that we haven't been following closely in the GAC. So much of our time and focus has been on generic top-level domains that these are the kinds of issues that we do want to at least be aware of. And then, if there is anything to contribute or comment on, that ensuring that we are in a position to do so. And, as well, the GAC will be talking tomorrow about an issue related to the release of two-letter characters, two-letter -- well, potentially, country codes in brand top-level domains. So there's a provision in the guidebook related to gTLDs and some sort of issue about what is the process, does there need to be a particular process around that. And, if there are a lot of requests coming to GAC members about those two-letter country codes, then what are the implications for the GAC, really, GAC members individually to be able to contend with that? So those are the three things we'd like to identify as a priority for discussion in this session.

And then, from the ccNSO side, you may as well also have -- you may also have issues that you'd like to add. So thank you for coming to meet with us and to having this exchange.

Can I hand over to you at this point, Byron? Is that -- okay. Please, go ahead.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you, Heather, and all the members of the GAC. I'm pleased to be here in my first really official day as chair of the ccNSO or new chair of the ccNSO at my first ICANN meeting in that capacity.

So we have several significant topics. I think much of the time will be spent around the framework of interpretation working group. But we wanted to start with an update of the IDN ccPDP that we've gone through. And Bart, in his capacity as issue manager on this issue, is going to provide the update. Bart, over to you.

BART BOSWINKEL: Good afternoon. I will be very brief for -- as a change.

The -- from a ccNSO perspective, the IDN PDP is not closed. But we've done what we've done. The final -- or the board report, including the voting of the ccNSO members, have been submitted to the ICANN board in September of this year.

If you look, it is -- say, from a substantive point of view, it's the same as the final report of that that has been forwarded to you.

What -- if you look at the PDP itself, what it addresses is, in fact, two points. First one is the overall action or the policy on the action of IDN ccTLD strings. This part of the PDP replaces or is intended to replace the fast track process, takes into consideration all the experiences with the fast track process and the reviews, et cetera.

And the second part of the PDP deals with the inclusion of IDN ccTLDs in the ccNSO. Currently, that is not possible. And there needs to be some bylaw changes.

That is my update where we are. I think the substantive parts of it have already been communicated to you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:	Thank you, Bart.

If I can ask Manal from Egypt to comment. Manal has been working on these issues for some time, whether it's the fast track or related to some of the technical issues associated with IDNs. So, if you could say a few comments, that would be very welcome. Please.

EGYPT:

Thank you, Heather. And thank you, Bart, for the brief. Just to remind colleagues that the GAC has been closely work with the ccNSO on this issue as early as the issues paper and the fast track. And also we have raised flagged out some concerns at the Prague communique which I believe have already been addressed with this two-panel evaluation process, which is much welcomed.

I also believe that I have to remind everyone that this is going to replace the fast track process. And, in that respect, we might need also to review our interim GAC principles, because those were compiled for the fast track. Now, in light of the PDP that's in place, we might need to review our interim principles and ultimately label them as GAC principles for the ongoing process. And I believe we've already received a letter from the board seeking our advice. So we probably will be also providing such advice. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you, Manal. That sounds like a reasonable proposal to me. So we can, as a GAC, have a look at the interim principles and respond to the board about the final report that is out there.

Are there any questions from the GAC on the issue of the IDN policy development process for country codes and the transition from the fast track approach over to using the policy development process results?

EU Commission.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION:
Thank you very much. I just, in this context, would like to draw your attention a little bit about dot EU in Greek script. Basically, saying that, of course, we now welcome that there is a second panel being set up for this. And we are very appreciative that we are able to review the previous decision on this.

I think it is important. This process now is conducive to, actually, the delegation of a dot EU in Greek. I think that, from a political and legal point of view, it is untenable for the European Union not to be able to use one of its official languages on the Internet with dot EU.

So I just appeal to the procedure that it is -- procedure that will be conducive to, actually, the fact that we will have a dot EU in Greek script. Otherwise, I really don't know the consequences of what would happen. It has been dragging on for too long time now. We would like very much to see that it happens really quickly. We have been promised several times that it would happen relatively soon.

But this is a situation, as I said, for European Union that has 24 official languages that we cannot write something in one of the official languages of our EU Union in -- on our own ccTLD. It's, of course, completely unacceptable in the long run. So thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you for those comments. Would anyone like to comment on that particular aspect of the process? Otherwise, we can certainly take note of your concerns and take in any other comments or questions on this. Switzerland?

SWITZERLAND: Thank you. And hello to everybody.

We have detected something that we think maybe should be discussed or considered in the ccNSO policy development process regarding IDNs. There is a line that talks about selection of IDN ccTLD strings and claims that they should be a meaningful representation of the name of the territory in a designated language of that country.

And we actually think that this is problematic, because your territory is your national sovereignty in any language of the world and not just in the languages that are spoken or that are designated languages of your country for, let's say, official politically accepted languages of the country.

So, if, for instance, a Chinese speaking minority in Switzerland, that would be useful to have dot CH in Chinese language or in Russian, in the Cyrillic alphabet, that should not be something that is under the control of the country or the region that uses normally this alphabet. But it should be under control in the sovereignty of the country of the territory that is named, no matter what the script actually is.

So we think this is something that doesn't make sense in our views. We just wanted to flag this. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, Switzerland. That's an interesting point.

                       Would anyone like to comment on this or talk about this particular issue
                       and how it has been discussed either by the fast track or the current
                       policy development process? U.K., please.

UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. Good afternoon, everybody.

                       Just to say, actually, I do get inquiries on this. I've got one on my desk at
                       the moment. Why can't dot U.K. be in Chinese script? There seems to
                       be a kind of discriminatory approach here. And there may well be trade
                       aspects related to this. British companies registered under dot U.K. in
                       other countries are not able to provide email addresses in the script of
                       those other markets.

                       So I support Switzerland's intervention on this point. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, U.K.

                       I do recall that with the fast track this was a criteria that was identified
                       because that was meant to be a more limited approach to quickly get
                       some country codes to be put in place. But I admit to not being familiar
                       with the policy development process and the key elements of that.

                       Were there any other comments or questions on this issue or anything
                       else related to the country code policy development process? Norway,
                       please.

NORWAY: Yes, thank you. Just a quick comment in the line what Switzerland and the U.K. commented. And, of course, that should, in our view, also, it should be possible. Because, with reference to the fast track -- for the sake of the fast track, of course, it was agreed that they should be only official languages in the country for that application and so on. But that was for the purpose of actually achieving a fast track process. So, of course, that's why the limitation for that was made for the fast track. So now, of course, it's a general PDP. And we should have sort of let those limitations in our view. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, Norway.

                         Egypt.

EGYPT: Just to highlight that the -- I think the U.K. concern has already been forwarded to the working group. And I believe there has been a response to this. So I'm not sure if we have it with us right now. But, Bart, if you can let us know what the status of this is.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, Egypt. Okay. So is this for follow-up later on; or would you like to comment now, Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL: Let me check what was in -- it was submitted, I believe, on the interim report. Let me check with the working group and what happened to the

comment you made at the time and send it -- and forward it to you. Because it's been dealt with in the usual way. And it will be recorded anyway. But I will forward you. And, through Manal, I will send the response of the working group during the interim -- during the process.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Great. Thank you. That would be appreciated. And then, once we see the follow-up that has occurred on that question, then the GAC can determine what, if anything further, we would comment on or do.

Are there any other issues to raise in relation to the IDN country code policy development process? Okay. I think that's probably the main issue. Okay. All right. So can we move to the next topic then? Okay. Over to you, Byron.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thanks, Heather. The next topic is an update on the framework of interpretation working group. And for that I will pass it over to Keith Davidson, the chair of the working group.

KEITH DAVIDSON: Thanks, Byron. For those who don't me, my name is Keith Davidson. And I have the joy of chairing the framework of interpretation working group. And, just from an historical perspective, the working group grew out of an earlier study on delegations and redelegations, decisions on ccTLDs that was a review of all of the decisions made by ICANN since its inception. And from that it gave rise to the need or the -- yes, a need to

have a -- some color and depth around the existing policies and guidelines, namely, RFC 1591 and the GAC principles of 2005.

With me today on my left is Bernie Turcotte, who is contracted by ICANN to provide support for this working group. And also on Byron's right is Becky Burr who is vice chair of the working group and has been instrumental in crafting some of the -- or finessing some of the more delicate parts of the script along the way. We do have a presentation, and it is quite intense. There is quite a bit of subject material in it on the topic of revocation. So I'll hand over to Bernie and get Bernie to walk us through it. Thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Thank you, sir. All right. Since it's been a little while we've gone through this, we'll go through the basics again. So, for those that remember, I apologize immediately. And, for those that don't, I think it will set the stage for the information we're providing a little later on.

We'll be going through the working group's scope, our processes, the topics we have been working on interpreting, the activities since Durban, where we are relative to consent, significantly interested parties, and revocation.

Next slide, please.

Applicable policies. So, basically, the only thing we are looking at are RFC 1591 and the GAC principles 2005.

The framework of interpretation is to add color and depth to existing policies and guidelines.

Out of scope: Changing applicable policies or guidelines. The IANA functions contract, including contract implementation issues or procedures.

We're clearly only focused on interpreting in a clear fashion RFC 1591 and the GAC principles. And why is that?

Well, as Keith mentioned earlier, a rather detailed review of delegations and redelegations of ccTLDs for the past 20 so years, almost, really brought out a lot of questions. And that was detailed to a great extent in the delegations/redelegations working group report, which is online at the ccNSO, should you care to go through that.

Next slide, please.

Our processes internally. The working group prepares drafts out of interpretations for a specific topic in an interim report, such as the consent report. The working group undertakes a public consultation of that draft. The working group reviews comments and input from the public consultation. And the working group prepares a final report of interpretation for a topic.

That's the general presentation that we give to the public. We're always glad to take input from the GAC in any format that it comes so we can increase the quality of our work.

Next slide, please.

Continuing on the process, the GAC and the ccNSO support for the final report for all topics is mandatory. I mean, we cannot go forward

without the support of both the ccNSO and the GAC. And we're very clear on that.

Submission of the final report to ICANN will confirm that it has been approved by the GAC and the ccNSO and will contain the framework and its associated recommendations.

So just as a little bit of a background. Initially when we started out, there was a thought that we could do these serially; i.e., get the recommendations out, get them to the GAC, get them approved by the ccNSO, get them approved by the GAC, and send them on. And with our first topic of consent, it became clear with the comments from the GAC that really you would appreciate seeing the entire package before making any kind of decisions. Everyone thought that was extremely reasonable, so we changed the approach, and we're at the point of packaging all the substantial recommendations.

Next slide, please.

The topics for interpretation. Consent for delegation and redelegation requests. The final report is complete, and I believe you've received a copy of that.

Significantly interested parties, or SIP, the public consultation is complete. We have gotten some comments back from the GAC, and because there was a strong focus from the GAC during that period on other topics, we did not complete that, and that was on purpose from our part until we could get some bandwidth here to do so properly.

Revocation of our current topic or unconsented redelegations. The working group has reached a consensus on recommendations for the

EN

revocation of the delegation of a ccTLD and the public consultation is currently ongoing until the end of December.

Next slide, please.

The remaining topics, which are not critical to the activities we're doing here, include a comprehensive glossary of terms to be used. Why is this actually on the list? There is actually a very good reason why this is on the list. If one goes through the documentation in the history of delegations and redelegations from IANA, there are some dramatic changes in language that appear with no documented reason for them. Yet signify in many cases a change in the interpretation of policies. And this was -- occurred often enough that it was a concern to us, and we felt that to avoid misconceptions at various levels, it would probably be very practical to define exactly what we mean by certain terms and how they are applied.

Just one example of this is that there is actually no formal definition in the policy documents of what a redelegation is. There actually is a term that's called "transfer," and that can work. And that has a certain meeting as to what it involves.

Finally, recommendations for IANA reports on delegation and redelegation, which sort of dovetails with what we were talking about previously.

Over the last 17 years or whatever that we have been looking at IANA reports for delegations and redelegations, as mentioned earlier, the language has varied significantly, the format has varied significantly, and the content has been highly variable depending on given situations.

And we feel it would be nice to set some type of boundaries as to what are minimum standards to be respected so everyone can understand what is going on.

Next slide, please.

So those are our topics.

Activities since Durban. The working group has met by teleconference five times, published a progress report on our activities, which can be found at the ccNSO Web site, and we have published the public consultation on draft recommendations for revocation.

Next slide, please.

That's more for the history. You can look up the presentation and obtain the exact Web address of the documents should you require it.

Next slide.

I believe we probably skipped one. Ah. Nope, the other way. Ah.

That was consent. I apologize. So consent for us is closed, and will be included in the final report.

Next slide, please.

The status on SIP, significantly interested parties. Again, another interesting word. Many of you may not have heard it. After combing through the policy documentation and various other documentation, we became convinced that this was the correct term, although you may have seen it in a variety of other formats, including local Internet community. But if you actually go through the documentation, the

thing that is fairly steady since the beginning "significantly interested parties."

As mentioned earlier, we haven't closed the chapter on that, and we are looking forward to doing so as we come to a close on the substantial issues for the FOI Working Group, which will be consent, SIP, and revocation. The other things being rather administrative in nature, and probably not of any significant interest to this group.

Next slide, please.

Status on revocation. Before we get into details on this, because there is a fair amount of meat, we finished going onto -- over the background that has brought us to revocation, and should we actually have any process questions or questions on the history, we'll be glad to take them at this point.

Frank.

NEW ZEALAND: Yeah, thank you. And thank you, Keith and Bernie, for a very clear outline of the current status of the FOIWG work.

I'll just very, very briefly note that we have submitted comments on the significantly interested parties draft report, and I have, on the 31st of October, circulated to the GAC a very brief summary of -- outlining the fact that the revocation report was open for public comment in draft form and invited members of the GAC to contact me with any comments they wanted to make at this meeting, this face to face with the -- with the ccNSO.

I didn't receive any in that time. It was to -- we have been very busy with other work, so that's, I think, understandable. As Bernie said, the bandwidth is limited.

But I have, since being here, had some brief comments from colleagues, and I will -- I'll invite them to comment in a moment.

The main comment we had on the significantly interested parties was whether sufficient attention had been given to the GAC principles and the role of governments in these -- on these issues. It may well be that we'll have similar comments on the revocation draft report, but that's over to colleagues to comment.

So I don't want to say anything more, but that is the position.

I just want to say that I think that I'd like to be in a position, through you, Heather, and the consent of colleagues in terms of our consensus process, that we will be in the position and we will submit a final comment from the GAC to be in the position to align ourselves with the ccNSO so that it can be a joint report to the Board or to IANA at an appropriate time. It's a matter of scheduling that work. I don't anticipate that it will be very difficult, but it may take some time, given other preoccupations of the GAC at the moment.

And so just in conclusion, I wonder, Keith, when -- because it hasn't, as far as I can see, been on any of these slides. When are you expecting or hoping to close off this work with a final report to the Board?

KEITH DAVIDSON: Can we come back to that in a moment or two, please, Frank. And, yeah, we paused at this stage to talk about this process to here.

We still have quite a bit of presentation around what's included in revocation. So if we could come back afterwards and discuss that, if that's all right?

NEW ZEALAND: Yeah, sure. That will be very welcome because I know that the opportunity for members of the GAC to read that report has been limited.

KEITH DAVIDSON: Thanks.

Please continue, Bernie.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Thank you, sir. All right. On to the meat of the topic.

Revocation.

Actually, revocation is another interesting term relative to the glossary. For those who have been aren't for a while, probably the better known term is unconsented redelegation. Actually, again, if you go through the details of the policy and the history, that just doesn't exist. It's not there.

So we've tried to realign everything so that it makes sense versus the words that are actually used in policy.

RFC 1591 identifies three mechanisms available to the IANA operator: Delegation, transfer, and revocation. Official actions that actually impact the functioning of a ccTLD, there are only three. And those are it.

Under RFC 1591, a transfer requires the consent of the incumbent ccTLD manager. And the actual segment of 1591 that states that is about just slightly longer than that.

Also, um recall that we have closed our -- the topic of consent, and it applies exactly to this.

Revocation refers to the process by which the IANA operator rescinds responsibility for management of a ccTLD from a manager.

Next slide, please.

The FOI Working Group interprets RFC 1591 to limit revocation to cases where the IANA operator can reasonably demonstrate that there are persistent problems with the operation of the domain, or the manager continues to engage in substantial misbehavior despite the efforts of the IANA operator using all means at its disposal to resolve such conduct.

Next slide, please.

If a manager is engaged in substantial misbehavior or there are persistent problems in the operation of a ccTLD, and the ccTLD manager is unwilling or unable to rectify the problems to the reasonable satisfaction of the IANA operator and/or stop the offending conduct, the IANA operator may propose a transfer.

EN

So again, there's a focus that really the notion of revocation is a last resort, and we are trying to be very clear that it's a last resort. We're trying to be very clear about what you have to try to do before you get there.

Next slide, please.

If the manager does not consent to a proposed transfer, the only mechanism available to the IANA operator to deal with ultimately intractable problems is revocation.

So basically you'll remember that when we started this segment, there are really only three things IANA can do that can actually physically impact the operation of a ccTLD. They can delegate it, they can transfer it, or they can revoke it. If it's a running ccTLD, it has been delegated. Can't delegate it again. You can transfer it, but if the manager is unwilling to transfer, really the only thing left is revocation.

Next slide, please.

The FOI Working Group interprets the intent of RFC 1591 to provide revocation as the last resort option for the IANA operator. The IANA operator should use all means at its disposal to assist the manager to change conduct considered to be substantial misbehavior by the manager.

Revocation should only be considered if the IANA operator reasonably demonstrates that the manager is unable or unwilling in an appropriate time frame to resolve specified material failures to carry out its responsibilities under RFC 1591, and/or carry out those responsibilities in a manner required by RFC 1591.

So again, we're trying to be very clear. This is the nuclear option. Last resort; this is the context where you're using it.

Next slide, please.

If the IANA operator revokes a delegation, it should attempt, in collaboration with the significantly interested parties to ensure the ccTLD will continue to resolve names until a suitable replacement can take over.

Revocation does not imply that the ccTLD will be removed from the root.

So we're trying to be very clear here again. We're talking about the right to manage the ccTLD and not the right of the ccTLD to be in the root, because if you take it out of the root, everything goes dark. That's a fact.

Next slide, please.

The FOI Working Group believes that it is consistent general principles of fairness and with RFC 1591 to afford an affected manager the opportunity to appeal a notice of revocation issued by the IANA operator to an independent body.

And I think that speaks for itself.

Now, this one's a bit long. For those who have a little bit more problems with English, I'll try to give the translation staff a bit of a hand by not going through this too fast.

The FOI Working Group notes, however, that the IANA operator will rarely be in a good position to evaluate the extent to which a manager is carrying out the necessary responsibilities of a ccTLD operator in a manner that is equitable, just, honest, or, except insofar as it compromises the stability and security of the DNS, a competent manner.

Accordingly, the FOI Working Group interprets RFC 1591 to mean that the IANA operator should not step in regarding issues of equity, justice, honesty, or, except insofar as it compromises the stability and security of the DNS, competency, and that such issues would be better resolved locally.

So basically on these types of issues, we're just really drawing a fence around them and sort of saying, yes, they're part of RFC 1591, and the way to deal with them is locally.

Next slide, please.

We come to the end of our segment. We'll finish doing our slides and take questions after. There is also -- we noted that there is a -- there was some question about what exactly significant misbehavior means, and we did not have that text in there, so I will read it to you. Given what you've seen, you'll see it's not too bad. Misbehavior, the FOI Working Group interprets misbehavior in this context to refer to conduct involving the failure of a manager, 1, to carry out the necessary responsibilities of that role, or, 2, carry out those responsibilities in the manner required by RFC 1591.

That is essentially the same text you saw up there a little earlier.

The substantial misbehavior part is the part you don't have and we apologize for this but it is in the document.

Substantial misbehavior. The FOI Working Group interprets substantial misbehavior involved misbehavior, as defined above, that is either egregious or persistent and may include performing the necessary responsibilities of a manager in a way that imposes serious harm or has substantial adverse effects -- impact on the Internet community by posing a threat to the stability and security of the DNS.

So we've tried to sort of frame this within what we saw as being applicable in these areas.

As usual, we will be having our FOI Working Group meeting on Thursday. Should anyone have any further questions or wish to come see the working group in action, given it's very exciting, we welcome everyone to join us. And our main focus at this meeting will be discussion of comments received in the public consultation and significantly interested parties, and we've added also the glossary.

Next slide.

Next slide.

Aha. And I'll hand it back to Keith at this point.

KEITH DAVIDSON: Thank you very much.

So just to summarize, the -- this piece of work on revocation completes the framework of interpretation; that is, the three chapters. The

additional work to do is to compile the glossary and the implementation plan for IANA.

So essentially now you can have a look at the overarching framework on its own. I don't think anything that we do in terms of the implementation or the glossary should affect or impact the intent and purpose and usefulness, or otherwise, of the framework.

So we have left on the table your question on SIP, and in the knowledge that it will probably arise on revocation as well. So I invite you to look at it at the broader or overarching context of the entire framework.

It's critical to us, of course, to have the GAC support as we go forward from here. So we see this taking possibly more time in Singapore and London, and hopefully finishing it in London. And we are very open. And I think Bernie, Becky and myself are very open to the idea of being available for Webinars or teleconferences with the GAC and intersessionally if there is a need to spend more time and more deliberation on the substance of these topics. So we make that offer to the GAC.

And with that, I'm sorry we're a fair bit over time, but there is a lot to chew through here, so my apologies, but I hope we've done enough to give you a taste of what's ahead.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you very much for that really helpful overview of where you are in your efforts.

And, New Zealand, can you help us?

NEW ZEALAND: Yes, Heather. Very briefly, I'd like to repeat my question to Keith of when you -- what sort of timeline you have to in mind for completing this work to give us an idea of the focus the GAC needs to put into giving a final and joint recommendation to the Board?

KEITH DAVIDSON: I think if we could create a timeline, something along the lines of as soon as we've completed the public consultation on revocation, how do we then -- how long does the GAC feel it needs to feedback on the overall framework, and how long will the GAC take to make a decision to either support, or otherwise, after that.

If we're in a position of strong consensus in Singapore, then I think we would be doing a tidier -- or my aim is to complete the terminology paper and the implementation plan by Singapore as well, so that hopefully by London, in June, we could be disbanding the Framework of Interpretation Working Group.

So if that's a timeline that works for the GAC, that would work for us quite tidily.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you for that answer.

So we have Italy, U.K., and Australia. So if you could keep your questions or comments fairly brief, and then hopefully we can spend

just a few minutes on the issue of two-character codes. And I'll add Singapore to that list.

So Italy, please.

ITALY: So thank you, Chair.

So very, very much thanks to David and Bernie because this is something that was due, let's say. Because the GAC principles of 2005 didn't cover, intentionally, the problem of revocations. And this is something very subtle. And fortunately, in the GAC, we do not have so many cases that are problems over country codes, because maybe is all so (indiscernible) of us. But in any case, we know these problems are at stake and has to be solved.

So the only observation I make is that, for revocation and IANA function and so on, the study has to take care of the U.S. principles on the Internet domain name that were published in June 2005, and always confirmed. And this has a statement very clear for country codes that says governments have legitimate interest in the management of the country code upper level domains. The United States recognizes the government have legitimate public policy and sovereignity concerned with respect the manager of the ccTLD.

So just to conclude, any revocation that starts from IANA then, sooner or later, has to go with the consultation with the interested government. So this is something very, very essential.

KEITH DAVIDSON: That's quite an interesting proposition, and something that we hadn't taken into account because, of course, the U.S. government principles have not met a threshold of measurement amongst the ccTLD community or the world's -- or governments of the world.

So it's applicability might or might not be relevant, but it's worthwhile having some discussion and debate on.

Can I just add, too, there's one element that we have not included in the Framework of Interpretation, and that's retirement of ccTLDs because there is no policy or guideline historically on the concept of a retired ccTLD. But on two occasions, at least, the ICANN Board have chosen to retire ccTLDs, and that -- because there is no earlier policy, we can't provide color and depth on a zero policy, so that will require a policy development process of its own.

So there may be some other elements that might be worthwhile putting together to put into the policy development process in due course.

So thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you.

Becky, did you have anything to add on that? No, okay.

So next I have U.K., please.

UNITED KINGDOM: Yes. Thank you, Chair. And thank you to the working group for recounting the progress and so on. The U.K. looks forward to

celebrating the disbandment of the FoI working group in London next year.

I just wanted to express support for this position on revocation. Unless it's something critical to the stability and security of the domain name system, revocation decisions revert to the local community and the legal processes that should be followed involving the local community within the country where the CC applies. I think that's a welcome outcome. It's consistent with national sovereignty and so on.

So I just wanted to express at this point I think that's a good conclusion from our perspective. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, U.K. So I have a growing list. I'm cutting it off, because we do need to conclude the session. So I have Australia, Singapore, Norway, and Egypt. and then we will conclude. So Australia, please.

AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Chair.

And thank you to the ccNSO and the FoI working group and for this very comprehensive update. I'd like to say, for the record, that we very much appreciate the collaborative approach that the ccNSO has taken in this report working so closely with the GAC. It's very welcome.

It's been some time since we discussed this issue, so it's useful to receive this comprehensive update. And I think it's very encouraging, as in with other parts of this report, to see an acknowledgment of the GAC principles as a relevant policy or guideline for this work.

Following the recap from New Zealand, I think it's fair to say that my comments relate particularly to the references, or lack thereof, of the GAC principles in this particular chapter. And I think the comments are very similar to we had for significantly interested parties.

As Frank said, the GAC is still yet to talk about this. And I'll be raising this with colleagues in the GAC. But it appears, on an initial reading, that this chapter references a very important part of the GAC preliminaries, which talk about delegation and redelegation. I understand that redelegation is a slightly different terminology than used in the RFC where we have revocation and transfer. It's potentially picks up a little bit. It's a slightly different term but covers the same kind of space.

The GAC principles make it very clear that, from the GAC point of view, delegation and redelegation is a national issue and should be resolved nationally. And, once it has -- once a decision has been taken in that forum, ICANN should act promptly to initiate a process for redelegation and so on.

On my initial reading, what I'm seeing from this particular chapter actually focuses more on the IANA operator exercising discretion or taking decisions and then coming to actions but less reflection of the national decision process at that point. So I think it would be interesting to reflect a little more on that. And I'll be discussing that with GAC colleagues. It's just a preliminary comment at this point. And we actually had similar comments on the significantly interested parties question. But thank you very much. It's been really, really useful. And it's great to get a comprehensive update of where things are at.

CHAIR DRYDEN:	Thank you very much, Australia.
	Singapore, you're next, please.

SINGAPORE:	Thank you, Chair. First of all, we rather thank the FoI working group for the very thoughtful and comprehensive report. A large part of it we'd like to support. And our comment is with the revocation. We fully support the recommendation of revocation, which I think, in our view, is fair and reasonable. Just a small comment. I wanted to say that, in case the ccTLD manager disagrees with the IANA operator's decision on revocation can appeal independent body. Has the working group have any idea on what this independent body is about? Is it -- some believe within ICANN community or is outside of the current jurisdiction? Thank you.

NEW ZEALAND:	Can I answer very briefly? Or, Becky, do you want to?

BECKY BURR:	There is a reference in RFC 1591 to an IANA board, review board for these disagreements. Going beyond that is outside the scope of our particular charter. So it would be the subject of a recommendation for further work. But no such -- the RFC 1591 contemplates an appeals panel. No such panel exists. And All we're saying is we view the principles and guidelines as consistent with that concept of appeal.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you. Norway, please.

NORWAY: Yes. Thank you, Chair.

And I also would like to thank ccNSO and this comprehensive walk through of the report and sort of highlights. And it's very interesting to have this view than to -- with all these different terms, the definitions and the interpretation of these terms and definition which are sometimes legal and maybe not legal.

So legal terms. So that's really interesting to see the identification of the different aspects of this. And this also highlights the different national competencies. And it also highlights the legal competence of IANA to do this -- well, does IANA have the legal competence to actually evaluate national legislation of these procedures? It highlights a lot of different issues here, which is -- which will be very interesting to have a look at and discuss further. And, of course, like in Norway, we have a legal competence to do redelegation or to do a transfer, according to national regulation, regardless of other documents, whatever.

So it highlights lots of different aspects here, which is very interesting to look at and study further. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you very much, Norway.

And, Egypt, you are the final speaker. Thank you.

EGYPT: Actually, it's not on the same topic. I'm sorry. But -- I -- I didn't have the numbers in front of me. So I thought it worth coming back to the concern that was raised earlier regarding limiting the IDN strings only to designated languages. I have already circulated the whole response, so I won't get into details. I just want to highlight that a conservative estimate of around two million names or more than 1.75 million names would be eligible for delegation should we allow all country codes -- all country names in all languages. And this was considered a challenge to the overall security and stability of the DNS. So I just wanted to highlight the merits behind this limitation to clarify. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Very interesting. Okay. Thank you, Egypt.

So, at this point, I think we need to -- okay. So we might have a few more minutes where we can quickly touch upon the issue of two-character names or codes in the domain name system and the policies around that. Something that we'll look at tomorrow. And I think it's the U.K. that's the lead on that. Okay. Thank you. So, if we could just quickly go over that, then we can close our session.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Thank you very much. We have -- what we want to do is show you sort of four different case studies from around the world on how different CCs handle two-letter domains.

I think I can preface it by saying one of the reasons we've brought forth four of them is each has their own unique policy. A common thread here is each does something different, and we all respond to our own

national Internet communities. So, if there's a common thread among us all, it's that. And we'll just take a very brief tour of four different CCs to give you a flavor of what they do and how they view the impact of that. And it's literally going to be just a minute or two from each.

So, since we're in South America, we'll start with Patricio Poblete from Chile.

PATRICIO POBLETE: Thanks. I'm Patricio Poblete from NIC Chile. In our case for dot CL some 26 years ago, when we started, we decided to be as liberal as possible, have as few restrictions as we could manage. So there was no prohibition on registering two-letter domains in the second level. And it's never been a problem. And we've never found the need to revise that policy. So that's the way it is until today.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Thank you, Patricio. Now we'll fly you over to the Caribbean and the Cayman Islands for Dave Archbold, who not only has a very different geography but a different way of approaching this issue.

DAVE ARCHBOLD: Okay. In the Cayman Islands, we have a closed domain. So you can only register a domain name in the Cayman Islands if you're a Cayman Islands resident or a Cayman registered company. We don't currently charge for domains, so we take great care that people do not attempt to make a profit out of the domain name system itself.

As far as two-letter domain names are concerned, you cannot apply for them online. But you can submit an application, if you've got a special case.

And that is considered by our board of directors and may or may not be approved.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: So, as you can see, very different environments.

Now we'll head over to Debbie Monahan for dot NZ.

DEBBIE MONAHAN: In true New Zealand style, if you want a name in the dot NZ space, if it's available, you can have it. And that extends to two-characters as well. So no restrictions at all in dot NZ.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Thank you, Debbie.

Now to Hiro Hotta in Japan and dot JP.

HIROFUMI HOTTA: Yes, thank you. In the case of Japan ccTLD, dot JP, it has two kinds of domain name spaces. One is organization or type such as something dot CO, dot JP where two character strings CO stands for companies. Not for Colombia.

The other kind is general use type such as something for JP. So two-character strings such as CO are used as the second level for organizational type for JP.

So there are nine kinds of them. But, as new two-character strings may be introduced as new organizational types, spaces in the future, any combination of two-character strings are all reserved. As you see, two-character strings are reserved because they are potential organizational type abbreviation. Not because they are country codes. But, as a result, two-character country codes cannot be registered by registrants. And, as to country names, they are not reserved at all under organizational type or under general use JP. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you very much for that overview of four different examples using two-letter country codes. I don't know whether anyone has any questions about that. Netherlands, please.

NETHERLANDS: Yes, thank you. I suppose I've not followed it exactly. I suppose the reason was that certain groups, the BGR, requests for a waiver to have, let's say, a kind of waiver to be using these two-letter codes in the second level.

My first time -- we've given it thought and we've also discussed a little bit about this. I think one of the concerns which may be there is only a question of stability and -- yeah. A stability concern, whether this could -- let's say two things. Stability concern may be this puts -- could be

seen within the system as maybe contradictory and being a national code, which I suppose not. But it's something to check.

And the second thing is I think user confusability. But, as I see, in the major domains, for example, I know from a CDN dot NL, it's allowed. I would say what is your own perception as a ccNSO? You say, okay, we have a complete variety in our constituency that everybody has its own policy. But what is your own -- if there could be, let's say, view on user confusability of letting two-letter codes in as a second level. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you very much for that. Are there any additional comments or questions on this issue or --

>>   Sorry, if I'm jumping in. But is there an answer to that last question from the Netherlands? Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: So I wear two hats. I'm the CEO of CIRA, the operator for dot CA. And we do it differently than the Netherlands. I think that highlights -- again, highlights the fact that there is no commonality, even though we would consider the way we operate our registries actually quite similar from the technology stack and our general approach. Yet in this particular instance, it's the opposite. I think that just highlights that there isn't a consistent view or desire interest in having a common approach. It's not something that any of the registries feel compromises the registry from a security or stability perspective, one

way or another.   And, as such, takes a choice based on the local community and, quite frankly, historical legacy to some degree.

The dot CA environment had that rule from back in the mist of time. And it's not something that has come back around for consideration; whereas, I believe dot NL has gone down that path itself. So I wouldn't want to speak on behalf of the ccNSO because there simply isn't a common view.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you. And the reason why the GAC is taking an interest in this is there is a reference in the applicant guidebook around the release of two-letter codes, apparently. So the Brand Registry Group raised this with us, and they've been writing letters to us about this. So, in anticipation of spending a bit of time on that issue tomorrow and talking about it in the GAC, we thought it would be good to get a sense of how these issues are handled by country codes or whether there is some sort of policy work that you have been engaged in in the past. So this has been very informative to us about, you know, the different approaches and view that's taken recording the treatment of two-letter codes. So, for that, I think this has been very useful. Okay.

So my sense is that we need to wrap up. We have a 90-second update on one last issue. Okay. All right. So over to you Byron.

BYRON HOLLAND: I know time is tight. But this is a piece of work that I know there's GAC interest in and was on the agenda. And that is a very brief update on the work that the study group by the GAC and the ccNSO and country

EN

and territory names has done. So Paul Szyndler is leading that. I know he had this down to four minutes, but I'm going to ask you to Twitterize it and take it down to about two minutes. Over to you.

PAUL SYZNDLER: Hopefully, we've got some slides, so people can look at the screen rather than listening to me. Scribes, brace yourselves.

My name is Paul Szyndler from dot AU. I've been the chair of the country and territory names study group. We briefed the GAC on a number of occasions. Our work is now concluded. We made a series of recommendations in September to the ccNSO council.

And next slide, please. We'll move it along.

And our main recommendations are the ones that are up on the screen at the moment.   The council has adopted the study group's recommendations and issued relevant resolutions.   So that's where we're at. We've done our work.

But the recommendation from the study group, yes, I know, is to set up a cross-community working group. And the main function of that group is to continue with the study role or the study group previously did. And this is the big one, to consider whether it's possible to develop a uniform definition or framework for country and territory names across all SOs and ACs, the key point being that the GNSO and the new gTLD process, ccTLDs, IDN CCs all treat country and territory names differently. Is it possible to adopt a framework which doesn't subvert policy but at least we start treating country and territory names the same way?

The other recommendation is one that was in no small part thanks to the efforts of GAC and governments.

And that is the ccNSO council will recommend to the ICANN board that country and territory names in all languages that are currently excluded from the applicant guidebook have that exclusion extended to subsequent rounds of new gTLDs. This is because to make any changes now would preempt the work of the working group, and it would be a bad idea.

So sorry, not quite 90 seconds. But that's where we're at, and I'm happy to take questions afterwards.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you very much for that quick update. Just one thing to note. For future joint sessions with the ccNSO, it would be very helpful if there is anyone interested from the GAC to help work on organizing these sessions with the ccNSO, I think that would be enormously helpful to us in doing all the preparations, identifying the agendas, and identifying the materials and so on and so forth.

So do think on that, please. And volunteer for that to work with colleagues on the ccNSO side.

Having said that, we've had a really good exchange today on a number of topics. It's been very informative. And I can see there are a few issues where we do need to follow-up and continue the exchanges.

Did I see Iran asking for the floor?

IRAN: Yes. Thank you. It's not on this subject. It's -- sincerely appreciate all the efforts that's been made by the working group.

Chairman, with the task given to us, we have just started, we need at least another session from 6:30 to 8:30 tonight. I would like, during the coffee break, when you did the arrangement be made in order that we could be in a position to announce that we start at 6:30 continuation of the very simple tasks that were given to me. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you very much for that update, Iran. I understand the GAC room will be available this evening. So, once we have concluded our GAC session with the board, then the room is all yours. Okay.

Very good. So coffee break. 30 minutes, please. And then we will prepare for our session with the board. Thank you again to the ccNSO.

[BREAK]