

---

Bart Boswinkel: We will have a recording of this call for transcript purposes. As a start I'd like to propose to go along the room and introduce yourself. Ian, could you start?

Ian Chiang: Ian Chiang from TWNIC.

Eduardo Diaz: Eduardo Diaz, ISO Puerto Rico, North American RALO.

Ron Sherwood: Ron Sherwood, .vi.

Iliya Bazlyankov: Iliya Bazlyankov, Core.

Anthony Harris: Anthony Harris from Cabase Argentina and from the ISP Constituency.

George Asare-Sakyi: Hi, this is George Asare-Sakyi from Ghana.

Ching Chiao: Hi, alright, this is Ching Chiao from .asia. I'm the GNSO liaison to this group.

---

*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.*

Bart Boswinkel: ICANN Staff Support.

Sokol Haxhiu: Sokol Haxhiu, ccNSO Council.

Jon Lawrence: Jon Lawrence from Aus Registry, the .au Registrar.

Kathryn Reynolds: Kathryn Reynolds from CIRA, the .ca operator.

Heather Forrest: Heather Forrest from the GNSO IPC.

Henry Chan: Henry Chan from .hk.

Maarten Simon: Maarten Simon, SIDN.

Elise Lindberg: Elise Lindberg, Norwegian representative of the GAC but we don't have an official position on who's going to represent us in this group. But we will have to wait for that. We haven't got the time yet.

[background conversation]

Annebeth Lange: Annebeth Lange, .no.

Martin Boyle: Martin Boyle from Nominet, the .uk operator.

Paul Szyndler: I am Paul Szyndler from .au.

Gabriella Schittek: Gabriella Schittek, ccNSO Secretariat, and we also have two people on the phone. Leo, could you introduce yourself?

Leo Maluwa: Leo Maluwa from .mw.

Gabriella Schittek: So he's from .mw, Malawi. And we also have George, could you introduce yourself?

George Asare-Sakyi: I said it before. I am George Asare-Sakyi from Ghana.

Gabriella Schitteck:

Could you repeat where you're from? Okay, thank you.

Joke Braeken:

Good morning, I'm Joke Braeken from EURid, the .EU Registry.

Bart Boswinkel:

Thank you very much. I have, first of all, a bit on the agenda. Unfortunately Becky isn't here, she was supposed to do the... As Co-Chair she should run it but as she's not here I'll take on that role again. So we have one major issue - major, major issue - a nomination for a Chair for this Working Group; so preferably because this is a ccNSO Working Group a ccTLD-related person. Is there any nomination or do we have to wait and after this meeting we'll approach? I can do both ways.

Paul Szyndler:

Bart, this is Paul Szyndler from .au for those on the phone. We'd had some discussions before this and if it was a suitable arrangement I was looking to nominate and do that in conjunction with Becky. I believe that she was willing to stay on in that role, so that way we've got a Co-Chair status, such that if we have an event like this that arises again, that all our teleconferences don't suit then one or either of us could assist there. I'm ably happy to hold the pen as well; will admit to not being that much across the work of the Study Group to date but hopefully that won't impose too much on my commitment otherwise.

Bart Boswinkel:

Thank you. So I take it this Working Group agrees that Paul will act as Chair/Co-Chair of this Working Group because then I can propose this to the Council as a nomination of the Working Group and he'd be appointed as such; and then we are on the road, to say. The second point - that's a relief, by the way - the second point is probably because we have some members I haven't seen, just a quick overview of what the purpose of this Working Group is, and based on that then we can start the question regarding the GAC participation as well. And then we can go into something more substantive.

The purpose of this Working Group was to provide an overview of the relevant policies within the ICANN arena, so that's both going to be GNSO and ccNSO policy or gTLD- and ccTLD-related policies relating to the use of country and territory names as TLDs. So that would mean, say, the new gTLD process is already such a policy, and say the current ccTLD policy under delegation of country codes is such a policy as well, you could argue to fast track such a policy and probably one of the future policies will be the overall policy under delegation under selection if IDN ccTLD strings. Again, that is related to the use of country names.

So that was the first task, role, activity of this Working Group; so coming up with an overview that is not analyzing it, just providing an overview. I'll go into the status a little bit later on.

The second task, according to the mini charter is to try to define a kind of typology of kind of country names. Yesterday at the GAC I gave some examples but you can extend it as far as you want to

now, but you have, say, one category of country names would be the two-letter codes, like all the two-letter codes. It's a reference to the name of countries in the ISO 3166 code. That's one typology of looking at it; so that's just as an example.

The second group might be the full official or short official name of a country. So that's what's on the UN/GGN list, or what's on the ISO list. So that's a second group of country names.

A third group, a third category could be something like the translations of these official names in all official languages of the world. That's probably another example and you could end up with say, maybe that's a relevant category as well - historical names for countries and territories, or nicknames, or whatever. The reason for doing this is because country names are used in all different environments and for all different types of purposes, and going back... So that's the second objective or task of this Working Group, coming up with this typology, categorization, however you want to call it.

Then the next step would be to understand how the policies that were identified apply to these different categories of country names and whether or not the current policies, whether or not there needs to be recommendations of the Working Group to deal with them.

At the meeting, I think it was in San Francisco, and I will send it around again with all the new members, I devised a chart. It's a kind of decision tree just looking at country names from the fast

track perspective. Yeah, that's the one. It's like one of these...how do you call it? Games. It's one of these games...

[background conversation]

Bart Boswinkel:

And what you end up, probably if you have what I call the complete policy all end nodes in that decision tree, there should be rules around it or clear where you end up.

And if you start using this for the different policies then you see where there are loopholes and maybe that is the ultimate task of this Working Group: come up with the recommendation to the ccNSO Council but probably to the broader stakeholder group, say what needs to be done as a next step to deal with these loopholes in the existing policies if there are any loopholes.

So that is the overview of what this Working Group or Study Group is supposed to do. It doesn't need to come up with solutions but it's more identifying issues in the current policies and potential future policies of dealing with country names and etc.

And the type of solutions could be a ccNSO-initiated PDP on the definition of what is a country code. I hope it doesn't end up that way but it could be something like this. Or the other extreme would be "Please maintain the current restriction in the Applicant Guidebook of not using official country and territory names as a new gTLD." That could be another recommendation going up to

resolve some of the issues. So that's way ahead. Okay, where are we at this stage?

Just before the last call which unfortunately I couldn't attend, but I will resend it as a starting point, as staff support I provided an overview of what I think are the current and potential future policies that need to be updated as a result of this meeting, because in there I've listed the Applicant Guidebook and everything else, the new gTLD process still as a future policy. So, fortunate for those who are interested it's not anymore but that's something else.

What I've done is not copied the full blown Applicant Guidebook but only the sections which are relevant on the use and at the high level on the use of country names as TLDs. What I've also done, for instance, is give reference to the current rules for delegation, re-delegation of ccTLDs; so the two letter codes and what's also included is the relevant section of the potential overall policy IDN ccTLDs and existing rules for the fast track; and there are some additional rules.

I will resend that document, update it, resend it and I would say that was a request at the time to the Working Group: "Please check whether you think this is complete because then we have a starting point," and we've got the first one done. I think for the second one, and that's something maybe to discuss and do a little brainstorming about, is how does this Working Group want to approach the typology of country names? That is the second one.



So we've got one semi done but the second one will be a very difficult one and that needs the input from all the members of the Working Group and maybe somebody has a brilliant idea that we all can lay back and say "Okay, solved already." That will be the second one.

The third one as I said would be applying the rules to this typology but I think that is post-Dakar. So based on today's meeting I would suggest have a bit of brainstorming. Based on that input with the two Chairs we'll devise a work plan for this Working Group moving forward to Dakar; and then we can set up regular meetings, etc., based on that work plan.

Okay, that is a bit of the overview and the status. We have one more open issue - there was an invitation to the GAC, whether or not they wanted to participate in whatever manner they wanted in this Working Group, or in this Study Group I would say. If you want I'll explain the difference a bit but fortunately you were here and you have some news on that part. That will be good.

Elise Lindeberg:

No, I don't really have any news on that part. There are representatives from different countries, I think, who want to participate in the GAC but we just didn't have the time to discuss it. We're drowning ourselves in the communiqué, so Heather hasn't—because we should have an official position of who is representing the GAC in this group and we don't have that. That is what I said; I will just stay in listening this time and then we will

just go and ask Heather if it is okay if we join and also ask if there are other countries who wanted to join. I think it will be sorted but we just didn't have the time. Thank you.

Bart Boswinkel:

That's good. The only thing I think needs to be clarified and I think that's why it's a bit tricky, in this Working Group it will be—how should I phrase it? —it would be good if people with experience in governmental approaches, would provide input and not at the level that they represent the position of their country, but say there is a liaison with the GAC, so the GAC knows and is aware what's going on so if people—I'll phrase it down a bit more bluntly—if people from the GAC want to participate and give from their expert opinion and provide input it is not as a full member of the GAC but it's only on an individual level. But we need, say the views of people with expert knowledge of how governments treat country names.

Elise Lindberg:

As a liaison for the GAC you can never talk on behalf of the GAC anyway, you know. So it'll be an experience from what we have been discussing in the GAC, or how we see it in the GAC, so also different companies in the GAC have different opinions, of course, and also we have different focus. No one has been quite into the geo discussion because we made this report, as you said, and different governments on the protection of national interest in guard of using geo names as new gTLDs but I see that you have

---

the typology of country names that has not been discussed at all in the GAC. No. it needs to be done in this group, I see that.

Bart Boswinkel:

As this typology, and because this group will develop this typology it is very important to have at least the perspective of some people who are dealing with GAC matters. That's the way I best can phrase it and I think the best way to provide input into the GAC; that will be the role of the liaison.

Elise Lindberg:

Because typology, we saw that the typology of the name was very, very important when it comes to (inaudible) names and the ISO list names and so on because we were constantly being asked; the ICANN Board said "Do you want protection for all names? It's impossible." We had to get a precise definition of what we wanted for protection. Of course we wanted more, but we got what we had in the bag now. So the typology is very, very important, otherwise it will not go anywhere.

Chiang Chiao:

Thanks, this is Chiang again. As a GNSO liaison I'm not sure I should talk more, but the name of this Working Group is the Study Group of using and the usage of country names and territory names. Also, I'm seeing the possibility of learning from the experience of not only the GAC itself but the observer of the GAC, those intergovernmental treaties or organizations.

How those like WHO, WTO, IOC, how those intergovernmental organizations, when they have a meeting or they have any activities, how those organizations use a particular way to have a country to be represented in that particular organization. I mean, for most of the countries you will probably not find this. This could be a problem or issues but for a country names in the disputed status that could be how you look at how their names can be actually handled.

I'm not sure I'm getting my point understood. Because I will need to run for the GNSO wrap-up session so this is not a GNSO consensus but I would like to express that we have discussed, GNSO is aware of the initiation of this group but there is a discussion about whether this group will extend this concern or keep an eye, go beyond the ISO 3166-1 of R2 to the alpha-R3 list which is the three letter code country names.

So that could be an area of interest where the GNSO could be a very interested topic for the existing players and also the new applicants, which their codes—the three letter codes—could fall on the alpha-R3 lists.

Elise Lindberg:

As a starting point we have the Applicant Guidebook as it is today, where ICANN themselves have listed out what they consider as country and territory names; and the alpha-3 code is there. It's a lot of other things as well. So, as I see it, you say how to use it or not use it. Should we take it out and leave it as it is and continue with

the exception that ICANN has done in the Applicant Guidebook forever or for now and see how it turns out with the new gTLDs and the other gTLDs, or should it be the same rule as for the other gTLDs that do have to have a support from the government.

Should that list be extended? As the Board said, this is not complete. It's a list that some of the options are taken in, some are not. So, I suppose that GNSO might have other interests in this than we have. I see that. So, we'll discuss further of course, but I think that the list here is a good starting point.

Bart Boswinkel:

I think that's why, if you go back to the charter of this Study Group, that's why first it's a bit of a fact-finding mission. The first step is try to come up with how could you qualify different types of country names? Otherwise it becomes directly too much of a use focused discussion and the first step needs to be how can you distinguish between all or not at all. That could be the outcome as well. Any questions on the procedural parts of the meeting?

Just to recap; fortunately, we have a nomination for a Chair and a Co-Chair, so that's good. I will resend the overview of the policies to this Working Group. Probably what is a good idea is those who are not subscribed yet to the list, that they contact Gabby. Otherwise they won't receive the documents.

The next work item will be the typology and I think maybe either Paul, you want to take it from here, knowing what is requested is

---

how could we proceed on developing such a typology, and what are the options.

Paul Szyndler: If everybody else is happy with that just for the duration of this meeting, I'll be quite happy for Bart to continue.

Bart Boswinkel: There are a couple of possibilities here, I would say. Unfortunately, I've been in the Netherlands, and close to me is a university, a special university dealing in geographic systems. Geo-observation used to be linked with the UN, as the International Cartography Institute. If that's an option, I could go there and ask them if they have any idea to develop a typology. Maybe they have, maybe they haven't; and what are possible criteria. So that's one option.

Another option is we need to say maybe we can think of some, in a brainstorming way, of what could be possible criteria, or what could be possible, as I discussed in the introduction, what could be possible criteria to distinguish country names, which are relevant in the context of ICANN? Say historical names is one, full names is one, nicknames is one. And maybe somebody has some other ideas.

We start to list them and see if we can come up with examples in this group. That's the good thing of having this typology. You don't need to come up with a full list of all the names in one

---

category; you just need to be sure that all the categories cover all kinds of references or country names. So that's another option, and that's the end of my options, so the floor is open.

Male: It is too farfetched to say that these two-letters, all the combinations are just reserved for ccTLDs? Is that too far-fetched to say?

Bart Boswinkel: Sorry, I'm going to be a bit pedantic. We're not talking about – because what you do, you already apply a policy to a typology by using the word “reserve” so where we are right now is saying we have a category of two lesser codes. That's it.

We have a category like country names or reference like Holland, because I know that I'm Dutch. And Holland can only be used as a New gTLD because there is no policy; then you do precisely where we should end up after going through this typology, so the two letter codes is indeed one category or one way of identifying references to a country.

Elise Lindberg: I think it's a good idea that everyone that hasn't followed the New gTLD process closely take a look in the Applicant Guidebook in Chapter 2 and read these things that are there on geographical names. Then it will give a better understanding on what they think within the country and territory names category so far. So that is a

starting point. And Bart, I have a question for you. You have these three points that we shall go through. We will not be discussing the pros and cons as keeping them as they are or using them as gTLDs, etc.? That's not in the task we've been given; because that kind of enlightened the situation?

Bart Boswinkel:

I think at the end of the day when you come up with recommendations, and the recommendations are at a very, very, very high level. In developing recommendations, you end up in pros and cons; but before you get there, you have to have, in my view, a full understanding of what we are talking about.

Elise Lindberg:

Just for clarification, I understood you right; typology is one, whether or not to use them is two, if you want that much detail or not, and then how to use them as three? No? Okay, then I misunderstood.

Bart Boswinkel:

Do you mind, Tony? At least, that's the way it was drafted, the charter of this group, is we have existing policies and we will have a typology. What I think is, that was the basic idea, is to see to what extent, if we come up with this typology, if you run them through the policies, just as a simulation, what will happen? And then you have a full understanding of the impact of the policies on



---

this, and only then you can come up with recommendations, informed recommendations on what you want.

Tony Harris:

Just looking at the definition of the Study Group, the objectives, I was wondering if within the context of what we will be looking at, there is any intention towards the use of country names as a TLD in the case of a ccTLD; for example .tv; I think is used pretty much as a TLD. It's not restricted to citizens of Tuvalu to my knowledge, and of course there are some other, more recent examples. It's just a question and I have no objection to this being done at all.

Bart Boswinkel:

Say when then the Study Group charter was drafted, this was not in the minds of the drafters. That's what I know for sure. To paraphrase it in my words, what you are referring to is how a ccTLD is used, and what registration policy is used by the ccTLD.

This is at the level of ICANN, and maybe that could be the outcome of what's in the requirements of what's in the current policies; but what you're referring to, that for instance, .tv, and you have other examples like .me; the way they are used are defined by their local policies and not by the policies we are looking at.

Tony Harris:

I understand, but I do think when they are used in this manner, they are competing in the TLD name space and I don't know, but I

think the registrars do have access to sell them. Anyhow, it's just a thought. Thank you.

Heather Forrest:

In terms of your suggestion about the UN, I agree entirely that the Applicant Guidebook is a good starting place. Another good starting place from outside of ICANN is, in fact, the United Nations group of experts on geographical names, and that information can be had right on the Web, without having to go very far.

And their list has a built in typology to it. It's not a very complex one. It's not a terribly robust one, but there is a typology there. It could at least be a starting point for us, and I have the link on my screen. I can e-mail it around to everyone if that would be easy.

Bart Boswinkel:

You are referring to the UNGEGN lists, yes?

Heather Forrest:

I am indeed, and they have a list of geographic names. Again, it's not a terribly complex one. It's quite a simple typology with comments attached to it, to the extent that we want to have a bit of a domestic perspective on these things as well. There's also information in regards to toponymic guidelines, which I think is interesting in light of IDN developments and things of that nature, so toponymic concerns are something we'll have to keep in mind.

Bart Boswinkel:

Thank you for that suggestion, because I forgot it and I've been involved in developing the fast track, and especially toponomic expertise is one you might want to look for in this Working Group. To clarify this for those who are not aware: if you look at the Applicant Guidebook and the exemption, how it's formulated is probably people were not aware of what they had written down. Just go for the official name of countries.

I think about 190 countries in the world, real countries so we don't talk about territories. The unfortunate thing is we have listed about 7,000 living languages, depends on the list. This is the most acceptable one. So you end up with a complete field of 190 to the power 7,000 of names that you need to check, in principle. So, that's the bit about the toponomics, etc. Any other suggestions?

Ron Sherwood:

First of all, if I can, just a confirmation that what we are discussing is exemptions. We're discussing names that may not be used for TLDs because they are geographic titles, is that correct?

Bart Boswinkel:

Not at this stage. It is identifying possibilities to identify country names. What you are referring to is already way at the end of the process.

---

Ron Sherwood: Okay, but that is one of the end results?

Bart Boswinkel: Maybe.

Ron Sherwood: My second question, if I may. Is it within the purview of this committee to concern itself with languages as an exemption for a TLD. In other words, Dutch, English, French; those words, which represent a nation's language, are we involved in that at all?

Bart Boswinkel: No, this is only about country names. This is not about languages or script.

Ron Sherwood: Thank you.

Bart Boswinkel: Martin?

Martin Boyle: Just a follow-up clarification on that, in that there are certain languages that share the name of countries in certain cases, and I'm assuming that those, the country name would actually take precedence over any other use; but I'd like confirmation that we would actually see that as our expectation. Thank you.

Bart Boswinkel: That's one of the things I need to check, and you refer to, for instance, if they're outside the New gTLD process at this stage if I understand correctly.

Martin Boyle: Well at the moment, if it was a shared name, then wouldn't they be outside the New gTLD process at the first stage? It's just then what would happen when you got later down the process?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, and put it another way, that's almost a natural deadline for this Working Group. By then you need to come up with some recommendation. Any other questions at this stage?

No? Taking it from here, I think what I will do together with the co-Chairs and Chairs is come up with say, a type of typology we have here today, and start organizing some calls leading up to Dakar, and say the first one would be again, to review the policies which I will send around. It's just an overview. If it's not detailed enough please let us know, but it is not copy and paste the whole policy; it's just that we capture what's there.

Secondly is we will send some material around regarding initial steps to get to this typology, and I think online and at the first conference call or the conference call leading up to Dakar, try to come up with a reasonable typology and see how this applies and what types of name would be grouped under this one.

I think we don't have to have a complete overview of all the names under each typology. We have to have a couple of very, very good examples that describe the edges of the typology and what are the main threats. Yes? So we got activities and we will send around, and I figure, given the holiday season that we reconvene somewhere end of August with conference calls leading up to the Dakar meeting, so that you have a bit of a line of expectations when you can receive stuff. So, it will not be next week. Other business. Martin?

Martin Boyle:

Can I just, if we're looking to reconvene end of August, note that there is the IGF in September. I would be grateful if you can try and avoid overlapping with that.

Heather Forrest:

Because I come from the GNSO and I don't know many of you, and I've also mentioned the letters IPC, and I don't want there to be a misunderstanding that I represent any IP interest. The reason the GNSO has asked me to be here, is I will next month submit a Ph.d thesis on geographic names, their treatment in international law, and their treatment at DNS policy; and the book will be published later in the year. I don't say that by way of advertisement, but just so there's no misunderstanding in terms of my representing particular IP interests. I'm here as an expert in their treatment in international law.

---

Bart Boswinkel: First of all, noted; and secondly maybe that's one of the differences between ccTLD, ccNSO Working Groups and GNSO Working Groups it doesn't matter where your background is.

Heather Forrest: I'll respond quickly; nevertheless, if I might be of use to anyone given the background, I'm happy to do that and I'm happy to roll up the sleeves.

Bart Boswinkel: Absolutely, and thank you! Any there questions? If not, thank you very much for attending this meeting. Those who haven't been at this meeting or who have not been subscribed to the e-mail list, please contact Gabby.

[End of Transcript]