
SAN JUAN – ccNSO: Retirement of ccTLDs PDP Working Group

Thursday, March 15, 2018 – 09:00 to 12:00 AST

ICANN61 | San Juan, Puerto Rico

NIGEL HICKSON: Well, good morning, everybody. Nice to see such a large turnout. It looks kind of full, even though this room is so large. Welcome from me. You know who I am. I think we can start.

Just a couple of little ... It's alright. I'm just talking. We don't know if everybody is here yet, but I was just going to give a couple of ... Do you want to start recording now? Test. Okay, it's already being recorded.

Thanks to Kim. Where's Kim?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: She will be back in a minute.

NIGEL HICKSON: Okay. I wanted to say thank you. She's arranged coffee for us, so if you haven't already got coffee, it's over on the left. As an upgrade, we seem to have soft drinks as well, so great.

Review of agenda. Well, the agenda is in front of you, hopefully. I don't see there's anybody shouting to change it, delete it. Nope.

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.

Housekeeping. This is the bit I was looking forward to, but now that Kim's back, I was just going to say thank you for the coffee, Kim.

Handover chairmanship. As you know ... Yes, Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL:

As this is a large room and this is recorded, could you use the microphone when you want to make an interjection? We'll note, but please use the microphones, otherwise it will not be recorded.

NIGEL HICKSON:

Thank you, Bart. Handover chairmanship. Well, the original plan was I was going to conduct this meeting to the end, then our new chairman, Steven, would take over formally at the end of the meeting. As Steven's had some bright ideas on how we're going to have some fun in the rest of this meeting – I think that's the way you described it, isn't it, Steven? – we decided in the prep meeting that I would actually formally hand over the chairmanship like now, and Steven will run the rest of the meeting today. So, thank you for your attention. Thank you for coming. Steven, it's all yours now.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Nigel. We'd like to start with plan of action here, so do a little housekeeping with regards to trying to sort out meeting times, so as to maximize participation, and hopefully minimize collective inconvenience with regards to what time these calls are.

From there, we've got a couple of questions of Jaap, who I think is here, regarding the maintenance agency for the ISO table. After that, what we were thinking of doing is trying to develop a bit of a timeline for the workflow, although we may actually defer that. But, what we really want to get into today is doing two breakouts to discuss scenario one and scenario two, and hence the flipcharts around the room. We'll actually be getting up and moving about and doing some brainstorming on that.

We do have a coffee break scheduled, so don't freak out. We will take a break at one point between the two scenarios and we'll conclude hopefully with a discussion of what we learned from the flipchart exercise.

So, if we could get Kim's spreadsheet up, is that available? Yeah. That was the one thing I didn't ask you about. Or, we can defer that. Yeah, we'll push that off until the end then. Yeah, you guys should have it and look at it during the course. Look at the Google doc. It's in the Google doc, actually. And give some thought to that. There are some times I think would work pretty

well for most people, but I don't want to keep the kiwis up at 4:00 on a regular basis. Is Jaap here? He is here.

My understanding, Bart, is you gave Jaap a head's up? Okay. Jaap, can you give us a quick review of this upcoming meeting in I think it is Lisbon in May of the maintenance agency? Thank you.

JAAP AKKERHUIS: Let me first tell [the] colleague of the MA 3166 [inaudible]. She's the ITU representative. I told her that this meeting will be [inaudible] just looking into what's going on here.

Let me first state there is no meeting of the MA 3166 in Lisbon. It's actually the plenary of the technical community 46 of the [ISO].

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Well, I stand corrected.

JAAP AKKERHUIS: Well, it is kind of complicated. It's nearly as bad as ICANN with all the committees. So, there's a yearly plenary committee where [inaudible]. That's why all the various circles from the technical community comes and mostly it is actually things like the library people, the organization people, and there are various standards.

But, one of them is actually working group two. Working group two is actually the owner of the standards, of the authoritative [inaudible] standard. Working group is the group which does more than just the editorial changes in the standard. It's [custom] that any [ISO] standard is being reviewed every five years, and since the latest version is of 2013, this is just a natural [inaudible].

It doesn't mean that the standard needs to be changed. It's just a refuel of whether it needs to be changed. As we know, there are actually some changes in the standard of the [inaudible]. For instance, one of the things, it defers to the [inaudible] of the UN terminology and the [inaudible] doesn't exist anymore. There are a couple of these things.

Another thing is that more and more with the MA request is due to not very precise definitions of some parts of the standards or no definition at all, based on desire to [inaudible] these definitions and do more clarification about what's going in.

One of the things that, for instance, that is proposed is there should be a more clear way of ... When a country or territory will be eligible for carrying into the MA, into the standards itself. Currently, it's kind of wishy-washy, but the goal is trying to tighten this up. This is trying to somewhat [inaudible] stream of various groups which claim to have a country and want to have

a two-letter code for something, but really for getting a TLD. That's one of the things.

So, that's basically what it will be. There's work going on, but this is working group two, so this is not part of the MA itself, although the MA will be consulted with it and [inaudible].

Working group two, [inaudible] standard is currently – I'm doing this from memory – consists of 47 voting members and these are [inaudible] members, terminology is. These are the official members to this technical community and these are the national standard [boards] which are actually desired to sit in this committee.

So, there's actually nothing that ICANN can do for changing the standard here, but as a liaison class C I believe it is, to the working group two, I am actually invited to come to Lisbon and explain what's [inaudible] big uses as ICANN has with the standards.

So, that's in short the process, what it is. So, there's now in preparation and [inaudible] which is [inaudible] for draft standard or change of standard has been worked on. I think the main plan is actually [inaudible] this moment by [inaudible] standard organization, but [inaudible] is active what's happening.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Jaap. Do you have any idea of how long the review process might take?

JAAP AKKERHUIS: I don't really know. What the plan is, as far as I understand, is to have a draft version of the changes available in Lisbon, so it can be presented to all the members of [TG46] and then it's actually up to the secretary of [TG46] when it will be ballot vote. If the [inaudible] of a ballot decides to do that, I think the term is that at least months it should be a waiting period before, a commenting period, before it finally gets voted on. That's the very optimistic, very quick, the shortest [inaudible].

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Okay, thanks for that. Go ahead. Green microphone.

PETER KOCH: Good morning. Jaap, is this working group meeting an opportunity and the right place maybe to ask for certain clarifications about the ambiguities in the standards or at least the uncertainties that we have experienced so far with respect to especially the reserved list and the, say, unclear [inaudible] of

the reserved list is defacto published, but there is no task to do so to the MA explicitly mentioned in the standard itself.

JAAP AKKERHUIS:

Yes. [inaudible] terminology problem [inaudible] meeting last December, and I actually am [inaudible] e-mails, but I could bring in some more of this so they can actually do that with [inaudible]. All the parties that they don't want to get [inaudible] in standards, it's also the terms of reference which is an internal document of [ISO] to what things the MA should at least look. It might actually end up there, which is not a public document.

But, I have pressed to, as well as the [ISO] secretariat, to people doing the draft standard work whether they please could at lease harmonize them [inaudible] on the various publications. They have the standard website, three different places where the website, things are defined in kind of confusing state. All of the things, the browsing platform. [inaudible] different terminology, then the clarification document and then the standards.

PETER KOCH:

Can I respond?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Absolutely, yes.

PETER KOCH: Thank you. I hear you say that, yes, this might be an opportunity to get some clarification out there. So, just in case, if there is any need to draft a liaison statement into that group asking for clarification in particular, and actually maybe also notifying both the working group and the MA that by their continued ambiguity in usage of these terms, they might put themselves under pressure by countries and territories that then strive to get on the reserved list, which may or may not be the intent of the MA. If there's a need to draft a statement, I would be volunteering to help if anybody needs that help.

JAAP AKKERHUIS: Yes. There is some opportunity there, although officially [inaudible] type of liaison is that it's actually a [inaudible] only get information. But, [inaudible] how things happen in reality. That's basically the only thing I can say – if you really want to do it official, but that's another route and that's the official route is to go to your national [inaudible] organization, which is in [D47] and ask them to pay attention because they can really officially put input to the process.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Okay. Anymore questions? Nigel?

NIGEL HICKSON: I just have a quick question. This is just for my own understanding. The standard is being reviewed in May at Lisbon. Would that potentially include adding, deleting, or renaming code elements or is it the text of the standard that you're reviewing?

JAAP AKKERHUIS: No, no, it's only the text of authoritative standard. It's not a [inaudible] and that's the start of the MA. The MA is actually responsible for everything which changes on short ... For instance, there's now [inaudible] to officially adopt [inaudible] as a language in one of the tables. There are a lot of changes like that, but also coming and going of new countries. That starts with the MA. But, the whole framework is done by [TC46] and notably the working group two.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Jaap. Eberhart?

EBERHARD LISSE: I am just wondering that ICANN is a user of this table and recognize by way of liaison. How would ICANN actually

communicate? And we have ... Our main problem is not so much that they use different terminology. That's not the big deal. The big deal is that we don't know whether 50 years means 50 years. [inaudible] how? Basically, ICANN or we for the group, in ICANN we need to know what 50 years means or how long we can expect. How would we communicate that requirement as icann.org or our working group to ever [inaudible] that it filters into their deliberations?

JAAP AKKERHUIS:

Again, if you want to have more ... The 50 years, just to name an example, [inaudible] in the text. It's in the text of standards. And as you'll know, it says about 50 [inaudible]. It actually says it might change of the fly [inaudible] but I think it's 50 years and the previous user of that will actually be consulted in that. That's for [the specific]. So, if you want to know more about it, about the text, you go to [TC46]. The secretariat of [TC46] which is [inaudible]. You can find it.

So, you could also write to the secretariat of the MA 3166. These are the official [inaudible] points. [ICANN bring message], but that's unofficially. That doesn't ... Probably it's better to do it first if you want to have this kind of information. Do it first officially, then we can do it, have a dialogue about what exactly is going to happen.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: So, Jaap, if I understand you correctly, really the formal [entre] is via the secretariat. Thank you.

JAAP AKKERHUIS: For [TC46], all the [inaudible] in [TC46], they also do have ... Can bring [inaudible], so that can be [inaudible] representative besides operates [inaudible] for the Swedish. There's a list of who the members are, but you can ask your local official member of [ISO].

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you. Any other questions for Jaap? Going once. I think we're good. Thank you, Jaap.

I think what we're going to do now that we've gotten an update on that, timeline and workflow I think we're kicking to the end of the meeting. Yes. So, I think we'll jump straight into the comparative analysis of scenarios one and two. I assume you have read them.

What we're trying to do here is to identify the stakeholders and identify the actual activities that surround these two scenarios. The way we're going to do this is we're going to break everybody up into groups and send the groups to one of the four

whiteboards. Or, three groups? That's right. Excuse me, three groups. The fourth whiteboard is our summary flipchart. And have you guys spend some time discussing this amongst yourself and jotting down notes. You can either write directly onto the flipchart or you can amend it with Post-It Notes and so on and so forth.

When we get to the conclusion of the process with scenario one, we will consolidate what you've got on the flipchart behind me and we'll have some discussion of that.

Now that we know who's here, we're going to take a very short break so Bart and I can do some administrative housekeeping with regards to getting the groups finalized based on attendance. So, you've got about five minutes to get up and do what you want. I will remind everyone that they're giving away the T-shirts and bags that remain, so if you need additional T-shirts or bags, you can run off around the corner and come back and we'll reconvene in five minutes. Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL:

So, if you had your coffee, it's still there. It's still warm. We're going to divide the groups up in the following. Group one is with Stephen and that's in this corner. That's Stephen, Martin Boyle, Peter Vergote, Wafa, and Jaap. Your colleague from the MA, does

she want to participate? Then, she joins you. That's easy. You can explain what is happening.

Group two, Nigel. That's Peter, Ann-Cathrin, Allan, and Patricio. That's with Nigel. I'll repeat. With Nigel is Peter Koch, Ann-Cathrin, Allan, Patricio.

Then, group three with Eberhard in the far end corner. That's Debbie. So, that's [inaudible]. Annebeth, Nick, and Kim.

Who didn't we assign to a group and who wants to participate? Barrack. Yes, of course. You should be in group three with Eberhard. And Naela, you're in group two with Nigel. Then, we check who hasn't been assigned yet.

I'll repeat. I'll repeat. Group one with Stephen in this corner, that's Martin, Barbara, Peter Vergote, Wafa, Jaap and his colleague from the [ISO] if she wants to participate.

Group two with Nigel in the middle is Peter Koch, Ann-Cathrin, Allan MacGillivray, Patricio, and Naela.

Group three in the far end with Eberhard is Debbie and Debbie, Annebeth, Nick, Kim, and Barrack.

Who didn't I assign yet? Yeah, as soon as you spread around, that's fine. These are the working group members.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: So, to repeat, the objective of this exercise is to identify the triggering event – events, plural – and the stakeholders.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah, and then [inaudible] based on the triggering events, what are the steps and the process?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yeah. Then, again, based on the triggering event, what are the steps surrounding that event?

BART BOSWINKEL: Well, it should lead to a retirement.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Stephen, didn't we want to do the stakeholders in a separate step? So, only the triggering events?

BART BOSWINKEL: Triggering events and then the process leading up to retirement. So, the process steps, effectively. You have 20 minutes and I'll be the timekeeper. I'll pre-warn you. So, again, I'll repeat the groups for those who had other things to do.

Group one with Stephen, that's Martin, Peter Vergote, Wafa, Jaap. That's in the far end corner.

Yeah, it would be an opportunity just to see how people are [inaudible]. So, we didn't want to [inaudible] too much, but thank you for participating. Good to see you.

Group two, again, that's with Nigel. That is Nigel, Peter Koch, Ann-Cathrin, Allan, and Patricio, and Naela.

The far end with Eberhard is Eberhard, Debbie and Debbie, Annebath, Nick, Barrack, and Kim. Phillip, if you want to join, of course you can pick one. Göran, you can do it as well for the time being, as long as you want to stay. You have 20 minutes.

You have another 10 minutes. A little bit less.

Five more minutes.

Four more minutes. Could you wrap up and prepare for presenting your group's view and conclusions? Four more minutes.

We passed the top of the hour. Could you wrap up? One minute for wrapping up and appoint somebody to present. Then, we'll put the flipchart in the front of the room.

I suggest we start with group three.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: We are probably the only ones who used Post-Its.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I like your out-of-box thinking.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: The newbie gets to report. I thought I was helping by being an observer and now I'm giving the report back. So, tip for the next newcomer: don't take a pen.

So, we had Kim in our group, so Kim, if I say anything wrong, can you please correct me?

We talked about where the notification may come from and it really comes from the ISO standard and the ISO standard is something that anyone can subscribe to. They give a notification and it's about \$300 for a subscription. And IANA subscribe. So, it's a public notice, so anyone in the community can keep watch of this.

The process then is IANA is always looking for these notices. They are actually machine readable, so it's quite an easy process for IANA to keep watch of what's happening in this space. There are past examples that have been picked up already by IANA, so we've got those in our papers.

The main thing we focused on was a timeline and we had a big discussion about when the switch might happen. There was a

very broad range. We didn't want it to be too long that it lost focus, so you really needed to be flexible and think about when a switch date would be, depending on the circumstances of the particular change.

One thing that we said was really nice to have was a good working relationship between IANA and ISO, but we understand that that's a mutual respect relationship. It's not for IANA to say we must have that. It exists now and it's working well, but we didn't know whether it should be formalized or not because it's not really for us to say. Is that fair, Kim?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah. I think the point is whilst we have a seat on the committee, that's not guaranteed. So, we can't create a policy that assumes that will always be true.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you. Then, we had a couple more hypotheticals. Kim gave us an example where IANA would reach out to the TLD manager or so it's really for the TLD manager to actually figure it out for themselves. They would help by giving scenarios, talk about some factors to consider, but the main emphasis was to have a transition plan, and in that transition plan, you'd be considering

all sorts of things like notice, your coms strategy, and a switch date.

We had some examples of where this has already been done really well in the numbering space. For example, changes to postal codes or area codes. So, there is some good practice in other disciplines.

Some tips from Kim is don't be tempted to push out the dates if you have a short timeframe. It's good to focus people's attention on the date.

The technical, we all agreed. We have great experience when we implemented things like DNSSEC, etc., where you had a window of taking no new registrations and then the next day you'd be open for business. So, we do have examples in the technical of how easy this can be to implement. But, we all agreed that the other non-technical issues were harder to deal with.

Anything else that I've missed, group? Great.

BART BOSWINKEL: Any questions for group three? Questions for clarification? None? Okay, thank you.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Let's go for number two.

NIGEL HICKSON:

Thank you. Right. So, we obviously split this up into two sections of half the time used. The trigger event, we did a little bit of discussion about the trigger event in terms of how things become notified, or if you like in a legal sense, serving notice.

In the old days, there were these newsletters which were published and the date that's a change happened to the standard was in the newsletter. So, we classified that as being, in the broad sense, an alert.

We were talking then about the online browsing platform which has replaced the newsletter publication and this does not seem to alert the community in the same way.

We had a long discussion a little bit as a sidebar about whether when the IANA became aware of it or the date of the publication on the timestamp of the online browsing, but we decided that in the context of a long retirement period, the odd day or two really didn't make much difference, but we discussed that.

So, we came up to this format that the relevant date is when the IANA becomes aware of a change and that IANA should notify the community. That's the kind of responsibilities, and perhaps too strong a word, but that's the kind of obligation that we could legitimately expect the IANA to fulfill.

Stakeholders, we came with a lot of different stakeholders. The IANA government, ccTLD managers, registrar [inaudible] if they're different from the ccTLD manager, registrars, registrants. We had a little bit of a sidebar discussion as to whether the root zone maintainer or Verisign as it is at the moment was a stakeholder. We kind of think it is, but in this period between MA notification and an actual change, it's probably not that important, but it's down there because we were trying to map as many different stakeholders as possible.

Local Internet communities, people who publish links of any kind of resource. We originally thought of link route and website link publishers, but actually the existence of the e-mail services that had to shut down in former Yugoslavia. So, it's any kind of resource that refers to a domain name that publishes on the Internet. E-mail users, people who send e-mail.

In fact, it's almost any user on the Internet anywhere in the world is stakeholder in one description or another.

And we came to a definition of what a stakeholder was. First of all, we realized that some of these overlap. We may have missed one or two. But, a stakeholder is anyone who is affected by the retirement whether or not they have control. That's where we came to with that and that's how we dealt with stakeholders.

Did I miss anything? Does any of my group want to add anything? No? Thank you.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: So, I was the scribe, so I got nominated to ...

BART BOSWINKEL: Steven, first of all, are there any direct questions, comments, or questions for clarification for group two?

JAAP AKKERHUIJ: Yes. I want to correct the statement about [inaudible]. It is possible to get a letter out of the [Brussel] platform immediately of any change. Anybody in the world can do that. I think I have told this before, but if you go to [inaudible] put in the [inaudible] name and any change of the [inaudible]. We actually go by e-mail and you will receive that. So, this is [inaudible]. And as far as you know, [inaudible] is actually looking at this. One of the things I do is, even before things changes, I officially warn IANA when it's related. But, for anybody watching, you can easily get to it.

BART BOSWINKEL: Any other questions, comments for clarification for group two? None? Stephen, go ahead.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: We took a somewhat different tact. We were a little more high level in our discussion. We started out with TPTL situation and kind of went down that rabbit hole. We all agreed that the trigger was in fact the removal of what we're now calling generic TLD AB from the assign list with IANA being notified by keeping an eye on the list and so on and so forth. With the idea in mind that IANA then turns around and talks to the current manager to see what their plans are.

We discussed the concept of a framework for how this would work with the underlying realization that there will be some of these where there is no completed outcome of a transfer all. In other words, we think that going forward there will be more SU type situations where due to a lack of high level of enthusiasm by the local Internet community to migrate to the new TLD, the new string, that the old string will survive, and with the case of TP to TL you've got a fairly high level of enthusiasm, but with the case of SU to RU, certainly that's not the case.

Jaap brought up the question of what happens to one or more IDN strings that are associated under the fast track to [inaudible] that's gone off into the ... That's been removed from the assign list and that's something I've never thought of before now.

We also came around to the viewpoint that whatever this policy that we ended up with is IANA's primary function is to facilitate discussions between the managers and local Internet community and relevant stakeholders and we also saw that a large educational role for the IANA to help the interested parties discuss and hopefully come to an agreement among themselves as to how this would work and that is about it. Any questions? Yes, Nigel?

NIGEL HICKSON:

One thing I missed from what we discussed was the reference to the IDNs. We came to the conclusion that the IDNs are actually on ISO3166 by reference, so what applies to the ASCII codes would probably apply to the IDN codes because the trigger event would be the removal of the underlying code that qualified the IDN to exist.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE:

If we take a hypothetical example of, say, India, you've got 11 or 12 IDNs. What happens then? Yes, Eberhard?

EBERHARD LISSE:

I actually don't agree. In the [inaudible] name change or change of two-letter code element, two and three letter code elements, the IDNs are not affected because they refer to the same

country. It's just the name change. If the IDNs were in a table maintained by ISO and they were changing it then, we would have to change it, too, but they refer all to the same country code, whether the country code is now IN or NN or so has no real impact on the IDNs as far as I see it.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Kim?

[KIM]: I think it's a little more nuanced than that. I think that, yes, it's absolutely correct that IDN ccTLDs are predicated on the underlying ISO code existing, but you'd need to look at the reasons for the change and whether those IDN representations are still valid. If the country has fundamentally renamed and they're no longer proper representations of the country name, then the IDNs would need to be modified. But, if they remain proper representation of the country name, then that could be mapped to the new ISO code in sort of a renaming scenario.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Kim. Any other? Eberhard?

EBERHARD LISSE: The easy way out would probably be the number, the numeric representation in the ISO will probably remain the same. So, if [inaudible] the IDN to the numbers, we don't have to deal with this issue.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Did you have a comment or were you just ...?

PETER KOCH: I was wondering whether I had missed the point where we jumped into the discussion. I'm not sure that we all saw all the presentations yet.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Mine was the last one. Yes.

PETER KOCH: Okay, fine.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: We kind of went into the weeds on the IDN situation that my group brought up and discussed. Any more comments, thoughts, on this work so far on triggering events and so on? Seeing none, coffee break? Do you guys want a 15-minute coffee break? We will reconvene at 20 past.

BART BOSWINKEL: We can leave it up to the room. The next one would be to do the same exercise, same groups, now for the second scenario. Then, the third one. Or, do you want to do it now for the stakeholder? Identifying the stakeholders? I see some people who are reluctant to have a coffee break. It's up to you. Who will prefer a coffee break now and reconvene afterwards, do it for scenario two, similar exercise and continue with the discussion?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Nigel?

NIGEL HICKSON: This is just a procedural comment. If we're not going to take the coffee break – and I'm neutral on that – we should not do another exercise like that now. We should take a little bit of substantive work. It's basically the way your brain works. You want a little bit of gap between one brainstorming session and another.

BART BOSWINKEL: Coffee break.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Okay. Chair is going to make a decision. We're going to have a coffee break, 15 minutes. Reconvene at 20 until 11:00.

BART BOSWINKEL: I suggest we reconvene with the second round in a few minutes. The goal of the second round of whiteboarding is preferably in the same groups is to go over scenario two and probably in combination with identifying the stakeholders, the relevant stakeholders, in the process and their roles, why you think they are stakeholders and what is their successive role in the retirement process.

The purpose of the scenario two in this exercise is effectively identifying the process steps and who are the stakeholders and their role in that process.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Welcome back. We are going to run this exercise again, but with scenario two and we'd like you to identify the stakeholders and the – what are we doing, scenarios?

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah, roles.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: The roles. The roles of the stakeholders is what we're focusing on here. I've got too many notes. So, if we can reconvene in our groups as before and let's do this for 20 minutes, and if need be, we can extend that. Thank you.

Yes, Allan?

ALLAN MACGILLIVARY: Actually, it's not really clear. What do you mean their roles? Their roles in what?

BART BOSWINKEL: Retirement roles.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Who is doing what in the retirement process.

ALLAN MACGILLAVRY: Oh, you mean in the scenarios we have. So, if the stakeholders weren't mentioned in the scenarios, they're not a stakeholder?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: You need to identify the stakeholders. You want to take this on, Eberhard? Allan, can you repeat the question for the good doctor?

ALLAN MACGILLAVRY: Well, I'm just harking it back to our discussion in our group where we identified a very large range of stakeholders, potential stakeholders. Persons that could be affected. But, most of these are not referenced in the scenarios we have done to date, so I'm just trying to figure out how we parse this.

For example, Google search engine has results index based on that two-letter code. We identified them as a stakeholder but they're not part of the scenario we have. I'm just trying to decide, before we get down to talking about the role of Google indexing in this.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I don't know how to discuss this with Google, but the point is we should prioritize the stakeholders that are immediately affected. Link [inaudible] is one thing, but Google ... If we tell the search engines, for example, my country name is going to change, the ccTLD name is going to change, please have somebody on your site pay a little bit of attention to it, then they will basically adapt their algorithm eventually, so they will find dot-na or dot-nb no matter what you enter. So, we should prioritize, but the users need to be in some other way because link [inaudible] is a big problem. We mentioned link [inaudible] or link breaking in the scenario document.

ALLAN MACGILLAVRY: So, what I'm hearing you saying is that we should attempt to prioritize the stakeholders and focus on those with the highest priority and talk about their role in as much detail as we can.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yeah. You guys identified over 3.something billion stakeholders. We do need a little prioritization there.

BART BOSWINKEL: You can see that some play a direct role in retirement process and some don't and some will be affected and that's already a difference.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I think we don't need to only look at the important ones, but we should start from the top down.

BART BOSWINKEL: Okay, let's reconvene. How much time do you want?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I say 20 minutes and we can extend it if the conversations are still ongoing and you feel it's productive. Say maybe ten until 11:00. It's 13 until now. Yeah. Okay.

BART BOSWINKEL:

If you just arrived after the break and if you're interested to participate or if you just want to do your e-mail, you're more than welcome. But, if you want to participate in the discussions, just find yourself a group. The core members are still there, so just go to a group and participate in the discussions if you want to. Do scenario two, trigger events and principle process steps you think are a part of the retirement because I think nobody has a clear idea what are the process steps involved with the exception of people [from PTI]. Then, identify the stakeholders and prioritize them if feasible.

It is quarter past the hour. I suggest another five to ten minutes and then we'll reconvene.

Shall we reconvene with the whole group? Please conclude your discussions. Appoint a presenter and get back to your seat. Stephen, wrap up, please. Okay, let's reconvene. Nigel, will you start? Group two.

NIGEL HICKSON:

Yeah. I will start. Okay. We didn't spend an awful lot of time on trigger events. The first reaction we had was that the trigger event is exactly the same, so there isn't a difference. We did take a little bit of a side bar into the possibility that IDN ccTLDs could

have additional triggering events in certain circumstances. Voluntary abandonment of either the Latin or the local script, for example, and some others. But, we came to a conclusion about IDN which I'll come to at the end, which kind of makes this not so relevant at this time. But, basically, we thought triggering events were virtually identical, if not exactly identical.

So, we moved on to stakeholders. We decided to triage the stakeholders into three different groups. These were not written down in any order of priority. They were written down originally from the stakeholders who were identified earlier, so we could then discuss them. So, they weren't in any particular order.

It does turn out, however, that the first one that we looked at, the IANA PTI ICANN, is quite an important stakeholder. We put that in the very important bucket and we had some discussion about what this actually meant, but basically IANA has an executive role. It carries out the policy. It's implementation, operational, and effectively owns the process, but the policy should be guiding what they do.

ccTLD manager also in the very important bucket. You probably can't see this very well here. This is the ccTLD manager. We just wrote "lots". It's basically the big thing, responsibility, but including liaison working with IANA closely to achieve the process over the time period. We do think ccTLD manager has a

responsibility to do that, not just bury head in the sand which would might be the alternative.

Registry service provider, we didn't think about this too closely. They do what the ccTLD manager tells them. They presumably have a contract if it's different from the ccTLD manager.

Registrars we came down to being important rather than very important. They do stuff such as offer new TLDs, stop offering the existing TLDs, manage transitions, support registrars and respond to the ccTLD managers' guidance.

Here's the biggie: the registrant. Now, you can see these two items have a lot of scribble on them. We had a lot of discussion about whether they're important or very important. We came to the conclusion that they are almost in a class of their own. The registrant is, to use one of our members, the reason we're all here. So, in one sense, it's extremely important. But, what does it do? Well, it needs to be aware what's going on, has a transitional plan. If you're a big company – for example, you're a bank – this is a major, major thing that might happen to you. Maybe even object. The timeframe in which you have to change your TLD is basically going to affect everything in your business in today's world.

Then, we came on to things like web hosting provider, e-mail service provider, website owners, and these all basically do the

same thing. They're others. They're not the important or the very important, but you need to have [inaudible] effect on your systems. And to some extent, some of the things we just mentioned about registrant apply to these people as well.

Government. Well, government's role is public policy. They will have had an input to what's going on during the ISO process. They may have even [inaudible] initiated the process directly. And they will have different views as to how this will take place. Some countries may be quite relaxed about the use of the old name. Others will want to change immediately. For example, we looked at Zimbabwe [inaudible]. I can just about remember that as a small child and that was one cutover to another almost overnight.

Again, I mentioned something here about gTLD policy. Public policy in the gTLD world, you have a very – and then the new gTLD process – you have a very defined handbook on how new gTLDs are to be created and opportunities for letters of non-objection, things like that. But, obviously, there should not be big holes in the policy that allows “oh, well, we'll decide to do this ccTLD retirement, we'll do something different on a different ccTLD retirement.” [inaudible] didn't spend much time on this because basically their role is to do what the IANA do, so they're an other. And somebody suggested that the IAB in the past has had an input. We were not entirely sure whether that would still

be the case, but it's something that has been highlighted that we might consider.

Finally, a strong practical proposal is that we come up with the policy for Latin ccTLDs for ASCII TLDs and don't concentrate too much about possible additions or exceptions for IDNs at this stage, partly because there's no defined IDN policy. They're all fast tracks. Secondly, what generally works for ASCII ccTLDs will probably cover 95% of the cases of IDN ccTLDs as well, and then we can come back and revisit that once we've got the policy in its almost final stage. Thank you.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Nigel. Do we have questions for the group? Apparently not. Management is calling you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: We need to engage more.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Right. So, group three. I don't think we said anything that's not repeatable or it's already been said by Nigel. Nothing that we said I don't think particularly conflicts with what that group came up with.

In terms of the triggering event, it's basically a single point of triggering, which is the retirement for whatever reason. We spent, actually, in our group, a long time discussing things that might happen before the triggering event, sort of the reunification invasion, renaming type scenarios. But, fundamentally, they all boil down to at some point after whatever political reorganization has happened, there is a triggering point, which is that what was previously an [inaudible] is no longer in existence. So, that's the trigger.

But, we did recognize that it's a much more potentially complex situation than the previous one in that you might be dealing with multiple parties and in order to have some sort of process, there would need to be an agreement and that agreement may ... In lots of scenarios, we talked about be fairly amicable and straightforward, but it not be in the case there. So, this is a more complicated situation.

Leading into the sort of stakeholders who would be required to be part of that debate, dialog, and discussion ultimately trying to reach a resolution of that, we had obviously the registries effected and I think we went fairly quickly through the usual suspects of the registrars. Obviously, the registrants, service providers, all of the Internet community. Obviously, IANA would be a major stakeholder.

Internet community, we didn't go through a prioritization. There are some stakeholders I think we all agreed would be more equal than others in terms of what was going on, but there would be a need for fairly broad outreach involving all parts civil society, not just the operators and database operators and the registrant themselves. This is a thing of wider political significance given the type of situation that you'll be talking about.

We talked about some quite amusing examples of Puerto Rico, for example, being [inaudible] into the wider United States and the PR domain that therefore ceasing to exist. Previous historical examples, obviously including things like the East Germany DD domain being subsumed into the dot-dd for Western Europe.

And I think we recognized that in the large majority of cases, it would probably fall out fairly logically because of what had happened upstream of the thing which led to the code change in the first place.

So, those were the sort of thoughts and discussions that we had from our group. Is that fair? Feel free to chip in if there's any questions.

BART BOSWINKEL: I note you say Internet community. Is there any reference, resemblance to significant interested parties? Because that was the terminology developed under the FOI.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No, we didn't do that, but I think obviously we did include significantly interested parties as it would be defined. For example, obviously the registries and the governments would obviously be part of that.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Any other questions? Nigel?

NIGEL HICKSON: Yeah. Just a brief comment. One could go back in the IANA archives, but it's my understanding that dot-dd was never delegated. It existed as a code element, but was not ...

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: That was not the point. It's an example because post codes changed, telephone areas code changed, so we used that as an example to [inaudible]. The government we didn't really consider because the governments are the ones that institute this process. If two countries decide to merge or to reunify or whatever, the governments have already agreed on the political

thing. That's why the code change happens and we can take it from there.

Therefore, whether we then decide the surviving ccTLD manager remains and they must solve it [inaudible] themselves or whether we say the government must decide whether they must redelegate is not our purview I think.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I was going to say the only thing I would add is that we did talk about essentially a rogue legacy operator, and we did obviously think that it's hard to make people cooperate and agree in a smooth process. But, ultimately, there is the sanction of misconduct ultimately. If there was to be judgments conduct, then there would be sanctions available on an IANA level.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Nigel?

NIGEL HICKSON: Just a final one. What was actually at the back of our mind here I think was a circumstance where a government which had changed the name of the country, for example, or whatever wanted a longer process than maybe other parties such as ICANN board or something was trying to force. It was just like a

letter of non-objection, like in the GNSO gTLD thing. That was kind of a possibility.

It's not a big point, to be honest, but useful.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Any other comments, questions for [Nick]? Apparently not. I guess I will go next then.

So, we kind of took it [inaudible] this from the FOI definition of stakeholders, primarily significantly interested parties. We kind of drilled down a little bit into that and having governments and registries, local Internet community jointly identify ultimately who should be involved.

Then, we focused on process steps. We took the viewpoint that the process begins with ISO notification and IANA because they watch for this stuff, would pick up on it. We also felt that the interested party with regards to an ISO notification would certainly be the TLD manager for that code.

We then had a question about, well, shouldn't this be verified? So, we also threw in the idea of the ISO MA being involved as an interested party because we thought, well, IANA as part of its step should turn around and go back and ask the ISO, "Have you been spoofed or is this legitimate that it's been reassigned?"

We further thought with regards to the ISO notification process step that the admin and tech contacts for the TLD are also interested parties.

We went on from there to think, okay, so the TLD manager has got to come up with a plan because his code has been reassigned and he needs to start sorting out what he might want to do about this. Of course, one of the things that he or she could do would be to start litigating like crazy, in which point we just kind of let that one go on its own path because it's entirely likely that nothing further would happen for years on that.

But, we did identify at that stage of the TLD manager developed his plan that interested parties at that stage would be the local Internet community, IANA in some sort of advisory/educational role, explaining the overall process and so on and so forth.

We also said, well, significantly interested parties are involved at this point, as per the FOI.

Then, the last step that we poked at was the probable execution the managers plan assuming it's not litigation, but a wind up. We identified as interested parties for that step the local Internet community, registrants, and presumably one or more additional TLD managers, citing the case of CS going into CZ in Slovakia. We would have managers involved and registrars involved because these domains, assuming that was the scenario, they

would be moving out of the incumbent registry. So, that's where we got with that.

Any questions, comments? And did I accurately describe that, Martin? Thanks.

BART BOSWINKEL: I think I know the answer, but just to confirm, did group one identify one or more single triggering events and what is this thing? And if so, a single, what is a triggering event?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: We only identified one which would be the ISO MA taking action. We discounted revolutions and country name changes and things like that. Changing code element, yeah.

BART BOSWINKEL: So, maybe that's a start of the retirement process I think based on the discussions, but we consider that the changing code element as the starting point of the retirement process moving forward, because then at least we got one uniform starting point and building on this that we can start defining the process. We can let go of the scenarios, more or less. That's the main exercise. We leave the scenarios as is, the [inaudible] background material. They document what happened and the

next phase is taking this and analyzing and start thinking about how the process should look like or what are the process steps and we have identified some of the stakeholders, and based on that, we continue the discussions.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you for your participation in this. Are there any comments on this process that you might want to share with us? Was this at all useful? Was it a waste of time do you think? Do you have any suggestions for improvements if we do this exercise again further down the path? I'll take any and all questions and comments. Yes, [Nick]?

[NICK]: I think I just wanted to make one small point, really, which is that we had in our group certainly quite a lot of discussion around what it was in practice that we were going to be having to deal with and getting our heads around that collectively actually was not a two-second sort of conversation.

Actually, we [inaudible] quite a lot of benefit as a group discussing that, particularly with the collective experience. We were very lucky to have Kim in our group, for example. Actually, that was really educational and I think very beneficial from that perspective.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I think [inaudible] around other groups [inaudible] take advantage of his knowledge. Yes, Eberhard?

EBERHARD LISSE: As I said in my group, I don't like group breakouts, but if we do this again, I propose that we keep the groups more or less intact with the staff. With Kim and staff members, it's a different issue, but we should try to sort of keep the groups in the same way so we don't have people from one continent or one size of ccTLD, have a good mix, that we have got different views in each group, otherwise if the big ccTLDs are all in one breakout group that might be different from than if only smaller discuss.

So, unless there is no strong objections to this, I propose that we sort of try to keep the groups more or less the same [inaudible] staff, like Kim and Naela and Jaap to rotate if and when required.

PETER KOCH: So, I would just suggest the opposite might be true. If you have certain kind of TLDs represented in all the groups, they might be dominant and you get the same results everywhere. If you want diversity in the results, then either relying on a random selection

or actually allowing for some group assembly might give you a diverse set of results. Thank you.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Would you support self-selection into groups, then? Okay. Nigel?

NIGEL HICKSON: Just a brief comment. The reaction was very positive to what we've been doing today as far as I can say. In fact, one of my groups went so far as to mention me that he thought that the new guy was doing a much better job than the old guy.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yes, go, Allan.

ALLAN MACGILLVARY: Actually, as the guy who was slagging the old guy, I thought I better contribute. I just want to compliment you for having done this, both of you actually. I think it's a good way of drawing more people out into the process. So, I would encourage you, where appropriate, to use this mechanism as well because you just get more people participating in the dialogue.

Secondly, on the selection of the groups, I was comfortable with the kind of rough justice that was done with Bart and company because you have all these competing views of small versus

large and regions and whatever. So, rather than make the [inaudible] process I'm happy to leave it to you guys to figure out what would work best. So, thank you.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Allan. Thank you for those comments. It was, in fact, a planned allocation of people into groups along those lines. It may have been a little imperfect, but it also is a function of who shows up and so on and so forth. I'm glad you thought this was useful.

I think at this point I'm going to turn this over to Bart because we need to do some housekeeping with regards to the timeline and workflow. I don't know if we're going to get to Kim's spreadsheet regarding various times and percent of participation for those, but we may be able to ... I think we may be able to do that over the list.

BART BOSWINKEL: My suggestion would be ... I've built a bit of a schedule for tasks to start the meetings again, reconvene as a group on the fifth of April. That's on a Thursday. The rotation times and the starting times we'll figure out and then move forward every 14 days again. So, meet the 5th, 19th, 3rd, 17th of May, 31st of May, and the 14th of June because that will lead us up to the Panama meeting.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Which is like the next week or ten days?

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah. Based on that schedule, I more or less have, say, if you go back to the workplan, what has been discussed, and again it was just an auxiliary document. It is to assist the group and we should have made that maybe a little bit more clearer from the start. It's not about the commas and the exact wording of that document is not the policy. But, based on that, say we are now in the comparative analysis phase. The next one would be the development of the policy phase, but probably if one flows naturally from the other, the final phase would be stress testing.

My suggestion would be that, say, the leadership team and staff come back with an overview of the results of the face-to-face meeting, compile the results what we've done in an overview, and use that and these results and present them and discuss them to identify, say, the triggering events as identified by you. Just to confirm again, the first step of the process phases and the stakeholders and their respective roles. Use that part, first of all, to give feedback, confirm and to refine this for the second meeting in this cycle on the 19th of April and then go into a discussion on the almost already directing in the policy development process, the development of a process how should

these policy steps look like. Sorry, the process steps look like. Add some more meat to the bare bones of the respective roles about the role and responsibilities of the stakeholders, define them a little bit more, and then finally, say, leading up to the face-to-face meeting what should be ... Identify what should be included in the policy as add-on and use the Panama face-to-face meeting in a similar setting to really add substance to the policy itself.

So, using this period between San Juan and Panama to identify the bare bones of such a policy and use the face-to-face in Panama to add substance to the policy itself probably in this type of format, but we could use and think of another format. But, at least where you are all very much engaged. At the end of the Panama meeting and depending on where we are at the moment, at that time start looking at what needs to be done to complete this part of the retirement process. That's the first thing.

Based on the comments I've heard so far, my suggestion would be to the group first focus on the "ccTLDs" so that with the triggering event of only removal of the code element or change of the code element. Then, later add the bit about the IDN ccTLDs when there is more clarity around IDN ccTLDs as well. That would be my proposal as a work plan.

So, early next week I will circulate the schedule if you are tentatively in agreement.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Bart. It's ambitious, but I think it's doable and it would be really nice to get some policy thoughts down before our next face-to-face. Yes?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Stephen, or for Bart really, whilst the Adobe Connect issues are continuing, you described a remote working process up until Panama. Is there a potential for an alternative work space whilst the Adobe Connect things are being resolved?

BART BOSWINKEL: I can't answer your question. Very simple, I will not put Kim on the spot because she knows more. At the same time, what I say [inaudible] the group is that in principle we circulate documents, and whether we do have It takes a little bit more discipline and the way the documents are circulated is they got line numbering. So, even without an Adobe room, you could have a discussion based on the line numbering and what is happening. So, we rely a little bit more on recording of the call itself. That will continue whether it's in Adobe room or otherwise. But, based on that discussion.

It also assumes that you read the documents in advance and we'll do our best to circulate them well before the meeting itself, so around the Friday or Monday before the Thursday.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yes, Eberhard?

EBERHARD LISSE: What I usually try to do is I have [inaudible] that puts the version number on the bottom of the line and I put the version number in the heading in the file names, so we always know what document we're talking about. Then, all pages are line numbered until we have approved the document for the final purposes, so we should be able to reference easily version so and so line and so and so.

Any interesting thing that I have found or that anybody has mentioned will be put in as a margin or as an in-line note in orange so that you can easily see there is something that we need to talk about. We try to produce some documents that are workable. Now that Adobe Connect for the time being is offline, at least we have got some other way of dealing with documents even if we don't have them in front of us.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you. Any more comments or questions regarding the proposed work plan going forward? Okay, seeing none, I think given our timeframe, we're going to not dive into the what time of day you prefer the call. What do you want to do about that, Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL: Maybe one question. Say there are two options. Six-hour rotation or eight-hour rotation. I think there is a group ... Is there any strong sense of six hours? All those who are in favor of a six-hour rotation, could you put up your hand? That's Eberhard, Peter. Any eight-hour rotation preference? Three, four, five. I see you. I think I leave it up to the chairs and vice chair, but there appears to be a preference. Who is neutral? It's always painful.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Why is it always painful for you?

BART BOSWINKEL: Go ahead, Eberhard.

EBERHARD LISSE: If we take the eight-hour rotation, the one that is listed, that means my professional, my day job, is affected once every three weeks. I don't want it to be affected two times every four weeks.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Once every three weeks or three meetings?

EBERHARD LISSE: Once every three meetings. I don't want it to be affected really twice in four meetings, but I can handle this a little bit because I know it in advance. The timeframe with this eight-hour rotation is otherwise acceptable to me, but I'm not really willing to jeopardize two afternoons per month or so from my practice. I can't do that.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Duly noted.

EBERHARD LISSE: This eight-hour rotation that is listed now, 6:00 UTC, 14:00 UTC, and 22:00 UTC will work for me. I will have to ... If it's a one-hour meeting, I have to block out two patients every six weeks, which I then can basically push forward that I am finished later and start later, so I can basically rearrange this.

BART BOSWINKEL: My suggestion would be that, based on this discussion, we stick to the eight-hour rotation starting at 6:00 UTC on the 5th of April.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Okay. Before I close this out, are there any other comments, questions, concerns? Going once, going twice. Any other business? Going once, going twice. I believe we are officially adjourned. I thank you for participating. I thank you for coming. I wish you safe travels home. We will see you on the telephone at some point and possibly on Adobe if that ever gets resolved. Or some other vehicle of similar capabilities. We'll hope to see you all in Panama. Thank you very much.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]