

---

JOHANNESBURG – GAC and ccNSO Meeting  
Tuesday, June 27, 2017 – 13:30 to 14:15 JNB  
ICANN59 | Johannesburg, South Africa

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Hello, everybody. Please take your seats. We're starting.

Okay. This is the meeting with the ccNSO. We are under a little bit of time pressure, even more than usual, during this meeting. Also the lunch breaks are shorter to get things done, than usual. So sorry for the delay from my side. Let's not lose time. Let's quickly give a chance for our colleagues from the ccNSO to introduce themselves for those who may not know them.

KATRINA SATAKI: Hello, good afternoon. It's always a pleasure to be here with our GAC representatives. We represent ccNSO here. My name is Katrina Sataki. I'm the chair of the ccNSO. And with me today I have Annebeth Lange who is our co-chair on the Cross-Community Working Group on the use of country and territory names. She will give an update on current status with the work of this Cross-Community Working Group. And I have also Bart Boswinkel. He's from -- our support staff. He's our issue manager of PDP process. So he will give the update on the PDP we launched on the ccTLD retirement and review mechanisms.

---

*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.*

---

And with that, I will give the floor to Bart for a short update.

Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Good afternoon, everybody. This is an update, and it's on the -- effectively on the PDP itself as an overall process and on the first topic, the retirement of ccTLDs and the work of the working group.

As some of you will know, the issue report was extensively discussed at the previous meeting in Copenhagen. The GAC was requested to provide comments, which you did, and I thank you very much. The comment has been circulated and distributed to the working group on retirement, so they will take it into account in their deliberations. So that's one phase.

The issue report itself is again up for public comment. This public comment period will close on the 10th of July. To date, we have not received any comments, so in a way, that's good in the sense that it is -- I perceive this as accepted because all the communities were invited to -- in the drafting of the charters of the working group.

In the meantime, the working group on retirement had its first meeting, and at the time, the GAC was requested to provide input or advice on the issue report -- sorry.

---

In parallel, the working group invited GAC members on individual or in the way most convenient to the GAC and its individual members to participate in the working group itself. There has been a bit of a hiccup in the process. The working group is still open and accepts participants, in particular from the GAC because I think the working group thinks this topic is relevant, and early participation would be helpful. The working group itself will meet on Thursday morning in Block 2, so that's from 9:00 -- no, 10:30 until 12:30. So if you're interested, you are invited to attend.

That session will be on the -- say, the workings and the definitions used by the -- under the ISO 3166 standard and the role of the maintenance agency. And the second major topic -- and this is, again, an informational one -- is how the PTI slash the IANA functions operator treats retirements, and the practices and procedures they use with respect to retirements of ccTLDs. So this is more an in-depth information around ISO 3166 and the current practices without the policy in place.

And then the working group will go into, say, the work items for the upcoming weeks, months. The intention is the working group will meet every two weeks, but with the summer season coming up, that will be a bit more difficult. But still -- what else? The -- that's important as well. The ccNSO will, at its upcoming meeting on Thursday morning in Block 1, appoint the two co-

---

chairs of -- appoint the chair of the working group and the co-chair of the working group. So then my role is done. That was it. That was my update.

Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much. That's a short update on our -- how our PDP is going.

Are there any questions?

If --

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Maybe something to start with. First of all, thank you for inviting the GAC for giving advice and engaging with you. And we received that request, and we shared it with the GAC. It was felt that, at this stage, and given the other items that keep us busy, there was not a lot of substance that we were able to produce and feedback to you. But of course we know that these issues are interesting and highly relevant for a number of countries, and we're looking forward to trying to keep up with the process and engage and bring in the issues at the later stage. So don't take the lack of substantive response at this time for a lack of interest. It's just it was difficult for us. We realize it's difficult to

---

say something meaningful at this time, and also there were so many other things that we were not able to maybe -- yeah, go round and round more than once to see what could we deliver as input now. But we'll -- we're confident that the GAC will feed into the process at the later stages.

Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. And from our side, I promise that we will keep it, first, informing you, second, we'll keep asking questions and asking for your input.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Please continue to do that.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thanks. With that, we'll move to the next agenda item. It's the use of country and territory names as top-level domains. So I'll ask Annebeth, our co-chair, that Cross-Community Working Group, to share our feelings about the work of this group with you.

---

ANNEBETH LANGE: Thank you, Katrina, and good afternoon, everybody.

Before I come to the result of the working group, I just wanted to say a few things about what are we talking about here for newcomers, and also a little repetition, what we have been discussing in this working group.

We all know now that the new gTLD process is going forward. And what we are talking about here is top level only. Remember that, because I know you are also discussing second level but this is top level only. New TLDs. And the question here has been to which extent reserved strings should be kept. Should it be opened? Should it be more restriction? We have different views all over the community here.

For us it's all two letters, 274 three-letter combinations from ISO 3166. That's what we have been discussing in the group. It also is country names, but we never came there, so I just go through and say something about how did we get where we are today.

The Cross-Community Working Group was formed in 2014 in March. So we have been working for quite a long time. And it's comprising most people from the GNSO, but ccNSO, GAC, and At Large, and some other organizations as well.

And this working group was established as a result of the study group on country and territory names that was before that. And

---

what the result today after all these years of discussion is it's really not very much consensus. And what we have experienced is that the more we discussed, the more polarized and difficult the discussion has been.

So the report was produced in February 2017 and out for comments, but we didn't really get that many comments back.

What we achieved with this report in my view is that it's really good work explaining the background for the two-letter codes, for the three-letter codes, for why we have the separation between country and territory names and that kind of thing. So I advise you to take a look and read the historic background. That can help you in other discussions as well.

What we did have, what I would call a consensus, even if it's a few voices still in the GNSO that want to open two letters that are not country codes today but the rest of the two-letter combinations for G's, I would say it is a consensus that keep those for the coming countries in the world. It could be new countries coming up, and it would be a shame if we didn't have a two-letter code for them. And another thing is that to do something with two-letter codes, that is ccNSO policy. It's not GNSO policy. So that's an important separation.

So other things we discussed was that we have to continue the work. So even if we haven't had a lot of consensus, we have to

---

find a way to solve these difficult geographical questions. You have had your group. We have had this cross-community group. And it goes into each other, these different issues that we have been discussing, and you all know that what we are doing now, tomorrow, that first day and then on Thursday in the policy forum, it will be a lot of discussion on geo names in the following week.

So there is a lot of remaining geo restrictions that we have to discuss, and what we have seen is that it goes from wanting more restriction, that you want more restriction because there were a lot of geographic names that weren't covered in the Applicant Guidebook in the first round, and that made problem for some countries. And the GNSO will have less restrictions, less protection. Meant for us as the CCs, we are really most into the country and territory names what comes from the ISO 3166. Of course, that's (indiscernible) for us.

So we had a presentation this morning for the CCs and try to find out what the temperature among the CCs is. Do they want more protection? Will they have less protection? Or are they content with the Applicant Guidebook of today?

As you might know, we use green card, red card, and yellow card in our community, and that is interesting in this connection. So we ask them the three questions: Do you want to protect the



---

two-letter codes for only CCs? And it was overwhelmingly green. Yes, they want.

It's a little less green on the three-letter codes, because we know that there are different opinions there on how to go forward. But still quite much green, I would say. And the same for country and territory names as full letters.

So what do we do now? After this week, with the discussions in the policy forum, it has to be formed one working group of a kind to continue the discussion. And if I understand it rightly, it will be one group instead of having all these different things going on, something in the New gTLD Working Group and something with us and something with you, and it will be difficult to come to a conclusion in the end.

What it has been talked about is that under the new gTLD subsequent rounds, it's already now four work tracks working with different sides of a new policy.

It could be a possibility to have a special work track five, but that would be under the top hat of the G's. But, still, if we do that, it will be an advice that will be sent into the process of the new gTLDs, and if that is the result, it would be very, very important that GAC engages and that we engages, so we don't feel like we are an observer in this process. We have to come with our voice.

---

Another solution, of course, is to establish a new Cross-Community Working Group, but with the experience I have in these years, it will be very, very difficult.

What I hope is that the policy forum today, since they have engaged two mediators from outside, which should be not feeling one thing or another, to be able to lead the discussion to a level that we could think outside box, outside solutions that we haven't thought of yet, that we could find a way which made the governments happen, which made the CCs happy, and the GNSO happy. But we'll see how this goes in the end.

So I'll be happy to answer questions if you have them.

INDONESIA:

Thank you. Ashwin from Indonesia for the record.

Yes, I just want to ask whether in your discussion, in your document or in your meeting, practical problems is also discussed about the use of country and territory names as TLDs, top-level domains. You see, I remember several -- many, many, several years ago when we had strong discussion on .SPA, for example, use of .SPA in Singapore, and at that time Heather Dryden has to provide us with dinner, you know, because the discussion so long. Not mentioning .AMAZON, and so on.

---

Now, during that time, if I'm not mistaken, we have something like 50, 60 days for -- for -- what you call it? Different comments, and so on. Now today it has being changed. Now we are talking about discussing about the 21 days windows, which Tom still have problems how to solve to get the -- to overcome the 21 days' window. And in a big country, for example, a 21 days' window might be difficult to, you know, to be followed with all the bureaucracies in the government, and so on, and so on.

I just wonder if this is also discussed in -- in your group, why do we have to go to 21 days' window and not just keep it up with 60 days window, you know. These practicalities, these concerns. I think many, many GAC members, as we had since 2014 discussing .SPA, and so on.

Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much. Answering your question, 21 days' period is applicable to approval actions and rejection actions. When we talk about the gTLD process, it's not -- it's not the thing that will be guided by the process of Empowered Community.

So this is -- this is a completely different thing. Therefore, 21 days period should be discussed during some policy event when

---

we talk about how we handle Empowered Community and -- or approval and rejection actions.

INDONESIA: The previous 60 days windows, did you also discuss that or --

KATRINA SATAKI: They did not discuss windows. They discussed geographic names and country territory names as top-level domains. Not the process for approvals.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Maybe Finn can come in with some background, as well. We had, in one of our past meetings, for instance, a particular piece of advice that I'm sure you have noted about the three-character codes where we had the position that unless there's a consensus among the community how to let them go, basically what to use them, nothing should be changed in the current -- in the current reservations. That doesn't mean that we are fundamentally opposed to using them, but things should be well prepared and in the end there should be consensus on how to use them. And I guess similar approaches would apply to country and territory names in general. So I think that's trying to like sum up a little bit. We are not fundamentally opposed but this needs to be

---

thought through and in the end there needs to be an agreement.  
Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Olga?

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you. Thank you, friends, from the ccNSO for visiting us and thank you, Annebeth, for the presentation. Also Bart, thanks for the update. Annebeth, could you give us more information, at least to me, of this initiative of kind of putting together different working groups or initiatives in different SOs and ACs? This is the first question.

And the second one, if you, the ccNSO, had the chance to review the straw person document that has been prepared for this session this afternoon and if you have any comment about it.

ANNEBETH LANGE: The first question is, I don't really know all about the different things going on, but what we -- my understanding is that after this week, with the two policy forums, they will try to find a path forward, how to discuss this. And whether that be in a new cross-community working group or a work track under the GNSO or something completely different, we don't know yet.

---

As for the other question, I think that at least -- what I can say is from the center European CC's clear point of view is that don't fix what's not broken. Applicant Guidebook functioned quite well as it was and we used four years to get there and it was a lot of discussions to get to the protection we already have. In addition, we know that it's some geographical names that you had problem with that was not covered, and what has been discussed is that the system of non-objection support perhaps could be extended to cover other names as well, even if in many countries it's -- it will create problems, that too. And in this -- the straw person that's been produced for discussion tonight, or this afternoon, they try to find another way to say could we do it differently for what we have done forward. And you have had -- the repository is mentioned in that straw person. It's also mentioned if you don't use it geographically you can have it. I'm very skeptical to that because it's -- it's a different policy to sanction. It's difficult to follow it up. And it's really easy to circumvent.

So I don't know if that answered your question. Yeah?

KATRINA SATAKI: Switzerland, please.

---

SWITZERLAND: Thank you. And good afternoon. And apologies for being late. I was in a different meeting. On this issue of country and territory names as TLDs and discussions being organized by the GNSO this Tuesday afternoon and on Thursday afternoon, do I understand correctly that this discussions have been framed, have been organized and the papers which serve as background have not been consulted with the ccNSO?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yes.

SWITZERLAND: Thank you. Because I think Alec wasn't consulted either, and we obviously weren't consulted, as far as I know. The first information we got was like six days ago, in the case of Olga who is the chair of our working group and myself because I happen to present some ideas in the webinar of April. So I think that's on a process, from a process point of view, on a question that clearly deals with something that is not undisputed, that it should be discussed under the GNSO remit is an issue of concern, for me at least. Especially in the case of country and territory names. Their exclusion from the AGB of 2012 had these reasons behind with a long history, which you will remember very well, of the ccNSO and the GAC participating in the preparations of that Applicant Guidebook. And so I think that for the way forward

---

this cannot be done in a similar fashion. If we want to discuss this on a cross-community basis, we have to be all involved as peers in all the preparations and the setting.

As to our substantive position, we agree very much with this view that if it's not broken -- not broken, don't fix it. The AGB protections were a result of a long multistakeholder discussion, so I think it's important to look at the facts before us. And I think that the system worked well for these kinds of names. And for those names that have a -- let's say a -- a geographic meaning, those which were protected under the AGB also worked well, the letters of support or non-objection worked well. No data on instances that there should have been a substantial problem, with perhaps one exception that's referred to the city names where the AGB is perhaps a bit ambiguous as to the requirement of the non-objection or letter of support. And where we witnessed problems was under the geo names not covered by the AGB, and we can think about some rivers and some regions in Latin America. And there, I think, it would make sense to apply what worked, which was the system of letters of support or non-objection. So I leave it by that. But thank you very much.

ANNEBETH LANGE:

Thank you. I agree that this -- what you're saying now, this is really important input and tonight or this afternoon, this is the



---

kind of input we need to get forward, to get the GNSO to understand -- fully understand our concerns.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

If I may just come in quickly, there's also something that may be important for people to remember, because not everybody may remember, with regard to the discussions of where and what processes, which names should be held. There is the GAC advice from Nairobi about this which is fairly clear that was in the middle of the work on the first Applicant Guidebook and says the following, I'll just read one paragraph. "The GAC restates the advice contained in" -- and actually it's an advice that was given already before. "The GAC restates the advice contained in the Chair's letter of 18 August, 2009 which states, Strings that a meaningful representation or abbreviation of a country name or a territory name should not be allowed in the gTLD space. The GAC interprets paragraph 2.2 of the GAC gTLD principles that strings which are meaningful representation or abbreviation of a country or territory name should be handled through the forthcoming ccTLD, PDP, and other geographical strings could be allowed in a gTLD space if in agreement with the relevant governmental public authority. So I think that's also something that we should keep in mind. This is standing GAC advice from 2010. That is actually a quote from an advice of 2009. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Sorry, brief comment about organization of cross-community sessions. Jorge. About cross-community sessions. Well, first of all, we're only in a second year of our new meeting strategy, so I'd say that the notion of cross-community session is pretty new one. And cross-community sessions are proposed by SO/ACs, so any SO/AC can proposal a topic for cross-community session. And well, initially they were responsible also for organizing. Now anybody -- anybody who wishes to participate in the organization of this particular session can actively, proactively propose this -- him or herself as a valuable member to this organization team.

Another thing is that, of course, when somebody proposes a session, they also have in mind the structure of the session, some questions are being discussed, therefore I would -- if you feel that there are things that need to be discussed, please propose your own sessions, organize them anytime, invite others to come to your session and discuss those issues. I see that Olga wants to add.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Just a comment following up of yours, about this cross-community session. We expressed the interest of the working group of the GAC to participate. But it is not clear, at least for

---

me, which would be the format of the session. They told us there are no panels, that there would be moderators. There is this document, and that's it. So the request that we did was -- was attended -- was respected to in the relation with the two webinars that were organized. So Jorge did one of the webinars and I did the second one another time. But apart from that, it has not been clear, although we wanted to get involved.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much. I saw that there was a question, but sorry, we have only three minutes left. We have to run to another session. So we have only three minutes left for frequently asked questions document and any other business. So sorry, we'll cut the line here. So any input from Manal? Who would like to -- first of all, I would like to thank the GAC Underserved Regions Working Group for giving the opportunity to the ccNSO to provide our input to this document. We know that the group, this working group, gathered input from other -- other constituencies, other participants as well. We're looking forward to receive green light from this working group to go through the document again, see what needs to be clarified, what terms need to be perhaps explained or --

---

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Thomas, and thank you, Katrina, and thanks to the ccNSO in helping us to put this FAQ together. Just to reiterate one comment I did this morning within the working group session, which is the term "redelegation" and the term "transfer" which has now changed, and I thought this -- because people are still using redelegation, so maybe we can have a footnote or something noting this change and that -- that the terms literally mean the same and now we're using transfer. Apart from that, I already did -- provided my comments on the document, and thank you for your comments as well. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. Any other business. Yeah, one more comment.

ALICE MUNYUA: Thank you, ccNSO, and thank you, Chair. Regarding the FAQ document and the underserved regions, in terms of process, I just wanted to mention that we had long discussions this morning regarding some of the questions. It's still not ready. We still have a lot of work to do. We're still gathering comments from GAC members and GAC members from the underserved regions. So we'll then send it back to the ccNSO and the PTI for additional comments before it goes back to the GAC for final

---

comments. So yeah, it still has a long way to go. So we anticipate the document being endorsed, A either intersessionally prior to ICANN 60 or during ICANN 60. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much for this information. Thank you. Be looking forward to it. So thank you very much for having us for another exchange. Looking forward to some next opportunity. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Well, thanks to you, and look forward to an exchange on geo names later today. So that's going to be an exciting session, I guess. Thank you very much.

So next we have the meeting of the working group on protection of geographic names for 45 minutes until the coffee break. Thank you.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**