
ABU DHABI – Joint Meeting: GAC & ccNSO
Tuesday, October 31, 2017 – 13:30 to 14:15 GST
ICANN60 | Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Hello, everybody. Please sit down, we have to start. Time is a very scarce resource nowadays, so thank you.

So we are having our traditional session with the colleagues from the ccNSO today. We don't have that much time, so we try to run through a number of items and have an exchange on them. If maybe we can pull up the points of the agenda on the second screen that is not used that would be useful, but let me until then maybe start and say hello to our colleagues and let them present themselves because we have a number of new people that may not be familiar with you yet. So, thank you very much.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much, Thomas. My name is Katrina Sataki, I'm the chair of the ccNSO council from the European region. And with me I have Nigel Roberts, he's also a counselor also from the European region. And I have numerous colleagues of mine here in the hole. And if there are any questions that we cannot answer, they will be happy to step in and provide any information that you need.

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

So, our first agenda item today is ISO 3166 three letter codes as TLDs. Currently they are excluded. But we know that it's a very hot topic for GAC this and the next one actually about the development of policy with respect to the use of country and territory names as top-level domains in subsequent rounds.

We know that you've been working on that very actively. Your discussions we've seen the letter you sent to the GNSO, your requirements, your expectations from this policy development process and from discussions. And this time actually, we would like to hear more on your views where we can find some common grounds where we could collaborate. Any of your plans, any of your views, we would really be glad and happy to hear.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Katrina. As you say, these issues are of course of high interest to many of us, governments, and I think we share some common interests or concerns with the ccTLDs in this regard. And one element, and we don't have to separate them, we can allow for the floor actually on both because I think they are fairly close to each. The ISO list with the three letter codes is of course something that is interesting for many stakeholders for various reasons. The question is, what is the public policy interest or what may be rights, what may be uses and what is the history also in how these things were looked at or dealt with.

Also, from our side, an interest would be to hear your views and then again also the general conditions or concerns but then conditions under which as we understand you and us and the ALAC accepted to be part of this so called Work Track 5 to work on geo names, not just country and territory names, but geo names in general, but of course, country and territory names is something that is a specially important issue.

So let's just open the debate and have GAC representatives as well as members from the ccTLD registries to share views. I think from what I read in both conditions that there's quite an overlap in the conditions, and so we may have a clear common interest here. So the floor is open to you, so I hope you will actively share your views and ideas and concerns about geo names, country and territory names, three letter codes. Whatever you think you would like to share something, would be very much appreciated. Thank you. Switzerland.

SWITZERLAND:

Hello, good afternoon and thank you for coming. I just wanted to see with you whether you are considering in any way launching a PDP or any policy development process on the three letter codes. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you for your question. At this moment we are not considering it. We are working on other policy development processes. And later today we'll share an update on that. We, as you may have seen in our letter to the GNSO, we pointed out that we reserve the rights to our participation in the work of the PDP GNSO on the use of geo names does not excludes us from launching our own PDPs that are in scope of the ccNSO, which means that those codes that are country codes. But at the moment, we are not planning to do that.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Other comments or questions? Norway.

NORWAY: Thank you, just a question. I heard about this; I don't know if it's finished yet, but have the ccNSO reached any kind of common position on the use of geographical names for the future round of new gTLDs and kind of like the status of the former applicant guidebook?

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much for this question. I think our community is not different from any other community which means that our views within the community differ. Some are more open to

having names as TLDs, some are more restrictive. So nevertheless, for us the common position is and it was now specifically expressed in some statements issued by Asia Pacific Top Level Domain Association and center that is ccTLD Registry Association in Europe, and we expect Latin American Association and African Association to join us shortly.

So our common position is that we are open to discussions and if we succeed in finding a better solution than it's currently proposed in the Applicant Guidebook, we're open to these discussions. But if we cannot reach consensus on any other solution that others would be happy with, then we expect that -- and yeah, that's quite an unprecedented event perhaps for ccTLDs registries; we're on the same page that if we can't reach consensus on a better solution that satisfies everyone, then we should go back and keep the consensus that we reached more than five years ago and that is written in the Applicant Guidebook.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Iran.

IRAN: Thank you very much from our sides also for coming.

Yesterday, I entered the GAC room, I was outside for another group and I saw that there was a meeting with the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group. Someone in that, on the top table, mentioned that there is no international law or agreement, but I think he said law, regarding any right or any country over any name and so on and so forth.

I think it is debatable this issue. If there is no international law, there is no specific law authorizing that. The issue is silent. And in addition, it is not only international law which should be applicable. Sometimes you have common law, sometimes you have many other things. So we are not convinced of that unilateral statement, saying that you can freely use because there is no law. I'm sorry to give you this very, very primitive example. If there is no rules for the speed of the car, you cannot run with 300 kilometer saying there's no rules. Still something common sense, common law, provide you some guidance. So this is one.

And the other one, we don't want the same issue which has happened for the two letters happen again for the three letters. We are very happy that the issue is in the hand of the ccNSO at least taking into account all of the comments in an appropriate manner, and do not count on this issue of minority and majority, because otherwise it might be that those people who have rights they still remain in some sort of thing they call the minority. So I

don't think that we should [inaudible] course to the majority or minority. We should come to have an agreement, a consensus satisfactory to everybody. Please kindly take that into account in your further works.

And the PDP, I think the PDP of ccNSO is so quite different from the PDP of others. But I hope that we don't go to that PDP because there are some resources, problems, difficulties of some governments if not all attending the PDP and they may be left behind that their views and comments are not properly reflected. This is just a view that we could express, thank you.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Iran. Other comments, questions also from ccNSO in case. Yes, Switzerland.

SWITZERLAND: Thank you for giving me the floor again. I guess one consideration which I'll just leave it as a very general level is that apart from when we distinguish between a ccNSO process and a GNSO process, is that what is the resulting legal framework applicable to that TLD. As for ccTLDs, we have a very subsidiarity-driven approach, were it lies more or less in the hands of the national community to establish the legal framework together with the ccTLD operator so it's very independent from ICANN. But if we go

through the GNSO approach, normally we end up with all the applicable laws, all of the contractual framework, and so on and so forth.

So I guess it's a consideration to make if we are going to talk about the three letter codes or the country and territory names as top level domains in the Work Track 5, whether the whole of the contractual framework would apply or as these are really from a substantial point of view, more like the ccTLDs whether we are to go for a more subsidiarity approach. So I don't know if you have thought about that. Thank you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Well, are you going to answer?

KATRINA SATAKI: No.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: So that was the answer? Okay. Other comments, questions?

A transcript is a transcript, so it will be there forever, maybe.

Okay. If there are no more, maybe just one thing that before giving the floor to Iran, we understand that the Work Track 5 co-chairs are currently in the process of trying the figure out the

procedural bases for that work. And they have read, and from what I understood, the conditions that you and us we have given them for our participation and there seems to be some aspects of this that seems to be rather easy to build in whereas others are maybe not foreseen in exactly the way we've formulated it in the GNSO structure.

And I think I signal personally to the chair for instance that we may have to be innovative also there to accommodate for structures that are not in breach with what we have but maybe going a little further than what there is in order to find solutions that are workable and that create a trust to deal with this very important matter in this particular environment, and we would be willing to continue to work with them. So in a way that these concerns and these criteria can be built into a process so that we don't have to spend time for something that in the end will be challenged because of the process, but that we feel comfortable all of us in this process.

So I don't know whether you have already had exchanges with the GNSO about how to process this into something that is acceptable and trustworthy to everybody.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Yes, thank you very much, Thomas, for this question; yes, we had an exchange with the GNSO yesterday. We also asked if they were going to provide an answer to our letter that we sent. And they said that they received letters from you, from us, apparently from ALAC as well, as some of the requirements are the same, some are maybe a little bit contradicting; some are easy for them to accommodate within their framework, some are more difficult. But they are looking for ways to address all our concerns and they are planning to send us common proposals how we could move forward.

Today we also already had an update from our co-chair on that Work Track 5. That's Annebeth Lange. You all know her, she's from .no, it's a top-level domain for Norway. Unfortunately, she has to take care of her voice, so she's not speaking much. But a colleague from .uk, Nick, he's her voice, so if you have any questions, the voice will be happy to answer. She nevertheless can kick and if he answers wrongly, then she will use at least this leverage to put us back on track.

So if you have any questions to them, they will be happy to answer. But today as I mentioned, we had an update from them and they also encouraged ccNSO members and not only members, ccTLDs that are not ccNSO members at the moment to participate in the work of this Work Track 5 because we need

people to participate there. And especially we need people from different regions, not just, you know, one-two regions covered. The more people we can get on board, the better.

Of course, we understand that not everybody can participate, and that's normal in all discussions, all processes. But the more people we get on board, the better it's going to be.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER:

Thank you, and maybe one final question from my side. We are discussing in the GAC, how do we support organize our participation on this in addition to just having one co-chair which is an important function, it's a important signal. We are thinking of selecting a number of GAC representatives that may somehow portray the diversity of issues, of views, or situations that we have in the GAC about this issue of geographic names.

How will you participate in this? Do you have some ideas that you will designate in addition to the co-chair? Also, a number of people or are you inviting everybody to participate? How are you making sure that it's not just for the filter of one person but it's actually several voices from the ccNSO that can somehow be heard and that people understand how the read these voices but it's an individual representative or he speaks for a number or for the whole. So how do you organize your participation in addition

to the co-chair; that would be an interesting thing. So we will hear the voice I guess -- the voice of Annebeth.

KATRINA SATAKI: Nick Wenban-Smith from .uk.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Thank you for the floor, I'm the voice of Annebeth. So it's a very good questions and I think we have to engage constructively and meaningfully and efficiently because as [inaudible] resource on time potentially in these GNSO policy processes. The initial answer is it's open to everybody to participate. So we would encourage our ccTLD colleagues to join the participation groups.

But as in terms of our inputs, and we've tried to prepare the ground very carefully for this; we have already the Asia Pacific statement, we have the sent statement was unanimous among 60 ccTLDs. That includes the UK in agreement with Brussels for a change there. And we are expecting something from the Latin and Caribbean TLDs, and I think our initial plan is to have a smaller group of people we will coordinate our input but we strongly will rely on the legitimacy of hundreds of ccTLDs making who are making the same statements from around the world, and that's what we will say.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Pakistan. Sorry, Palestine.

PALESTINE: Thank you very much for all of these clarifications. I have a question regarding the three-character domain. We have talked about the characters on the top-level domain and the second level. Now my question is, is there going to be the ISO 3661 some letters or digits reserved for the government or is it going to be dependant on the interests of the countries?

For example, for Palestine is .ps, but relating to ISO 3166, so is this going to be automatically reserved for the government? So please clarify the situation and thank you.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH : So the 2012 Applicant Guidebook for the new gTLDs recognized that because it's more than two letters, this is GNSO policy territory and that's constitution in the ICANN bylaws. But there are geographic protections. So although these are generic terms, they also have geographic significance and there are restrictions on geographic significant terms.

And as regards, the three letter ISO 3166 codes, and you referred to the one from Palestine, the present rules are that they are

blocked and that nobody is able to use these as a gTLD, they are blocked and that is the position that we wish to maintain.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you for this. UK.

UK: Thank you, chair, thank you Katrina, and Nick Wenban-Smith for coming to join us today. That's always very welcome.

Nick, you mentioned the center statement And you've recounted elements of that, I think. And also, a statement of position by the Asia Pacific region, if I understood you correctly. What about the other regions? Are they in the course of preparing positions on ISO 3166 three letter codes? What is the sort of timeline for an overall ccNSO positions? Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, so first we need to distinguish between ccNSO and regional organizations. We are talking about regional organizations here, so Asia Pacific as a regional organization, just as a center as European region, not organization. These are regional organizations that unite ccTLDs in particular regions.

So yes, we have two statements from two regional organizations and yes, as we already mentioned, we expect the Latin American region and the African regional organizations to join. About the timeline, well they work according to their own timelines. We expect it's going to be very soon.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: The Latin American and Caribbean Top Level Domain Association, they have their general assembly on the 15th of November so very soon we expect that statement to come.

UK: Mark Carvell again. Just to say that the UK government supports what the center statement was in respect of three letter codes as TLDs. In other words, only those that are listed on the 3166 of a three list should be blocked. So all the other combinations of three letters should be variable if I understood center correctly. And Nick is nodding, yes I got that right. Thank you.

And as far as two letter codes, then all our reserved as the current situation I think, whether they are on the list or not as country codes. If I understand contractually; yes, Nick agrees.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Yes, that's absolutely right and I think one of the things as we've gone into this process we've understood is that the 3166 standard is not absolutely static; it's dynamic, it changes over time as countries created and change names. So it's vitally important for future ccTLD creation that all the two letter combinations are reserved for future country names.

KATRINA SATAKI: I think Europe is happy to note UK's agreement.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: I have three more requests for the floor. Let's be brief, we are trying to move on. So Indonesia, Iran and Argentina. Thank you.

INDONESIA: Thank you, Thomas. Yes, I understand it now. So several statements from several regions. Just to remind Thomas and ccNSO that there's also an Asian statement for the ccTLD [inaudible]. If you want the letter, I have the letter. Thank you.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you very much. Iran.

IRAN:

Thank you, chair. First, one question and second, a comment. The question is that when we say Asia Pacific, has there been coordinated views for the entire region of Asia Pacific? Or some Asia Pacific putting proposals, suggestions in the name of Asia Pacific? So I would like to know whether there has been coordination among all members of Asia Pacific, first one.

And the second question, with respect to the use of the three letter characters, our strong view is that it should be under the specific agreement of the country with which or to which that associates. We don't want to have a similar situation that we have and saying that it's under the two rules, either rule one or rule two. Either go to the governor or not go to the governor; this is our view that it should be under the written agreement of the country in question. We don't want to have the same problem that we had before. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much, Iran; so answering your first question. As you know ccTLDs there are five regions, ICANN regions or count them as you wish, five regions. And ccTLDs in a particular region they come together and they form associations where they come together and discuss different issues. Not all ccTLDs are members of regional organizations. Nevertheless, many participated in the work in these regional organizations.

In the Asia Pacific region there is an organization, APTLD; Asia Pacific Top Level Domain Association. At their general assembly in September, that was one of the ideas that emerged during discussions; so they proposed a common statement, the statement was later discussed on the mailing list and that was the way that particular regional organization agreed to this statement.

Later in October there was a general assembly for center that is a regional organization for European National Top Level Domain Registries. And again, during the general assembly, ccTLDs in the European region -- I was part of one of the ccTLD there; so we discussed a statement and also approved it.

Later this -- well not this month, the next month in November, later in November, in the Latin American region, registries from that region that are members of that particular regional organization will come together at the general assembly and we expect that they will also discuss this issue, and we believe that they will join statements issued by regional organizations, Asia Pacific and in Europe.

Have I answered the question?

IRAN.

Thank you. Yes, the first question.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you, and then the second question, I'm not sure I quite understood it, so therefore I'd like to ask Nick to address it.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: I mean, my understanding of the country code assignment rules is only that the government is a significantly interested party cause these things are defined and therefore have a very strong input into how these things run. So I think the answer is in short yes to your question.

IRAN: Yes, a specific agreement. Thank you.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Argentina, very briefly.

ARGENTINA: Thank you, cair. Briefly, several GAC members have been sending emails to me that they would like to join our effort in participating in this Work Track 5. There will be a session on Thursday morning, three hours.

Some of the GAC members have also contacted me in evaluating if some issues like for example geographic indicators are going to be considered. The thing is, the rules, the scope is yet to be defined. So it's important if you have ideas or are not able to participate, send them to me or participate in the session, because the terms of reference will be defined starting the session on Thursday and beyond.

So have that in mind. And it will be not a big room, so you have to go early to have a seat. Thank you.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you. I see Nigeria very briefly, and then we have to move on to the other issues. It is obvious that this issue is a very sensitive, very political issue, so I think it's right to give this the most amount of time. Then we'll very quickly run through the other ones as they are also important but this is really something that is burning on a number o governments and other stakeholders' fingers. So Nigeria, and then we will move to the next item.

NIGERIA: Thank you, chair. I mean I apologize, this seems a bit pedestrian, but it does puzzle me why this conversation is going on and on. And we accept that the two characters for the ccTLDs handled by

the ccNSO, the three characters now that are coming up are to be handled by the GNSO and so on and so forth.

But the reality is that when the issue of the ccTLDs, the two characters was done, was speaked straight from the ISO list and assigned appropriately. So if for whatever reason people have decided to create three character TLDs, why should there be a debate about whether or not the list that is representative of various countries should be in contention? I think it shouldn't be in contention whatsoever.

And it's just surprising that we have these conversations and people keep debating it back and forth. I can understand when we talk about the general gTLDs, yes it's to help the Internet to grow, not the stifle innovations, and so on and so forth. But why should we have to plead or argue or make a case for people not to jump out with three-character codes that obviously have been used to represent names of countries for so long. Thank you.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER:

Thank you, Nigeria. This is a very useful question. The thing is this, I think mainly that when the structure of the DNS was set up, nobody was thinking that there would be anything else than two-character codes for countries, and at that time there were seven generic top level domains. And if you read what RFC 1591, or

whatever it is, says, it says that, “Yeah, we have two letter country codes and we have these seven gTLDs, and it's highly unlikely that there will be anything in the future.”

This was the basis somewhere in the 90s I think, that was the thinking and nobody had ever thought that we would have something like dot music or dot Amazon, or a 3-character TLD that would be a country code, a second version of a country code. So, you're right, we have this three letter ISO list that is used in sports or in other things, we also have not countries but cities with airports where you have three letter systems. But that wasn't meant to be used for the Internet as a top-level domain.

And this is now being discussed to what extent they can be used, and as we know, dot com is a generic top level domain and as a country that has this code as well and there may be others. So historically, this is a new situation and [inaudible] have heard the position of the ccNSO, of ccTLDs and there are also views within the GAC on this, but this is not something that has always been there. So there's an evolving development that puts us for new challenges to see what is the best way to deal with what should be allowed, what should not be allowed under what conditions. Maybe something should be allowed with regard to three character codes. So this is something that needs to be seen as a

development from a point when nobody ever thought that this would be possible. Yes, Nick.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: I totally echo all of those points, I think it's a very accurate and concise statement of where we are today.

I was going to just say some breaking news, which is that the African Top Level Domain Association has also prepared a statement along the following lines, so I think we have all the global communities now in one place. So I think that's a very strong mandate for those of us who are participating.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Yes, thank you. So we have only five minutes left, we really need to move to the other ones. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. Yes, but we have only five minutes left, and with that, we will be very quick and will give you a very short update on our policy development process. Nigel.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Yeah, thank you very much. My name is Nigel Roberts from Guernsey. I'm pleased for this opportunity to update GAC

members on the progress of the ccNSO policy development process on retirement of country code top level domains. I'm the chair of that working group.

As you've just heard, when the system that we know of it today of two letter codes was codified in the 1990s, policy was settled on how to create and add transfer responsibilities for ccTLDs; RFS 1591 and we've done a lot work since then on that on what it means. But as you've also heard recently, over the last few years a number of occasions arisen where the ISO codes that correspond to ccTLDs, although the two lists are not identical 100%, has changed; countries and territories have changed names, they've split, they've merged and there may or may not be a successive state in international law.

It became clear during the policy work that we good on the framework of interpretation that there were gaps in the policy environment that the IANA needs to do its job properly. So we launched this PDP several months ago, we held regular telephone meetings, and there will be a face to face meeting here in Abu Dhabi on Thursday.

We've started out, we reviewed how the changes happened to the ISO standard, which is not at all obvious, and we started to define our terminology. So progress is steady and good.

We do have something missing; during the framework of interpretation work; we had GAC participation and that we found was a very very helpful two-way channel of communication. And speaking as chair, and for all my colleagues, I'd like to reiterate that we'd like at least one, hopefully more than one of our colleagues here in the GAC to come along and assist us. So if you, the Chair, Mr Chair, or any particular member can do that, either contact myself or the ccNSO secretariat. Thank you. Any questions?

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much. Are there any questions? We have time for one or two questions. Yes, please.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

Thank you for the detailed briefing, particularly on the PDP process. It is appreciated that ccNSO and other concerned quarters in ICANN agreed and working hard to further progress on the policy development process on the issues. Particularly the mention in three letter codes and country and territory [inaudible] of the geo names. I want to know about the estimated time schedule on which ccNSO will be able to complete relevant PDP processes.

NIGEL ROBERTS: I'll take that because I believe you are referring to the retirement PDP, because that's the only one we have active. As I said, we had a slow and steady start. It's a relatively simple process. We begin to identify that there's just one or two identifiers, and particularly it's about time; how long do you preserve a ccTLD for when it's corresponding ISO code has moved away from the list.

I'd be hopeful that we get something done by the summer. But that's my hope and I can't speak for it; we don't have a fixed timetable in that regard.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Basically, I want to know if you have any -- have you started the plan, so what other activities you perform to get this one, particularly for the GA 17, 18, and 19; what is your targets, what activities...

NIGEL WENBAN-SMITH: I don't quite understand the question. We have a PDP, it will produce an outcome which will be a document. And at that point, it will come to the GAC for advice, it will go to the ICANN board for approval.

Those are time scales that are outside our own control. We found that when the framework of interpretation was done, it took an

awful lot longer to get through. We thought we'd finished, and it took an awful lot longer for the actual finished product to go through the additional processes even though it didn't change. So we can't really predict that. But as I say, we're aiming to have something publishable by the middle of 2018.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Okay, thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, thank you very much. Unfortunately, we do not have any more time to address other issues that were on our agenda. Probably we have been too optimistic in setting up our agenda.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: We would have one or two minutes left, time is relative as we know, to some extent at least. I don't know if anybody wants to just take one minute for the meeting strategy review and make a point. With regard to lowering barriers I would like to spend one minute with you on this one.

We have had several discussions with all other SO and ACs, with the board, with ICANN org, that we think in terms of living up to the expectation and the call value of informed and inclusive participation that steps need to be undertaken to improve the

accessibility of ICANN's work, ICANN's processes, ICANN's documents.

And just to let you know that we will continue to work on this; we're also having a discussion on this with the ALAC and we are looking for ways to support ICANN in improving the understandability, the traceability of issues, of documents so that noninsiders who have limited resources, also time but also other resources have an easier access to the processes and can make their voices heard. So we'll keep in touch with you on this.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Yes, thank you very much. Time is up. And we would like to thank you, Thomas, for all your support, and every time when we meet it's really great working with you. And also would like to welcome and congratulate the incoming chair. And wish her all success and if you need any support, we are here and we are willing to provide any help that you need. So thank you very much. With that, see you around and see you next time in Puerto Rico.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER:

Thank you all. So we are having a 30 second technical break for the recording of this as we learned, which is the perfect time to invite our colleagues from the ALAC to come to these tables. While we are installing the people here, thank you.

Thirty seconds is up for the technical break so we are on the record again. So for those new in the GAC we have quite theme in the new GAC representatives for us at this time. So these are colleagues from the ALAC where which is another there is an advisory committee a governmental advisory and advisory committee the Internet user.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]