TRANSCRIPT

Framework of Interpretation Working Group
6 March 2014

Attendees:

ccNSO:
Ugo Akiri, .ng
Martin Boyle, .uk
Becky Burr, .us (Vice Chair)
Keith Davidson, .nz (Chair) Chris Disspain, .au
Stephen Deerhake, .as
Daniel Kalchev, .bg
Paulos Nyirenda, .mw
Patricio Poblete, .cl
Maureen Hilyard, ALAC
Cheryl Langdon Orr, ALAC

Staff Support and Special Advisors:
Bart Boswinkel, ICANN
Kim Davies IANA
Kristina Nordström, ICANN
Bernard Turcotte, ICANN

Apologies:

Jaap Akkerhius, ISO
Frank March, GAC

Keith Davidson:	Anyway, I think it's probably time that we start the meeting, and we don't appear to have a full contingent, but perhaps it's enough for us to be quorate. Kristina, can you give us roll call of those present, and apologies received?
Kristina Nordström:	Yes. So, from GNSO we have Ugo Akiri, Martin Boyle, Keith Davidson, Stephen Deerhake, Daniel Kalchev, Paulos Nyirenda. From Liaisons we have Maureen Hilyard, Cheryl Langdon Orr. From Staff Support and Special Advisors we have Bart Boswinkel, Kristina Nordström and Bernard Turcotte. Apologies have been received from Jaap Akkerhius and Frank March; and apologies for lateness from Kim Davies and Patricio Poblete.

Unidentified Participant:	Apparently Becky is on the call as well, but she's not--
Kristina Nordström:	Yeah. I was going to ask if she's on the call. So, Becky Burr as well.
Keith Davidson:	Well, okay. Great. Welcome everybody. And were there any further apologies received by anybody. If not, can we consider the apologies accepted, and those present noted. I think for the sake of this meeting, since it's our third reading, and people have had two other opportunities to have input into our main document, we can -- and think we've got a reasonable number on the call, we can consider ourselves quorate.
	Were there any issues with the agenda at all? I hadn't seen any on the list, but we'll consider the agenda confirmed as well. Thank you, everybody.
	Moving along to item three on the agenda, the meeting report from the 20th of February. As this has only been up for a very short time, I think probably less than 24 hours. Bernie, can you just step us through? I know we don't normally step through this, but can we, so we can just have a look at it as we go?
Bernard Turcotte:	Yes, sir. I think I've got the participants right. We've covered the meeting notes for 6th February meeting. There were no real discussions. We reviewed the responses to the public consultation again. The ALAC, we ran through the same things again, and the Andrew Eggleton thing, and I don't think there were any comments on anything. Then we dove into the heart of the subject with (inaudible) policy, and we have the wrath of suggestions since it was Nigel's first go at it.
	Nigel objected to the use of the word "official" and we need to add a 2, which I did in the draft we'll be going through today. Consent section 401, Nigel did not need to use the word definition, I agreed; "delegation" Nigel, strict points regarding proper English writing. Discussed with Becky Burr, objections of the word "process;" definition is the FOI agreed text that has been published in revocation.
	On manager, this definition was not agreed, and there are a bunch of sub-points to this, which I won't go through, but we can go through when we go through the document, and basically Nigel and Martin had a bunch of suggestions, so I guess we will step through those, even if Nigel is not here since they were documented, when we get back to the terminology document.
	Revocation, Nigel objected to the use of the word "process" and, again, this is an FOI Working Group agreed to text that has been published in revocation. And SIP, no comments; stakeholders, this definition has not been agreed to or published. Nigel, the current text is not a definition, which was correct, so basically I adjusted this one since the suggestions were not to change something that has been published and agreed to, and actually made a lot of sense. We wrapped it up, and we are now at the March 6th meeting. Over to you, sir.
Keith Davidson:	Thank you. Any questions or comments? Was there anything missing from the meeting report? If not, can we move along; and as I've said on the list, on reflection on the last meeting, I think we were tending to go towards relitigating some of our previously-made (inaudible) decisions. So, you know, just reminding you all that it's not our job here, if we agreed things that have been out for public consultation, it's probably not the cleverest thing for the Working Group to start to revisit its own work. And yeah, so rather -- and speak to this as if it were the actual definitions that we've previously agreed or -- and whether that's appropriate or not, and not agreeing with it.
	So on that note, can we move to the terminology paper, and Bernie, do you want to step us through?

Bernard Turcotte:	Yes, sir. Thank you. Again, just to go through Section 211, the FOI Working Group amended the definition to include the naming of relevant processes, I threw that in the last three readings; no one seems to have had any issues with that. So I'm thinking we are fairly good on that one. Going into the actual terminology, Section 411, I've removed the word "definition" as per Nigel's request, everything else is essentially the same. Anything -- I think I'll do them one at a time so that we can clear them. Anything else on consent?
Keith Davidson:	Nobody has got a hand raised, so I think everyone is happy.
Bernard Turcotte:	Delegation, again, I've removed the word "definition" and I'm hoping everyone can follow through with the track changes where things are fairly clear. Any other questions on delegation? And we will note that Nigel objected to the word "process." I did speak to Becky about this. I don't think she agreed that the word "process" was a problem.
Keith Davidson:	Everybody is looking happy, too. So, please continue, Bernie.
Bernard Turcotte:	Oka. I'm actually going to skip over manager, because that's the one that created the most problems, and we'll save that one for the end. So, we'll move on to 4.4, revocation. I've removed the word "definition" and as with the rest, the thing is essentially as it was. Are there any other concerns about revocation? And again, Nigel objected to the word "process".
Keith Davidson:	Paulos had his hand raised. So, Paulos? Paulos, the floor is yours. You must be on mute I think.
Paulos Nyirenda:	Hello?
Keith Davidson:	Ah, now. Yeah, go ahead, Paulos, we can hear you.
Paulos Nyirenda:	Can you hear me?
Keith Davidson:	Yes.
Paulos Nyirenda:	Sorry I -- maybe I just -- maybe move one step back. I have just one concern on manager.
Keith Davidson:	Oh, okay. No. We are going to come to manager, Paulos. We've just skipped over it, but we'll come back to that at the--
Paulos Nyirenda:	Okay.
Keith Davidson:	Okay. We'll come back to it, and I'll reserve your place in the queue. Thank you, Bernie.
Bernard Turcotte:	So, nothing else on revocation?
Keith Davidson:	No.
Bernard Turcotte:	Okay. For five, significantly interested parties, again, the only change, I've removed definition. Anything else on this? This is agreed-to text, and did not raise any concerns at the last one.
Keith Davidson:	Everybody is looking happy again.

Bernard Turcotte:	Okay. Stakeholders for DOS (ph) 6. Here, there has been a little bit of surgery. This had been plowed together from various bits we had done. And I don't think anyone wants to die in the ditch on this one, but it's just something we had said, so basically, along the lines, I've taken Nigel's wording, because I thought it was actually a very good suggestion, and changed it slightly, so that it makes sense as a definition. Stakeholders: is some -- a stakeholder is someone that has an interest in the operation of the ccTLD, and includes significantly interested parties, interested parties and other parties referenced in RFC 1591. So there should be a mess there, but we'll fix that. So I'll be glad to take questions and comments.
Keith Davidson:	Thanks, Bernie. I notice Cheryl is indicating a tick of agreement with the comment. I also notice Kim Davies has entered the room, and also a little earlier, Patricio Poblete also entered the room, and I thought we had received an apology for Patricio but -- and also noting Maureen, has a tick of agreement for this.
	I think this was a great suggestion from Nigel to clarify to stakeholders, and it got us all -- or it gets us elegantly around the issue that RFC 1591 refers to, significantly interested parties, interested parties and other parties. So encompassing that, I think, you know, explained this; and yes, it did.
	And I see Ugo has asked for the floor. So Ugo, the floor is yours. Ugo, you may be on mute, so if you could unmute. I'm not hearing you, Ugo. Can you--? Sorry. We are getting no audio from you at all, Ugo. Maybe you could -- I see you're typing your question. Any other questions or comments from anyone else, while we wait? Well, we'll come back to -- I think if -- No, we'll just wait a minute. I see Ugo is still. Ugo is saying, "I think we should add something to 4.6.1."
Unidentified Participant:	What?
Keith Davidson:	Yeah
Bernard Turcotte:	Okay. And what should that be?
Keith Davidson:	Oh. And Ugo has slipped away, so it should say: someone/group..
Bernard Turcotte:	I believe it's -- Oh, I understand, I think, what he's saying. I believe what Becky would tell us is that the use of "someone" is a generic person which means it covers all parties, a person, company, government, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. I will be sure to double check that with her, or we can ask her when she comes back. But if that's the concern, we are not only talking about individuals.
Keith Davidson:	Okay. Yeah. I think the common law of our English-speaking countries know that "someone" can be an individual group of people, or any structural organization that involves people, so it should be correct for most of us. But, Ugo, I'm not sure if that addresses your concern or not, but -- then we should say "a person" rather than someone, as Ugo is suggesting. A stakeholder is--
Unidentified Participant:	Keith, sorry. If we are going to go to person, then right there you have a problem, because that does limit it; to an individual.
Keith Davidson:	Yes. That's correct. Ugo, would you be happy if this goes back to Becky for another look, and if Becky has an agreement has an agreement that someone -- or if necessary we could add a footnote to define someone as being any person or people, group or organization. Otherwise I think if we add a change in the actual definition, we will start to lose the clarity by which we get from the current wording. So, okay.

	Okay. Ugo is saying "It's fine," so we'll note that. And Cheryl has her hand raised too.
Cheryl Langdon Orr:	Yeah. Thanks. I just -- and I'm absolutely supportive -- Cheryl for the records -- I'm absolutely supportive of the footnote, I think that's an elegant way out of it, Keith. But I just wanted to make sure the foot note use the language that we often see in common law English, because I think it will interpret well to other languages, and that is natural person, or blah-blah-blah. As long as it includes that natural person for, and all of those other things you've indicated that would be good. Thanks.
Keith Davidson:	As opposed to the members of this Working Group which--
Cheryl Langdon Orr:	Which are supernatural (inaudible)--
Keith Davidson:	--(inaudible).
Cheryl Langdon Orr:	Not unnatural, supernatural we are.
Keith Davidson:	Thank you, Cheryl. Okay, I will so note it. And Bernie, if we can we refer that back to Becky, and please continue.
Bernard Turcotte:	Thank you, sir. For seven, transfer. The only change has been the removal of the word definition, as you can see, and that takes us to the end except for the definition manager. So, are there any other question points on 47, transfer? And this is agreed-to text.
Keith Davidson:	It looks like everybody is happy.
Bernard Turcotte:	All right. Excellent. So let us head back, as promised, to the significantly discussed definition of manager, section 4.30. Now, I will recap a little bit, as far as I could tell, where we ended up on this. Right now as it says, it says "The entity, whether an organization, enterprise, government or individual, which is the trustee of the ccTLD, as the term trustee is used in RFC 1591. I granted Nigel that one.

Supervisors, the domain names in the ccTLD operates the domain name system in the country or territory associated with the ccTLD, and is listed in the IANA database of TLDs, thank you, Paulos; as the manager of the ccTLD.

Now, there were several issues around this, one of them, and I believe Martin is on tonight. If I remember correctly is that he was saying, this is a bit of shopping list of things, and if any one of them is not true, is the person not a manager? And that circled around to say, "Well, no, this is only a definition, it's not a policy of the list of things that sort of tell us what a manager should meet, but it's not a question that it is the definition, and therefore someone can't be a manager if they don't have all those things. Nigel and a few other people, we got back to our -- what is actually our original discussions. I look back in the documentation, and this actually goes back several years.

Supervisors, domain names in the ccTLD, and operates the domain name system in the country or territory, which is just a minor, minor adjustment from RFC 1591, because of course RFC 1591 doesn't refer to territories, but we cleared that. I think, as a group, whenever we see country we replace it by country and territory, and everyone is comfortable with that.

So, there was a suggestion by Martin to simplify this, to an extent. I am going to bring that up now. Hold one sec. Working Group, meetings, take notes, as in 13 -- All right. So Nigel had suggested operates domain name system, "in the country" to "for the country;" and we said we would review that with Becky. Becky had somewhat of a concern with |

that when I did speak with her earlier this week. Paulos noted the ccTLD thing, that's been corrected as far as I'm concerned.

Patricio had a concern, going to supervise. And that's when Martin suggested simplifying the clause to, "Have the responsibility for the domain name system for the country" and is listed in the IANA database of TLDs. And there were a few other minor points. So we were thinking -- so the major suggestion that we have from Martin. And Martin, am I characterizing this properly, if you are on and listening?

Martin Boyle: I am on. I am listening. And that seems to me to be quite a fair recollection of the discussion. Thanks.

Bernard Turcotte: Thank you, sir. So the thing we have on the table right now, is have the responsibility for the domain name system for the country, and are listed in the IANA database. Now it's my understanding when I presented this to Becky, who sent me an email. She's very, very sorry not to be here. Her boss decided that he wanted to talk to her now. So I guess we'll all have a bit of sympathy for her on that. She was not sure that would work for her, for a few reasons. So, that's about all I can say. I don't know if there are other comments.

Keith Davidson: Well, Paulos was seeking the floor earlier for a comment. Paulos, do you wish to raise your concern now? And, Paulos, you're on mute. Ah. I can't here you.

Paulos Nyirenda: Hmm?

Keith Davidson: Ah, there we go. Now we can.

Paulos Nyirenda: Can you hear me?

Keith Davidson: Yes.

Becky Burr: Hi. It's Becky.

Paulos Nyirenda: Yeah. I've been checked for one (inaudible/audio skip) -- Hello?

Becky Burr: Hello?

Keith Davidson: Paulos, yes. Yeah. Hi, Becky.

Becky Burr: Hi.

Keith Davidson: Paulos is just raising an issue on the manager topic. So, please go ahead, Paulos.

Paulos Nyirenda: Yeah. Can I go ahead?

Keith Davidson: Yes.

Paulos Nyirenda: I'm just worrying about the word "associated with" and maybe -- I'm not a first English speaker, so associated with -- Okay. What I'm worrying about is operates the domain name system in the country until -- associated with the ccTLD. In this context the word "associated" mean that the ccTLD is associated with the territory, or that the domain name is associated with -- I'm just trying to understand it. My interpretation was that maybe domain name system as used in this last part, is referring to the global system, and the association is between country and ccTLD. And I can get some clarification, I would prefer if they make it real clear that the domain name system is the country's domain system under the ccTLD, but I'm not sure if that is what it says.

Bernard Turcotte:	Okay. Sir, if I may?
Keith Davidson:	Yes. Thanks Bernie.
Bernard Turcotte:	Just as a quick one to Paulos, and then I'll catch Becky up, because I think she's the one who can add the most to this. I understand your question is probably a good one. My understanding is it's as it states there is the country or territories associated with the ccTLD, but given we are going to have a bit of a hash or a go at this today, maybe what we can do is table Paulos' concern for a few minutes, and catch Becky up and see where we go from here?
Keith Davidson:	That's sounds good.
Bernard Turcotte:	If that's okay with you, Paulos?
Keith Davidson:	Yes. And I think Paulos has just highlighted in the chat that the concern is on the word "associated" so yeah, let's come back to that, and as we work through with Becky. And welcome, Becky, you're just in time.
Becky Burr:	Thanks. Sorry I'm late.
Bernard Turcotte:	You are indeed.
Becky Burr:	Sorry. And late.
Bernard Turcotte:	I made -- I tried to make profuse apologies for you saying it was justified. So, on a quick catch up, we've done everything and basically have said that approved text is approved text, and that you did not feel that the use of the word process was inappropriate where Nigel had to object it, and I don't know if I misspoke, or if you were comfortable with that statement.
Becky Burr:	I am -- is Nigel on?
Bernard Turcotte:	No.
Becky Burr:	I am not uncomfortable with that. We talk about delegation and revocation, and we talk about a series of things that happen, while -- as that takes place. So, you know, there's a -- there's interesting support from a significantly interested parties and there are all of these kinds of things, and so, you know, delegation would, you know, is the act of recognizing -- transferring authority for whatever it is responsibility, and processes just -- it's more than one. There are series of steps, and so I think it's totally consistent to say that we are talking about the process. There is this noun of delegation which is sort of like the credentials. And to me that sometimes -- but that's not, when we are defining it, we are defining what IANA does, so I think it's a verb, for most of the time we use it.
Bernard Turcotte:	Okay. So, does anyone has any questions on the use of the word "process" as we have it here in the terminology document?
Keith Davidson:	It looks like everyone is in agreement.
Becky Burr:	It works for me.
Bernard Turcotte:	All right. Now, the next point we would like your input on is relative to stakeholders. Now in the new definition because we have accepted the notion that Nigel presented on the last call, that it wasn't stated as the definition, which was correct. So now it reads, "The stakeholder is someone that has an interest in the operation of the ccTLD, and includes

significantly interested parties, interested parties and other parties referenced in RFC 1591. Now we've had a question from Ugo that says, "Is using the word 'someone' as a stakeholder is someone, cover all the possibilities? Meaning an individual, or as in (slash) natural person, a company, a government, et cetera, et cetera." And we said we would refer that to you; and since we have you, we are now referring it to you.

Becky Burr: So, if we wanted to remove all ambiguity we could say a stakeholder is an entity or organization that has an interest in the operation of the ccTLD. You know, in legal speak, you'd use the word "person" that probably covers it, but "someone" is a less precise term.

Bernard Turcotte: Okay. So what would we be using instead? So, your recommendation is that someone--?

Becky Burr: It is -- a stakeholder is an individual or organization that has an interest in the operation of the ccTLD.

Bernard Turcotte: All right. I'm very comfortable with that. Anybody else has any comments.

Keith Davidson: So, that was suggested change. A stakeholder is an individual or an organization that has an interest and -- Does that cover the concerns raised by Ugo earlier? And does everyone else find it acceptable? I see Martin, and he's typing. Martin is typing on the point relating manager, and Maureen is indicating agreement.

Cheryl Langdon Orr: Yeah. I'm wondering, entity, et cetera or -- Cheryl here for the record -- Becky, the other alternate we discussed was just leaving it as is and putting a footnote from there with the footnote indicating the usual natural person, blah-blah-blah -blah, but I don't (inaudible)--

Becky Burr: Either -- I think either way is -- I mean, I think if you say it's an individual or an organization, we are not talking about a formal organization. It could be a group it could be, you know, a club, it could be -- whatever it is. But I don't mind I don't care whether it's in a footnote or in the text, it's sort of--

Keith Davidson: I think if we changed it to, "Is an individual or organization," that doesn't blur the lines, but if we went into the more descriptive, is a natural person or group of people or organization, or--

Unidentified Participant: (Inaudible)

Keith Davidson: And being a totally dilute thought or distracts attention away from the purpose of the sentence. So I think it remains quite elegant if we change it to "Is an individual or organization," and if it's organization with a small O, then it's--

Becky Burr: That will help, yes.

Keith Davidson: That would certainly cover groups as an informal organization. So Paulos, Ugo -- oh, I think Ugo is agreeing with Becky on the chat. Do we have a way through if we make that change to, "A stakeholder is an individual or an organization that has an interest?" It's a proposal--

Becky Burr: It's or and -- not "or an" it's just "or."

Keith Davidson: Yes. A stakeholder is an individual or an organization that has an interest.

Becky Burr: Okay. Put your "an" in if you want, I don't speak British English, so I don't know.

Keith Davidson: I know. Okay. Are we happy everybody? Do we have agreement? Martin is indicating agreement.

Unidentified Participant:	Yeah.
Keith Davidson:	Cheryl is indicating agreement, and so is Maureen, so I think we have some happiness around that. So we have agreed to it. Thank you. And Patricio also indicated agreement. So, please continue, Bernie.
Bernard Turcotte:	All right. So we've done all the housekeeping, Becky. And now we are into the heart of the matter, at 4.3, the definition of manager. Just when you came in we were getting going on this, right now it reads, "The entity, brackets, [whether an organization, enterprise, government or individual], close brackets, which is the trustee of the ccTLD, [as the term trustee is used in RFC 1591] supervises the domain names in the ccTLD, operates the domain name system in the country or territory associated with the ccTLD, and is listed in the IANA database of TLDs as the manager for the ccTLD. Now this did bring out quite a bit of discussion last time, there were some of our old nemesis which, I guess, we haven't really finished wrestling to the ground, and it operates the domain name system in the country.
	I think from the history of this group, what I ended up gleaning is that, yes, those are the words that are RFC 1591, but our understanding of those words is that it operates the ccTLD for that country. And the only -- very concrete suggestion we had relative to amending this, was from Martin at the last meeting, which was to change the last part of this, to simplify it and simply have it saying, "Have the responsibility," So the manager has the responsibility for the domain name system for the country, and is listed in the IANA database of TLDs." So, with that I will send it over to Becky for her thoughts and comments, and turn it over to you, sir.
Keith Davidson:	Okay. Thanks, Bernie. Yeah, Becky, just -- I think that confusion that's arising in people's minds individually as we first (inaudible) invested, they have been the same -- you know, the domain name systems in the country or territory associated with the ccTLD, is a little clumsy I guess. Anyway, Becky, your thoughts.
Becky Burr:	Well, I guess my question is whether -- I mean we go through all of this language in the -- in our different factions, and we toss all of these things about trustees and in, and all of that kind of stuff, and whether there isn't a simpler way to do this, which is to take RFC 1591 and just use a very truncated language here so that we then get referred back to the text. We are not repeating this. As I remember -- I mean, I'm just looking at RFC 1591, is the manager designated to -- there's a manager that supervises the domain names and operates the domain name system in that country.
	So that's from 1591.1, it doesn't mean they have to be in the country, it says basically -- it said, if a manager that supervises the domain name, and operates the domain name system in the country, in accordance with RFC 1591. Rather than going through this elaborate stuff.
Keith Davidson:	Mm-hmm. So would we gain clarity by putting a bullet point so it would read, you know, which of the trustee of the ccTLD, as the term trustee is used in RFC 1591, bullet point 1, supervises the domain name and the ccTLD, bullet point 2, operates the domain name system in the country and territory associated with the ccTLD bullet point 3, and it's listed in the IANA database of TLDs, as the manager for the ccTLD. Would that work us through it? Would that be an -- would that give us greater clarity? I mean, I think they intent is that we -- you know, what we want to do is veer away from the idea of IANA using that as descriptive like supporting organization, and use the word manager. So, I'm not sure that we need to do too much more than sort of really state that.
	Anyway, Patricio has taken the floor. So, Patricio.

Patricio Poblete:	Yeah. So, the last call my concern was with the word "supervision", I don't know if it remains or not in your proposed amended language.
Keith Davidson:	Oh. Okay. I think, because it's a -- correct me if I'm wrong, Becky, but because it's the language that's used in RFC 1591, it seems appropriate to use the word "supervisors" in the sense that, you know, it's really hard to come up with an alternative word that properly encapsulates what the manager is doing.
Patricio Poblete:	Keith?
Keith Davidson:	Yes.
Patricio Poblete:	If you look at the RFC, the words supervising or supervisor, it's used twice in the same paragraph. The first time is the first supervising the domain name space, I think I, I don't have a problem with that, with supervising the name space, that means setting up the rules and procedures for that. My worries about the second time it is used there were -- we were supposed to supervise the actual domain names. And that word might be understood as a responsibility to review each and every domain name application before granting it, and taking responsibility if a domain name is offensive or something; which is something that, of course, we have avoided getting into all this time. So that was my worry about stating this supervision duty for the actual domain. I would be okay with: supervising the domain name space.
Keith Davidson:	Okay. I think that is quite a valid point, because on the other hand, too, the domain name system includes the regulation back to IP addresses which might be, in many instances, beyond the ccTLD manager's capability as well. So, good point. And I see Becky is -- has a tick, but Becky, do you want to comment on that?
Becky Burr:	No. I actually think that's a great clarification and change. I've always been a little bit uncomfortable with the breadth of the domain name system. As the world is a little bit different, but I think -- I think that that's a really good point, and I would be very comfortable with that.
Keith Davidson:	Yeah. Is it does operate -- just, if we deleted the word "system" and had: operates the domain name in the country or territory (inaudible) of the ccTLDs, would that be sufficiently clear and--? So rather than I think, Patricio was suggesting "domain name space" something, just domain name.
Becky Burr:	Just the domain name.
Patricio Poblete:	I was just reading from the RFC.
Keith Davidson:	Yeah. I think if we say just "domain name", then it's clear that it's the ccTLD, because the ccTLD is mentioned later in the thinking. Would that--?
Becky Burr:	Isn't it the domain name space?
Keith Davidson:	We can. Okay. Yes. "Domain name space", let's go with it. I guess if it comes from 1591 it makes it even more lucid. I see Eberhard has joined, and wanting the floor, so Eberhard?
Eberhard Lisse:	Sorry about that. I just joined just now, but what is this about domain space, have I seen this in any RFC before?

Keith Davidson:	Yes. 4.3 manager, is what we are discussing. And, yes, Patricio was just reading from RFC 1591, and so where we have, currently, the wording operates the domain name system in the country and -- or territory, and Patricio was saying, you know, it's a bit of a stretch to say that "operates the domain name system" so the revision, or the suggested revision is to go back to "domain name space" which is directly lifted from 1591.
Becky Burr:	And isn't it supervisors?
Keith Davidson:	Yeah, that's supervisors.
Unidentified Participant:	Supervises the domain name space in the ccTLD.
Unidentified Participant:	By the domain, it means the TLD?
Keith Davidson:	Yeah.
Becky Burr:	Yeah.
Keith Davidson:	Well, I think the lift from RFC 1591 is, "Supervisors the domain name space in the ccTLD." Is that right?
Becky Burr:	-- I heard.
Keith Davidson:	But I think Paulos is -- I'm sorry -- Patricio is suggestion was, we are not making the change there. It's to operate domain name space in the country or territory associated with the ccTLD. So, Eberhard.
Eberhard Lisse	I quote directly, "In the case of -- as top level domains that are country codes, this means that there is a manager that supervises the domain names, and operates the domain name system in that country." I don't mind using domain name space, but then we need to define it.
Bernard Turcotte:	If I may, sir?
Keith Davidson:	Yeah. Sure.
Bernard Turcotte:	In RFC 1591 I think where we are picking that off from is 3.1; the key requirement is that for each domain name there be a designated manager for supervising that domain's name space. That's really in section 3, the only place that "space" comes up, the current word anyways.
Unidentified Participant:	So the name space for the TLD?
Eberhard Lisse:	I've just posted the exact quote onto the chat, everybody can read it.
Becky Burr:	Eberhard we were using a different section, that's what he was saying.
Eberhard Lisse:	But 3.1 yes?
Becky Burr:	No. I think -- I'm sorry -- I think Eberhard -- it is supervising that domain's name space, yes.
Unidentified Participant:	Yeah.
Bernard Turcotte:	Yeah. It is the second -- it's the second (inaudible) for the 1.

Cheryl Langdon Orr:	Sorry. Cheryl here. So the proposal then is to replace the text that we currently see on screen, with the exact language which is: supervisors, that's domain name -- domain's name space. That's -- like I said, try it now.
Keith Davidson:	Domain's name space, yeah, that -- I think that sounds right. Eberhard, is seeking the floor. Eberhard?
Eberhard Lisse:	We have never used this term, hence we need to define what that means. We need to interpret what that means, let's put it like this.
Keith Davidson:	Okay.
Eberhard Lisse:	By the way, I was okay with Martin's proposed language last time, it was shorter and simpler.
Keith Davidson:	Do we have that? I'm remembering again here, this is just drawing the conclusion that -- yeah, the term "manager" is what we would prefer to be associated with the person who -- or organization that's listed in the IANA database, this is not much more than that in terms of the glossary.
Becky Burr:	Keith?
Keith Davidson:	Yes.
Becky Burr:	Yeah, I mean -- I think that we detail this in the sections in the interpretations that we do, and I guess my proposal to shorten it down and try to refer back to 1591, which we've sort of interpreted, reduces the risk that we are going to have -- you know, that we are sort of like interpreting it again in here. And what we want to be doing is just having this as a list of terms that you go back and you look and you see, "Oh, we are not. When they talk about manager here, I understand what's going on.
Keith Davidson:	So what's your suggestion in that regard? That we just say managers, the entity, organization, enterprise government or individual which is--?
Becky Burr:	Which supervises the domain's name space, the ccTLDs may -- that those -- that country code domain's name space, in accordance with RFC 1591.
Eberhard Lisse:	I can't live with that; that means nothing. It doesn't define what name space is, and it's circular, I can't have that.
Keith Davidson:	Hmm? What would you suggest, Eberhard?
Eberhard Lisse:	Sure, it's a big question -- I have -- I can live with text if I see it front of me.
Keith Davidson:	Okay. Is there anyone who is really struggling to -- you know, is it okay? Are we hitting or just getting unnecessarily complicated by seeking to make change?
Bernard Turcotte:	I will play the placeholder for Nigel here, who says he couldn't live with: operates the domain name system in the country or territory.
Keith Davidson:	He's saying he could live, or couldn't live? I didn't quite--
Bernard Turcotte:	Could not.
Keith Davidson:	Okay.

Becky Burr:	So with it -- but how about: operates the country or territory's domain name system?
Eberhard Lisse:	No. It's not owned by the country.
Becky Burr:	Yeah. Martin has put his hand up.
Keith Davidson:	Yeah. Martin.
Martin Boyle:	The -- associated with the country was long thought and finally accepted as the way to refer to that, so the chunk -- the country or territory associated with the ccTLD was painfully one, and I think we can't go inside of that.
Keith Davidson:	Okay. Thanks.
Becky Burr:	Correct.
Eberhard Lisse:	I can live with I'm reading here. I'm not saying --
Keith Davidson:	Okay. Martin has his hand raised, so on the basis of an appropriate order. Martin, the floor is yours.
Martin Boyle:	Oh. Thanks, Keith. I'll just go back to what I said at the last call, the problem I had, or the problem I think I have, is associated with the fact that not all ccTLD managers actually operate themselves the TLD, but rather supervises operations. And I think that case is in Australia.
Becky Burr:	(Inaudible) the managers, yes.
Martin Boyle:	Yeah. And I also think that that is the case in India, But if people think that I'm wrong, I'm quite happy just to take that and at which point I can just fall in behind the text that was here originally. I didn't raise this as being, I have objections, but rather is it actually correct what we've got written down here, where three things have to apply simultaneously, whereas I think only two needed to apply, the supervision and the entry in the database. Thanks.
Keith Davidson:	Thanks, Martin. Okay. I'm not sure where that leaves us. I'm still wondering whether having -- you know, whether breaking the paragraph and having three separate bullet points, adds or confuses the issue further. Anyway, I'm not sure. Bernie, have you got any clarity from what's been discussed, or are we getting more confused?
Bernard Turcotte:	I'm slightly torn. I have not gotten more clarity. I mean, all the words that are there, are the words from RFC 1591 and no amount of wishful thinking is going to take them away. And we've been, in terms of historical perspective that this group, we've been around this one several times and, you know, we, to a certain extent I'm in line with Eberhard, and that's why this one was crafted the way it was. In that -- you know, it's just pieces of maybe grammatically imperfect, but every single piece of something in there is from RFC 1591. Now whether we go into -- and I take to Martin's point. You know, supervises domain names in the ccTLD, is one thing, we had some discussions, operates the domain name system in the country or territory is the concern.
	And Martin, quite correctly, points out that if you do a hardcore definition, operates domain name system in that country, meaning that the stuff that makes the domain -- the ccTLD work, is in the country or territory associated with the ccTLD. But where we came out on that, and maybe that's a way of coming out of this, I don't know; just a suggestion, if we keep the text the way it is, and we provide our discussions -- definitions of what we think those things mean, specifically operates the domain name system in that country,

and supervises the domain name system in the ccTLD, if we give some definitions of that relative to where we had landed with that, maybe that would help.

I don't know, I see Patricio's hand up. That's my comment.

Keith Davidson: Patricio?

Patricio Poblete: Okay. Now, as I said, my concern was the -- assuming this duty of supervising each and every domain name which might be on the throughput (ph) from the back. So I would be happy with something like, "Supervises and operates the domain name system," instead of about -- a couple of sentences.

Keith Davidson: Okay. I'm not sure that helps at all, because -- and I think Eberhard clear the problems. I wonder -- I think we are in danger of going a little bit circular on this. Maybe this is a topic we should take forward for face-to-face discussion in Singapore, and see if we can get out clarity in the face-to-face arena. And perhaps -- yeah, I think there's just too many people who've got -- who've raised individual points that we are not really able to address. So we have Eberhard, Patricio, Martin and Becky, all -- not necessarily different viewpoints, but--

Bernard Turcotte: Let's not forget Nigel.

Keith Davidson: And Nigel, yes. So perhaps we might be better, even though I wanted to nail this chat, before we go out to Singapore, I wonder if we -- perhaps if Becky and Bernie, you could work on some suggested text, and we bring that as the only unresolved piece of text to Singapore. And, yeah, debate it when we are face-to-face, I think that might be our only way out of this. So, I'm not hearing any objections, as a proposed way forward. So, can we do that?

Becky and Bernie, do you want to have a crack at new words, and get it out to the list as soon as possible that we use Singapore as the place to discuss that if -- I mean, and the list of people who want to raise it on the list around the team in Singapore.

Bernard Turcotte: I'm willing to try. Becky?

Becky Burr: Yes.

Bernard Turcotte: All right. So, there you go sir. We will be on it.

Keith Davidson: Okay. Is there anything else in the terminology paper that is still unresolved, Bernie? Bernie, I've lost you.

Bernard Turcotte: Sorry. I thought that was a general question, and not for me. As far as I'm concerned, everything is good. The only thing we have to do is finish nailing down that.

Keith Davidson: Okay. Does anyone else have any issues at all with anything else other than the manager definition? So we can consider everything except 4.3, resolved.

Becky Burr: Yeah.

Keith Davidson: Okay. And we have a way forward. So Becky and Bernie will have a look at the wording, and get something to the list, and we'll put that on the agenda for Singapore. So, if there's nothing else on terminology, I think we have agreement that the responses to the consultation is drafted by Bernie, should go to the two people who has made submission on that.

Are there any other business today? We have no future meetings scheduled other than the face-to-face meeting on Thursday the 27th of March, in Singapore. We have three hours dedicated for that meeting, but it's looking to me that we won't, necessarily, need to use all of that. And obviously the topic of manager is going to be the first item on the agenda for that meeting, but please (inaudible/audio skip)--

Becky Burr: (Inaudible)

Keith Davidson: Please consider what else you might want on the agenda for Singapore. Was there someone seeking floor? Was it Becky or Cheryl?

Becky Burr: No. It's just Becky saying, I'm back on. I mysteriously disappeared off of -- the phone just went away.

Keith Davidson: Oh. Okay. Welcome back. Okay. So I think -- and the other thing from Singapore is to determine what work is left for us, and whether we need a schedule of calls after Singapore through to London and, you know, we may be only needing calls from here on, and to consider public consultation responses, and perhaps the implementation aspects of the FOI. So I think our work is largely done. And well done everybody. And was that, I guess -- unless anyone has anything else to raise, I think we can call our meeting to a conclusion, and--

Unidentified Participant: Do we have any news on the GAC?

Keith Davidson: Oh. In terms of the GAC, I can report back that Frank has sent to the GAC our summary of the recommendations from the FOI, and has had no feedback at all from GAC members, and as early as Tuesday or Wednesday this week was going back to the GAC to make an offer for any level of consultation required between now and during Singapore, ICANN. So at this stage, the GAC seems to be either very heavy or blissfully unaware of our work. And so I think we'll find out, and certainly it's going to be the dominant topic for the upcoming ccNSO and GAC session. So, other than that, no. I'm tending to think they probably will get -- you know, we'll have some questions as we hit Singapore, so it might be useful for us not to conclude the terminology paper until we've heard more from the… but I'd like us to be reporting that we've only got one unresolved issue in terms of the terminology paper anyway.

So with that, unless anyone has anything further to raise, I'm sorry, I've lost Adobe Connect, so I'm not seeing anything on the chat.

Becky Burr: Eberhard has his hand up.

Keith Davidson: Oh. Eberhard?

Becky Burr: Down now.

Keith Davidson: No. Nobody has anything to raise?

Eberhard Lisse: Can you hear me now?

Keith Davidson: Yes. I can.

Eberhard Lisse: Okay, sorry. I was on mute. Now Kristina, (Inaudible) and Alejandra and I, we played this LUCID's Meeting today.

Keith Davidson: Oh. Okay.

Eberhard Lisse:	Yes, I think this is something you'll want to look in, this is quite sexy.
Keith Davidson:	Oh, LUCID?
Becky Burr:	It's bloody awful, Eberhard. I detest them with a passion that I can hardly express.
Eberhard Lisse:	It's quite sexy and it allows access, instead of a dialup, straight via Zip, we are in Open Source or Public software you can -- if you've got Internet connection you dial in. It's different from what we -- it's different from the way we use it, it looks different, and you don't have dial ups, but if you do it, it's cool.
Keith Davidson:	Okay. I'm pleased you think so Eberhard, but some of us have been using it in other working groups in ICANN, and all the reports I've heard is it's not good. The codex for audio quality -- don't seem to be as good and, yeah, quite a few other grumps and griddles (ph) about it. Although there are one or two people in ICANN who are advocating for it, so maybe--
Cheryl Langdon Orr:	Keith, Cheryl here. I've got a hand up on that. It's that it's a small working group, if you've got, you know, less than half-a-dozen people, it has particular benefits, I will give it that. But for larger, it's a, hmm.
Keith Davidson:	Anyway, I think for this working group we don't have a lot of work ahead of us. So I think we are coming very much to end of our work, so perhaps we should just stick with the tools that we know, and have come to have faith in along the way. But anyway, thanks for the suggestion, Eberhard, and perhaps it's one of those things that ccNSO Secretariat could give a demonstration of at some point. So other people can evaluate for other working group purposes. So thanks for bringing it to our attention, Eberhard.
Eberhard Lisse:	You're welcome.
Keith Davidson:	If nothing else. I will declare the meeting closed, and see you all in Singapore, and happy to discuss further on the list any arising issues. So thank you, all.
Becky Burr:	Thanks.
Keith Davidson:	Good day, or good night.
Kristina Nordström:	Bye.
Becky Burr:	Great.
Bernard Turcotte:	Goodbye.