

**Transcription ICANN Singapore  
Update on Country Codes  
Saturday 22 March 2014**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

On page: <http://gnso.icann.org/en/calendar/#mar>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page

David: Next session, as I said, will be the joint working group on Use of Country Codes and Territory Names. Could we start the recording on that please? And I would ask Bart to start the discussion.

Bart Boswinkel: Thank you very much inviting as a ccNSO support staff explaining what the ccNSO has done, and will do with regard to the use of country and territory names.

Just a little bit of background. I think in 2010, the ccNSO started what is called a study group on the use of country and territory names as TLDs. The GNSO and At-Large were invited to participate as observers, and that means in the context of the ccNSO to fully engage in the discussions on the use of country names.

And because this was a study group, it was just identifying some issues with regard to the use of country and territory names under the different policies that exist. So you do not just have the new gTLD, there is a section in the applicant guidebook on the use of country and territory names, but also you've got the regular ROC 5921 Policy on (asking) ccTLDs. You've got the IDN PDP and you've got the IDN fast track all dealing with country and territory names, and all having a different regime.

So the first thing they did is try to develop – they first provide an overview of these different policies and draft policies, and that's included in the final report of this study group.

The second thing they've done is try to come up with what is called a typology of country names which is not really – say not how they use but get a meaningful description of different kinds of country names. And that typology was vetted with the assistance of UNESCO.

(And they) survey to the member (face) of UNESCO and check whether it was a meaningful representation. And based on that analysis of some of the issues, the recommendation of the study group there needs to be further study to really identify the issues with the different policies.

And as this is not just ccNSO work of ccTLD or ccNSO, ccTLD related policies but has a broader impact.

The study group also recommended this should be a true cross-community working group. So the charter was – there was a straw man drafted and it was refined, also based on the discussions of the cross-community working group, say dealing with the framework for cross-community working groups – and I still can say it without laughing.

It's – so that's reflected in the charter that was sent to you through the GAC and to At-Large. And say the objective and the scope in that study group or in the charter that was sent to you, reflects the recommendation that was almost a literal – it's the recommendation as suggested by the study group for a cross-community working group. That's it I think.

Woman: Was it something I said?

David: Are there any questions? Yes John.

John Berard: Yes – John Berard. I just conferred with Bart that this charter is an early example of what we hope we will be able to instigate with the cross-community working group working group work.

How much wood could a woodchuck chuck if a woodchuck could chuck wood?

Yes, and so it's an example companion motion to the earlier one that we discussed. And certainly because I moved both of them, I would encourage that they be acted swiftly and in concert.

David: Thank you John. Do we have any other questions? Yes, Kristina.

Kristina Rosette: Hi. Thanks Bart. Kristina Rosette from the IPC for the transcript – sorry - over here.

What I am trying to figure out – and I haven't done it so I'm hoping you can help me – is to and try and figure out how this work that this working group would do would interact or intersect with the work that is now being discussed in the GAC about completely revisiting the geographic names issue.

Bart Boswinkel: Geographic – the easiest way to explain it is probably this is a small subset. The ccNSO is not concerned about the whole geographic names; that's very clear as well.

And this is around, I think, a footnote in the Applicant Guidebook. And that footnote said during the first round of new gTLDs, country and territory names, could not be applied. And the core of it is all those names listed on the ISO 3166. That's the scope of this working group.

I don't know to what extent the GAC and the revisit of geographic names will overlap with this work because I wasn't aware of that work. I know the GAC has been invited to participate in this working group, so my presumption is

that part as it was already exempted from say the whole discussion on geographic names will be exempted from that one. But that's my private presumption.

Kristina Rosette: Okay. Do you – what would your suggestion be as to how we could get some clarity on that? Because just given some of the historical issues that have come out of the GAC expressing frustration about work going on in certain areas on policy issues that they're also dealing with, I'm just whether or not we know for a fact that there's been kind of a decision to coordinate or a decision not to coordinate.

Bart Boswinkel: I think – and the reason for inviting the GNSO, ALAC and the GAC – so if you would really look into the charter itself is you will see that no – say every recommendation, even a non-recommendation, will be reported back to every participating SO and AC.

But I think that's, again, maybe too much ccNSO review of ccTLD review. It is up to the participating SO and AC to coordinate internally how they will manage it.

Say if a participating SO or AC does not support the final recommendations or the final report, then there will be no recommendation to whomever.

So I hope that – it's a procedural answer, but that's the best I can give you.

Kristina Rosette: No, that's helpful. Thank you.

David: I think the next question was from Ching Chiao.

Ching Chiao: Actually it's not a question. This is Ching speaking.

Since we have the motion in front of us, so just a friendly reminder that suppose that we on Wednesday session we will have to have the name for

the GNSO co-chair and also the GNSO liaison for this cross-community working group. Is that correct?

David: I think so, yes. So that's a good point for everyone to think for Wednesday, who will be there. Yes?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, two points going back to your question.

I think it's very relevant that say – and you will see it in the charter of the cross-community working group on the framework as well, is the role – and that's the experience of say the more successful cross-community working groups, I think, is that the working group itself will be forced back to the participate or constituting SOs and ACs. That's really the core of it, so that's the first remark. And that's why they are drafted the way they are.

The second point is there is a competition on Thursday morning for those people who are interested in the cross-community working group on frameworks of cross-community working group and this working group. They will have their first meetings at the same time.

David: Thank you for that. Do we have any further questions on this item or shall we – because we will have more opportunity to discuss this further when the motion comes up on Wednesday.

If there aren't any further questions, I'll thank Bart for his time and we'll move on to the next item. So if we could stop recording on that one.

END