

20180125_ccPDP_Retirement_Working_Group

- Kim Carlson: Thank you. Welcome to the PDP on Retirement Working Group on 25 January at 17:00 UTC. On today's call, we have Danko Jevtovic, Eberhard Lisse, Jaap Akkerhuis, Nenad Orlic, Nigel Roberts, Stephen Deerhake. Apologies from Martin Boyle, Abibu Ntahigiye, Patricio Poblete, Peter Van Roste, Nick Wenban-Smith.
- As a reminder, these calls are recorded and transcribed. Please state your name before speaking for the purposes of the transcript, and keep your phones and microphones muted to avoid any background noise. And with that, thank you. And back to you, Nigel.
- Nigel Roberts: Thank you, Kim. As Eberhard noticed, we have a fairly low turnout today. Whether or not it's actually a quorum, let's take some views as to whether or not we should proceed or whether we should adjourn. Any comments on that today?
- Eberhard Lisse: I find it's very few-- it's very few members.
- Nigel Roberts: Yes. I think I agree, Eberhard. What I could do is we could have an informational meeting and just talk about items three and item six and then adjourn to the subsequent meeting. How does that sound?
- Eberhard Lisse: We could also talk a little bit about scenario two, go through and kind of do it short and quickly.
- Nigel Roberts: Okay. Okay. Well, we have item two, two action items. Both action items are completed. So unless we have-- I hear anybody or see any hands up to talk about this, then I would call item two completed.
- Moving on swiftly to item three. I see Danko's hand is up so let's hear from Danko before I speak to item three. Danko.
- Danko Jevtovic: Okay. Thank you very much. I hope that you can hear me.
- Nigel Roberts: Yes.
- Danko Jevtovic: Peter and myself exchanged in an email - I think (inaudible) also mentioned that on the document page two-- oh, sorry. Just a moment. Sorry. On page two, line 47 and 48, in the case of the user for TLD, it says that CS was never delegated as ccTLD. And as far as I know, that was the case concerning Yugoslavia. It was not delegated to Yugoslavia. But as far as I remember - I don't have any documents here, we can check that - CS was delegated for Czechoslovakia before that.
- Nigel Roberts: Yes, you're correct. Yeah, you're--

Danko Jevtovic: So (inaudible). So (inaudible)--

Nigel Roberts: Danko-- So let's deal with this under item four. Danko, let's deal with this under item four when we have the discussion on scenario two. Is that okay?

Danko Jevtovic: Okay. Sorry, I was--

Nigel Roberts: It's all right.

Danko Jevtovic: (Inaudible).

Nigel Roberts: It's a valid point. Yeah, good. Okay. So I call item two completed.

Item three, update on the appointment of the new Chair. You'll all know that with time I'm planning to step back. And I'm pleased to report that Council agreed with the recommendation of the Working Group to appoint Stephen as Chair. I regard him as effectively in post at the moment, although I will continue doing what I'm doing and will chair the face-to-face meeting in Puerto Rico, after which point I will retire to be an ordinary member of the group and maybe even have some more time to give some time to the documents.

Stephen, do you have any comments you want to make or does that cover it?

Stephen Deerhake: Excuse me, guys. Very briefly, thank you for the confidence. I intend to pretty much run it as Nigel has run it with the idea that-- emphasis on a lot of free-flow discussion, and expecting the vice chair and staff to provide some considerable assistance. So thank you again. Look forward to taking over after PR and I hope we can continue to make some good progress on this important topic. Thank you.

Nigel Roberts: Yeah. Thanks, Stephen. And unless anybody else wants to make any comments-- I know there's some congratulations in the chat. Unless anybody wants to make any comments on the voice channel, I'll call item three complete.

So with that, I can comment on Danko's point that he made earlier. I think that's correct. I think we need to address scenario two to incorporate the qualification that CS was not delegated to-- I think it-- what-- I can't remember if it was Yugoslavia or Serbia or Montenegro, but it wasn't delegated for the purpose, it was allocated by the ISO, but it was an active ccTLD for Czechoslovakia.

Any more comments on that? Danko, do you want to say any more?

Danko Jevtovic: Sorry, it's just a clarification. Nothing significantly changes.

Nigel Roberts: Okay. Well I have three. I have, in order, Jaap, Stephen and Eberhard. Jaap, would you like to go ahead?

Jaap Akkerhuis: Yes. When I looked at the document that was sent out, there was actually in the margin a question mark about which year it happened. I think you can find that in the ISO (inaudible). So both states can (inaudible) since 2009 when it was-- 2006 it was retired from being used for Serbia and Montenegro before it was Yugoslavia. Czech I cannot find. But at least we will-- to find that out if people want to know this.

Nigel Roberts: Okay, Jaap. Thanks for the clarification. Stephen, your hand's gone down. I take it you don't want any comment on that. Eberhard.

Have we lost Eberhard? I can--

Eberhard Lisse:

No, sorry. I had (inaudible).

Nigel Roberts:

Yeah, we can make out what you're saying now. And now there's silence.

Eberhard Lisse:

(Inaudible). Peter sent us to the list-- yeah, let me dial in.

Nigel Roberts:

Okay. I'll hold on for a minute or so while Eberhard dials the bridge directly. Don't forget your mic's still on, Eberhard. You want to mute your mic while you're doing that.

Any other comments while we're waiting for Eberhard to rejoin us? Stephen, was there something you wanted to say or has it already been said?

Stephen Deerpake:

No, Jaap's clarification is helpful. I think Peter's question regarding line 47 and 48, the reasons he stated in his email needs to be resolved definitively, but I think we're close.

Nigel Roberts:

Okay, cool. I'm happy to report that we seem to be-- now have pretty much a full house. Lots of people have joined us in the last five minutes. I'm sure Kim's keeping a list for the-- to update the notes on the site.

Welcome to Naela. I notice, Naela, you've got your hand up. Go ahead, please.

Naela Sarras:

Yeah, hi. Sorry I joined late. Thank you, Nigel. So we were actually researching the .CS as we walked into this meeting. And so I don't where the discussion is at, but I'm confirming that CS was a delegated ccTLD. I'm looking at a document that we have in the IANNA archives from 1993 that confirms that CS was a delegated ccTLD. And in fact, it was CS that requested the delegation of .C-Zed. So, a confirmation that it was a delegated ccTLD. And I'll respond to Peter's message as well.

Nigel Roberts:

Okay, that's great. I see Nenad's got her hand up, but before we go to you I'll just check if Eberhard's back with us because he was speaking and trying to get back on.

Eberhard Lisse:

Okay.

Nigel Roberts:

Eberhard?

Eberhard Lisse:

I have emailed a reply to the list. I think-- I just took the paper as given by Bart and I agree that this may be misunderstood. I think what is meant is that CS was never delegated as .CS to Serbia and Montenegro. When Czechoslovakia was dissolved into two countries, the ISO code was assigned, but the ccTLD was never delegated because it went then two years later anyway.

Nigel Roberts:

Okay, Eberhard. Thanks. Nenad, you're up.

Nenad Orlic:

I will just shortly-- to my point. The CS was-- there was two problems in the community with CS. That's the fact that it was previously delegated and the fact that nobody wanted CS for Serbia, because we were all joking like, okay, are we a counterstrike country? So there were-- that's why nobody requested delegation of CS.

What I wanted to ask initially is part 2.4, lines one through three, what are the consequences? I'm not sure what you mean by that. And certainly, the consequences in 2008 and 2018 are not the same. That's why we should do a longer run or a longer process for redelegation and a deletion of the domain, national domain, since it wrecks

havoc on links, ranking for the site and everything like that. So there were serious consequences even then on traffic to the website in Serbia. And those consequences would be even more dire 10 years later when Google states how old your registration of domain. That was not part of their algorithm in 2008; now it is. I hope you can hear me well. I'm not sure that you do.

Nigel Roberts: Yes. Yes, thank you for that--

Nenad Orlic: Yes.

Nigel Roberts: And it's a very good point. And I think we need to capture that point in our final report somehow when we're examining recommended timeframes. So both-- because I think Stephen and I were both--

Nenad Orlic: Yes. That's a very serious (inaudible). If somebody wants, I can document. I have-- I think I have in my archives some traffic levels for the website that switch from U to RS to see how it affected the level of traffic. It's very serious.

Nigel Roberts: Yeah. I think if we capture that in the meeting notes and that the actual transition was quite serious in effect on the users of the retiring ccTLDs, then that will affect what we recommend in terms of changeover times and things like that.

Any more points on this section four scenario, please? I see Eberhard.

Eberhard Lisse: Yeah. I just wanted to say that I have posted into the list. Can you-- Can Nenad send me some language that we can amend the document accordingly and I will just put it in then.

Nigel Roberts: Okay. Thank you, Eberhard. Any more comments on agenda item four, the scenario two, comments and discussion?

Okay. I see no hands, I hear nothing. Last chance. Then we'll move on to agenda item number five, which is the work plan. Bart, have you got some comments on this?

Bart Boswinkel: Eberhard has his hand up, Nigel.

Nigel Roberts: Okay. Eberhard, then.

Eberhard Lisse: I made some remarks in the document in orange, some line things. Since I don't hear comments, Bart, Nigel, Stephen and I will work on resolving these issues and propose it in the next reading.

Nigel Roberts: Okay, Eberhard. Thank you, yes. That's a good plan.

Bart Boswinkel: And your hand is up again, Eberhard, or is that an old hand or a new one?

Nigel Roberts: It's gone down. Bart, over to you.

Bart Boswinkel: And can you change the documents, please? Just a minute. It is up-- yeah.

This document was circulated last week as well. This is the clean version. And as I said, I'll scroll down. And this document is scrollable. Please go to page D. And I know there were some questions around it. What we say-- the intention is to do the-- say the next step of the process sequentially, so start with a comparative analysis as soon as both scenarios are adopted or both scenarios' documents are adopted, and then start to seek differences and commonalities. And then the next one is to start the discussion based on

that analysis. Start the discussion on the initial questions and for-- to structure the policy development discussions and the discussions on the policy development process.

And then finally you have to think about stress tests. And maybe it's an idea to say as a full group to start working on stress tests in conjunction with policy development in order to-- you don't want to complete the whole policy development process or the development itself of the recommendations too late to find out that, due to the stress test, it's not feasible. I think that's-- yeah, all that's in the document. So it's more around a way forward and is not-- it doesn't include a real time plan yet or a schedule. So that's open for discussion. So this is the final version that was sent two weeks ago.

Nigel Roberts: Okay. Thank you, Bart. I notice some comments in the chat from many on the CS issue, but we'll just keep on the work plan for this point. Inviting any comments on the work plan item five. And I see just Eberhard's hand up. Anybody else? No? Eberhard?

Eberhard Lisse: As I said, I will work on this over the weekend and this week. It needs some serious revision. For example, in the stress test we noted last week that there is an error with regards to the significant interested parties having a role in the revocation of a ccTLD, which is not correct. And I'm going to-- I didn't have time this week, but this weekend I have some time so I will work on this and put it in the same format so we can work on it with the other one.

And previous-- as far as work methods go, we-- Bart and Stephen and Nigel and I, we have discussed that we will try and-- I will try and produce each document into such a form with line numbers and good fonts and version numbers and so on so that we do not have an issue with regards what document we are working on, and we also exactly know what lines we are referring to. It's not much work once I've got the templates done.

Nigel Roberts: Yeah. Thank you, Eberhard. Line numbers, as I've found in legal matters, is very, very helpful. You can go straight to it. I'll just make a personal plea for when you are choosing these good fonts as you're offering that you pick a sans serif form, which is much easier to work on. That's just a personal plea. But yes, as Stephen says, thank you. That's good work and helpful.

Any more comments on the work plan, please? I know you-- that's probably an old hand, Eberhard, isn't it? And by dropping it, you confirm that.

Any more comments on the work plan? If not, I call item five having been completed, which just at 20 minutes past 5:00 brings us quite smartly to any other business. Does anybody have anything for any other business?

Plenty of time. You can have plenty of any other business today. Don't see any hands up. Oh, I got two. Okay. I'll-- I think Stephen was slightly before Eberhard so I'll take Stephen first and then Eberhard.

Stephen Deerhake: I just want to encourage members of this group, if they have any suggestions or concerns with regard to how we're moving forward under my chairmanship, by all means do not hesitate to get in touch with me. I'm open to suggestions and criticism. Thanks.

Nigel Roberts: Great. Thanks, Stephen. Eberhard?

Eberhard Lisse: Yeah. As I said a little bit before, we have discussed that we tried to take the document production into the working group so that staff doesn't have to do it. And also, we are also supposed to do a little bit more work ourselves than we have done, from what I see, and I am guilty myself. So the way that I'd like to do this is I'll get-- Joke will do the

notes as usual, send them to me, I'll put them in this format, email them out in addition to the normal email. The documents typed up will be by staff and then we'll format them into this nice format. I can also put them in sans serif if you like, so that we get-- once we get into a rhythm it's not really much work to do this.

Nigel Roberts: Thanks. Very encouraging.

No more comments under any other business? No-- and there's none from Barrack and from the chat? Then in that case, I think we're just up to items seven and eight.

Bart, any comments about the meeting schedule?

Bart Boswinkel: Go ahead. Oh, no; you can say it, Kim.

Kim Carlson: Okay. Yeah, I think the next one is 8 February at 1:00 UTC.

Nigel Roberts: And how many-- Kim, how many more will we have between that meeting and the face-to-face?

Kim Carlson: Two more.

Nigel Roberts: Then we have plenty of time to get some substantive work done, I suspect. And if we can have some substantive output by the time of the F-to-F we can have ourselves a little party.

With that, unless I see any hands up asking for any further input, I'd like to thank you all for attending today. It's been one of the shorter meetings, but actually reasonably productive once we had a few people onboard so thank you all for coming. And unless I see any other comments, I'm going to close the meeting. Thanks and goodbye.