STEPHEN DEERHAKE: All Right. We have a decent turnout. Good morning. Good afternoon. Good evening. I want to thank you guys for joining today's teleconference. Our first, after the High Holidays season here in the northern hemisphere. For the record, this is the 12 September 2019 edition of the ccNSO PDP Working Group tasked with developing ICANN policy, with respect to the retirement ccTLDs from the Root Zone. We convene this today at 23:00 UTC.

I realize it's late for those of you near the meridian, early for those of you near the antemeridian, and I wish to thank all of you for joining the call this morning -- depending on where you are. I'm not seeing any written apologies. Perhaps the Secretariat has received some. And I'm also assuming then that staff will be taking attendance in the usual manner. If there's anyone on audio only, please identify yourself so that you're properly recorded as being present.

I'm pleased to announce that we have Bart back with us, and also Moses. So, I want to wish both of you back from your holiday, and I trust you had a properly relaxing time. So the plan today is to pick up where we left off on our last call and continue or dive back into the actual draft policy texts that Bernard has been working on. He's taken the remarks from the last call to heart. Needs cleaned up, and otherwise improve the document. Thus, he will lead us through that again.

I have no administrative matters to discuss with you other than to remind you all of our upcoming face-to-face Montreal meeting. And that is, as I mentioned last time, scheduled for blocks four and five on

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.

Saturday the 2nd of November. And again, as I said last time, no details yet on how our time will be structured, other than it's likely we will dive into the revised ISO 3166, as it has some terminology changes that Peter has some issues with. So we need to look at that a little bit.

I think that's it for me, in the way of introductory remarks. I do want to caution everyone, I'm a little more incoherent than I usually am because I am still severely jet lagged from attending the Asia-Pacific TLD conference in Malaysia last week. Usually, I get over jet lag pretty quickly but this has just been the worst ever.

So with that, I turn to the heart of today's call, which is further discussion on the core draft policy document being developed by Bernard. So Bernard, I'm assuming you're going with the red line version, you've sorted this out with Kimberly. And so, I turn the floor over to you, sir.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, sir.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Bingo. Thank you, Kimberly.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Our policy document, one more time. Nothing here. Next page please. And no changes there. Next page. The policy objectives, sorry. Policy objective 24, 25. The objective to policies to provide a clear and predictable guidance, and to document a process that is orderly and

EN

reasonable from the time -- colon, next page. Now, we had the three things last week -- which code element is removed from the ISO 3166 list by the ISO 3166-MA.

And then we had two other things: A code element is removed from the list of exceptionally reserved codes by the ISO 3166-MA. An IDN ccTLD string of characters no longer qualifies as an IDN ccTLD string, to be defined under ccPDP 4. And you'll notice that from line 27 to the end of line 30 there is a square bracket meaning, this is not agreed text. This is what was there last week. We said we would square bracket it because there were significant discussions around that text. And so, I don't know how we want to proceed. If we want to take up that discussion again; or if we want to run through the documents, see where I've made changes and then come back to this. I'm open to either way. Patricio.

PATRICIO POBLETE: This seems to be the place where we define what it means for the country code to be, so to say, ready to be retired. I think we should make an effort to come up with a good definition of that right here. And later in the text, do not go with the same kind of wording. I noticed that in several places later on, we say, "When the code element is removed from the lists, ISO 3166 [inaudible]."   We shouldn't repeat that. We should refer to this definition. Probably give it a name, like say, "A code element is due for removal," or something. And then use that term and not repeat this definition. Just leave it here in this place.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Good comment. Thank you Patricio. Peter, you're next in line.

PETER VAN ROSTE: Thank you. Hopefully I'm audible a bit. I was just going to suggest or share that my recollection was, that particular discussion about the exceptionally reserved list was postponed to the face-to-face meeting. So I suggest that we take that to Montreal, unless that disturbs the timeline and the schedule. I'm prepared to discuss it again, but I think we need a bit more in-depth discussion about which other versions of 3166 to apply, in what way, and so on and so forth. That might be a distraction from the rest of the updates that you've applied, at the moment, at least. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, Peter. Eberhard.

EBERHARD LISSE: That's why it is in square brackets. But technically speaking, line 26 is also not correct because there is more than one list. The ISO Maintenance Agency maintains a list of assigned names and reserved names -- sorry, transitionally reserved names and exceptionally reserved names. And at the moment, there are a few that are not part of the standard. And they will, probably in the new terminology, go on a list of indefinitely reserved.

So, I would agree with Patricio, that we make a proper definition. And we can approach it from a status point of perspective and say we can refer to it either by status or by the list of assigned, unassigned, transitionally or other reserved list, so that we have consistent -- I also

like what he said, that we use one terminology throughout. Because it becomes very difficult to read, and we don't want to overburden casual readers like the ones from the GAC.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, Eberhard. Nick.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: I put it in the chat, but I agreed with Patricio -- have a definition, like retirement event, to encompass all of these triggers. In terms of the question you asked about the square bracketed bit, whether we should deal with it now, my inclination would be to park it for now. Partly because it's quite tricky to deal with, but also, we shouldn't lose sight of the fact that the vast majority of retirement events are going to be under the first thing, which isn't in square brackets -- the ISO 3166 list, the standard list -- and that's really what we should spend our time on. That's going to be the 99% of all of these things. Let's not let the tail wag the dog, as it were, and spend too much time on those two things, I think, for the time being.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, Nick. Steven.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, sir. I just want to reiterate with Peter that yes, we are going to have to take a dive into this revised 3166 at our face-to-face, and I will be calling upon Jaap to help us out there. I'm just putting him on

EN

notice. I haven't written to him yet that we're going to call upon his expertise to give us a bit of a walkthrough as to what's new and different. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, Stephen. All right. So, the heavy discussion is parked until we meet in Montreal. Excellent. Applicability of the policy -- Oh, I see Bart.

BART BOSWINKEL: Just as a reminder, which we need to include as well, is the glossary -- see what is included in the glossary, with respect to this. Because the glossary also, that was the starting point where we defined some aspects of it. Thanks.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Good point. Thank you, Bart. All right. Any other points? The rest of our changes, hopefully, will not be too controversial, keeping in mind Patricio's request which seems to gather a lot of support, and I think is a great idea, too. We can certainly revise according to that.

Now, Section 3 -- 33, 34 was changed last time, but I did not see any opposition to the policies developed in accordance with Article 10, Section A 6(a) and (b) of the ICANN bylaws, and accordingly, is directed at ICANN.

Thirty-five -- some editing, just to make it clearer, because it was a little fuzzy. It now reads, "For the purpose of this policy, an IDN ccTLD is

considered to be a ccTLD, and an IDN ccTLD manager is considered to be a ccTLD manager, unless it is explicitly stated otherwise." So I think that clarifies what we were trying to say there last time. Any comments on that? No. I think we achieve clarity. Excellent. Next page, please. And most of the changes will be along those lines.

Line 40 -- IDN ccTLD, which no longer qualifies as such. Peter, yes. I see your hand, Peter.

PETER VAN ROSTE: I had the feeling you jumped over the last two lines on the previous page.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay. Back up please, Kimberly.

PETER VAN ROSTE: There might be a clerical error, but it reads, "The policy is applicable to ccTLD managers, which are members." [Inaudible] by a functional manager. One is the managers and the other is TLDs. So we need a bit of clarity there. So either the policy is applicable to ccTLD managers, which [inaudible] ccNSO, that's fine. So it's applicable to the managers, rather than to the ccTLDs. But then the "are managed by a functional manager" doesn't make sense, the reference breaks, because the manager isn't managed, anyway.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay, understood. We'll look at that. Thank you.

PETER VAN ROSTE: Sorry. Forgive my verbosity, it's very early in the morning, or late at night. Sorry.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: No, Peter. That's fine. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: All right. Next page, please.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: You've got a hand from Eberhard.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Oh, Eberhard.

EBERHARD LISSE: For me it's equally late, and I'm going to be equally verbose. I agree with this Peter. [Inaudible] by a functional manager, we defined it somewhere else anyway. So, I think this should go away here.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yes. That was my thinking too, Eberhard. Thank you. All right. Next page, please.

EN

Forty-two 55 -- There is no great changes there. In 56, we've got exceptionally reserved codes in square brackets. However, we end up resolving this, "The removal process shall be decided on a case by case basis, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case. As an example, if a code element from the exceptionally reserved lists where bracketed is assigned and associated with the country and this code is transferred to the ISO 3166-1 list, and remains assigned and associated with the same country name." So again, there was some fuzziness there. I tried to clean that up before we submit to the same country name. The next line says, "It shall not be retired." Do we have any questions on this? Stephen.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: "Assigned and associated with a country" -- I would say assigned and associated with a country or territory.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Good point. Yes.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: You'd think after all these years we would have remembered.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: No, I was reading 15 91 today actually.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Bart, next.

BART BOSWINKEL: I believe, we have to be careful just to do country and territories. Again, this is done as a reference to the definitions and to the glossary. It's been defined in the glossary as such. And we talk about country and country codes, not country and territory names. That's why you see it with a capital C. So, that's something to look into as well. And I agree, we need to be very consistent. Probably it's a good thing to include the glossary in the next version as well, so we can check and you can check, whether the references, etc. are consistent. But, don't assume that we should use country and territory, that you should use the full name as well -- areas of geopolitical interests or something. So, be aware that country is used here in a definitional form. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: All right. Yes, to Peter -- 59, 60 depend on how we resolve the bracketed issue. And Jaap, the standard definition "What is a country?" and doesn't mention that a territory could be considered a country. All right. Thank you. Anyways, next page, please. Sorry. Eberhard.

EBERHARD LISSE: I was also going to say that the exact title, like Bart said, also includes geopolitical interest, or whatever it's called. My point here is, we should go away from the lists. And it's also not that a code element changes the status, it's the name of the country -- it's the definition or

EN

the name of the country is removed from, changes it status. And that means the alpha-2, alpha-3 anti numerical codes, anti name -- it all goes onto a different list. So, I fully support that we should be exact on the terminology. And we should maybe find a definition, put it in the glossary, and then refer to it always consistently under that name.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, Eberhard. Jaap.

JAAP AKKERHUIS: I wanted to say that if you're going to use ISO terms, you should use that definition. And the definition actually mentions -- I'm doing this by heart now -- but it just means country codes are [inaudible], and I'm not sure about the exact wording, but territories of geopolitical interest or something like that, we should not make up these things ourselves if we talk about ISO 3166. So, I'll have a look at that definition, if you mean that definition.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you. Very good suggestion, Jaap. Anything else on this one? Not seeing anything. Jaap, your hand's still up. All right. Next page, please.

"When it is a sign which is a sign and associated with the list of exceptionally reserved core elements, then the ccTLD shall not be retired. And yes, we probably need a few more square brackets in there. Yes, I understood that. Jaap, is that an old hand? I guess that's an old hand.

EN

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Jaap, is that old? I would assume so, Bernard.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: All right. There is nothing else on the rest of the page until 72. Next page, please. There is nothing that we've changed here to 87. Next page, please. There is nothing we have changed to 104. Next page, please. Nothing we've changed to 123. Next page, please.

All right. Some changes -- 132. "If the ccTLD manager wishes to produce a retirement plan, it must do so within 12 months of the IFO having sent the notice of retirement to the manager of the retiring ccTLD. At its discretion, the IFO can extend the 12-month limit to a maximum of 24 months in total, upon receiving a request for such an extension from the manager. It was unclear if there was a request coming in or not. So I decided to clear that up. And that's the only change there. Any questions on that one?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I think we're good.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: All right. Next page, please. And here what we've got is the user mechanism that will be developed in part of the ccNSO PDP-3. We've got square brackets around that, as we agreed last time. Any comments here? Okay. Next page please.

Let's go back up one, please. I added this in just for clarification purposes under the exception conditions. "If the manager becomes non-functional after a retirement plan is accepted, the IFO can use the same procedure outlined in the requirements section to transfer the ccTLD to a new manager. In such a case, the original notice of retirement is still considered valid." So, we're just trying to clarify here that if there is a change in manager, it doesn't mean you're starting the process from scratch and you get another five years or whatever. The original notice of retirement is still in effect. Stephen.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Questions to the group: do you agree with this? I certainly do. It seems reasonable, when you got Eberhard weighing in. So I will defer to him. Thank you.

EBERHARD LISSE: If we wanted to say that the timeline will not change, we should say that it will not change. Because in such case, the original notice of retirement is still considered valued, does not exactly convey what we meant. We meant that the timeframe specified in the original notice is still the same. In other words, if you have used three years out of five and you change manager, you don't get another five on top of that, or you don't get a total of five. You continue to get it done in the rest of the remaining time. That's basically the intent as far as I understand it. And then we must just find proper wording for that.

EN

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I'll play with the wording but I think what I'm getting is that people support the notion here. We'll fix that. All right? Stephen, your hand is up. Okay, it's not up. All right. Oversight did not really change that much, except you'll notice that 172, we've square bracketed some text. However, it is expected that the IANA naming function contract will be amended to refer to this policy with respect to the retirement of ccTLDs. We did that after the email from Naela last week, and the discussion that we had around that, as far as PTI is concerned. They do not see why the contract would be changed because of this policy. So that's something else that we're going to have to deal with at some point, to see if that's necessary or not in there. Questions? Comments? Not seeing any. Next page, please.

The rest is pretty much as it was last week. You will see that in 186, we have some square brackets around "shall be developed" -- part two of ccNSO PDP-3, as we discussed last week. That's it for me. Oh, I see Bart. Bart, you have a hand?

BART BOSWINKEL: Yes, with respect to line 172 and the email from Naela. Would it be worthwhile that we ask ICANN legal what their position is -- whether that needs to be changed? And I don't know, Naela, if you checked with ICANN legal what the impact would be on the contract.

NAELA SARRAS: Thanks, Bart. I did check with Sam. And the text that I sent, actually, Sam helped me with it. We both don't see a reason why for this specific policy, once it's certified by the ICANN board, the IANA naming function

contract would need to change. Because it would fall under all the other policies that are developed by the community, and sent to ICANN board,and then the board sending it to their organization to implement. That was Sam's opinion [CROSSTALK] that I captured.

BART BOSWINKEL: Thank you.   I'll include it in the notes so we use that for future reference.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: That would mean that we can take that out. So I'll do that for the next version. Eberhard.

EBERHARD LISSE: I will also suggest to consider whether even this sentence in the square bracket, helps us. We could refer to it -- put it in the conditional that we don't expect it but -- we can just remove it, actually.   If the naming contract change, the naming contract change. If it doesn't, it doesn't. It doesn't help us anything, so we can take it out.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: All right.   We're all in agreement on that one.   So, that's it for me. Stephen, back to you.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, sir. I appreciate it. Does Eberhard want to give us an update on his GAC onboarding presentation, or do you want to hold off on that

until the next teleconference? I know you're working diligently on it, and I leave that up to you to let us know, one way or the other if you want to.

EBERHARD LISSE:

I have progressed, but this pesky day job of mine is interrupting with my thought processes all the time. And I wanted to work on it on the weekend, but now our receive of revenue has changed their way of dealing with us, so I have to rewrite all my little tools that I have. So I'm not sure I can do something over the weekend. But I will work on it and get it into a useful state, and then I will send it out as we discuss it. And when it is ready for comment on the list, I will send it out to the list before we discuss it on the call.

I am quite sure that we will discuss it at least on one call, and we can also discuss it on the face-to-face. The presentation is on Tuesday and the face-to-face on Saturday. I should have enough time to polish a few things. So I don't foresee much, other than if I may use terminology that Jaap or Peter or Nick, for example, who are the ones that are concerned with some things that I'm saying -- or most knowledgeable about it, are concerned.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE:

Okay, great. Thank you for that. We are now moving on to any other business. Is there any other business that anybody would like to bring up? I've got a hand from Bart and I've got a hand from Eberhard. Eberhard, I'm assuming that's an old hand. Or is that a new hand?

EN

BART BOSWINKEL: Going back to the GAC presentation, please note that some time ago -- I don't know where it was -- Jaap and I prepared a presentation on ISO 3166 and everything around it, which was based and used, despite that Jaap presented to the Working Group, initially. So, I will dig it up and send it to you, Eberhard. And I think that was the presentation using the terminology and the working methods of the ISO-MA. So that was an ISO-MA's perspective. Thank you.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Excellent. Thank you, sir.

EBERHARD LISSE: I was going to ask you for that, now that you mention it. But I'm not going to explain to the GAC, the inner workings of the ISO. I want to make an overarching presentation from how the DNS started and how it then became administrated and so on. If you go into too much detail, you lose the audience when you do that. I've shown Stephen how I'm going to do this. I have set it up that I can produce a hand-out from the same document that I make the presentation, and we will send the hand-out to the to Mrs. Ismail from the GAC, beforehand, that she can distribute it to her people so that they can read what we write in the hand-out already before I make the presentation, so they have got a little bit of an insight.

BART BOSWINKEL: I'll circulate the slides anyway, Eberhard.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yes. That's good. Is there any other business?

EBERHARD LISSE: Thank you.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Okay. I don't see anybody waving hands, so that's good. So with regards to our next meeting, it will be on the 26th of September at 05:00 UTC. So those near the meridian are going to suffer. I apologize for that, but we do shift things around as it should be. It'll be nice for those out in Asia Pacific. I think that's it. I'm not seeing a last minute waving of hands.

I just want to take the opportunity, as Chair, to thank all the participants on today's call. And I want to extend my sincere thanks to Bart, Bernard and Kimberly who of course, make it all possible. So thank you, again. We'll reconvene when we reconvene, on the 26th of September. So between now and then, be well. I declare this teleconference adjourned. And Kimberly, you may stop the recording. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]