1410276

Kim Carlson:	The recording has started. Welcome to the PDP on Retirement Working Group on September 28th at 1800 UTC. On today's call we have Danko Jevtović, Debbie Monahan, Eberhard Lisse, Elise Garrets (ph), Martin Boyle, Mirjana Tasić, Naela Sarras, Nenad Orlić, Nick Wenban-Smith, Nigel Roberts, Peter Koch, Stephen Deerhake. Apologies from Marita Moll, Svitlana Tkachenko, Kim Davies (ph), Jaap Akerhu (ph), and Barrack Otieno. If you are on the audio bridge only, please let yourself be known now. Hearing no one, as a reminder, these calls are recorded and transcribed. I would also like to remind participants to state your name before speaking for purposes of the transcript, and to keep your phones muted and microphones muted to avoid any background noise. Thank you, and over to you, Nigel. Or Eberhard?
Eberhard Lisse:	Nigel, if you're speaking, we can't hear you. Okay, let's start until you get yourself sorted out in the meantime. The first things on the agenda are action items. And so, this is usually Bart's (ph) state of affairs, so go ahead.
Bart Boswinkel:	Yes, thank you, Eberhard. So, just to -- as a reminder, if you are interested in the ISO 3166 standard, please send me or Jaap an e-mail, and we'll get you a special copy of the ISO 3166. So, it will be recurring one or two meetings, maybe up to Abu Dhabi, but then -- so you should be able to have the ISO 3166 standard for purposes of this working group only.

The second one was the outline of the presentation of Kim Davies. I think that was two meetings ago. Eberhard did his magic on it and circulated it to the group, so that one is completed. So, these were the two action items open, so we'll keep action item 31 (inaudible) open one or two more meetings, and then you should have been able to get these standards. Back to you, Eberhard and Nigel. |
Nigel Roberts:	Okay. Well, I've made it in, it seems, but if the background noise proves too difficult for the conference, then Eberhard's under instructions to take it over. I think we've done the roll call?
Bart Boswinkel:	Yes, that happened (ph).
Eberhard Lisse:	We're at item number three, work plan discussion, what are the next steps.
Nigel Roberts:	Okay, Bart, you want to take that?
Bart Boswinkel:	Yes. It appears to be my line that is crackling, so let me just say the next steps. On the previous meeting, (inaudible)--.
Eberhard Lisse:	--It sounds like your line, because you moved it now, and the crackling has gone away, so maybe you have to dial again.
Bart Boswinkel:	Yes, I will.

Eberhard Lisse: Can somebody say something so that I see whether I still get audio?

Kim Carlson: Hi, Nigel (ph), it's Kim. Bart and I, we're back in.

Nigel Roberts: Yes, it's Nigel here. Just switching mute on and off is just very, very slow on Adigo. Eberhard, you hear me fine, I take it?

Kim Carlson: Nigel, this is Kim. I hear you fine.

Unidentified Participant: I hear you fine, Nigel.

Nigel Roberts: Okay. Thanks (inaudible)--.

Bart Boswinkel: --Can you hear me now? Is that better?

Nigel Roberts: Well, the QRN's been replaced by QRM, it seems. Bart, try--.

Bart Boswinkel: --Hello, this is Bart.

Nigel Roberts: That's not too bad at all.

Bart Boswinkel: Can you hear me now?

Nigel Roberts: Yes.

Bart Boswinkel: And is it better?

Nigel Roberts: It's pretty good for me. It's a lot better than normal for you, actually.

Bart Boswinkel: Okay, thank you. So, let me go back to the document in front of you. So, this is -- it was circulated on the previous call as well, and because we had hardly any attendance because of the APTLD meeting, the idea was to circulate it again and go a little more in detail around the next steps.

So, again, this -- the work plan, so what are the next steps? First of all, it's -- what is included is what's in the issue report regard -- and in the charter of, say, the topics and issues pertaining to retirement that need to be addressed. So, that's listed there, so that's item number one. I don't think there are any questions, et cetera, around these documents, or this part of the document.

Then, what we've done as well is -- or what I've done as well, is capture what we've done to date, and that's Jaap's presentation on ISO 3166 from the meeting in Johannesburg, and the presentation from PTI/Kim Davies to present PTI's perspective. And there was a lot of discussion on the e-mail list regarding the scenarios, the role of the MA, terminology, and the different categories of the two letter codes. And there was a lot of discussion around the .SU (ph) case and the .UM (ph) case. What I've done in the meantime, say, is compile these e-mails into these different sections. I've shared with you on the last call the scenario bit, because there was a agreement, at least on the calls -- the previous calls, that say, to move forward, we would focus -- or the working group would focus on the scenario approach.

And so, what was presented last time was how to move forward with the -- what are the next steps so that the terminology and glossary and approaches for analysis of developing the recommended policy. So, as a lot of you were not on the call on the previous -- say on the previous call where we discussed briefly the terminology glossary, again, the basic

idea is to turn this into a living document and, say, at the last call, everybody agreed. So, I assume, say after this call, if no objections, it will be considered a second reading.

And in the document that was circulated, there was a summary of cases. And Kim, could you change the documents, please, to the terminology document? And again, this is (inaudible), but I -- please, if you go down to the third page and below, then you should be able to recognize, say, what was shared with you two weeks ago and what we discussed two weeks ago. It's just, say, the -- say the cases that were listed in the delegation/re-delegation working group report on retirement with the addition of the Netherlands/Antilles case and the Portuguese TMO (ph) case, so the .TP (ph) cases.

These, and even the .UM case, is not really probably a retirement as, say, in the sense of the ISO 3166 list. So, what I've done in the meantime, and you should be able to recognize this also from part of the issue reports and the topics (inaudible) related, I've highlighted the terms used by both India in the reports and in the -- say, the IANA reports and in their (ph) roots on database, and also the code listed, or the IPN (ph) or the ISO 3166-1 status.

And what you see and what's based on this, and now I'm scrolling back up to the first page, but I've captured already some terminology in, say, term practice, say, of terminology. So, one of them is not assigned, which is the UN case, so it's used in the UN case. Retired -- term retired is listed as such in the IANA root zone (ph), so a .AN (ph) was one. The process concluded in 2015, so that was a comment I thought might be useful. Retired is also used in the case of .YU (ph). However, only -- you can only see it in the, say, IANA report.

And YU, as such, is not listed anymore in the root zone database. In .TP (ph), a similar case. Again, that one was concluded in 2015 in the, say, IANA report, it is recorded as TP, but I think this one is not listed on the -- in the root zone database, as well. So, you can already see there is -- are some different practices here.

Again, in some of the -- in one of the reports in the .UN case, there is mentioning of unallocated CCTLDs. Probably that's a term, and disposition of, say, top-level domains, retirement undelegated. We had a discussion previously, and that's a term, say -- I say used to -- as a kind of heuristic to describe all the different cases, like .UM retired and others, and under other terminology. So, that's, say, some of the terminologies I've seen within the ISO 3166. Again, there is different terminology. Some of it is described, but however, if you really look into it, and Nigel has, say, circulated a bit of an analysis, again, there is not really consistency, not that this working group could influence it, but it's good to note there is some inconsistencies, as well, at the level of the ISO 3166.

So, my suggestion for the group would be -- I'd say don't try to define it right now. That was the experience of the framework of interpretation working group. But, as the discussions move along, have -- try to, yes, come up with some definitions, descriptions of this terminology, and in the end phase (inaudible) a thorough analysis, et cetera, revisit all the terminology, and include it as a kind of glossary into the reports of the group for the audience, so for the community.

That's my bit with respect to the summary of case in terminology used to date. I see Eberhard, your hand's up.

Eberhard Lisse: Let me just unmute quickly. I'll note, in the .TP case, and I just wanted to put it on record, there is this three (ph) digit numeric code which, when TP changed to TL, the three-digit numeric code remains the same. For the cases of retirement due to pure renaming, this three-letter code, if it remains the same, can be helpful in defining our case, for describing our case.

Bart Boswinkel:	Eberhard, and I'll get back to you, Martin, just as a question, if you look at the structure of the terminology around the ISO 3166, do you want me to include or, say, for the next phase, the numeric digits, et cetera, as well? Because that -- in that way, it provides the background you need.
Eberhard Lisse:	Maybe it's a good idea to use the two-letter code, the three-letter code, and the three-digit code. The -- letter code changed from TP to (inaudible), but the numeric code is maintained (ph). And I'm just -- it (inaudible) to do with -- it can help us (inaudible) case of (inaudible)--.
Bart Boswinkel:	--So -- and maybe that's something to do with the -- say if you start the analysis of the codes as well, because at the end of the day, this is about the definition, so the two-letter code needs to be defined, three-letter codes need to be defined, and the three-digit codes, and maybe do the analysis that you look how it evolves. I see Martin. Please go ahead.
Eberhard Lisse:	I can't lower my hand. Can somebody do it for me, please?
Bart Boswinkel:	Martin, go ahead.
Eberhard Lisse:	You're on mute.
Martin Boyle:	(Inaudible) muted. Can you hear me now?
Bart Boswinkel:	Yes, we can, Martin.
Martin Boyle:	All right. Okay, thanks. I'm obviously missing something, because .TP in the IANA.org database is actually listed on the delegation record. It just shows it as retired. There is an admin contact and technical contact, which is IANA. So, I think I'm missing something in your defined division, Bart, between retired -- term retired is listed as such in IANA, and retired not included in IANA, in which case probably the second heading needs to be modified.

Secondly, just picking up on what Eberhard has said, I'm not sure I properly understand -- my line this evening seems to be pretty bad, and so I missed a lot of what you were saying. But, I can't understand why we would put the three-character code and the numerical code in, because we're looking at CCTLDs. I would have thought the two-letter country code is all we need. So, I would welcome an explanation from Eberhard on that. Thank you very much. |
| Bart Boswinkel: | Let's -- Peter first, and then Eberhard to respond to Martin. Peter, go ahead. |
| Peter Koch: | Yes, thank you, and good evening, everybody. I can actually live with the suggestion made by Eberhard. However, I fear that we are trying to, again, read the tea leaves in the (inaudible) of the ISO 3166 maintenance agency by doing that. For having full information it's okay, but we shouldn't draw any wrong conclusions.

That said, in the list of country codes, there are current statuses of ISO 3166 mentioned. Formerly, 3166 only has two states, assigned or unassigned. Everything else is only a status on that maintenance list, so it might be assumed to be a sub-state of unassigned. And for clarity, I'd appreciate if that could be made more transparent in the list of codes that we have. Thank you. |
| Bart Boswinkel: | Thanks, Peter, noted. We'll update and we'll see -- probably we need to revisit it anyway, because, say, some of them are in use. So -- but, I'll include it, and it's part of the discussions on the list, as well. Eberhard, go ahead. |

Eberhard Lisse: I put this also in the chat. The point is, if we have a pure renaming from, let's say, X-ray alpha to a Bravo-Alpha, say nothing (ph) as the country change its name. What changes and what remains the same? If in the ISO -- if the ISO agency keeps the three-letter digit -- the three-number digit is three digits identical, then we can describe this case as this is a pure renaming. In the ISO standard, the three-digit code did not change, only the alpha code changed. It's for descriptive purposes only for this case where there is a pure renaming, a one-to-one renaming, TP to T (inaudible), ZR to CD, and these kind of cases, whereas the one-on-one renaming, where there is no issues involved, is just how to deal with the transition. Does this help you, Martin?

Bart Boswinkel: Okay, Martin (inaudible) for the response in the chat. This is Bart again. Any other comments on -- with respect to this document at this stage? Let me say, the way I see it right now is that we -- I'll update this one, circulate it, and this will be probably a document that will be in the -- say in the Wiki space, and needs to be updated on a regular basis. So, my suggestion would be that, once in a while, we revisit the terminology document as is and see if it needs to be updated. So, it's a background, living document trying to capture the terminology of the -- as defined by the group and as it evolves. Any questions, remarks about on that way forward?

So, Nigel, maybe as an introduction, you'll want to do your document, or shall I continue with, say, the next points on the way forward?

Eberhard Lisse: I would propose you go in order of the agenda.

Bart Boswinkel: Okay, then we go into the order. Kim, can you go back to the agenda, please? Thank you. Oh, this is fine, leave it as such. So, again, I will make this document scrollable for everybody to see. Again, based on -- and this is, again, for discussion, and let me explain the background of this document. It's if you -- say on the previous call we discussed the potential use of, say, the scenarios and end-stage and final-stage models, et cetera, and asked, say, in consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chair, we thought it might be useful to present a way forward and, say, share with you some different approaches. They're all around the same model, but I'd say in this document you will see two different approaches. There are more -- there is more a nuanced difference than any real substantial difference, but say the type of questions and the starting point is different.

So, let me take you through, say, these two different approaches models, and then see if there are some questions, and then have a discussion on the preferred way forward, because that will, say, start the substantial discussion. So, starting point of, say, what we -- the working group itself is defining the retirement process, say there is, as everybody knows on this group, there is no policy for the retirement of CCTLDs. That's the reason why this part of this -- from policy development process.

Now, you can start the retirement process as -- with the assumption that, say, in order to kick in, a CCTLD has -- or needs to be delegated. So, this is a purely, say, IANA-focused approach. You have a delegated CCTLD. For whatever reasons, the retirement process kicks in, and then you end up with -- that's why I've used the term undelegated CCTLD. Could be retired, unassigned. Maybe there's another status, like dot -- say that's where we are. And, say, this group, the role of this group is to define the retirement process, and define -- and develop the policy around it.

So, if you agree with that type of approach, and the first question I would say that probably needs to be raised and answered is what are the faces of such a retirement process, what -- and particularly, what is the initiation? What kicks off this retirement process? So, that's the -- and this is a way of looking at the discussions around the end states on the ISO 3166. So, what you're seeing here is the -- excuse me -- is the

definitions -- or sorry, the descriptions used in this scenario document, and that came about by the discussion of the working group. So, that's, say, a first step.

And then, a second related (inaudible) that starts with what events cause a retirement process, and then the second related question is who should be -- or who initiated first, and then the next step is who should initiate such a process, because, say, to date, and that's where you see the analysis of the common cases kicking in, to date, this retirement process was initiated by someone, or by an entity, and some events that caused the retirement process to be initiated. So, that needs to be defined and/or analyzed and defined.

And then, say -- and then the related question around the initiation is how is it initiated? Is this a letter from PTI or the IFO to the CCTLD, an ICANN Board decision? Is it a letter from a relevant government? Is it a letter or an announcement by the individual or by the incumbency CCTLD? Again, that is something for discussion, and that needs to be defined and analyzed in relation to the initiation of a retirement process. And then, say, for sake of discussion, what I have included as well is the implementation phase. So, once you have this, say, the initiation phase ends with a decision of retirement, and then you need to start implementing it. And then -- and it will result, and it's not included, in a end phase.

So, that's the first approach, I would say. Nigel, do you want to have a question now, or you want to jump in now, or you want me to finish it first?

Nigel Roberts: I just want to see if you can hear me okay. I think I've got audio working properly.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. No, we do. It's a bit cracky, but -- so, I'll -- let me continue. So, this second approach, and this is more along the lines of the scenario approach, effectively, you end up with some -- say the procedure and the process of reaching the -- say a policy (inaudible), but in the end, you should be able to answer the same type of questions. So, this starts with, say, again, a model which starts with the end stage or change on the listing of the ISO 3166, and this is where, say, Eberhard's remarks around the relevancy of the three-digit code kicks in. Say this is -- say if there is a name change, you can -- for example, and there is no change of the three-digit code, this could mean there is not really a real major change on the ISO 3166.

So, as an example, but -- say there are some -- the assumption is there are some end stages changes on the listing of ISO 3166 that cause, again, the retirement process, and this retirement process again ends in, say, the undelegation, or the undelegated CCTLD, because that's the end stage. But again, undelegated is used in, say, as heuristic, not defined properly. It's just an overall comsat (ph) to capture the different end stages.

So, again, you start with the stages, as they already -- that were already set for the -- say or the result from the discussion on line, and probably they need to be vetted and agreed upon. And then, say, once a country code, or once an end stage is reached, you need to start to, say, look at -- the retirement process kicks in, and then is -- probably there are some other questions that need to be answered, and that will lead, say, in order to -- and analyze to start developing a policy.

Say some of them is, say, for this -- in this method is a relevant change scenario. This complete and is a relevant -- is the change relevant? Does a change cause the retirement process? And again, you have the same question, is who initiates the retirement process, how it's initiated, et cetera, and what are the consequences. And again, you reach and say, okay, you've got the initiation phase of the retirement process, and you've got, say, the implementation, and then the end stage.

So, that's -- based on the discussions, what -- say the Chairs and the Co-Chairs and I are still on the list. We say these are the two models that, say, maybe they're less different than at first look, but at least it's an approach to start working on the staging of the work of the working group.

So, say, if -- say based on one of the two approaches, the suggestion would be that, say, following the -- one of the two methods is described and analyze the cases to date, and that is, say, building on the work of the delegation and re-delegation working group reports, and use relevant publicly available documentation and the retirement of CCTLDs to date. So, as they are described in the IANA report and as, say, some of the -- maybe there is some additional material publicly available, as well.

And then, based on these descriptions and analysis, start to develop a recommended policy. And as said in parallel, and that's probably a very good use of the analysis as well, start develop the glossary and define the terms.

So, that is a long introduction to this document, and start looking into the -- say the development of policy, et cetera. So, the floor is yours again, Nigel and Eberhard.

Nigel Roberts:	Yes, thanks, Bart. I'm going to pass this to Eberhard to run the meeting in view of the awkwardness, because it looks like (inaudible).
Bart Boswinkel:	Eberhard?
Eberhard Lisse:	Okay. Can you hear me?
Bart Boswinkel:	Yes, we do.
Eberhard Lisse:	Okay. As I just typed, I'm good with this approach, and I propose that we look at the easy cases first. The easiest case I think is the transition from ZR to CD and to take TP to TL, one-on-one replacement, same number. I didn't look for the CR to CD case, but say (inaudible) -- that's the first thing we could look at, and then we can look what happened there, who started the process, what was done, because at least for the retirement part, not necessarily for the delegation part, but we can look at what triggered this, how did this come about. And this is uncontroversial. There is no baggage there because there is no hard feelings, no drama, and we can just go and have a look at it.
	Any opinion on this? Nigel agrees. Debbie agrees. Anybody opposed in the first reading of this approach? Okay then. For the time being, we can take this as read one (ph), but we can -- so then, on the next meeting, start basically looking at these two cases. Who is going to do the donkey work? Can we maybe stuff (ph) it onto Kim Davis to have his staff maybe prepare a short series of events, or timetable of events, what happened roughly, not exactly the date, the main events of the story so that we can take it?
	And probably it's a good way of doing this in sort of a formal timetable way, then we can compare each analysis to each other. Okay. Is anybody opposed, please scream loudly or disagree on the chat.
Bart Boswinkel:	Eberhard, this is Bart. Say whether PTI has the resources of doing it, at least, say, let -- otherwise, say, I'll take a first crack at it and circulate it, as Kim is not on the call, and as Elise says, he has a lot of other stuff, as well. So, let me take a first crack at it, and I'll check with, say, PTI staff, whether I'm on the right track, but at least then we have something in two weeks.

Eberhard Lisse: It doesn't have to (inaudible) that maybe (inaudible) maybe that is not really (inaudible), so at least we need to have (inaudible) the timeline, and we want to make sure that things that should not really (inaudible) -- let me finish -- that are (inaudible) Bart is concerned (inaudible).

Bart Boswinkel: Eberhard, your line is very bad.

Nigel Roberts: Eberhard, don't waste your time.

Eberhard Lisse: Okay. I will--.

Nigel Roberts: --Eberhard, don't waste your time. We can't hear you now. It's all broken up. Okay, Bart, can you hear me?

Bart Boswinkel: I do. You're much better now, so go ahead.

Nigel Roberts: Okay. I'm going to do my best to (inaudible) yes, but obviously Eberhard are taking -- and I are taking it in turn to be not audible, or not able to discuss. So, if both of us drop off, can you just wrap things, please?

I think I saw Elise's comment just now, and that's correct, I guess, and I was going to volunteer to assist Bart in this first stab. But of course, some of the information that we need in the IANA PTI (inaudible), so we're going to have to request Kim or Elise to provide that information even if you don't write documents for us. I hope that's in order.

Bart, any more comments on the work plan discussion?

Bart Boswinkel: Not from my end. I think the only thing is, and that's probably important, is do you want to start -- at the end of the day, it really doesn't matter, but we start with, say, the end stages, and so that's more or less the second approach, use the different end stages, and run through the different end stages and see what happens. So, that's option two.

Nigel Roberts: Okay, Bart, thanks.

Bart Boswinkel: And I think, say, on our next call, we'll quickly revisit what we discussed today, and then probably you will see the first results of this approach, so that's the analysis and the -- or at least the description and the analysis, and then we move from there. I think -- say, I have nothing else on the work plan discussion. Nigel, do you want to share or discuss your -- or present your document? I don't hear Nigel anymore, either can you hear me?

Unidentified Participant: I propose we -- since the connection is so poor, I propose we let that sent (ph) over for next meeting date. It also came on the list, I think today or yesterday. That gives everybody time to read it.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. So, I want to move -- so maybe just AOB, because it's -- if anybody has a real pressing question?

Eberhard Lisse: I don't see that to be the case.

Bart Boswinkel: No. Then, the next meeting is in -- and this is the confusing one -- is in two weeks. And to avoid any confusion, it is a 2359 UTC on Thursday. And it will be Thursday the 12th, I believe, yes. So, next meeting, Thursday, 12th of October, 2359 UTC. Thank you--.

Eberhard Lisse: --Which is 1:00 in the morning for me.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. So, thank you, and have a nice day. Talk to you next week. Bye-bye.

Eberhard Lisse: Okay, bye.

Unidentified Participant: Bye.

Unidentified Participant: Thanks, and bye-bye.