
STEPHEN DEERHAKE:

Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. I want to thank everybody for joining today's teleconference, our penultimate teleconference prior to our face-to-face meeting at ICANN66 in Montreal. For the record, this is the 10 October 2019 edition of the ccNSO PDP Working Group tasked with developing ICANN policy with respect to the retirement of ccTLDs from the root zone, and we have convened this meeting today at 1100 UTC.

It's almost lunchtime for those near the meridian, and late night for those of you near the anti-meridian. For those of in the Western Hemisphere, including myself, it's a pretty early start to our day. I want to thank you all for joining the call and of course I want to thank ICANN Staff for their able and valuable help today. We have some written apologies which the secretary of Staff has noted. It turns out that we have butted up against a center meeting, which I think has contributed to some of our apologies today.

Further, I'm assuming that Staff will be taking attendance in the usual manner, so if there's anybody who is on audio only, please identify yourselves so you're properly recorded as being present. As you've seen from what has been posted on the list, Bernard has been hard at work again reengineering our draft policy document and I think we're getting near the end of our discussion of it.

So the plan today is to have Bernard run us through it once again, hopefully for the last time, although we may revisit it on the next call just for getting twice reading, so that we can turn our attention to stress testing, and stress testing will be a focus of our last teleconference prior

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.

to the face-to-face meeting in Montreal and it will certainly be a center of topic there. [Yoke] documented three Action Items from our last teleconference. The first was an appeal to working group membership to review and comment on the proposed glossary.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I'm sorry, I didn't understand what you just said.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Discussing Action Items from our last teleconference. The first was an appeal to working group membership to review and comment on the proposed glossary under development and I see no action on the mailing list regarding that. The second was for the revision of the policy document which we will be discussing shortly. And the third was the request of the working group for suggestions as to how to move forward with respect to the policy document, and the mailing list was silent on that topic, as well.

So, I think that's it from me as way of introduction. So, Kimberly, if you can put up the latest and greatest from Bernard, I believe it's Version 1.90, that would be great. And if Bernard is back, I will turn the floor over to him.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Bernard is back.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Bernie's back, okay. Bernard, I give you the floor, sir.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yes indeed, I have the mop and I'm ready.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Okay, I hope you can walk us through what I hope is the final iteration of your wordsmithing on our core policy document, so the floor is yours, carry on, thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Alright, I doubt it will be the final wordsmithing, but I think on the general concepts we're close. Alright, so let's go down the next page, please. Okay, so, after our great debate, we're currently using ISO 3166 Alpha 2 code, which will be referenced elsewhere as an Alpha 2 code. There is still some discussion going on if that will be Alpha 2 code element, and if it is, it's not a big change, we'll just change it here and then it will be Alpha 2 code in the rest of the document.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I can live with that.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay, great, thank you. So, that's the only change there. We removed country code, "When a new ISO 3166-1 Alpha 2 code also referred to as an Alpha 2 code in the rest of the document with the foot note, is

added." So we've removed the country code thing there. Alright, line 25, it's important to note that ccTLDs. Sorry, yes, please.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

We can remove the footnotes on the first page, really.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Yeah, really, I know. So, "It's important to note that ccTLDs include two letter ccTLDs corresponding to an Alpha 2 code," the majority of ccTLDs, so just to match with what we've done. Next page, please. The following two letter ccTLDs not corresponding to an It's important to note that ccTLDs include two letter ccTLDs corresponding to an Alpha 2 code, AC, EU, SU, UK. IDN ccTLDs as approved by ICANN. So that's pretty consistent with that change we made up there.

After that, we go to Section 3 line 35, 36, so, this is a key statement and let's make sure we're all okay here. This policy applies to all entries in the root zone which are identified as ccTLDs. Okay, that's the key element, as you can see the red line, members of the ccNSO, et cetera. So now we're saying to all entries in the root zone which are identified as ccTLDs. Next page please. Thank you.

And our subject to a retirement triggering event. So, we've introduced the notion of a triggering event, I guess we've been talking about it for a little while, I just formalized it in this document so that it's consistent. Retirement triggering events are defined as follows: For two letter ccTLDs which correspond to an Alpha 2 code, as defined up there, the trigger is the removal of the corresponding of the Alpha 2 code from the

ISO 3166-1 standard by the ISO 3166-1 maintenance agency, also known as ISO 3166-MA.

For the following two letter ccTLDs which do not correspond to an Alpha 2 code, and we're going to have to work on that, because that should say "two letter latin ccTLDs" because there are two letter IDN ccTLDs, so there's a correction there, Alpha 2 code AC, EU, SU, UK. The trigger is the ISO 3166-1 MA making a change other than making the code an Alpha 2 code to any of these. For each such triggering event the IFO will consider if the change requires retiring the ccTLD. If the ccTLD manager disagrees with the IFO's decision to initiate the retirement process, it can appeal the decision using the ccTLD appeals mechanism. Alright, next page, please.

For IDN ccTLDs the triggering event will be identified in the policy which applies to IDN ccTLDs. And then red line, red line, if a ccTLD is to be, sorry, line 68 for those following a recording later on. If the ccTLD is to be retired but does not have a functional manager, the IFO cannot transfer responsibility to a new manager according to standard process. This set of circumstances would create a deadlock situation which would prevent the IFO from ever retiring the ccTLD. To avoid such a deadlock and only under these specific conditions, this policy allows the IFO to proceed with the transfer responsibility for the ccTLD to establish a functional manager and ensure the ccTLD can be retired. So, we removed the word "retiring ccTLD" there. Eberhard has a hand.

EBERHARD LISSE: In my presentation, I used the nonexisting word, "CC-EBERO" which exactly is this. We haven't really got a defined process for that, but some other way we need to make sure that we can basically retire..

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yes, good point, thank you. Next page, please. Alright, minor fix on 9E1 "CIFO confirms that a ccTLD should be retired," I don't think that's going to cause any heartburn.

EBERHARD LISSE: I'm sorry, I don't like that "confirms" previous page.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Let's back up, okay, thank you.

EBERHARD LISSE: Confirms, and then next line, has confirmed, are two different tenses. I would like it either all in present or all in present perfect.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay, good point; noted, Eberhard, I'll take care of that. Next page, please. Thank you. Changed retirement "period" to retirement date, because we weren't really talking about a period which is a length of time, we were talking about a date it's going to go away, it seemed to make more sense.

Alright, all the way down to section 4, 3, line 104, "The IFO cannot require that a retiring ccTLD be removed from a root zone less than five years from the time the IFO has sent a notice of retirement to the retiring ccTLD manager unless an alternate retirement date is mutually agreed to by both the ccTLD manager and the IFO." So just bringing in the notion of an alternate retirement date. Same change in 106, the retirement date.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I would put the footnote 7 in the paragraph after line 96, because it doesn't have to be a footnote and I think we can strike the footnote article 4.2, but put it in a bracket, so we don't need a footnote for that.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay, we'll look at that.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Just for the way this looks, we should go away from footnotes as far as possible in the end document.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: No problem, I think we have a term in French for this, [inaudible] .

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Let's discuss that, okay.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Alright, next page, please. Retirement period, retirement date on line 110, 113 same thing, 115 same thing. Copy of the notice of retirement, date that ccTLD is expected to stop taking registration, renewal and transfers that exceed the date of removal from the root zone. Okay, so this was as was discussed between Eberhard and Patricio, we collapsed that whole thing into one statement. Is that okay for everyone? Looks like it. Next page, please.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Works for me, thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Alright, and I get a green check from Eberhard, I like it. Details of A, communications plan to advise registrants of the retirement of the ccTLD. Date versus period. Yes, Eberhard?

EBERHARD LISSE: I have sent an email, I have received a query from the Indian registry. They have moved to Northstar and they want to make a presentation at tech day, and I've noted that they also had a communication program to advise their members. And I think that might be a quite good thing for us to look in how it is, so we have a bit of an idea what a communication plan could look like.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yes, I read that this morning, that's interesting, it could be one of those things that is an annex to documents so people can get inspired.

Alright, line 129, date, period, 132 period replaced by date again, alright, and all the way down to 137 where we have those changes of collapsing things and reordering them a bit, did not change the meaning, but just compacted things a bit.

Retirement plan which requests an extension shall include in addition to the previously listed items, the following; the length of the extension required, a maximum five additional years, including the proposed date of the removal of the ccTLD from the root zone, the reasons for requesting an extension. Next page, please. So these are in blue because they got moved around, but basically they're the same things we had previously, an impact analysis which supports the reasons for making the extension request. Alright, given it's not really new text, I'm not expecting any arguments here. Okay, next page please.

Alright, that takes us down to 167, the word "group" anticipates that if the request for an extension is rejected, I think we agreed to remove the word "group" from that point, I forgot to do that, so I will note that. So it should be "if the request for an extension is rejected and the ccTLD manager believes," I removed feels, "believes that the rejection has been unreasonably withheld" and we have the footnote there. Eberhard?

EBERHARD LISSE: Move this footnote up into the paragraph.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Which one, 10 or 11?

EBERHARD LISSE: 11.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay, just so we're clear. Alright, thank you. Next page, please. "Shall and should" got fixed, I don't think that should cause any heartburn. Next page, please.

Alright, we removed the reference to part 2 of ccNSO PDP 3 and just left in "this policy on retirement decisions have been identified which shall subject to such a review mechanism." Eberhard?

EBERHARD LISSE: If you write "such a review mechanism" we must write what it means.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: A review mechanism.

EBERHARD LISSE: We should maybe point to we defined it in the previous page, we must just refer to this that is clear what we mean.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay, noted. Next page please, I think we're essentially done, yeah, that's it. So, back to you Stephen. So I think apart from some [inaudible] I think we're there.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I think we are, too. Going once, going twice, not seeing any hands waving, I will assume that those on the call are pretty happy with where we are. I spoke too soon, a got a hand from Patricio and a hand from Kim. Patricio gets to go first. Go ahead, sir.

PATRICIO POBLETE: There was this line where there is the date when the manager will stop accepting revisions that extend beyond the deadline right? I forget what line it was.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yeah, do we need to back up to that particular text?

PATRICIO POBLETE: Well, my point is, and I said that in the email three weeks back, I would prefer that to be a commitment to stop accepting such registrations or renewals and transfers at the earliest practical date. It's like if it said that you should state the date when you stopped beating your wife. Because if you're marketing a product that you know you will not be able to deliver, then that doesn't sound right.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: How would you like it phrased, then?

PATRICIO POBLETE: A commitment to stop accepting registrations renewals and transfers for dates that extend beyond the, I don't know the term, beyond the date of removal from the root zone at the earliest practical date. I mean you're probably not able to do it right now, but do it next month or so, as soon as possible. My point is that you should not be taking money for a service that everybody knows that you will not be able to deliver.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I think I can wordsmith something that will include both those things properly, Stephen.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Okay, great, thank you Patricio. Does that work for you, sir?

PATRICIO POBLETE: Yep.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Eberhard just put his hand down, but Kim's got his hand up.

EBERHARD LISSE: It wasn't a hand, I just agree with what Bernard said.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Okay, Kim Davies, you have the floor, sir.

KIM DAVIES: I want to better understand the implications of lines 46 through 48, which was the trigger condition for the non alpha 2 codes. To confirm my understanding or help me better understand, is the implication here that for the four identified codes that are non alpha 2 codes today, that the expectation is that IANA would take no action until such time as in the future ISO takes action and therefore it's implicit that they become recognized as active ccTLDs or is the intention that the current status is that in effect upon implementation of this policy they would be retained until such time as that trigger condition is met? Or is it something else? And I might have followup question depending on the answer to that.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you. Bernard, do you want to address that?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I see Eberhard has his hand up, let's give him a shot, and then I can fill in if needed.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Okay, excellent, Eberhard the floor is yours.

EBERHARD LISSE: My understanding is that if one of the four that correspond to exceptionally reserved ones, if that code element goes into the standard, for example .ac is the only candidate, then nothing changes,

really. But if for example they unreserve this exceptionally reserved code, if for example the one, the only two where I could foresee this and the priority would be .su where I could foresee it as the easiest it would happen, if they say it's not exceptionally reserved anymore, it probably would then be formally used, then the ccTLD would need to retire. If they were to move .su back into the ISO code, then it would not be retired and it probably would not be affected. That's how I understand this to read.

KIM DAVIES:

Okay, so the current status of those four, is three of them are active ccTLDs, AC, EU, and UK, and SU is in sort of phase out status, which is the expectation. SU is to be retired but under the current operational procedures there is no default date. Would it therefore be correct to say upon application of this policy, .su should go from being phase out to being considered active, this is promoting .su to that status?

EBERHARD LISSE:

We are unaware that .su is supposed to be retired. Where is this documented? Can you maybe forward documentation to the group so we can read this? My understanding up to now, and I'm speaking under ignorance here, is that it's exceptionally reserved and it's in limbo, and we don't touch. If there is an expectation, then basically when you can define a trigger event, that same trigger applies. If not, you must find a way of dealing with it.

KIM DAVIES:

On its status, they fully understand its status, it was in my presentation on the very first meeting of this working group back in Johannesburg, I'm happy to reshare those documents, but we have been very clear that is its status and it has been for many years.

But then with respect to my objective, my objective is simply to clarify the status and should it be retained as active, I think I mentioned this in working groups long past, the practical operational challenge we have with .su is unlike the other three, it is not an existing geopolitical entity, and therefore we cannot normally apply the core principles of ccTLD delegation et cetera that rely on work-related community, significantly interested parties, and so forth, because they are ill defined in this situation and my hope and my expectation with this working group is ultimately should .su be retained in some active form, provide clarity around how the policy should be practically applied in that situation.

If it doesn't, that's fine, but I think my understanding is under the operational contract we will need to refer that question back to the ccNSO policy making regardless. So, that's where I'm coming from, and any clarity you could provide would be very helpful.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE:

Kim, thank you for that. We should have further discussion about this hopefully offline in Montreal to try and sort out your concerns here with regard to .su specifically. I see that I've Nick with his hand.

EBERHARD LISSE:

Sorry, can I finalize this?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yeah, go ahead, and then I'll go to Nick.

EBERHARD LISSE: I would like to see the source documentation, not the presentation you made, but your internal, what can be published, the source document that clears this status up. At the moment, maybe because we overlooked this or whatever, we are under the assumption, we are proceeding under the assumption that those four are ccTLDs. If that understanding is wrong, it would be best if IFO could present us with a formal advisory, and you are fully right, it's for ccNSO to make policy if .su is a member, they have to adhere while they are a member, if not, then we can take it from there, or you can take it from there.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Eberhard. Nick, go ahead.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Yeah, just this bit about the exceptionally reserved codes. I think the way Eberhard explained it made total sense to me, but looking back on the detail of the word, I'm not quite sure whether the wording is quite matching to how that would work. Because it just talks about the trigger being a change, sorry, the trigger is the maintenance agent making a change, I'm not sure whether that is exactly right, and I think I'd like to just put a flag reflecting that, and I also think that the other people in this basket, .eu, I did talk to Giovanni about it, to try to explain to him that this is ongoing, but I don't know if he's quite focused on it,

but I think they need to have eyes on it, and similarly the .ac folk; .su, by the way, considers itself to be an active ccTLD, it has an application in to join Center, which is probably going to be accepted.

So, if they're not a ccTLD, then that would be super useful to know, because the rest of the world is moving on a bit. I think we need to this as housekeeping and clarify the status of these four edge cases, and I think it would be good if we can get the policy to encapsulate them. This is an area where if we're not careful, because they are by their nature, exceptional, we don't want to inadvertently do something, so I think careful eyes if we can get them in Montreal to bring their eyes specific to this bit and point it to them before we finalize the document and send out for wider comment.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE:

Thank you, Nick, I appreciate that. I think we're going to have to get Giovanni more involved. Kim, his hand is back up, so Kim, the floor is yours, sir.

KIM DAVIES:

I just wanted to add, I dropped a link into the chat which is sort of our primary public place document that enumerates what we consider today operationally what are eligible TLDs and what the definition is under the current procedures. I will collect additional information and share it with you. I will note that most of our discussion with .su has been bilateral and according to our normal procedures, that is privileged. We don't share direct communication we have with other

parties without their consent to the general public. I will provide additional materials after the call and then we can discuss from there.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Understood, thank you, Kim. Anybody else on this? Eberhard has a new hand, so Eberhard the floor is yours.

EBERHARD LISSE: I do not consider this within scope of this PDP. If you have, this link has got grandfather clauses, so if I was asked for my opinion I would say .su is grandfathered. If not, it's not an issue for us to solve. Fix it outside of this working group and if it is then decided they don't qualify, and this is justified to be seen as a trigger event, go and do it. But this is not something that I want to get involved with in this working group because it doesn't belong here. The question of whether .su is a ccTLD ineligible or a ccTLD does not belong in this group and I think we should not deal with it here. To make it obvious, I am unwilling, strictly and strongly, to discuss matters that don't belong here.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Alright, thank you, doctor. Anybody else with anything?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Can I just say, I agree with Eberhard, I think this is a forward looking policy and were not by necessity trying to rectify all the slightly curious process whereby some ccTLDs are grandfathered or otherwise created, and it's really looking forward to creating an orderly process. The

ICANN Board for many years obviously hasn't dealt with .su, it's now on the exceptionally reserved list, and I guess that's kind of the status quo, we can't really do anything about that now.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I kind of agree with you, of course, the question of .uk after the 31st of October is another issue, but we'll hold that for future meeting.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: That's a low blow, that's a low blow.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I know, I know, just kidding, I just got disinvited, I know. Yeah. Kim's got his hand up again, so Kim, the floor is yours.

KIM DAVIES: Just briefly, we have not proactively done anything with .su for many years. Based on conversations with the ccNSO leadership et cetera, that this very working group would be tackling the issue. So it's kind of circular to the point that nothing is being done, as to a reason why this working group should not take action. It's not for me to say what this working group should or should not do, but I think from my position, if this working group does not clarify the status, then as required by the IANA naming contract, we would be obligated to ask the ccNSO leadership to create policy around the topics that are not clarified by this group. I'm not trying to derail the discussion at all, but that's my operational understanding.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: It would be useful to have a comment, Kim, because obviously some of us don't know what previous ccNSO leadership teams did or didn't say or might not be within the scope of this group, but I'm a bit worried about it being quite a political issue and actually the tail wagging the dog in the sense that it derails the rest of it, for which there is no real reason to not proceed and get a good policy.

EBERHARD LISSE: I would need to see documentation that ccNSO or whoever at ICANN has agreed previously that this working group is going to decide the fate of .su. I would like, not a link to a website, I would like to see this documentation, if necessary, on an NDA, otherwise for me this is something where I cannot achieve consensus and I will not achieve consensus.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Alright, thank you L. Kim, do you have any comeback? Bernard's got a hand up, Bernard?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Being part of the club of the ancient ones, waiting for my triggering event, yeah, Kim is right in one way and in the discussions we had many, many, many moons ago, when .su was brought up in Kim's presentations, ICANN didn't go there, and we ended up saying we're going to wait for a retirement policy. Well, we've crafted a retirement policy and we said that if there is a change to .su by the ISO3166 MA,

then the IFO can look at it, if it makes sense, then they can go for retiring it.

But I think you're trying to take it one step further, Kim, and I understand why, from your point of view, but from our point of view and relative to what Nick said, we're just trying to craft a policy that is forward looking and taking into account the realities. If you make a request to the ccNSO because that doesn't meet your terms in .su, because .su is not associated with a geopolitical element, then so be it, but I also understand Eberhard's point of view, that we would be twisting this policy pretty seriously if we were to go beyond this, or at least that's what I understand it to be from what we were doing. I don't know if that helps any, but thank you.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE:

Thank you, Bernard. Anybody else on this? Or can we move on to our next agenda item. I'm not seeing any further hands. Comments, particularly Kim's, acknowledged and be thought through, and hopefully we'll come up with something to discuss at our next meeting. Given that, next up on the agenda is content overview of Eberhard's proposed presentation to the GAC at the ICANN66 meeting in Montreal.

It's shaping up in my view to be a two part presentation, a handout with serious references that they can take home and study, as well as the actual slide deck which he will walk the GAC through. I think it's pretty solid material. So, Kimbelry, if you can put up Eberhard's slide deck, I'll turn the floor over to the good doctor and Eberhard, the floor is yours, sir, go for it.

EBERHARD LISSE:

I'm not going to go through my presentation, I'm roughly going to share my ideas what I want to do and we will circulate it beforehand, especially to some of the experts in this group, to make sure that I don't shoot myself in the left foot, the right foot is already damaged. Introduction, one thing I need to tell you is the way I'm doing this presentation, it will be put into a handout where I will put in some comments, quotations, and references.

The handout will include quotations to try to clarify things, where it's coming from, and so that they can do homework before we start. The idea is that the GAC is not involved in this at all. We have noticed that when we go there, they look at us as if we were talking funny, and there is also a turnover, so at some stage the word onboarding was mentioned, and I more or less volunteered to assist them. The first two slides, this is basically a slide which says what the presentation is about and how it works.

Then I do a little bit of an introduction, because I want to be systematic, what the DNS is, how it works from one single file with the flat name space to what we know now about the DNS, what the design codes were, shortly, because I don't want to spend too much time. I will use the slide that you can see now, the graph, repeatedly, to make points which will become apparent when we go a little bit further. Explain a little bit how the DNS works.

We have got more knowledge about how this works with application queries and recursive resolvers, it's all technical and buzz words, so I

tried to dumb it down that even a government civil servant can understand what we're talking about. I want to explain the zone concept, that means local control. We have got 330 million domain names in .com. If each of them had 1000 local names, there would be 300 billion, and it still would work, because control, there are 330 million zones like ICANN which has control over its own little domain name and 1000 hosts within ICANN, for example, is much easier to maintain than 300 billion.

Then I explain who this works with the zone file that is generated by databases, and so on, say a little bit about what resource records are and that it is extensible, what part of the DNS system was that it could be extended easily, that we could put in the IPV-6 which is AAAA and we could put in the DSNSEC which is double RSIG, and the other three for completeness' sake. The work is ongoing, they are developing new resource records every day as we speak at IDF.

It's extremely difficult to find an actual definition what a domain name is. The first time it's actually mentioned, I went through the RFC editor site, is 1034, I think, where it's reasonably defined, it doesn't help much. Interesting is that RFC 1591 is, personally, if I have an opinion of it, is sloppily written. For example, the root off system is unnamed, there is something missing, and then "there are a set" which is clearly the wrong grammar, it's there is a set, and things like this.

And I can use this not wanting to diss this but to say that this was written for a particular purpose and a framework of interpretation was necessary or developed in the end. I like the definition of Wikipedia what an actual domain name is, because that really tells us something.

But Richard doesn't really like to use Wikipedia to define these things, he's right in a way, but it's actually only for nerds who can understand what is written in the RFCs.

Then a little bit about top level domain, this is all relatively clear. Interesting here is to record things that the independent review process has been recently in the .africa case clearly states, this is a quasi-judicial proceeding, anything you want to sue on, you have to already deal with internal remedies, and this can inform us on our appeals process, because if an internal remedy is well designed and is well conducted, then you cannot really bring arguments afterwards that are totally contrary to what you alleged in the review process. Okay, then I just show that the left part of the domain name space is the gTLDs, green means new and red means deleted, so it's fairly obvious here in this context.

Then a little bit about ccTLDs because it has developed over time. Location based instead of purpose based is not as easy. What is the location but also what does .io or .me, or .md means to some people or others. And then shortly, because 1591 was probably not totally intended for what we use it today, it's also many ccTLDs were created beforehand, and so on, so we have a more or less binding framework of interpretation that is basically agreed by everybody working with this and it's a result of compromise in many ways, like RFC-1591, for the want of something better, this is the way we work, and it seems to work out quite fine.

Showing on the right side the ccTLDs a little bit, I have written an email to Kim and Naela and when they have time, I would appreciate the

correct numbers, how many ccTLDs are currently delegated, how many are not, I know of three, and then how many IDNs are possible, and so on, so that I have the correct figures. These figures are from a few years ago, and I just want if I do this, also the new gTLDs, if 1800 is too little, just give me the right numbers roughly so that when I say this I at least have the correct numbers.

I'm going to say a little bit about the ccTLD historically, actually we should deal with the manager, but historically we're dealing with the technical and admin content, and someone has to explain this a little bit. As you know, I'm very much against the use of the word "redelegation" so I'm using this a little bit to introduce the concept of transfer and the location end of transfer. The interesting thing is that we never have had such a case yet, so we don't know what process is there, but as I always said, I know substantial misconduct if I see it, so the process will be probably appropriate to some egregious conduct. And then the retirement is explained.

Interesting is that the correct abbreviation for International Organization of Standardization would be IOS, but as the organization has an explanation on their website why they chose that one. Then I will try a little bit to explain how this works, that we're not dealing, I have always not been in the business of deciding what a country is, but this is the action of the ISO. So, they work with names and they standard this for interchange, and in my handout there will be a little quote from their website which spells it out a little bit nicely. I show that there are different country codes with quotes from the standard, and I mention that there is a draft.

And then I show the combination which is actually a subset, AA to ZZ is the combinations that are possible, but the code that they use leaves out, for example, X and a few others, don't want to go into the reasons, but if you want to make examples with nonexisting ccTLDs, you can use XA, XZ, and things like this.

Here are the numbers that I would like some help from IFO, .ium, .bq, and .aa are not delegated. If there is another one that could be that is eligible, but if not, I would like to know about it. Then we show that 12 codes are exceptionally reserved for interchange uses, but for which no country name has been defined, and current there are four. I am not going into which one of them are legit or not, I'm just going to mention it.

Then we would like them to see what we have considered as internal event examples. They all know that if a country changes its name or ceases to exist, that is something that a few years before any changes to the ccTLD happens, the country goes through an internal process, so everybody in the country is aware that this happens. This is what happened to Germany, East Germany was not delegated so they didn't have a ccTLD, so that was not interesting. Interesting here is .bq, not only because it wasn't an edit, rather .bq was previously used for British Antarctica and was removed from the list in 76 or 79, and that was done in 2010, so it's about 30 years. We know that removed formerly used codes should be reserved for about 50 years, but depending on how big the usage was, 30 years strikes me as reasonable. We had this other thing with .cs, which was only removed for two years and then it caused problems when it was used.

Then, how retirement would work, ISO removes, decision is taken by IFO. ICANN ? means I am not sure whether we have decided whether the ICANN Board should cross the T's and dot the I's on the start as it will do at the final approval, so it's not an issue, it's just for completeness' sake. And then the steps that we have discussed.

I haven't the slide on the retirement plan, maybe this is enough, maybe I must put some more there. Some milestones, maybe I should bold the exceeding, because it doesn't come out very nicely, the point is as Patricio clearly states, we must make sure that they stop taking registrations when they know that they cannot perform and they take money for a service that they know they cannot provide, and we can't really enforce it. But if they make a plan, that should include this commitment.

Out of scope, the first two other ones that we know about, ccNSO membership is also clear by the [inaudible] whether somebody registered in .me or .io or .md, or .ml, and .to for that matter, where they have some millions, not our problem. The purpose based use of a location based TLD cannot inform this policy.

Then the unexpected consequences. If a country has ceased to exist and the ccTLD manager needs or wants to change, that will interfere with the current process that the IFO used for a change of manager, the significantly interested parties are ill defined, not to be defined, don't exist, it's just for completeness' sake. Then we mention what happens if the manager walks away, turns the light off, and abandons everything, the name servers need to continue operating and some orderly process needs to be done. That's why I call it CC-Ebero, there is no formal thing

like this, but IFO will find a way of doing this, there are three or four Eberos and two of them are ccTLDs, .uk and .cn does it, so there may be a way of pushing the zones so at least they resolve until this has been sorted. Probably not part of the PDP.

If a manager is uncooperative but continues to work and he says I don't care what you do, it's not my problem, if you mess with me we will sue you or do something else, it's not part of this policy. IDNs is what we discussed. We cannot as this group decide what is a trigger event. If a name changes that results in an alpha code change but it changes in a way that the IDN name does not necessarily have to change, I don't speak the language, what can I say about this? Therefore the PDP can look at that and once it's decided, we all know we will use this policy.

Then a little bit about exceptionally reserved for want of a better term. We have no formal policy, but we have a Board guideline, this is basically from the eligibility document. AC is grandfathered, if they were to change to assigned, it could probably be handled the same way. And then of course what would happen if .su for example or .uk was just removed altogether, how that works we are not really clear yet, so for the presentation purposes I will say it's probably going to be handled case by case. And that's the end of it.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE:

Thank you, Eberhard.

EBERHARD LISSE: I am supposed to spend 45 minutes including question time on this, and I hope I can get it without rushing it too much in 30 minutes so that they have enough time to ask silly questions.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Alright, let's not delegate our colleagues. Any questions from anybody? Jaap has got is hand up. Jaap, go ahead, sir.

JAAP AKKERHUIS: Good morning, I hope you can hear me. There are some things that need some correction. For instance, .bq was retired in 79. Anyway, what I really would like to not use the term primary and secondary names, that's very old term and a lot of people are taking that as being the primary more important than the secondary, which is not true at all. I would really refrain to use it. And there are more of these words which I think you probably looked at. And furthermore there is a standard, and it's still valid, so don't say that there is a draft standard. But these are the main things I noted down.

EBERHARD LISSE: As I said, this is not as final product, and you are one of the people I wanted to send it to, to go over the terminology. I wasn't really too sure about primary and secondary, maybe master, slave...

JAAP AKKERHUIS: Yeah, it's the same problem.

EBERHARD LISSE: We will work on wordsmithing that to use the correct terminology, that is not a problem. The thing about the draft, I said it's underway, it's under development. The standard is the one that is currently there, but it's being reviewed, so I should mention it because it may change terminology or not, but it should be for completeness. But you are quite right, the plan was in fact to send it to you as the technical expert to go through the terminology so that we get this agreed upon. Once that is done, then we undraft it so that it can be circulated to the wider area.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Jaap for your comments.

JAAP AKKERHUIS: I just want to recommend that please do it as soon as possible.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Acknowledged, thank you Jaap, I'll let you and Eberhard sort that out. We're not into extra time. So, on item 6, corner cases, et cetera, stress testing, I would like to get you all to start thinking about stress testing scenarios, as well as some possible bizarre corner cases. I would like stress testing to be the focus of our face-to-face meeting and now that we've got an actual retirement policy pretty much locked down, I think we really need to direct our attention to weird and obscure situations and see how the proposed policy stands up to them.

So I would encourage you to think about all this between now and our next teleconference, as I want the focus of our next teleconference to really be on stress test scenarios in our lead up to the face-to-face meeting in Montreal. So that's if from me with Item 6. Do we have any other business anyone wishes to raise?

I'm not seeing any hands, so that being the case, let me remind you of our upcoming meetings. We've got a teleconference on the 14th of October at 1700 UTC, good time for those of you near the meridian, and then of course we have our actual face-to-face which will be on the 3rd of November, 3:15 to 6:30 local time Montreal time. And I think that's it. Anybody have anything else?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I just made a comment in the chat.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Okay, I'm sorry I did not see that, sir, I'm having glasses issues. Okay, I'll let you and Eberhard take that one up, as well. There is merit in what you've said there, so let us capture that and we go forward.

BART BOSWINKEL: Stephen, this is Bart, please note that the next call is on the 24th and not on the 14th.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE:

Ah, a typo, yeah, yeah, okay, 24th of October, not the 14th, in two weeks, as per usual. But at 1700 UTC. Thank you, Bart, for pointing that out. I believe that's it. I will thus call this meeting adjourned. Thank you, Kimberly, you can kill the recording, and thank you Bart and thank you everybody else who has been participating for being here this morning. Thank you, we're done, see you in two weeks.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]