
JOHANNESBURG – ccNSO PDP Working Group on Retirement of ccTLDs

Thursday, June 29, 2017 – 10:30 to 12:30 JNB

ICANN59 | Johannesburg, South Africa

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: 29th June, 10:30. ICANN59 Committee Room 2, ccNSO PDP Working Group on Retirement of ccTLDs.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Bart, I think we give this three more minutes.

BART BOSWINKEL: Okay, I'll start. He's on his way so that's fine. Well, we can start anyway.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah.

BART BOSWINKEL: If you want, please sit down and we're going to kick this off. First, welcome for this part of the session before I hand over to former Chair. Welcome again on this second meeting of the PDP Retirement Working Group. We'll not go around the room. I don't know. Do we have remote participants? Yes, we do. So if you speak up, please say your name your name as well for the transcript purposes and for the person online.

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.

At its meeting this morning the Council appointed Nigel Roberts as the Chair according to the nomination of the working group, and Eberhard as Vice Chair. Also they've accepted the nominations, so congratulations with your appointment.

I'll hand it over now to the former Chair.

EBERHARD LISSE: I'd much rather accept your condolences.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Oh, well. The Vice Chair always getting the word in. Okay, welcome again. Welcome to the first face-to-face meeting, I believe, as well as being the second. The third item on the agenda is the presentation of the rules of engagement. Bart, is that something you'll be able to speak to?

BART BOSWINKEL: This is effectively the second reading of the rules of engagement. Let me open it up. As you know, the charter was included in this year's report and was drafted. The charter defines in a little bit more detail the scope and the issues to be addressed by this working group.

There are some underlying documents to inform the discussion and I will go a little bit into the deliverables again, membership working methods, and the tentative timeline.

Deliverables of this working group are the interim paper and the interim paper needs to be published for at least one public comment period so you could think about two or three versions. It's up to the working group but at least they have to go through a public comment period that will result in a final paper.

The final paper needs to be adopted by the working group and then will be submitted to the issue report or the issue manager who will include it in the interim report. The interim report will also include the final paper of the second working group.

The working group is supposed to provide some progress report. Again that's no novel to what the FOL Working Group has done and what other PDP Working Groups have done and provide updates to the ccNSO Council. So for that purpose, it's very good that Nigel is also a Council member so that makes it easy.

The public comments on the interim paper or interim papers need to be at least 40 days and, as I said, the final paper will be included.

The tentative timeline is say the working group is now fully established including say the Chair and the Vice Chair have been

appointed. The GAC has been informed and I assume already one or two members from the GAC community are present and they will participate under the rules and etc. of the GAC itself. There are others as well, so if members of the GAC want to follow what's happening and they are present in the room, please after the meeting contact Kim or me and we'll include you on the e-mail list.

So this is, as I said, the second working group. The purpose of say we start developing the interim paper starting June 2017, the tentative earliest point in time for the period is by November that would allow the opportunity to inform the community at the Abu Dhabi meeting that's around four months.

And then if say once the interim paper is being published, the Secretariat will send out a call for volunteers for the second working group so that can be established so the two working groups can work back to back. So if you're a member of this one and you want to be a member of the follow-up or the second working group, please be advised around that time to put your name forward.

At the core, so you know the differences around the membership, we've got members participants. Participants are from the other SOs and ACs, observers are people who just attend a meeting once or twice, and we have two groups of

experts. One group is from PTI IANA and the other one is from ISO 3166 so that's Jaap and Kim. And is Naela around? Okay, it's just Kim today.

The working methods – and that's probably the core of the rules of engagement – we try to schedule a call every two weeks. After this meeting we'll sit down with the Chair and Vice Chair to set up a schedule and whether to start that cycle in two weeks or in three weeks that's again... but we'll get you informed by the end of this week.

NIGEL ROBERTS:

Bart, just to make it clear, I suggest that we do what we did in the FoI which was to rotate and to make it equally convenient.

BART BOSWINKEL:

That's the timing but you want to have the dates first and when you want to really kick it off with the calls and then say rotational to share the burden.

We'll provide transcripts of the call if so requested and I assume that worked very well with the FoI. The turnaround rate will be around 72 hours because that's probably most cost efficient. Doing it faster is rather expensive. This is not needed.

Again like with the FoI is staff will provide the documents and maintain the documents as a repository and include any changes and the change will then be discussed.

You are requested to provide comments online at least no later than one week after a call because that allows staff and the Chairs/co-Chairs, the Chair and the Vice chair to include any changes needed and to check and to send out an updated version ahead of the call. So an expectation is that the members once after the call read the documents and check again when they receive and within one week respond to any changes so we can include it and discuss it at the next meeting.

Red line versions will be circulated hopefully three business days before the next meeting so you'll have the time to read it through and digest what has been changed, the consolidated changes, and probably the most important rule is any changes will only be adopted after two readings. So you do not have to be afraid to miss one call. It will be a bit of an issue if you miss two consecutive calls but at least you will have always the opportunity of course online but also to participate in the discussion and raise a topic again.

And probably this is also again very well-known for at least the ccNSO members or the ccTLD managers on the group and who participated in the FoI is consensus decision making in principle

no difference between members and participants unless it comes to a vote but we try to avoid voting as much as possible.

So consensus is decision making by the full group and probably the best way to do it, it's the Becky Burr criteria, the die-in-the-ditch criteria. Most people have experience around it and once it needs to be done, you will see to it.

So again to reiterate, if there is a vote, it will be only a vote by members and members are the ccTLD or ccNSO appointed people on this working group but say the Chair and Vice Chair will try to avoid voting as much as possible, I hope.

NIGEL ROBERTS:

Well, we were pretty successful the last two groups on that regard so I'm very confident.

BART BOSWINKEL:

The other thing is – and I think Debbie's up to the Chairs and Vice Chair as well but also on the group itself, engage the broader communities no matter where we are at face-to-face meetings. And maybe it's an idea that's put something to discuss to inform the broader community also at regional organizations meetings.

So if you are present and a member or participant at the regional organizations meeting, update the people in the

regions as well on what is happening, so a little bit more active outreach.

That's with respect to the rules of engagement. Any questions with respect to the rules of engagement? Eberhard.

EBERHARD LISSE:

For the record, I think it should not be the Chair and Vice Chair to decide what day of the week it is. I think we should put this to the group what's most convenient for the group, what day of the week. I think we did FoI on Tuesdays. I have no particular choice but if some people have regular commitments on a particular day, we should maybe take this into consideration, and then we'll set up the first day and then we go every six like we did previously.

BART BOSWINKEL:

May I suggest that say by the... Say we'll prepare a Doodle poll for the working group itself, send it out, and by next week – so give everybody a week to fly back home, etc. – and by the next week we get together as Chair and Vice Chair and staff to pick a date based on the Doodle poll then build on that one.

And it's going to be two weeks after the Doodle poll has been settled so that's in three weeks we'll have the first or the next

call and it allows us some time as well to prep the work items on how you want to structure the meetings.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Thanks Bart. Peter, do you want to say something? Okay, anyone else? Any comments or questions for Bart or on the rules for engagement? No?

BART BOSWINKEL: That's good because now the rules of engagement went through a second reading, so whatever happens you can fall back on the rules of engagement and people are supposed to know them.

Then the final thing, the tools. There is a PDP Working Group Retirement webpage. It lists the members, the background material, and it will include static information moving forward. Something like the progress reports, the interim reports, the interim papers, etc. So that's the webpage.

There is also a wiki space or wiki page. This is where we'll include the drafts moving forward so that will be circulated. Also the presentations like today's presentations will be included on that one but also on the Retirement webpage itself because it's available and probably very educational for the broader community what we're going to discuss today.

It's to be used by the working group and we'll allow, if you want to, the Chair and Vice Chair to update the wiki space as well if you want to have editorial rights – no, not necessarily. Then we'll do it, okay.

EBERHARD LISSE: So far we have worked very well this year. So far we have worked very well but if sending it to Kim or to [inaudible] ended up [inaudible] the same day so I don't need to have [inaudible].

BART BOSWINKEL: Okay, great but this is just for the offer. So as I said, it will be the repository of working documents of the working group and so it also becomes available for the broader community to check where the working group is at, so it adds a bit of transparency of the work of this group.

Finally, conference calls, we'll use the Adigo bridge. There will be a dedicated Adobe room and, as said, transcripts will be available. So that was the part on the rules of engagement and this should be no surprise because we discussed it on the previous call as well.

NIGEL ROBERTS: And it's familiar to many of us. Thank you, Bart. We're coming to Agenda Item #4, a presentation on retirement from the maintenance agency perspective. Yeah, please.

JAAP AKKERHUIS: I was in [inaudible]. Apologies for being late. I have quite some slides. Do I do my slides myself? He'll do the next slide? I'll first of all explain who I am then I will explain what the ISO organization is and go on and quickly move to details of how really the 3166 [stalemate] is made and zooming on the terminology used in the standards so everybody hopefully knows what it is, and then go to the life cycle of some of the codes – how this goes from birth to death. Next please. That's interesting. Next please. Oh, there of course.

I am a member of the ISO 3166 Maintenance Agency and the liaison to Technical Committee Work Group 2. So that's basically sitting in for ICANN playing these roles. But I really want to say that if I express opinions to these, they are my personal opinions and not for Mike and staff or from the ISO group itself, so be aware of that. Next please.

ISO standards. The nature of the ISO standards is that they actually fall into... there's no international law or an international treaty or whatever which dictates that you should use the ISO standards. The idea is that you conform to the

standards or not, and the basic idea about standards in general is it helps to be consistent in the use of various stuff and it promotes the interchange of goods and ID. So that's why you have things like standardized sizes of cars, a lot of stuff.

It also can be used to protect markets. That's another flipside of it. If you don't do this standard, you are not allowed to do business. It's kind of interesting that sometimes some of these protection measures by countries actually turn out to become standards by itself and then suddenly they are international. [inaudible]. The whole idea is to have [inaudible] objects that [inaudible] that you don't have, that it will be more efficient and financial stuff. Next please.

The ISO organization is a non-governmental membership organization so the members to this organization and the rules states one member per country so it might be actually inter-government but it might also be organizations appointed by the government, represent the government.

For instance, the American representative in the ISO is actually MC which is the American standard organization but then they have other people as well helping MC out doing that, but these are its official standards.

Actually, the ISO standards standardize anything from business processes to nuclear power plants and you just name it. It's all

there. For the electrical parts, to cooperate with the IEC, the International Electrotechnical Commission, which is another standard organization, they have this kind of a joint agreement to work together. Next please.

The members, as I said, standard bodies representing country and actually three different types of members – the full members, these are the ones who votes, develops, implements and adopts standards so it's across the whole [inaudible].

The correspondent members – they actually implement and adopt but they don't help to standardize itself.

And then there are subscriber members which are the observers. They just get information but don't make a commitment to implement standards.

Depending on the countries themselves, the full members pay more than the correspondent members and the subscriber members. There's a member fee and that's actually how they are financed by the member fees and by the [sale] of the standards itself. So that's the financial background. Next please.

The government structure, not only ICANN has a complicated structure. The ISO has it as well. I [inaudible] this from the website. And this General Assembly, there's a Council Standing

Committee which help the Council. There's the President's Committee which help the President.

There's a Policy Committee which has the technical membership say Board, which is actually [inaudible] by the Technical Committees. In the Technical Committees, that's where the real standard development happens. The rest is all on top of it doing the policy stuff. So the Technical Committee is where the standard is. Next please.

There are a couple of Technical Committees. One is whether it's J in front of the name. It actually means it's combined with IEC, the Electrical Committee. The Technical Committee 1 is information technology combined with IEC. Technical Committee 1 is defining how you make the skills and so they fit in and you not having different tools for different skills all the time, although I presume it's to [inaudible] that.

Anyway, Technical Committee 46 deals with information and documentation so that's actually where we're heading to, but typical business type of stuff is the Tech Committee 176 about quality management and quality issues. It's what you get ISO 9 to ISO 1 and all these things. There are about 200 different Technical Committees. Next please.

So as I said, Technical Committee 46 is about information documentations. There are about 38 participating members – so

these approved members – and 32 observing members who are just sitting there.

The Tech Committee itself is devising lots of working groups and subcommittees and maintenance agencies. And working groups are actually the ones which own the standard. Next please.

So the Working Group 2 is coding of county names and related things. The owner of that is ISO 3166 and that's the only way how the substantial changes of the standard can be made and the changes need to be ratified by TC 46 by the whole plenary of that technical meeting.

The Work Group 2 is about 25 members, more or less, and so they are the actually the ones being active in looking at standards. ICANN has liaison type D – that's me – and that's actually information only so no right to fall there. It's just being on the mailing list. So that's where top-down involvement is from ICANN in that. Next please.

The ISO 3166 actually comes in three parts. It used to be one part but it's now three parts. It's county codes, sub-division codes and there is a part which actually tries to document a history of used names and codes and they also have special codes for this history.

Actually, first is part 1. Actually, that's the most used part at this moment. Next please.

What I've discussed they are the letter codes and they're not really defined what to mean with each letter but it's alpha-numeric [inaudible]. So the alpha-2 codes which are the well-known, which are used as TLD [inaudible]. There are alpha-3 codes. They come in pairs actually. If there's an alpha-2 code, most of the time there's an alpha-3 code. The other way is not always true. Sometimes the alpha-3 codes don't reflect into an alpha-2 code.

The alpha-4 code which is a combination of four used codes and/or other codes to maintain the history of the codes. That's what alpha-4 codes are used for. Next please.

You can actually get codes mean. That's always an interesting [source] for confusion. In retirement territories as defined by the guidelines, and normally these are the UN members, so if you're a full UN member, then there's no problem of getting codes. There are some exceptions there like the Vatican, the holy [inaudible] official code. It's not really a UN member but it's one of the few recognized observers by the UN plenary so that's why they get a code as well automatically.

And there are the geopolitical interesting areas. You'll notice that if you reach a standard that these are the ones which

[daunted] a little note saying that they're independent most of the times.

And geopolitical areas it might be [certifications] of the real country and territories. You find them in different but they might have their own codes.

One thing to note is that all those areas mentioned in all the parts of the standards have nothing to do with geographical names. They are just administrative areas as defined by various entities so things like rivers or seas or whatever. You just don't find them in the standards and also things which are super national. Amazon which is a well-known area, for instance, in multiple countries they're not in the standards. So that's a good thing to realize. Next one, please.

Then the numerical. Numericals are three numbers and they're actually mostly assigned by the UN Statistical Division N49. They're not really assigned by ISO but they're signed by those guys.

Then there's also different numerical representation of ISO and these are defined by ISO according to an algorithm using from the two-letter codes. That's actually to be used in those places where people cannot do alpha-numeric codes for instance Chinese databases or things like that. So they are representation of the two-letter codes. Next please.

What type of codes do we have? Well, this is current status from the website officially assigned codes, about 249 of them. And there are other codes for them with 7 but some double F. A couple of [inaudible] ones, the exceptionally reserved ones, the transition reserved ones, the ones with are reserved but nobody really knows for what purpose they are, they indeterminately reserved.

And the formerly used codes – and of course there are quite some codes unassigned and there is one particularly weird code, SK code. Nobody knows why it's there but it is assigned. It's OO and I don't understand the use and I asked at ISO. They don't understand it either but it's defined anyway. Next please.

Let's zoom in on the reservation codes. There are exceptional reserved codes and the exceptional reserved code is what the name says. It's an exception to the rules. So there are no real rules. They are made specially made specifically for that code while they are reserved. And if you go to the database, you actually find the reason why they are reserved for that or for whom.

There's the transitional reserved codes which is basically... they are reserved for some times and the duration of the reservation used to be completely unpredictable what it is. It actually still is.

It's up to the maintenance agents how long these codes are alive.

The guideline is if codes are unassigned taking out of the same pool, they should not be re-used at least for a maximum of 50 years. After that it's [regained] but it doesn't mean that it cannot be used earlier. I want to stress that. It used to be no guideline at all, then it became five years, and now it's 50 years. That's trying to hold on to that. But whether or not... Next, please.

There's quite some different style of codes, the user-assigned code elements which is AA, ZZ, and then the two ranges which might be used for arbitrary stuff. The only thing that's promised is that they won't be assigned by the maintenance agency, but you can use it if you need it for your specific needs of interchange. And the numbers 900 to 999 [it has to save it].

Note they're not guaranteed to be unique, but you can use them. But for instance, the UN is using XX for some type of papers. Let's say [inaudible] and go so far as XK for it because it's not assigned. RIPE is using CZ for various purposes, and more of these. Next, please.

What is actually the purpose of 3166? [I cannot] really should keep that in mind. The scope is actually for use in any application requiring the expression of current country names in coded form.

Does somebody have some water for me? [inaudible] Thank you.

These are quotes literally from the standard. The standard costs about 100 Swiss franc, by the way. The name of a country, dependency, or other area of particular geopolitical interest – that’s the definition from standard what a country is. So, that’s why I always use the term country and territories, just to make sure that this is included in this. Next, please.

So, who’s using these alpha-2 codes? That’s the technical term. Two-letter codes are alpha-2 codes. Well, travel documents, as it says. The machine-readable passports use them, which is different. They also use three-letter codes for various, but these are for the old passports. And finance related business. The ISO 4127 defines the codes for currency for interchange in banking. And they always tie it with alpha-2 codes, plus an extra. So, the [inaudible] EUI which I always called [inaudible] but it’s EU for Europe and then the I, I don't know where that came from. But that’s what. The U.S. dollars, Australian dollars, things like that.

It’s used in the international bank number as an identifier for countries. The SWIFT or BIC codes are also using alpha-2 codes, and it’s also used in 6166, the international security identifying numbers, and they actually use sometimes some reserved codes as well. Next, please.

Credit card companies for local credit cards use the [inaudible] 2 a lot. For instance in India, you've got credit cards which are only some parts of India [inaudible] and they actually identify it by this. A lot of trade related stuff. The UN LOCODE uses it a lot of the time. The UPU s42 standard for the postal distribution centers are marked that way. And in Australia, they use it for the defined interchange of client information, an Australian standard. [It's a lot]. Next, please. And of course, ICANN is using them as well.

What does the maintenance agency actually do? It is a small body of people which maintain what are called ephemeral parts of the standard. So, the things that happen to change. So, they don't really do the text of the standard at all, although there might be some editorial changes, reference changes, things like that. To do the maintenance of editorial change, [that's right]. It consists of about 14 voting members and has a body of about 50 different nonvoting experts around the world who give advice when necessary.

This is actually typical how an ISO works. Most ISO standards have a registry like that, or for a part of the standard. The 14 voting members, some are permanent, some are actually rotating. That's trying to get new blood on board, and this [inaudible] for instance just became a voting member recently. Next, please.

And I'll switch this off for the moment. Sorry about that.

The names of countries. Well, the names from the countries mainly come from United Nations Terminology Department. It used to be a bulletin, it's now a database where you can look up the names. So, that's where the names come from. And they only use the French and the English for these codes.

The codes should have some relation to the short names of [inaudible]. Saying that, some relation – when possible. Sometimes, the codes are just gone, there are no codes anymore so something has to be [fended]. Especially for the territories, that's where the board of experts comes from, because they help out here because they don't have names in the UN terminology. So, that's part of it. Next, please.

Why do codes change? Well, countries do split. For instance, Czechoslovakia. The country which has been using that code has split twice. And the major name changes, that's also a reason for doing that. Think about Rhodesia, for instance. Also, there are countries which are merging, for instance East Germany and Vietnam is another one where that's very obvious where it happens. And other things. Territories themselves change. The way the states organize changes. An example is the Netherlands and Dutch Antilleans. There are also things still in limbo, like

Kosovo, but that's why they use XK for certain codes, waiting for getting that solved. Next, please.

Merging countries, as I said the German Democratic Republic is now part of the entry of Germany. The code itself is unassigned, and so DD is free to use. And DDDE is actually the four-letter code signaling that these two codes have been merged and are denoting the history. Vietnam, Democratic Republic of – that's what the official name was – is now part of the entry of Vietnam, both parts. VD is unassigned, and the codes are again... I made a mistake there. Yes, there's a mistake. These are the codes for Yemen, but it should be VDV. Sorry, I should correct the slides. Next, please.

Now those are obvious cases. Name changes. Well, Zaire changed its name to Congo, and ZR is transitional reserved. So, that's one. Actually, [inaudible] Upper Volta is now Burkina Faso, and HV is unassigned, but alpha-4 code is HVBF, denoting the name change. Southern Rhodesia is now Zimbabwe, and actually, the interesting part is that RegioHelden is indeterminately reserved because it was actually reserved for Haiti under the UN road sign convention. And when ISO started, they actually incorporated all the road signs from that. So, that's what most of the indeterminately reserved codes are, the old road signs. Next, please.

Then there are countries that kind of explode. The Pacific Islands split into the Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Northern Mariana Islands and Palau. It used to have the code PC, it's unassigned now, and there is an alpha-4 code denoting that. The Gilbert and Ellis Islands is now Kiribati and Tuvalu, and interestingly, the codes got reassigned to Georgia, the former Russian republic. But there is also an alpha-4 code [that] documented the fact that it had been used somewhere else. This reassignment actually happened and nobody complained about it. Interesting. So, [and I doubt that] it was very quickly done. Anyway, next please.

The more problematic example is Czechoslovakia, CS. It split into – hey, why didn't – it looks like it's – sorry. Split into Czechia, and I do see I sent the wrong PDF here, because I had that corrected. Anyway, so it split into Czechia and Slovakia. And CS is transitional reserved, meaning this split is documented by CSHH. And then we have the next problem, Yugoslavia got divided. Next, please.

It got divided to – and the name changed [from] Serbia and Montenegro, and some things split off, like Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, the former republic of Macedonia, although I think they're changing the name again, Serbia and Montenegro – CS – and Slovenia. And doing CS is a problem, because the code is used everywhere. And that's when the [moment] actually started for how to do transitional reserve.

That period came in time, because it got reassigned within three years. The Czech libraries were screaming murder. I think there are still problems with ICANN, and there are a lot of [problems for] doing this.

So, this was a real problem. It was a very bad idea, but luckily – next, please – Serbia and Montenegro split again, so that was a good reason to get very quickly rid of that code again. And so it got divided into Serbia and Montenegro, and CS is also transitionally reserved for 50 years. And you see the alpha-4 code is now CSXX because the HH was already in use. That’s where the committee was really being very silly there. Anyway, this is more [problematic] ones. Next, please.

Splitting the Soviet Union was also an interesting affair. It divided into an awful lot of codes. It was a big territory. And interestingly enough, some parts of the Soviet Union had already their own independent codes. I don’t really know why, but it’s not really important. And then so it’s Belarus and the Ukraine. They were already coded, but SU itself became to be a severe problem for the committee with a lot of process. For instance, [inaudible] still using SU as their [airline] code. A lot of [airline] parts still have the code in it. Stuff like that. So, it’s been asked to actually exceptionally reserved codes, the MA made this exception to not doing a transitional reserved but it’s now

exceptionally reserved code. And it's documented as SUHH. Next, please.

Well, statehood changes. We have the Kingdom of the Netherlands. That's the official name, and it consists of a couple of parts. Aruba, Curacao, Sint Maarten and Netherlands. These are the countries, and then there's some weird stuff which doesn't really belong to anything, but still for [group] purposes is actually part of the Netherlands. These are known as the BES islands. Aruba, Curacao, Sint Maarten are known as ABC islands. And this is complicated history, and I take Netherlands because I know that the best. Next, please.

You have the code the Dutch Antilles AN, which consisted of Aruba, Bonaire, Curacao, Saba, Sint Eustatius, Sint Maarten, the Dutch part. Sint Maarten is also part in France. So, that's where the Netherlands and France actually share a border without Belgium in between.

Then in 1986 – next, please – Aruba called status aparte, and so the new code was born to – it actually kind of split, a separate kingdom part of the Dutch Antilles. So, in 1986, Aruba got code AW. Sint Maarten and Curacao in 10-10-10, they also got the status the same as Aruba, so they are separate countries within the kingdom of the Netherlands.

But then we had these little islands there, really small places. Bonaire, Saba, and Sint Eustatius. I think Saba has a couple of thousand people living there. They're too small to be independent, and they really didn't want to, either. So, they have been made special Dutch municipality, so they're actually now part of the Netherlands.

Then there was this problem about what do we do for whether or not they need extra codes. At that time, I actually was consulted by the Dutch government how to deal with that and they tried to get different codes and I said, “Well, not sure whether that will go over very well with the maintenance agency, because you really have to find proper reason to have that special code.”

And interestingly enough, I didn't hear from it until suddenly, [via] TC 46 and the plenary vote, it got assigned by the Technical Committee, and not by the MA 3166. It's kind of an interesting thing. And so they're called BQ, which I now call the [Becquerel]. The motivation apparently was that they used American dollar for the valuta, they use special [text] rules, the IPR rules. They have done an awful lot of things where they don't fit in under the Dutch law. So, that's the argument used to TC46. But interestingly enough, MA was not really involved in this. Next, please.

Questions?

NIGEL ROBERTS: Nick.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Well, first of all, thank you very much. If you're geeky and into country codes, this is brilliant.

I've got a few questions. And excuse me if I'm a bit slow or I've misunderstood, but I heard that you had 249 assigned codes, right? And 407 other, exceptional reserved, etc. It seems to add up to 656, whereas I think I'm right in saying there must be 676 two-letter combinations, 26 squared. So, there seem to be 20 missing, and I wondered, have I misunderstood something?

JAAP AKKERHUIS: I took these numbers from the ISO list, and they're still there. What is not on these numbers are the user-assigned codes. The QA, the XX. And so that's the missing numbers you have there.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Okay. So, all of the 26 squared combinations are accounted for in some way or another.

JAAP AKKERHUIS: Yes. That's all the combinations possible, yes.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Thank you. So, I've got just a couple of other questions. I know this is a sort of background presentation, but on the glossary to the 3166, it makes it very clear that the alpha-3 codes – because they're obviously three letters long and not two letters like the alpha-2 codes, it's clear from the glossary and it explicitly states that the alpha-3 codes are more commonly representations of the country name, or it's a closer representation of the country name than the two-letter code.

JAAP AKKERHUIS: Well, you've got three letters, so you've got more choice.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: So it's obvious.

JAAP AKKERHUIS: But note there are quite some three-letter codes which are in a reserved and are not in the standard. So, there are actually more reserved than you think there are, more in use than you think there are. And the glossary is just a glossary. As you have seen for the BES islands, BQ, because they were running out of the Bs and you've got more choice there.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Got it.

JAAP AKKERHUIS: And even that's BES has nothing to do with the name of the territories. It's just –

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: The reason why I ask is in a different group, ICANN is looking at perhaps releasing the alpha-3 codes, but obviously not making country names available at the top level now, so this is an ongoing debate.

And finally, you talked about geographic terms, and I wondered if there's any guidance as to what that actually means, any definition. What is a geographic term according to the standards bodies?

JAAP AKKERHUIS: I displace the definition. It is the geographic, it's country, it's a territory, geopolitical. This is literally quote from the standard. So, that's what it is. And what you will notice is always kind of an administrative entity.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL: Nick, this presentation will be put on the working group page right after this meeting, because one of the reasons for having this meeting today is precisely for the reason to inform not just the discussion of this working group, but also for the broader group, because there is so much misunderstanding around country codes, what they represent and how they're used. One of the major issues that we came across for example in the geographic or in the use of country and territory names as TLD working group is as you have seen right now, although slowly, the list is not static. It changes over time. And as a result, the three-letter codes will change over time as well. That's one of the underlying issues that you come across if you talk about the use of three-letter codes or top-level domains. So, that might inform the other debate.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: I totally agree, and I almost think it should be compulsory viewing for anybody who's involved in this sort of area.

JAAP AKKERHUIS: I also want to warn that you should not take the glossary as the proper definition. The definition is in the standard. And if people

really want to get nitpicking about definition, stuff like that, please refer to the standard and not to whatever is floating about.

SCHOMBE BAUDOUIN: Thank you. My name is Schombe Baudouin from [inaudible]. I want just to ask if you can correct, because I see you spelled Zaire now Congo. [inaudible] to correct it, because we have two Congo. We have Congo-Brazzaville and Congo-Kinshasa. I think it is better to write DR Congo, Democratic Republic of Congo. I think that is better, because there is some confusion in that.

NIGEL ROBERTS: That's helpful. Peter?

JAAP AKKERHUIS: I specially picked this because it's the definition in the ISO database and of the short name, but I will make a note explaining what I did there. But I used official name as being in the database.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Okay. I've got Peter, then Eberhard, then Allan. Peter.

PETER KOCH:

Okay. Thank you. Peter Koch, DENIC. I'd like to get a better understanding of what the role or influence of ICANN or the ICANN representative in either community is. Jaap, you mentioned that the standard setting body, the technical committee, you and I refer to you as the ICANN representative, as a nonvoting liaison, if I understand correctly. And so given that this whole setup is not unlike the IETF is dealing with the IANA, so the maintenance agency is something like the IANA for the IETF, except that it seems to have a bit more decisional capacity than the IANA should have for protocol registries. And I'm referring to the second thing, the maintenance agency.

You also mentioned that you are a member or a part of the maintenance agency, and it turned out that the maintenance agency does seem to have influence on who gets a code, where the code gets and what exactly the codes are. As you said, they made some decisions for the four letters, and probably also some decisions about how the two-letter codes look like. Could you elaborate a bit on that, how your particular role is there?

JAAP AKKERHUIS:

Yes. The liaison role with 46 is purely informative. It's no voting, nothing there happening. Not [a right] to vote. There are very strict rules about how that works in TC 46 and what the role of a

liaison is. ICANN is liaison D on the request of TC 46 itself so they can get communication channel [code].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

PETER KOCH: The question was what the role of the maintenance agency is.

JAAP AKKERHUIS: Yes. I started from the top. The maintenance agency, the members are – half are standard organizations, the other half are big customers. ICANN is seen as a big customer, and the official is yes, it is actually voting capacity. I could vote for this stuff. What the operation is inside, and MA is aware of that, is that that came on board when the [inaudible] also made the rules about how to vote. Electronic voting was introduced, and I made sure that I will only set a vote on things like editorial changes, things like that. The moment there is any code involved, country or whatsoever, I abstain from voting and have always done that.

BART BOSWINKEL: Peter in addition, I'm his substitute [which] nobody knows, actually. But say, I think the maintenance agency is not involved

in deciding what is or what is not a country or territory that should be included. There are rules around it, and so that's where they don't take a vote. They take a vote on the assignment of the two-letter code to the country or territory. There's the difference.

JAAP AKKERHUIS:

Yes. Basically, if somebody pops up, [inaudible] deciding to have a code, that happens a lot. There is this board of 50 experts which I actually consulted, and that's part of the rules. And did not consult it about the silly ones, but when there is serious stuff, that's where it goes. And they give guidance to the maintenance agency whether or not we'll assign a code.

NIGEL ROBERTS:

I'm conscious we're starting to run a little bit short of time, but it's very interesting, so I'm inclined to give a little bit of leeway here. So, if you can be quick.

PETER KOCH:

Thank you, Nigel. The point that made me raise this question is where you mentioned that SU was I think long term, indeterminately, whatever, reserved instead of being transitionally reserved.

JAAP AKKERHUIS: Exceptionally reserved.

PETER KOCH: Exceptionally reserved, yes. Thank you.

JAAP AKKERHUIS: It still doesn't mean that it is forever.

PETER KOCH: No, but this is a decision that as I understood your presentation is made by the maintenance agency. Maybe on request of somebody, but it is made as a decision of the MA, and in theory, ICANN would have a say, but you said ICANN or you are abstaining in these cases as a matter of principle. Thank you.

JAAP AKKERHUIS: Yes. Always. And the voting rules are also complicated, but actually, what people want is to have a consensus minus two. When the first vote doesn't work, it will actually – there will be multiple rounds, and so it's possible to abstain and not hinder the process. That's basically –

NIGEL ROBERTS: I hope that answers your question fully. Eberhard.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I just want to make a quick comment, which was that when we were setting up this relationship about ten years ago, we were extremely conscious of the perception of conflict of interest, which is why we didn't choose an IANA staff member to be the liaison, for example. It's why we contracted Jaap as a third party to be our liaison, so he was at arm's length. So, I think clearly we're the biggest user, arguably, of the standard. So, there was a strong interest in us having some seat at the table to express concerns about interoperability issues or what have you, but when we implemented it, we were very careful about abstaining from all votes and ensuring that we had someone who was sort of somewhat independent.

EBERHARD LISSE: Okay. Whether it's IANA or ICANN or whoever is involved in creating a new country is not relevant, really. My real interest—and what reflects on this working group – is how long is the minimum of a transition. The maximum is defined, what you said, but for us, it's important to know what's the minimum.

JAAP AKKERHUIS: There is no number.

EBERHARD LISSE: That will have an effect on our work.

NIGEL ROBERTS: That was very useful. Just before we go to Allan, I just want to see if there are any more questions on this one so we can get on to the next interesting presentation quickly. Bart, did you want to say something quickly?

BART BOSWINKEL: Yes. As Jaap said, what is probably very important – but I didn't know how to organize this – is that the working group at least has an understanding and a view of the rules themselves. And I know that there are also available as an e-book or something. I do have a copy, but it's very restrictive use of it. So, if you're really interested, go to the ISO website and get a copy. You can download it, and if you download it, it's about 36 Swiss francs.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Yes, I think that's something we should do. Allan, sorry to keep you waiting.

ALLAN MACGILLIVRAY: Thank you, Nigel. It's Allan MacGillivray from CIRA. Actually, my questions were largely the same as Peter's. I might phrase them a different way, but I'm not going to. I'm just going to make a

couple of observations. Really, at a certain point, we're going to try and understand at what point two-letter codes go from this list to that list, who makes the decision on that movement, and I think it would be valuable if we could understand the difference in roles between the maintenance agency and the Technical Committee who makes decisions on the movement of those codes, and based on the history that you've outlined, Jaap, which was very helpful, what the observable norms were. Like actually [in answer to] Eberhard's question, there's no fixed norm on how long a code is on the transitional list – point taken – but typically, how long are they? Just so we can establish some norms around possible – am I making myself clear, Jaap?

JAAP AKKERHUIS:

Yes. As I said, there is no guarantee at all. There is the goal – we try to keep them for 50 years – but it might not happen at all. And quite recently, I think the code for Sint Maarten was actually on transitional base and was reused very quickly, but people just forgot it was on the transitional list. And there was no protest, so that went smoothly. A lot of the things [this PDP decides] about exactly when they cease to exist, they have the research from text about it, and I cannot quote it down.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Perhaps we could get that out and send it by e-mail or something.

BART BOSWINKEL: As I said, the standard itself is copyright protected, so we have to be very careful using this. So, maybe I get –

NIGEL ROBERTS: So maybe we pay for it.

BART BOSWINKEL: As a group. That's something else. What is probably –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

BART BOSWINKEL: I have an addition to what Jaap said in response to your question, is probably what Jaap said was very important to understand is you've got the rule for the assignment. The rules about unassigning or moving, they are the exceptions. And because they are the exceptions, they are not as well defined as the rule for the assignment, and that's one of the major issues.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Thanks, Bart. Allan, would you like to finish off? I'm very conscious that we need to move on to Kim.

ALLAN MACGILLIVRAY: Yes, so that's exactly my question, is to the extent there are rules or norms for moving as [inaudible] from lists to lists, I think it would be useful if those could be explained, just written down. I don't think we need a presentation. And in particular, who makes the decision. Because I heard you say it was the maintenance agency, but in this exceptional case with Sint Maarten, it was the Technical Committee. And even if that's the situation, if we can just kind of get that written down somewhere, I think that would be useful when we do our report.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Excellent. I think that's a very good suggestion. This is the sort of thing we've done before. If you can't produce an absolute finite rule, we look at incidents over the past few years and compare them. I think that probably brings us to the end of this. It's been extremely interesting and extremely valuable.

Jaap, one final comment.

JAAP AKKERHUIS: The final comment is there is no movement between lists. Actually, it is on the list or it's unassigned. So, you don't really move these things around.

BART BOSWINKEL: To move this forward, otherwise we get stuck, and I think the purpose of this session was – of this presentation was to make you start thinking about what is and what is not on the ISO 3166 as a basis. I suggest that for the next call, we go a little bit deeper again and answer Allan's questions and your questions, and try to get into the rules and have a presentation around the rules and present these rules, and what really happens deep down, because that will provide the answers Allan is looking for, and what you're looking for as well.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Yes, I think Eberhard had it right. We're looking for the trigger. Thank you for that. Kim.

KIM DAVIES: Thanks. I guess while I wait for the slides to change, both Jaap and I are on the committee, so throughout the life of the – sorry, the working group, throughout the life of it, we're here to clarify any questions like this that come up throughout so we don't

have to answer everything today. We can certainly do so during future meetings.

I'm going to give a presentation that essentially tries to provide background from the side of implementation, how ICANN/IANA/PTI has, over the course of ICANN's history at least, implemented changes to the ISO standard with respect to operational reality. This is hopefully a little shorter presentation. I know we're pressed for time. Adobe is losing text off my slides, so that's unfortunate.

But this slide really is intending to illustrate the statuses that a ccTLD can have with respect to the ISO 3166 standard. If you think about the status of a TLD using two dimensions, one is eligibility. Either the string is eligible for delegation, or it's not eligible for delegation. And then if you think about it in a different dimension, a string can either be delegated in the root zone or not delegated in the root zone. And if you divide that into quadrants, you can actually kind of see the natural lifecycle of a ccTLD delegation. Incidentally, this actually applies to gTLDs as well, but since we're only talking about ccTLDs, I'll focus on that.

In its natural state, before a ccTLD exists, before a country exists, obviously it's neither eligible nor delegated. It's not in the ISO list and it's not in the root zone. At some point, a country is

created. The string is therefore selected. It becomes eligible for delegation. So, for lack of a better term, we'll call that string selected. That opens a pathway for an eligible applicant to come to IANA to request delegation in a ccTLD. Assuming they meet the criteria, delegation occurs and then it goes into an active state. So it's both eligible and delegated.

At some point, a change happens. Perhaps the country ceases to exist. It is now removed from the ISO standard, and I think it's an important comment that Jaap was just making, which is that all of the reserve types that he was explaining are not in the ISO standard. These are housekeeping annotations that the MA has, but any kind of reservation is not in the ISO standard.

So, at that point it's not in the ISO standard any longer, but it's still in the root zone. So, at that phase, it's essentially in a phase-out stage. Over some period of time, the expectation is that will be removed from the root zone. And then finally, it's removed from the root zone and it sort of goes back to square one. It's now neither eligible nor delegated, and the cycle of delegation could theoretically continue.

So, how do we calculate eligibility? Obviously, there are two types of ccTLDs. We have ASCII ccTLDs, two alphanumerical characters, and we have IDN ccTLDs. The way we assess eligibility in terms of the string, there's really three criteria that

we use and have used. Firstly is assignment of the alpha-2 code in the ISO 3166 part 1 standard. Secondly is eligibility under a specific ICANN Board resolution that was passed in the year 2000. And I'll get to the details of that on a future slide.

And thirdly, grandfathered ccTLDs. Grandfathered here means TLDs that were delegated based on the reserved list of the ISO standard prior to that 2000 resolution. So, we had a situation where there was a number of TLDs that were not in the ISO standard that were delegated, essentially prior to ICANN. That was when ICANN was constituted recognized as a gap, and the Board resolution was designed to clarify the circumstances under which moving forward, those reserve codes might be used, and everything prior to that day we consider as grandfathered.

Apologies, because the Adobe is messing up the slide a bit. But on the IDN ccTLD side, essentially, eligibility is calculated in a similar fashion. String eligibility is determined by one of those first two boxes from the ASCII side. That is in order to be eligible for an IDN ccTLD, the entity must be either eligible because that entity has been assigned an ISO code, or because that entity is eligible under resolution 00.74. But obviously, that is not how the string itself is selected, it's just eligibility of the country/territory. Then the string itself comes today through

the IDN fast track process or any subsequent procedures that might be developed by the ccNSO.

This perhaps talks to the question received earlier about are all 676 accounted for. This is a charter generated from the ISO data, and it indicates all the reservations as well as all of the assigned codes. So, everything in green on there is assigned in the ISO standard. It's considered in ISO 3166. Everything in various different shades of gray is considered not in the ISO standard, although some have certain reservation statuses with the ISO 3166 maintenance agency.

So, this is the exact text of the resolution I mentioned passed in the year 2000, and I've essentially highlighted what I think is the critical language here that is relevant to this discussion. IANA staff is advised that alpha-2 codes not on the ISO 3166 list are delegable as ccTLDs only in cases where the ISO maintenance agency, on its exceptional reservation list, has a reservation of the code that covers any application of ISO 3166 that needs a coded representation in the name of the country, territory, or area involved. So, that is essentially the litmus staff that we use as staff whenever we receive a request for assigning some code that is not in the ISO standard.

This is a screenshot of a – I think slightly dated – bulletin that was issued by the ISO 3166 maintenance agency. But it sort of

illustrates where that language derives from, which is essentially a footnote attached to the European Union entry that has almost verbatim the language from the 2000 Board resolution. So, essentially, this is the applicability as it is today.

Marrying those things together, what do we consider exceptionally reserved, and what do we consider their status as of today? As of 2000, there were four codes that we considered grandfathered: AC, GG, JE, UK.

NIGEL ROBERTS: You missed one.

KIM DAVIES: Did I miss one?

NIGEL ROBERTS: IM.

KIM DAVIES: I don't think that was exceptional. That's regularly assigned now.

NIGEL ROBERTS: I don't want to go into the weeds here, but GG, JE and IM were exceptionally reserved together and became regular codes together.

KIM DAVIES: Okay. I might have miswritten here. I'll trust Nigel on this one. But the reason there is an asterisk next to GG, JE and potentially IM is exactly what Nigel said, which is that subsequently, they have been promoted I guess you could say to assigned status. So, I'll leave it as an exercise for the viewer as to whether they're still grandfathered or not, but today, the two delegated domains that are still not assigned but grandfathered are AC and UK. There's one domain eligible under the Board resolution from 2000, that is .EU, and then the remainder that are exceptionally reserved by ISO today are not considered eligible under either of those criteria, which are those listed on the screen.

I threw this in just because I think it's an important thing just to keep in the back of your mind as you do your deliberations as a working group, which is that if you are looking at the various eligibilities of exceptionally reserved codes, which is something that I've personally confronted over the years having dialogs about various requests and the practicality of them is that the fundamental nature of the entities behind the different codes can vary. So, you have some that are either direct correlation to

widely accepted nations, or they're somewhat subsidiary to a nation, there's some kind of dependency on a nation.

But then you also have entities that are, let's call them supranational, like the EU that is combined of multiple nations. And then we also have, let's call them supranational with an asterisk, which is that – so in the case of SU, represents what today would be a collection of individual nations but in its time was not. And in fact, today is not an entity of any particular legal standing.

There are a lot of asterisks here, but I think when it comes to the practical nature in terms of both assignment and removal, bearing in mind thinking back to the framework of interpretation and the other policies associated with ccTLD activities, it's important to identify what the local Internet community is, it's important to identify things like who the local government is, and these are essential questions that we as staff need to answer to have a practical implementation of using these codes that are not around well-defined concepts.

This graph might be a little hard to read, but what I've tried to do is give you just an overall picture of relevant events associated with all of the codes that are now no longer in the ISO standard that have been delegated, at least in the time ICANN has been in existence. Essentially, the class of ccTLDs really they're in [script

here of] five. I'm not going to go through them in order, I'm going to start actually from the bottom.

We talked about Zaire earlier. It has now been replaced with the Democratic Republic of Congo, so that happened somewhere around 1997. Now, just to explain the color coding for a second, green means it was in the ISO standard, it was eligible at that time. Yellow means that it was now no longer in the ISO standard, but its successor domain or domains were not yet delegated. So obviously, the day an ISO code is removed is not the day its successor is delegated in the root zone. There is a transitional period where a new code is assigned, an operator needs to be found for that domain, they need to go through the delegation process, that domain needs to become active. Our transition approach is to be mindful of that. We're not certainly rushing anything here. There should be an orderly and deliberate process to implement a successor domain, and that factors into this.

And then what is actually orange on the slides – it shows up as brown on the screen – is the period in which the successor is active, and this is the period in which transition should be actively happening to that new or multiple new domains that have been created. And then the end of the bar chart is when the domain is actually removed from the root zone. So, coming back

to Zaire, it was assigned until 1997, it was delegated later in 1997, and then it was removed from the root zone I think in 2001.

The next case on the slide is the case of .yu for Yugoslavia. Now, there is a bit of a twist when it comes to .yu, which is that it was regularly assigned until 2003, and successor domain was CS. Now, CS is interesting for a variety of different reasons that were in Jaap's slide, but in this particular case, what's interesting about this is that people in the know throughout this period kind of knew that Serbia and Montenegro were going to split and all the writing was on the wall.

So, when we were in discussions with the operators of .yu about transition and approach to that, essentially, the common understanding was that Serbia Montenegro is extremely likely to split again. There'll be two more codes that need to be generated. And all this transition to CS will be for naught because we're going to have to transition again in a very short period of time. With that in mind, there wasn't an approach to retirement that was strongly active at that time until the two successors for Serbia which is .rs, and Montenegro which is .me happened, at which point that CS line ends. Both .rs and .me were assigned within a year later, and then the transition happened.

In this case, as we somewhat formalized the approach a little bit, as ICANN was maturing, there was a Board resolution. The Board had given .yu two years following the Board resolution to end of life the domain, and then after two years, the operator had come back to ICANN asking for an extension. A six-month extension was granted, and then it was removed in early 2010.

In the case of .tp, it was a longer time period. What's not obvious from this graph is that .tp were actually very diligent in stopping all registrations in .tp as soon as .tl was assigned, they moved almost everything right away. TP was effectively empty for most of that time as a zone. There were very little registrations, and they were effectively sort of dead registrations.

The reason it took that long was just simply that the President of the country was listed as the administrative contact for the domain, and I spent years dealing with bureaucracy just to get it on the radar to get some authorization from their – it was not through any lack of goodwill and so forth, it was just bureaucracy, really. Then there's the case of .su, which is the only one in this status that is still in the zone today, and I suspect might be a topic for consideration as this working group does its deliberations.

So .su was delegated in 1990. In 1992, it ceased to be an ISO 3166 alpha-2 code, and December 1997 is when the last of the – I think

it was 12 or so – successor ISO codes was delegated. It has been delegated since that point. A notable event happened around the year 2010, which was that a third-party application was made to the ISO 3166 maintenance agency to change it from transitionally reserved – i.e. it was not in the ISO standard in any reserve capacity – to exceptionally reserved, which again ICANN abstained. We didn't involve ourselves in this decision. The other members of the ISO MA granted that request. Since that time, it's been exceptionally reserved, but as I noted in the previous slide, it is not conforming with the guidance we have from the Board resolution of 2000.

.an in this case that Jaap has had in his slides, it was broken up into various parts in 2010. The successor domains were delegated about a year later. There was a transition plan similar to .yu, and it was removed in 2015.

That's pretty much all of the retirement activity that has happened, certainly on my watch, and I think on ICANN's watch in terms of TLDs that have existed and don't exist any longer, or have some kind of status that suggests they need to be phased out. Just to finalize my presentation, I wanted to just give some bullet points on what our approach to phasing out ccTLDs has been.

Firstly, what we do is we trust and empower the ccTLD managers to be responsible in finding the locally appropriate mechanism to phase out these domains. We check in with them, we give status updates to one another. If they need counseling, advice or suggestions, we provide them to them, or sometimes we point them to other countries that have gone through the same experience. But essentially, the exact plan of who to speak to in the country, what the roadmap is and so on. Just as we trust ccTLD managers in the beginning to be responsible for what the community wants to do there, when it comes to phasing out and transitioning to successor domains, we trust them to do it in a similar fashion.

Like I said, we provide counseling and experience based on other cases, but we do not prescribe a certain specific approach on how to do a phase out. I think importantly, all ccTLDs that are phased out have natural successors. Countries become other countries, they always sort of go somewhere else. There are no landmasses that just sort of disappear.

So, maybe that will not prove true in the time – yes, sea rises might change that assumption, but for now, let's assume that there are always natural successors for domains. And often, there's a lot of coordination on our side, because quite frankly, a lot of the successors are delegated to the same people who ran

the domain that is now being phased out, so there's a natural synergy between multiple TLDs.

One of the interesting things about the transition is obviously the question of how long it should take. And we don't have a lot of case studies from the ccTLD world to really look upon. But we do know that these kinds of transitions are a lot more common than you might think, because they actually happen a lot in other spaces. For example, telephone numbering schemes in countries.

In my country, at some point they changed phone numbers from being seven digits to eight digits. In another country I lived in, they changed the phone area code for my city to another one. So, these kinds of transitions happen in the telephone numbering space quite often. Postal codes are often also changed as well in different countries, and these kinds of transitions are usually done in the order of a few years, a small number of years.

My observation from the ccTLD space is that excessively long crossover periods discourage timely action. The tendency is if the deadline is way in the future, like decades away, no one is going to start taking action now. I think IPv6 is perhaps a corollary from our industry about there's not a pressing urgency right in front of you, that people's tendency is just to delay. So,

again, I'm sure the working group will deliberate upon it in detail as it moves forward. But that's experience that I've seen in administering this.

That's all I had. Happy to –

NIGEL ROBERTS: Yes. Thank you, Kim. I'm conscious we've now overrun slightly, but anybody got any brief questions for Kim? Allan.

ALLAN MACGILLIVRAY: Actually, I just want to be clear, Kim. Of the five cases you mentioned, are any of those TLDs still resolving, or are they all out of the root now?

KIM DAVIES: Yes, just one, .su.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Thank you, Kim. We did have one more item on the agenda, I think.

BART BOSWINKEL: I think that was the work items moving forward, and I think what I've taken from this meeting is at least that we send out a Doodle poll to start and kick off the first meeting together with you, say,

that we prep for the next meeting that we try to get deeper into the rules around assignment and changing the status of a code from one, from assigned to for example exceptionally reserved, as they are in the ISO list, and I think have a discussion around it so there is again a more deeper understanding of the implications of these rules. Those are the major things I've taken [off.]

Maybe what I have listed here as well – and again as basic material, maybe we can do it together with Kim – is try to create a repository of the relevant Board resolutions at the time which are currently driving the practices of PTI. I think then you have basic material to really start looking, say, then call afterwards, then we can really start addressing the issues. But this is all fact-finding time.

NIGEL ROBERTS:

Thank you, Bart. I think it's been extremely constructive. I'd just like to thank everybody, just ask anybody if they have any final comments or questions, but make it extremely brief. I'll give you about ten seconds to do that.

We have 30 minutes? Oh, then we're ahead of the game. That's alright, so we only had an hour and a half. Well, then ask away.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

NIGEL ROBERTS: Yes, I think the plan of an hour and a half was probably right, even if we did have two hours.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

NIGEL ROBERTS: Yes. Well, with that, I'll adjourn the meeting until the next call. Thank you very much indeed.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]