
YESIM NAZLAR:

Let's please start recording. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the At-Large Capacity Building Program 2018. It's our seventh webinar on the topic of ccTLD Assigning Country Code Delegation and Retirement of ccTLD, taking place on Thursday, 11th of October 2018 at 1330 UTC. We must be doing the role call if it's a webinar but if I could please remind all participants on the phone bridge as well as computers to mute speakers and microphones when not speaking please.

Please do not forget to state your name before speaking, not only for the transcription purposes but also to allow our interpreters to identify you on the different language channels. We have English, Spanish and French interpretation for this webinar. Thank you all for joining and now I'll leave the floor back to Tijani Ben Jemaa, the Chair of At-Large Capacity Working Group. Over to Tijani. Thank you very much.

TIJANI BEN JAMAA:

Thank you, Yesim. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. This is our seventh webinar of the At-Large Capacity Building Working Group Program. Today we will speak about assigning country codes, delegation retirement of ccTLDs. Our speaker is Bart Boswinkel who is recommended our friend, the Chair of the ccNSO, she said he's the best person who can speak about this subject, so we are lucky to have the best speaker about this topic. Before starting, I will the floor back to the Staff for some housekeeping items. Yesim, please.

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.

YESIM NAZLAR:

Thank you very much Tijani. Let me cover the housekeeping items. We take a quick look at the housekeeping presentation displaying now, I'm just going to move to the next slide. We'll have a question and answer forum during this webinar, as you see it is located on the left-hand side of the Adobe Connect Room. If you have any questions, we do encourage you to type them here and they will be directed to the presenter.

Also, we'll have the pop quick action and it's located on the right-hand side of the Adobe Connect Room. After the speaker's presentation, please be ready to answer a couple of questions also there. Finally, we'll also have a user experience part and we'll have a couple of questions to be answered after this webinar, so please don't forget to stay around for an extra three minutes or so to complete them. That's all I have for now and back to you Tijani. Thank you very much.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you, Yesim. Thanks to Katrina, we have today Bart who is expert, who will present the topic of the ccTLDs. Bart, please go ahead.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Thank you, Tijani. Thanks for having me on the call. Just a few remarks before I go into the overview of the presentation itself. Let me give you a few introductory remarks. First of all, I'm a member of the ccNSO Support Staff, these are not my views, they just reflect -- try to make it as factual as possible.

A second remark I want to make is before I go into the presentation, this is not extensive, complete overview of all the topics related to the delegation, transfer, retirement of ccTLDs, if you really want to go into depth into that topic I advise you to look at the relevant document and after the meeting, after the webinar, I will send a email with the URL's for the relevant document. If you're interested you can read them at your leisure.

The third remark I want to make, what I will present is a policy perspective, ccNSO Support Staff, ccNSO is the supporting organization that develops policies around delegation, transfer and revocation and retirement of ccTLDs and that's my background. If you would talk to a or if you would invite an individual ccTLD manager who just went through the process, you will hear a different complementary story probably and if you would invite IANA staff, they will give you again another perspective or present another perspective and tell another story. Beware this is a policy background of the issues.

The final introductory remark is I will use a substantial part of this presentation to talk to you about ISO3166 Standard and its role in the process. The reason this presentation or this part of the presentation was given to the GAC as well in Panama and the feedback we received is that it really gave some clear -- it enlightens the GAC members on say the scope and the issues around the ISO3166 Standard.

What is interesting is if you look at the name of this webinar as Tijani already indicated, this is about assigning country codes and that is exactly what the ISO3166 Maintenance Agency does, has nothing to do with policy, there's nothing to do with ICANN and IANA. In that sense a

lucky touch to include the ISO3166 Standard part of this webinar, into this webinar as well.

The final reason for including this is, I assume a lot of you will be involved in the discussions around the geographic names in the subsequent procedures of the GNSO, so work track five and as you will have seen, the ISO Standard, two letter codes, three letter codes, part two and part three of the ISO Standard to play an important role in that discussion and so from that perspective we thought it would be useful to share the experience of the ccNSO with the ISO3166 as well. Moving forward, a brief overview of the presentation I will go a little bit into the current policy framework, talk a little bit about the current policy development efforts as undertaken by the ccNSO and then spend some time on the ISO3166 Standard.

I'll go into the Policy Framework now. The Policy Framework for the delegation, redelegation or transfer and replication of ccTLDs, this is the existing Policy Frame, effectively is two documents. It's the RFC5091 and that's the policy documentation. It's from 1994, it's in the RFC tradition, so it went through ITF process. It's a basic document and it predates ICANN as you can see from the date and it's author is John Pastel, with the help of a lot of others. It's reflected the practices up and until 1994 around not just ccTLDs but also gTLDs at the time and there were eight. If you would have the time to look at it, it's interesting in his sight with the all the new gTLDs but that's just if you are really interested.

The basic document is RFC5091. As I said, it's from 1994 and since 1994 a lot of major changes happened to the internet and including the DNS

and including the ccTLDs. The ccNSO undertook to develop a framework of interpretation and this framework of interpretation is not a policy, it is what it says it is, it is an interpretation effectively of RFC5091 and terminology including in 5091 and to check which part is still valuable. It's at the level of terminology. It never went through a formal ccNSO policy development process and so it's not policy but interpretation of policy documentation. It standardizes a lot of misunderstandings, I'll go into a little bit more in detail in a minute.

If you look at the policy framework, other relevant documents are the GAC principles clearly, as developed by the GAC and ICP1, which was retired and overtaken by framework interpretation. ICP1 by its own definition was not a policy document, it was an interpretation of RFC5091, so that is overtaken by framework of interpretation, clarifying it to the current situation. The GAC principles, as I said, it was developed by the government advisory committee. It plays an important role, it provides guidance but it is not the policy or a policy document, it never went through a policy development process.

Basic policy concepts and the reason for calling this affectively these are the processes, from the introduction you saw the delegation of ccTLDs, transfer of ccTLDs, replication and transfer of ccTLDs and retirement ccTLDs. I'll go into a little more detail for those of you who are not familiar with these terms. For the delegation of a ccTLD, it's probably a once in a lifetime event, that's the process to assign a country code to a top level -- it becomes a top-level domain and then it's -- oh, what is happening? Adobe is playing, apologies.

The initiation of the ccTLD, this is how a ccTLD grows into a system and what you need to think about and this where you can see the clear link with the ISO3166, a country code is included in the ISO Standard as of that moment it is eligible to become a ccTLD. There will be a process to assign it or to designate the manager and delegate it to the manager and to include in the DNS root zone, at which time these two processes have been concluded it's a designated ccTLD. That's the delegation of the ccTLD. That's another reason why the ISO3166 and a better understanding of it is important.

ISO3166 is not static, it changes overtime, not fast but it does change. Transfer of ccTLDs, probably you have a sense of it, it was known as the redelegation ever since the framework of interpretation or transfer. It is the management over the ccTLD goes from one manger over to another manager, that's a transfer.

Revocation is affectively a one-sided ending of management. A manager misbehaves, significantly misbehaves and then delegation is revoked and at the same time it is transferred to another entity which then becomes the ccTLD manager. This was used in the past, it was a unconsented redelegation, forced redelegation, it hardly ever happens. I'm not familiar with a case, some were very close but still it is a concept that is include RFC5091, so therefore it was elaborated.

Finally, the retirement, again that's the fourth basically policy concept or process. The retirement of ccTLDs, it hardly happens but it reflects the changes in the ISO3166 Standers. The most recent one was probably the retirement of .AN until starting in 2010 and just recently

concluded and .YU, the retirement of the YU ccTLD, which was initiated when Serbia, Montenegro separated.

These are the policy concepts, there are a few more. Again, this is concept which is reflect and which came through the framework of interpretation. It replaced the term local internet community and if you would look at the framework of interpretation, it includes and, in some cases, only includes the government of the country. Significantly interested parties is a very important concept and an important group because it includes the government. If we start looking at the basic principles of RFC5091, you understand why it's so important.

Finally, as I said, significant misbehavior by ccTLD manager, that is defined in the framework on interpretation. It took quite some time for the working group to come up with a description of this. Again, if you're interested in this one, have a look at the framework of interpretation; to date, again to my knowledge, it has never used in the context of revocations because there's hardly been any revocations.

Let me now go into a little more in depth into the RFC5091 policy principle. I think, again this is my personal ordering of it, they are directly extracted from RFC5091, probably the most important one is that they IANA is not in the business of deciding what is and what is not a country. This concept or this principle predates RFC5091 but in 5091 it was solidified and there was reference to ISO3166. I will go into more details about the consequence but it's clearly whether geographic entity is a country or a territory in sense has a country code, it's not up to ICANN or the IANA to decide, it's clearly outside it's remit and it's

probably one of the wisest decisions ever made, but that's my personal view.

A second important concept is that in country, the ccTLDs in country, so ccTLDs, there's a wide variation in country, this was already recognized in 94. The ccTLD, how it's organized and how it's structured reflects the local customs and local law, that's one of the reasons why ccTLDs are so I would say, proud of the sovereignty and being part of the local community. It is the cause of this wide variation. The major concern in seeking a ccTLD manager is that a capable and a technical capable of running a ccTLD and has the ability to do an equitable justice and competent job in running the ccTLD. Again, if you would look in something like, significant misbehavior, this is the area when there is a significant failure in one of these concepts where significant misbehavior kicks in.

A designated manager, I will not go into details on this one, you can read it at your leisure. This is where you can see the significantly interested parties and the role of the significantly interested parties. They should agree that the designated party is the appropriated party. This means not only at the time of the delegation but also at the moment of transfer they are involved. If there is a ccTLD that is transferred for whatever reason, the significantly interested party included in government play an important role in determining whether the succeeding ccTLD manager is the appropriate party. The steps are clear as well.

The final one and this is where you can see the concept of transfer that is in 5091 is both the current and the future ccTLD manager need to

come to an agreement and need agree. Transfer is the correct term to move, whether it's agreement between the incumbent or the current ccTLD manager or future and significantly interested parties are also on board. That's the current policy framework.

As you may have noted, I haven't addressed anything about retirement, although that's a question that's part of the topic. The reason is that they retirement ccTLD is not covered in RFC5091. There is no policy to date. As you may have heard and as I said, there are cases of retirement of ccTLDs, it reflects the changing nature and the Geo political changes in the world. The best known and probably most recent ones are the retirement of .YU and .AN. Although it's important - it was not urgent on the list of ccNSO to develop a policy but in the context of the need for a review mechanism it became very clear that the ccNSO needed to develop a policy.

The reason for doing this is very simple, what we say in the working group, what has been mentioned is, CC and not just CC's but probably governments and others, want to have a predictable and well defined process in case a country code is removed from the ISO, what happens next. How does the retirement look like? And that is not documented or clearly lineated. It is a subject of the current ccNSO policy development process, which was launched about two years. The work to date is developing the basic terminology, analysis of the cases up to date, that includes the YU and Netherlands and develop a basic process and start an end date.

The next steps in Barcelona is continue to develop and post Barcelona will go into stress testing of the developed policy. As I said, it's part of a

broader policy development process. The second part will be the development of a review mechanism for decisions pertaining to the delegated, transfer, revocation, retirement of ccTLDs, this is the second part. This part will kick off once the working group develops the review mechanism, has completed its work on retirement. This is one of the particularities of the ccNSO process. We can leave it as it is for some time, until the ccNSO council and members vote before we sent it to the Board and the CC community decided we need to do this subsequently, these two parts, not in parallel because the outcome of the retirement feeds into the second part, the review mechanism.

The reason for doing this and this is a side effect and a consequence of IANA transfer, the CCWG accountability developed an independent review mechanism. The ccTLD community and particular the ccNSO excluded or at the wish and also at the requirement for approval, decisions around a delegation, transfer, revocation, were excluded from this IPR because it touches upon sovereignty issues. As a consequence, the ccNSO needs to develop a policy for the review. This is with respect to the policy efforts undertaken by the ccNSO. In the next part, as I said, I will focus on the ISO3166 Standard, which is underpinning the ccNSO development.

As you see, it lists the name of Yap and this presentation was prepared by Yap and the reason why he's doing this and why he's listed, he is the ICANN person on the ISO3166 maintenance and what that means I'll talk about in a minute. This is manly the work from the part of the presentation, manly from Yap. Again, a brief overview of what I'll be talking about. I'll skip some parts of it so you can look at it at your leisure.

A little bit about why this is important with the ISO3166, in mind a little bit about how the ISO is organized and so how the ISO3166 is embedded in the broader picture. A little bit about details and finally terminology. We'll not touch upon the lifecycle of some of the other two codes or the use of alpha three codes due to the limit in time.

A little bit why this this presentation. I hope it's clear from the previous part of my presentation that there is a strong relation between RFC5091 and ISO3166. I'll not go into details. Another reason for doing this at the time with the governmental advisory committee but also CSD community, is that it's often referred to in discussion without really proper understanding of the standard, so what it is about and what it means if something is listed in one of the parts of the ISO3166. Finally, this standard has a lifecycle of its own.

It is, again, subject to review changes, although that's happening slowly, it is what you think is included in standards and one day might not be included at a later day. Currently we already see some issues, if you look at for example the definition of part of the standard itself and go to the online browsing platform, there is a discrepancy in the definitions used in the online browsing platform and in the standard itself. Again, this is just to give you some clarity around the ISO3166 Standard.

Views of country territory names is that it is a reflected not just in RFC5091 but it also is part of broader discussion and where this discussion takes place and is Yap's perspective as well, is that countries do have a lifecycle, although it could take very long but there are changes to countries. If you would take a broader look at history and there is some very interesting literature, you can see the countries that

existed 200, 300 years ago do not exist at all anymore and people even forgot their names.

I'm not talking about that type of timelines but say even to date you have countries added and countries change their names significantly and or split up and that causes changes to the standard. Also, to understand is the scope of ISO3166, is relatively limited, not everything is included and what is included is partly voluntary and partly only managed strictly by their maintenance agency, I'll go into a little bit more detail about this as well.

In the next part of the slides it's mostly ISO3166 terminology, that's something prewarning as well for you. Sometimes there is [inaudible] ICANN environment use the terms country and territories and everything that's associated with it in a certain meaning to it and we think it's from the ISO Standard. If you would look carefully at it, some of it is not included and sometimes with a different meaning then we think is included, so that's something to be aware of it and that's one of the reasons why for example, the PDP Retirement Working Group spent a lot time in clarifying its terminology. The ISO Standard is voluntary, it's not an international treaty, it is developed to assist users in the views and there's an economic reason for doing so.

The ISO Organization as I said is non-governmental and voluntary, it's a membership organization and it has only one member per country, and these are most of the time the standardization organizations in countries and you have one probably in every country in the world. The purpose of ISO is to develop standards in all kinds or areas, not just in the purpose for the DNS but in technology, health care, food safety,

project management, etc. When this slide deck was developed there were 21,884 standards and the ISO is just one of them ISO3166.

A little bit about the structure, what is important to understand today is you got the general assembly and you have technical committees, which are part of it and technical committee's this is where the work is starting to be done. If you start focusing on and zooming in on ISO3166, you will see that it's part of and is one of the working groups and standards that of TC460, Technical Committee 46 and it's on information and documentation. It not just includes ISO3166, as you can see it has other working groups, it has a lot of members and sub committees.

The MA, the Maintenance Agency, is part of this that falls on the TC46, what is important is the ISO3166 is under one of the nine working groups, so working two. Working two is effectively the owner of the ISO Standard. What it means is, if there are substantial changes to the standard, it has to go through working group three. Working group two will develop these changes, it needs to be ratified but working group two is effectively the policy developing body in our terminology. Working group two is developing and takes care of the evolution.

The role of the maintenance agency is very limited and the role of the maintenance agency is just to maintain the standard, the bits and pieces in the standard, for example the country codes which need to be assigned, that's done by the maintenance agency. In our terminology and our meaning, ICANN terminology, it's the registry for the ISO Standard. It is a bit of the IANA function. It doesn't develop the policy, it applies the policy and it applies the definition. Again, the reasons for doing this and some of the organizational issues pertaining to the maintenance agency

but you need to keep in the back of your mind, this almost administrative role of the maintenance agency.

Let me go back a little about the scope and the background of 3166. It clearly states the origins go back to 1974 and it is an effort to bring together all kinds of code systems and make it more universal. You can read this at your leisure. In 74 they succeeded in doing this and it was developed in coordination with a lot of other international organizations.

If you would look at ISO3166, it consists of three parts. Part one, the country code and this part includes both the two letter and three letter code. Part one is two letter and three letter codes and about the country code. Part two is about countries subdivision code. Once a country is included part two of the standard, so that's the second part of it, this is where you can find geographic regions within the country and not across country borders or anything, just within a country. The step is first you need to be in part one and then you will be assigned a two and three letter code by the maintenance agency. Then in part two, the subdivisions are included.

Part three is more for historical purposes, formally used by names. As I said, it's something I'll keep on repeating is countries go and countries change their names, for historical and archive purposes they are included in part three. They're assigned together with the two codes, the starting point is the alpha two codes and then you go to the alpha three code. It's only the same entity and one of the major differences, it doesn't have a list of reservations. The three letter codes do not need

to be related to the alpha two codes, there are a lot of uses there as well as you can see.

Subdivision codes and again, this is important. I'll elaborate a little bit on what I just said. Sub divisions are proposed by the entities listed in part one. Not everybody or not even an entity within a geographic -- in a country can request inclusion of these subdivisions and assign codes to it. Only a particular entity in a country can submit the names that will be included in part two and it's a voluntary act and a maintenance agency has no oversight of that.

Going back to the ISO3166 in general and particular part one, who are eligible? Independent territories, so the UN members, geo political interesting areas and that's at the discretion of the maintenance agency and there are rules around it. It is clearly defined which entities can be included on the ISO3166 and ultimately by eligible to become a ccTLD, it's not just geographical names. It has to be administrative entity. The names mainly from the [inaudible] that means the country and territory names, not the country codes but the name, the codes have some relation to the short names and the goal is to have a phrasal association between the country name and the code element, code element meaning the two or three letter code.

A little bit about purpose because I think I'm running out of time. A little bit about the purpose of 3166 and think that's important for you to understand as well, is the use of the 3166 is far broader than the DNS and this is one of the issues the PDP Working Group or Retirement is facing. The country names and the system of country codes under 3166 are used in a variety of functions. Travel documents for example, in

finance related services, credit card companies and they are trade related, trade and transport locations. Not just for the DNS and that's one of the issues that the Retirement Working Group is facing, is when and how do you stop using a country code in the DNS because at one point it may be assigned again and it has far broader use than just the DNS.

The format I will not go into details. A little bit you heard me talking about, the code types and this is what I said around terminology at the start of my presentation. You have officially assigned codes, these country codes, that's 249 at the time, that is user assigned codes which is a particular group. They are assigned -- for example WIPO or the Postal Union and you have a lot of other codes. Then you have the exception and reserve codes, transition and reserve codes and determine reserve codes, so they will never be used. Exception and reserve and transition and reserve codes will be -- there is no set time limit or clear around this, these are all exceptions to the general rules of assigned, just something to keep in mind as well. Don't use and don't think about the exception reserve, transition reserve and determine reserve lightly, there are no set rules around these types of codes.

Again, reservation times, going back to the retirement discussion, transition reserve, people think it's 50 years max, however it's unpredictable because it's up to the MA, depends very much on the need and depends very much on the interpretation of vague rules. There is no clear-cut rule there.

A little bit about the addition change and removal of countries. As I said and this is of course for retirement otherwise unstable, countries do

split, CS is a very good example, it was used for Czechoslovakia, that was split into Czech Republic and Slovakia. After five years it was assigned to Serbia Montenegro and Serbia Montenegro split, now you got RS and ME for these two entities, this where you can see the dynamics come in. Major names changes, and countries merge, [inaudible] republic and the Bundesrepublik Germany, so that's clear; and territories change in capacity, the main one was ANK, which was split and then renamed.

Merging countries, names changes, we talked about it a little bit, splitting of countries, again these are the historical cases and splitting and as a special case again, the split of Yugoslavia and the whole history behind it. This was all reflected in ISO3166. It clearly states it is dynamic. Splitting of SU is a special case, status changes, again you can read it at your leisure, this is the result of the Dutch -- have a lot of entities and this is how it resulted the split of AN.

In summary, and then I'll quit -- and this is my final slide -- the basic document around the delegation, transfer, revocation, retirement are RFC5091, the framework of interpretation and ISO3166 Standard. I talked a little bit about the basic principles and about the current policy development efforts and the main one being undertaken right now is around the retirement of ccTLDs and upcoming is the review mechanism which goes back to the cross-community work group in the context of the IANA stewardship transfer.

Finally, I talked about the ISO3166 Standard and the role of the maintenance agency. Things to remember about ISO3166 are the role of the maintenance agency, the standard itself, so what's included in the standard changes over time but also the standard will change over

time. It has a broad application, it is not limited to the use the context of the DNS, you can see it in financial instruments, you can see it in travel document, etc. The ISO3166 is not relevant only in the context of discussions pertaining to the ccTLD world but also in the broader context of what we do at ICANN. Thank you very much. I know this was quite an extensive presentation. Back to you Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMMA:

Thank you very much Bart. It was extensive, it was exhausted, so thank you very much, even if we are short of time. We already have the permission to have 10 minutes on this webinar. Now, we will go to the next point on the agenda which is the pop quiz. Yesim, please go ahead with the pop quiz questions.

YESIM NAZLAR:

Thank you very much, Tijani. We have five pop quiz questions and I'll read them all for you.

The first question is, what is the status of framework of interpretation? A -- it's a policy. B -- it clarifies policy. C -- it is relevant documentation that could provide guidance like GAC principles. Please cast your votes now. Bart, if you could please give us the correct answer.

BART BOSWINKEL:

In my view and reading it now, you could argue C but it's clearly defined when it was envisioned as it clarifies policy, that's why interpretation and framework of interpretation. Its purpose is to clarify RFC5091, which is the basic policy document.

A very good example, is significantly interested parties, the concept included in our RFC5091 it is further clarified but it's over time, local internet community was used to describe it, it was clarified -- the framework of interpretation that the correct term for it be framework would be significantly interested parties and it's described how it looks like. From that perspective, the way I see it, it is option B. It could be C as well because it provides guidance but it's definitely not at the same level as GAC principles.

TIJANI BEN JEMMA:

Thank you very, Yesim please. Try to be quick because we don't have time. We have to submit for Q & A.

YESIM NAZLAR:

Thank you, Tijani. The second question is, the ISO3166 Maintenance Agency decides what is -- sorry. I think there is something missing. Agency decided what is and what is not a country, is it a yes or is it a no?

BART BOSWINKEL:

It's a definitely a no. The Maintenance Agency just assigns two letter codes to the name of an existing country or territory. The correct answer is B, no.

YESIM NAZLAR:

Thank you very much. Next question is number three. In which part of the ISO3166 Standards are the alpha three codes for countries listed. Is

it part one, is it part two or part three? Please cast your vote. Bart, the correct answer is?

BART BOSWINKEL:

The correct answer is A, in part one. Part one contains the alpha two and three letter codes for countries. Part two is about subdivision, part three is about history. It's clearly stated in one of the slides. Correct answer is A.

YESIM NAZLAR:

Thank you. Moving on to the fourth question. ISO3166 part two includes the subdivision of countries. What is the correct answer. Is it regions that [inaudible] are also included? Is it little subdivisions exhausted? Is it only entities listed in part one can submit names? Please cast your vote. And the correct answer is?

BART BOSWINKEL:

C. The list is definitely not exhausted because the maintenance agency doesn't over see it. It depends on the country listed or the entities listed in part one what they submit. In that sense, it's voluntary. Reason that cross border by definitions they are not included because these are set positions of countries.

YESIM NAZLAR:

Thank you, Bart. The fifth pop quiz question is, the current policy and development process on the retirement of ccTLD is intended to refine

existing policy, is it correct or not correct? Please cast your votes now.
And the correct answer Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL: It's B. It's not correct because there is no policy in place. I hope you've listened carefully.

YESIM NAZLAR: Thank you very Bart. Tijani, back to you please. This was the end of our pop quiz section.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much Yesim. Now, for your questions. We have already questions from Alfredo. Yesim, can you please read the questions of Alfredo one by one?

YESIM NAZLAR: Okay, sure. By the way, just a heads up that Alfredo had to leave the webinar but he told me that he will be listening to the recording for the answers. Just trying to find the first question. The first question is, delegation of ccTLD happens when new territories are established, he's asking?

BART BOSWINKEL: To be very precise, it happens when a new entry or country code is added to the ISO3166 list. A country is probably clear but especially around territories, there is a lot of ongoing discussion what is a territory

eligible to be on the list? The point is, when a country or when a country established a name is added to the ISO3166, a two-letter code and three letter code is assigned to the name of that country, as of that moment, the two letter code, it is eligible to be a ccTLD.

YESIM NAZLAR: Thank you, Bart. The second question is, can more than one ccTLD manager be designated?

BART BOSWINKEL: No. My understanding -- if you mean per CC, no I definitely agree. What you do see a ccTLD manager or the entity ccTLD manager for one country or territory can also be the entity another ccTLD and there are a few examples. Depends on how you interpret the question is my guess but in principle, you can't have more than two managers for one country code.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: The question was that Bart. The answer is no.

YESIM NAZLAR: Thank you, Tijani. The next question is, who initiates the retirement process of the ccTLD? How long might it take based on previous experience and what is the impact to end users?

BART BOSWINKEL:

That's an interesting question because it's part of the current debate of this working group. The retirement effectively is initiated and that's where agreement is among all participants, when a country code, so the two-letter code, is removed from the ISO3166, that's the starting point of the process. Then take the next steps, because there is no policy, depends very much on the circumstances. In some cases, it is part of discussion -- previous discussion on the successive ccTLD.

For example, if there is significant change in name, which results in a new one for the same territory, at one point the former will want to be the designated manager for the new one and then it's part of that negotiation between ICANN, IANA and the ccTLD manager. In case for example the .AN, the initiative you could argue came from the Dutch government but at one point it clearly needed to be an agreement and I don't mean it in a legal sense but that people have a common understanding between IANA and the ccTLD manager how to move forward.

One of the main concerns is for the end users, how long do they have to move and to end the registration codes? You don't want to remove a ccTLD with say a million second level domain names from the root, that would be create havoc and it's in nobody's interested to make this happen. That's clearly out of bounds, out of everybody's consideration. I hope I've answered your question. I can't give you a straightforward answer given the current discussion.

TIJANI BEN JEMMA: Bart, I have a follow up question. Who entitled the YU retirement because the country exists anymore?

BART BOSWINKEL: I think -- if you look at the documentation, if you really want to have, you need to talk to IANA people and I don't know to what extent this is confidential, but based on the public available documentation, it is clear that the initiative I would say came from IANA as part of the -- because one of the entities became the ccTLD manager for the successor, for one of the successors.

The way it worked is you got .YU, that was Serbia Montenegro and that became .RS for Serbia and .ME for Montenegro. .RS, the ccTLD manager for .RS was also the manager for .YU, in that process on delegating .RS this became part of the issue. Again, the documentation only reflects there was an understanding, what really happened I don't know. As I said, that's the policy perspective, I don't know have the operational perspective, I can't give it to you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you. Next question.

YESIM NAZLAR: The next question is, if the ISO organization is voluntary, does it impact ISO3166 when assigning ccTLDs? How is issue resolved with a country besides the implement the country code that is not a member?

BART BOSWINKEL:

I think you need to separate the organization around ISO3166 and the role of ISO3166. The ISO itself we thought it would be useful to make very clear that it is a voluntary organization but it is -- it's not based on international law, that's the only point we really want to stress and talk a little bit about the organization of ISO3166 so you see how the policy making for ISO3166 is embedded in the ISO structure. Whether a country is included in ISO166 has nothing to do about its role in the ISO organization.

If you would look at the rules included in 3166, it clearly goes back to the United Nations terminology etc., once a country is recognized by the UN it will be included in the ISO3166. If you go back to RFC5091, that is precisely the type of process they were looking for at the time. Even the maintenance agency, that's why I've included that question, the maintenance agency does not decide what is and what is not a country code, that decision is taken out of the ISO organization and effectively reflects what is happening in the United Nations. I hope that answers the question.

YESIM NAZLAR:

Thank you, Bart. Next question is, for my comprehension, does it mean that PTI does the function of IANA and maintenance agency?

BART BOSWINKEL:

I just use it as comparison. The maintenance agency, to be very clear, that term is used in the context of ISO. Please don't mix them up. I just use them to make you familiar or I hope you understood the role of PTI IANA, what it does for example ccTLDs. The policy is developed through

the ccNSO, the execution is with IANA. The maintenance agency has a similar, comparable role with respect to ISO3166, don't stretch it too much. Don't think of IANA as a maintenance agency. I was just using it to explain their role [inaudible]. Hello, Yesim?

YESIM NAZLAR: I was trying to locate the background noise, I think it's gone now. This was the end of Alfredo's questions actually. If we look at the AC chat, I see a question from [inaudible]. I would like read that one as well, Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, please.

YESIM NAZLAR: The question is, we need to keep collaborating between ccNSO and At-Large. My question is that, what are the steps of the joining the ccNSO because most of the ccTLD don't know ccNSO, so you need to do more outreach like working with ALAS to check if they are ccTLD of chat to join the ccTLD. Since last week we are working with them to join the ccTLD as part of our contribution as At-Large community to help the ccTLD to part of the ccNSO. I see Joke is responding to him I believe.

BART BOSWINKEL: We do have an application from the ccTLD. Just to be on -- at the moment to give you a basic idea, as I said there are 246 country codes. Currently the membership of the ccNSO is 168 but that's on the low side

because as I said, some managers or some entities who run a ccTLD operate more than one. The main examples being APNIC and Norid for the Norwegian. The membership is a little bit higher. If you'll take these into account, we're around 176 out of 246 and we know we do have some issues in the -- there are some areas where the CC's are not members of the ccNSO and for various reasons.

One area where we have less membership is in the Caribbean, the other one is in the area of the Pacific Islands, I would say these are the main areas. One of the reasons is people don't want to, secondly, it's not known and that's a fair point, outreach. We as secretariat work very closely with our colleagues from the GSE department.

We know it's coming and we have not been active in the past. It's very hard to get these last ones. It takes resources and most of them are the smaller ccTLDs, so that's with respect to that point. Who can be a member? Joining, it's just the ccTLD manager. That being said, we do organize a lot of meetings and session during ICANN meetings, including ICANN63 and all these meetings are open, not just to ccTLD managers but to everybody who's interested.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you, Bart. Can we, Yesim, please go to the evaluation questions?

YESIM NAZLAR:

Sure, Tijani. Let me pull up the first evaluation question. Our first question is, how was the timing of the webinar for you. Is it too early? Is it just right? Or too late? Please cast your votes now.

I'll quickly move on to the second question. The second question is, how is the technology used for the webinar? Is it very good? Is it good? Is it sufficient? Bad? Or very bad? Please cast your votes now.

Thank you very much. Moving on to the third question. Did the speaker demonstrate mastery of the topic? Do you think it's extremely strong? Is it strong? Sufficient? Weak? Or extremely weak? Please cast your votes now.

I'll be moving on to the fourth evaluation question. The fourth question is, are you satisfied with the webinar? Extremely satisfied? Moderately satisfied? Slightly satisfied? Not satisfied at all? Please cast your votes.

I'm moving on to the fifth question now. Our fifth question is, what region do you live in at the moment? Is it Africa? Is it Asia, Australia and Pacific Island? Is it Europe? Is it Latin American and Caribbean Islands? Or is it North America? Please cast your votes now.

Moving on to the sixth question. How many years of experience do you have in the ICANN community? Is it less than one? One to three? Three to five? Five to 10? Or is it more than 10 years. Please cast your votes now.

I'm moving on to the last but not the least question. What topics would you like us to cover for the future webinars? Please type your answers here in the blank space and don't forget to hit the button next to it so we can receive it. I'll leave this question open till the end of the webinar. Now, leaving the floor back to you Tijani. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much Yesim. Please, this question is very important for us. If you give us your preferred topics, we will be able to program for the next year a very good program. Please, try to either fill into this box your preference or send us an email so that we try to accommodate it. Thank you very much all. First of all, I'd like to thank a lot Bart Boswinkel, who is the Senior Director and the ccNSO Development Support, I thank him for his time and his energy and his patients because ask him several questions and he always tried to answer them. Thank you for interpreters, for our Staff and for all of you who attended this webinar. This webinar is now adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]