

TRANSCRIPT

Framework of Interpretation Working Group Telephone Conference

23 January 2014

Attendees:

ccNSO:

Becky Burr, .us (Vice Chair)
Keith Davidson, .nz (Chair)
Chris Disspain, .au
Stephen Deerhake, .as
Dotty Sparks de Blanc, .vi

GAC:

Heather Dryden (GAC Chair)
Jayantha Fernando
Frank March
Alice Munyua
Suzanne Radell

Other Liaisons:

Maureen Hilyard, ALAC

Staff Support and Special Advisors:

Bart Boswinkel, ICANN
Kim Davies IANA
Kristina Nordström, ICANN
Bernard Turcotte, ICANN

Apologies:

Jaap Akkerhuis, ISO
Martin Boyle, .uk
Eberhard Lisse
Cheryl Langdon-Orr, ALAC
Patricio Poblete, .cl

Keith Davidson: Okay, Kristina, could we have a roll call of those present and apologies received?

Kristina Nordstrom: Yes. On the call we have Keith Davidson, Chris Disspain, Stephen Deerhake, Dottie Sparks de Blanc. From Liaisons we have Maureen Hillyard. From Staff Support and Special Advisors we have Bart Boswinkel, Kristina Nordstrom and Bernie Turcotte and Kim Davies. Apologies from Eberhard Lisse, Martin Boyle, Jaap Akerhaus and Patricio Poblete. That's all.

Keith Davidson: Okay, so there's a large number of absences that haven't entered an apology. And it sounds to me like there's only four of the ccNSO actual working group members. And it sounds like we're outnumbered by staff and advisors. But I wonder if that constitutes a quorum in terms of us being able to do anything meaningful on this call.

Unidentified Participant: What were we planning on doing, Keith?

Keith Davidson: Well, the agenda's up on Adobe Connect.

Unidentified Participant: Oh yes.

Keith Davidson: The prime objectives were to discuss the public consultation aspects of the two bits of feedback we received on revocation and to do our first read of the terminology paper. And a GAC update if we had Becky on the call who I think's the key to our next steps on the GAC, and Becky hasn't connected at this stage. So I'm a little bit concerned that we probably don't have a mandate to continue. What do others think? Should we proceed with the call?

Unidentified Participant: I think we need our lawyer.

Bernie Turcotte: Keith? If I may. I think Bart, correct me if I'm wrong, but I think we have until the 30th to reply to the public consultation submissions.

Bart Boswinkel: No, it's the other way around. As of the 30th—31st of January, the response is more for community and it's used for more or less as an extension of the public comment period. It means that on the 31st, you and I need to do a summary of the public comments received, and then we have, say, one or two weeks or one call at least to organize the response, as long as we publish the summary. So that's post 31st.

Bernie Turcotte: Okay, so we've still got—so we can delay that. And as far as the terminology document, it won't count as a first read but those that are here, given we're here, maybe we can just run through that.

Keith Davidson: For the people who have bothered to turn up for the call, I think that might be a useful use of our time just to get at least this group familiar with the document and so on. So if the meeting is comfortable, shall we just skip everything else except item 4 on the agenda and have a look at the terminology draft? And if we happen to attract some more people during the course of this call, we may revisit other agenda items very late in the meeting. But if everyone else is happy, I simply could proceed to a very quick first look just to familiarize ourselves with the terminology paper but we couldn't really count that as a reading one of it. But at least it gets our heads around it. So yes, Bernie, if you wouldn't mind, take us away on the terminology, please.

Bernie Turcotte: Okay, I will get that up on the screen.

Becky Burr: Hi. It's Becky. Sorry I'm late.

Keith Davidson: Oh hi, Becky. Welcome.

Bernie Turcotte: Just when you need a lawyer. Alright.

Becky Burr: Uh oh.

Keith Davidson: We're struggling for a quorum today, Becky. But we've decided we'll spend a bit of time having a look at Bernie's terminology paper without it counting as a first reading of it, but just to familiarize those who are on the call with where we're at. So Bernie, take it away.

Bernie Turcotte: Okay. So we've called it a lot of things. I've titled this document "Official Terminology Related to the Administration of ccTLDs." We can change that as we go along and just to show that this is a real draft, it's version 0.1 as we do quite often with these types of documents. That's a little small for me to read. Okay. So basically, background and introduction issues identified by the ccNSO DRVWG that require interpretation by the FOI Working Group terminology surrounding delegations and re-delegations. This issue was only raised in the DRVWG final report but we said we would do it in the FOI Working Group. Mandate, and then the related topics and objectives, blah, blah, blah.

So the objectives to point 1, produce a list of unique identifiers to be used for the administration of ccTLDs. And it was—I modified this a bit from what was up there because we spent a lot of time working on things that were more than just the names of things but processes also. So if we wanted to include those and I could not see why we would not, then we needed to stretch this a bit but I'll have to ask if everyone is comfortable with that, especially Becky.

Becky Burr: I believe that I am.

Bernie Turcotte: Okay. Under reserve, I'll take it.

Becky Burr: I want to read it altogether.

Bernie Turcotte: Yes. I'll know that. Applicable policy statements and guidelines on terminology, I don't think there are any. Defining that we have to use a certain terminology, obviously there is terminology that is used in both RSC1591 and the GAC principles. So I just dived into the subject. I classified them alphabetically for simplification. And what I've done is I've gone through all the documents we've published so far and listed the things that seem to be useful. So the first one that came up was consent or delegation or transfer of a ccTLD. Consent must be specific, informed, unambiguous, affirmatively communicated and freely given. So that was directly listed from the consent document and you've got the references there from RSC1591. And FOI consent, that was listed from section 7141. Any questions on consent? Hearing none, I will take it there are none and move on.

Delegation 421. Definition—the process by which the IANA operator initially assigns management responsibility or transfers previously assigned responsibility for the management of a ccTLD. And that is from section 411 of the FOI working group public consultation on revocation. Any questions, thoughts, comments?

Keith Davidson: Doesn't appear to be.

Bernie Turcotte: I don't see any hands or anything else so we'll keep moving. Manager 4.3. Definition—the entity, whether an organization, enterprise, government or individual which is the trustee of the ccTLD (as the term is used in RSC1591) supervises the domain names in the ccTLD, it operates the domain names system in the country or territory associated with the ccTLD, and is listed in the

IANA database of ccTLD as the manager for the ccTLD. And I've got the two references we usually attach to these things here. In RSC1591, the term Trustee is used to describe the manager's duty to serve the community, and not to describe the specific legal relationship of the manager to the delegated domain. IANA currently uses the sponsoring organization instead of manager. And then on this one I've included a few qualifiers, incumbent manager, same as manager, however, the terms is useful in differentiating from the proposed manager in applications or transfer. Proposed manager, blah, blah, blah. Okay, and the references are there from RSC1591 3.1 and 3.2, and FOI Working Group consent section 7121. So any questions, thoughts on Manager?

Keith Davidson: I'm particularly interested, Kim Davies is on the call, and Kim, I'm particularly interested if any of these present any issues to you from an actual day-to-day use for IANA. So please feel free to voice your opinions along the way.

Kim Davies: Will do. I have to admit, I'm not in front of a computer right now so I'm not tracking the wording as closely as I could be.

Keith Davidson: Again, this is just an informal and not a formal first reading but—

Kim Davies: Sure.

Keith Davidson: But your opinion, just in terms of the overarching aspects of it would be valuable in case we're heading down any wrong tracks.

Kim Davies: Of course.

Keith Davidson: Okay. No one else is seeking the floor so please continue, Bernie.

Bernie Turcotte: Thank you, sir. So that would conclude section 4.3. Section 4.4 Revocation. 4.4.1 Definition, the process by which an IANA operator rescinds responsibility for the management of a ccTLD from an incumbent manager. And that's from the FOI public consultation on revocation and I actually don't have anything else on that. Is there anyone that has any questions, thoughts or comments on that?

Keith Davidson: Doesn't appear to be.

Bernie Turcotte: Okay. Moving on to section 4.5 Significantly Interested Parties or SIP. Definition, significantly interested parties include but are not limited to A, the government or territorial authority for the country or territory associated with the ccTLD, and B, any other individuals, organizations, companies, associations, educational institutions or others that have a direct material legitimate and demonstrable interest in the operation of the ccTLD. The references are section 3.4 of RSC1591 which talks about significantly interested parties, and from the FOI Working Group SIP document 7.1.1 from which this section was essentially lifted. Questions, comments? I see no hands, I hear nothing so we'll move it on.

Section 4.6 Stakeholders. Stakeholders encompass significantly interested parties, interested parties and other parties referenced in RSC1591. And if you'll remember, when we were going through this, we actually have to wrap our head around the idea of stakeholders. And so I thought it was important to capture that and refer to it. So there it is. Any questions, thoughts on stakeholders?

Moving right along.

Keith Davidson: Not everybody's (inaudible).

Bernie Turcotte: 4.7.

Keith Davidson: Everybody's very happy with (inaudible).

Bernie Turcotte: Pardon me? Yes, we should keep it to this size. It would work really well. 4.7 Transfer from an incumbent ccTLD manager to a proposed manager. Definition, reassignment of the incumbent manager's role as trustee for the ccTLD as the term is used in RSC1591 to the proposed manager including, without limitation, changing the entry in the IANA database. So RSC1591 the trustee thing again. The term, redelegation, there's sort of a note under section 4.7.1.2. The term redelegation and unconsented redelegation are widely used by the stakeholder community when describing the reassignment of a ccTLD manager. Given there is no reference to the term redelegation in RSC1591, and that there is no policy basis for an unconsented redelegation, the FOI Working Group recommends that the use of the term redelegation be dropped. So this was something we've talked about but is not written, and I tried to capture that in that point and I'll be glad to take direction on that. And below that we've got the various references from RSC1591 section 2, section 6, the GAC principles 2005, and FOI Working Group consent section 7.1.2.1. Any questions, thoughts or comments?

Keith Davidson: Nobody's jumping for the floor again so please continue, Bernie.

Bernie Turcotte: We've actually done it. It's done.

Keith Davidson: Gosh. I can't believe we can read a seven-page document in that time. So any general discussion in terms of the direction of this paper and how it will be used by IANA going forward? Any questions or observations? Stephen's just saying in chat room that he's in a public library so obviously he's not allowed to make noise in the library so any questions he has will be through the chat. No other questions or comments? Well, I think I've just noted in the chat too that I think we should continue with the transcript of this call and then I'll put a message on the working group list to urge them to read the transcript so they can be equally caught up with play so that we can start with a better-informed position on our next call.

I'm not sure if there's anything else we can expect to do today. Does anyone have any topical or issues they want to raise?

Bernie Turcotte: Sir.

Keith Davidson: Yes.

Bernie Turcotte: Maybe we can just recap the timeline between now and Singapore given this is rather short, and we can look at some of the work we've got to do. Maybe that will be helpful for everyone if we capture this.

Keith Davidson: Okay. Well, we have three meetings scheduled between now and face-to-face in Singapore that's on February 6th, February 20th, and March 6th. I'm taking that even though this group is a small group, if there had been arising significant issues in terms of the terminology, I'm sure we would have encountered them today. So my guess is we can probably get through the terminology paper in two readings. So February 6th, February 20th and maybe have it available for any final edits and bits and pieces by March 6th which might allow us the opportunity to have it out for consultation before ICANN Singapore. Would that be right, Bart?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. That shouldn't be too much of a problem. I think we've got the format of, say, the public consultation document et cetera. And I think by the next call we should have a summary, and maybe with some suggested or non-suggested changes, so with the draft analysis available as well for the working group

members. So that chapter could be closed and finalized. So the chapter on Revocation.

Keith Davidson: And nobody's commented on the list yet about the proposed responses from Bernie but I think the responses are probably going to be down the right track as well. So thanks for taking the lead on that too, Bernie. So the public consultation is tracking okay. The terminology paper will track okay. The GAC we still owe some—well, we still need some dialog with the GAC about the comments on two papers, I think. And I think we're hoping to have a webinar for the GAC members prior to ICANN Singapore, or at least offer them the opportunity for a webinar. So I'm not sure how that's progressed. I think, Chris, you were talking to the GAC chair on this. Has anything transpired?

Becky Burr: I'm going to just out myself because it's all my fault. I owe Chris an update.

Keith Davidson: Okay. Okay. Well, perhaps you and Chris, Becky could use the time that was going to be used for this call to have a catch-up after we conclude this meeting. Bart his hand raised, anyway. So Bart.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. Yes. Relating to the webinar, just as a reminder, if the working group decides and say, if there is agreement to do it, we've better schedule it rather sooner than later given the—we need a couple of GAC members to attend the webinar and they have probably a full schedule, anyway. And it takes some time to organize it.

Keith Davidson: Okay. Yes, indeed. So that probably becomes the immediate priority for the working group and so, Chris and Becky, could we ask you to assess that as the highest priority and let's see if we can get something rolling in the next few days? I think we'll be struggling to do much with GAC unless we can get something sort of firm before the end of January. So could we consider that a hard deadline and do you think, Becky and Chris?

Becky Burr: Yes. It's good by me.

Keith Davidson: Cool.

Bart Boswinkel: I just set an hour and a half back to I can finish what I was doing.

Keith Davidson: Okay. And Chris is saying in the chat, yes, and he'll see Suzanne within ten days. So that's cool. Okay. And Chris also adds so will I. And that's absolutely right, obviously, and Suzanne in Los Angeles in the first week of February. That will be at least prior to the February 6th call and so that—I may have to apologize for that meeting. I'm scheduled to be heading back from Los Angeles that day and I'm not sure of my exact arrival and flight times. So Becky, I hope you are available for that call just in case I can't make it and you would need to take the chair.

Becky Burr: I am.

Keith Davidson: Cool. Okay. Is there anything else that we can transact today? If not, we'll call this a very short informal meeting and call it concluded at 30 minutes after the hour. So thank you for those who have bothered to turn up and I will send a message to the list expressing my disappointment to those who didn't apologize and didn't attend. And hopefully stimulate some participation for the next call. Okay with that, thank you all very much and have a pleasant day, evening, night.

Unidentified Participant: Alright. Thanks, everyone.

Unidentified Participant: Bye bye.

Unidentified Participant: Cheers.

Unidentified Participant: Bye.