
MARRAKECH – ccNSO: Retirement of ccTLDs PDP Working Group

Monday, June 24, 2019 – 09:00 to 12:00 WET

ICANN65 | Marrakech, Morocco

BART BOSWINKEL:

-- more details about the exception and reserve and what it means. And again there will be a breakout session for that one and it's more about thinking of how to tweet and the exception and reserve based on your thinking to date and what you've heard from the presentations, so that's around the coffee. Then the next part of the agenda will be this stress testing, and this is about the scenario building on stress testing, what we'll do, what type of scenarios you have in mind to test the policy process against these cases, and just to check the policy, whether it's robust enough to deal with the cases you think of. Again, what we'll do is again breakout session, see the flip charts, and report to the whole group on it.

Finally, if we do have time, but it's probably relevant, is to discuss briefly what the group wants to report to the members, that's tomorrow, so we need to update the slide deck from the previous meeting, and then next meeting and AOB. Next meeting the tentative date, no time yet, is the 18th of July, so that's in 3 weeks, Thursday in 3 weeks. I think 2 weeks is too short to do anything. Maybe reconvene after the 18th of July and the objective of that session is just to share with you again

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.

the results of today's meeting and we'll reconvene probably at the end of August, given the seasonal breaks everywhere, but at least that we capture what has been discussed during this meeting and everybody is aware. So, that's the agenda for today. Any questions, comments before we convene? I'll hand back to Stephen. Does that look reasonable to you? Okay. Yeah, we have issues with Zoom. Okay, Stephen, back to you.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Bart, I love delegating stuff. Given that we have Zoom up and running again and recording, I'd like to formally restate that this is a face-to-face meeting in the PDP Working Group for Retirement of ccTLDs, for the transcript record. I want to thank everyone for coming today. I would first of all like to address the comments on the lists that appeared since our last teleconference subsequent to posting of Bernard's last draft of the basic policy document, and I want to acknowledge...

BART BOSWINKEL: If you're joining Zoom, turn off the speakers on your computer, that's the feedback we're getting.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, I was wondering where that was coming from. I just want to acknowledge and thank everyone for their participation in that discussion thread. I realize that there are still some last minute issues that have come to light from Kim, Peter, and Nigel and from Patricio, and I thank everyone for their contributions. I do want to acknowledge that for the moment as I described on the last call and again in my note to the list, other than for a few typos that have been corrected in the latest and greatest version, we're considering this document as pretty much locked down at this point in time, but at the same time as I say that, I want to acknowledge to everyone that the issues that have been raise on the lists will not be discarded along the way, they will be duly recorded, summarized by Staff, that summary we'll put back out to the list for verification that we didn't leave anything behind. We'll further post that on the Wiki so for transparency's sake it's publicly out there with the promise from the Chair that we will be coming back to those issues when we circle back around to this document, as we will be doing further down the road. So, that's my comment on that. Yes, Nick.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Can I just be clear, because although I've read this document now time and time, and time again, every time I read it I notice, oh, maybe that wording could be slightly better or clearer. Is it

that the end of the discussion process? I'm assuming there is some final read through for consistency, wording, terminology, readability, overall polish, or is that after the comment period? I'm not quite sure about how the timing goes.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: We will have another go at it, so yeah. There are some inconsistencies, I know Kim has pointed out a few things that look trivial on the surface, but actually we really need to tighten it up in the final go around, and we'll be doing that, I make that commitment to the group, that we will be doing that. Sorry, Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL: Maybe to add to that, Nick, as you can see, today's agenda is just adding new material to the document, so you have to go through it anyway before you make it public, so this is not going to stand alone.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Thank you, that's kind of exactly my point in a nutshell. We keep adding to it and slightly refining it, and so I don't want to have inefficient read through again, read through again, read through

again. At one point, once all of the substantive parts are in, it's worth the final read through.

BART BOSWINKEL: And I think that's the stage we're at, or the working group is at right now, so it's time to start focusing on other parts.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Okay, thank you.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you Bart, thank you Nick. Moving on, I'd like to note for the record that Kimberly Carlson is not available today, and as a result, Joke will be wearing multiple hats, both running slides when required and also being a real-time scribe, capturing the points made during this discussion. So I just want to point out to the group, we need to be kind to her, because she's going to be very busy today for the next few hours, and I want to thank her, as well.

I also note, to my right corner of the table seems to be rather weighted with Board members, a couple of which are members, one is not. I want to thank them all for attending, because I know they're very busy and I hope they can contribute, and I hope they're not just looking for new material for their standup

activities, but we'll find out as the meeting progresses. And with that, I don't have any other things I don't think I need to present at the moment. Let me double check with Bart and Bernard. I think we're good. I assume we have Zoom operational because I see a blank screen, so I'm not quite sure what's going on there. Remote participation is in order? Joke, can you comment, please?

JOKE BRAEKEN: Apologies, remote participation is in order, to the remote participants can see the slide deck that I'm sharing, we're just working on making it being displayed correctly here in the room. Thank you.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you. Bart, how do you want to proceed? We don't have slides in the room.

BART BOSWINKEL: We don't need the slides. The next agenda point would be the review of the decision table and going through it again, and then a breakout session identifying the decisions which are subject to the review mechanism. What we could do, so, Joke, how long does it take, there we are...

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Okay, is this going to be stable? Because I was thinking we could wing it and switch things around a bit.

BART BOSWINKEL: Otherwise, we could do, maybe we skip this one because you need the presentation, we go to the exception and reserve as the next item, because that's separate.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: That's what I was thinking, having our guest speakers go through there, okay, alright, we'll do that. As you've heard, there is a slight revision in the order of presentation today due to the technical issues we are having with Zoom and waiting for that to stabilize. Okay, given that we have Zoom back, it looks like, and it's stable, we're going to proceed with the agenda as outlined previously, and I turn it over to Bart. Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL: As you may recall, and for those of you how haven't attended, please lock into Zoom. The working group has been discussing a list of decisions identified throughout the process that was defined by the working group. These decisions are listed here. The main questions for the working group was are these

decisions the ones, or is the list complete, or is it over-complete, say, do we need to strike some of the decisions, or need to add some? So, if you can scroll down, Joke. Thank you. And then the second around it was a question, who takes the decision and is there oversight involved?

And this goes back to, if you look, for example, at the decisions around delegation and transfers, there is a clear separation between the role of PTI and decisions they take and the role and the decisions of the ICANN Board of Directors. The question is whether this with retirement you want to have a similar separation of powers with regard to decision making as with delegation and transfers, and then the other question is related, so that's more in the-relation between PTI or the IFO and ICANN, then the other question is, which of these decisions should be subject, if any, to a review mechanism? And the review mechanism is to be developed in the next stage.

So, for example, I think in the text of the process document there is at least one decision already more or less indicated as being subject to the review mechanism, that is the one on the extension, or not granting the extension based on the retirement plan. There clearly was a point in time where however it's structured between PTI and the ICANN Board, that final decision should be subject to the review mechanism to be developed.

So, these are the questions in front that the working group has been looking at since the last two meetings. Can you scroll down please, again, Joke. Scroll down further to the table. There is some text there, scroll down, scroll down, there is a table, there we go, scroll down to the table, further, yes.

So what you see here is a list of decisions and I'll scroll back for the breakout sessions to the list of decisions so you can have a look at it. What you see here is a list, so Naela was kind enough to fill in some of the decision making, who should take that decision, and then the next one is, is there oversight or who should take the decision. Scroll down, you can see it, and then the question is it is subject to review mechanism. And for this exercise what we want to do is at least -- we do have flip charts -- that we go to the list of decisions, so that's 12 decisions, and for each decision you discuss among the different groups which is subject or is it a decision that should be taken, should be included and identified as such. Secondly, who is taking the decision, is there oversight, so that's respecting the relation between PTI and the ICANN Board of Directors. And thirdly, should it be subject to a review mechanism. So, these are the three questions for the 12 decisions identified.

Can you scroll back up, Joke? A little bit more. And what is important, as well, so identifying this is one, scroll up a little bit

more, through the list of decisions. There we are, a little bit more, yep, that's the one, the 12 decisions. So if you say what is important as well, please provide a rationale why you think it should be subject or it should not be subject to the review mechanism and around the decision making itself. Because I think that is something that will underpin the results of the sessions. Is this clear? Are there any questions?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Allan?

ALLAN MACGILLIVRAY: Actually, we were just looking for that document, is it just in the meeting for today?

BART BOSWINKEL: It's the Google doc that has been circulating quite some time now.

ALLAN MACGILLIVRAY: Was it recirculated?

BART BOSWINKEL: No, I can recirculate it right now if you want to.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: We'll get that to you presently, then.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Stephen, so we're going to do the discussion on this in the breakout, is that right?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: That's correct. And I'm going to assign groups by having people count down 1 to 4. And I think I'll start up in the upper right hand corner. Okay, we now need to designate which board is which, I'm going to say the one that Bart's at now is number 1, that one in that corner is number 2, the one behind me in the corner is number 3, and this one over here is number 4. Alright, if you guys can assemble at your various boards, yes, we need to get the 12 criteria back on the screen. This will be a 20 minute exercise, assuming we can get Zoom to cooperate with us. I apologize again for the issues we're having with Zoom, they're beyond my control, it's the first meeting I've dealt with since we went to Zoom where we've had any issues. So, what can I say. Alright guys, 20 minutes, and we'll see what we can come up with. Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL: Please identify already somebody who will report back.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yes, if you would, select among your groups someone who will do the reporting back to the group afterwards as we have done in prior face-to-face meetings. Thank you. With regard to the observers, if you wish to participate, self select to a group. Again, with regard to observers, if they wish to participate in this discussion, and you're more than welcome to, self select to a group. Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL: Ten more minutes. If you will take your seats, be back in your seats at 10 am that's fine, so it's now 12 minutes to 10:00, so 10 minutes.

Five more minutes, and please assign somebody who will report back to the whole group.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you everyone, we're procuring a roaming mic for the presenters for each group to their boards, and I believe that Group 2 was the last to finish up, and therefore I think Group 2 gets to go first. So, whoever the spokesman is for Group 2. Thank you Allan.

ALLAN MACGILLIVRAY: I'm sorry, we didn't quite get through everything because Nigel was part of our group.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: You get points for that one. Can you hold the mic closer? Much better.

ALLAN MACGILLIVRAY: So, really, our process was to flip it. So what we did, we looked at the decisions to decide which of those was an exercise in discretion, that was the process, the who was always IFO, and then when we got to oversight, that's where we had a bit of a debate and I'll see if I can summarize this fairly. We saw the existing process that is used for delegations as the example for what oversight could look like, and tried to answer the question, would we like a similar process in respect of certain decisions. So with that in mind, we looked at the decisions in which there would be an exercise of discretion on the part of the IFO, and in that case we found, I'll take the first one for example, there is no discretion on the decision to send a notice of retirement, therefore we saw no need for oversight of that, it's a factual issue.

So the first example of the exercise of discretion was #7, which was a decision to agree to a retirement plan, so we felt that there should be oversight of that. The next one was #9, no, #9 is not necessary. And then we had a problem with phraseology of #11. We feel, in fact, #11 should be phrased, "a decision that the retirement plan has been breached," rather than the way it is now, because that's the exercise of discretion and we don't have that as one of the decisions. So, I think it's best to either add another one or to rephrase #11, because it's the decision that there has been a breach of the plan. And finally we saw everything as being subject to appeal. Is that fair, Desiree? Eberhard?

EBERHARD LISSE:

We noticed #11 too, the decision to return to the initial five year period is not listed in our policy, so I don't think the question has any there. The idea is what we don't, have decided yet what happens if there is a breach, but the decision that there is somebody in breach should be reviewable.

ALLAN MACGILLIVRAY:

Exactly, exactly. Are there any other questions? Naela?

NAELA SARRAS: Yeah, so Allan, looking at the questions again, I think it was #8 that we wanted to say has oversight from the Board, not #7. So #8 being the one where it's actually going through the retirement process. But I'm not 100% sure because I can't read that very good from here.

ALLAN MACGILLIVRAY: I have to say I agree that we didn't get enough time to discuss those. Personally, not representing the group, I think it should be #7 and #8, but we'll see what others have to say on that point.

NAELA SARRAS: Fair enough, thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL: Thanks Allan. Further questions for Allan? If not, maybe Peter #1?

PETER KOCH: Yeah, thank you. Surprisingly we were facing similar issues that Group #2 found. First of all, with the initial one, disjunction between the statement of the fact and then determination whether there is a response and so on and so forth, needs to be

separated, and again, the IANA functions operator, there's always the entity making a decision or finding...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Can you hold the mic a little closer? Thank you.

PETER KOCH: Okay, thank you. So the determination of an external, the trigger from the [inaudible] agency or finding out that the requirement has been met or has failed to be met within the required date, that's up to the IANA functions operator. Same as Group #2, we were thinking about oversight or appeals mechanisms and going back and forth, but it was not reasonable to design these on the fly. There is definitely a need for looking into this. Another example is #2, we didn't really like the word, "decree", declaration or something. We find the IANA functions operator finds a situation, finds a precondition met or not, and then declares that that is their finding, rather than issuing a decree by their own power that now the earth is flat, or something to that extent.

We had a bit of difficulty understanding the difference between #3 and #7, but we want to rate that in context of the proposed policy, it wasn't clear to us why they were listed as separate entities. I think that's basically it. We shortly thought about

what should be subject to external oversight, not explicitly saying who that should be, because that's the usual can of worms we would open, but Žarko I didn't recall what you said, it was only two or three items, I think we were #7, to that extent, again, that needs a bit more thought, also how these items on the list interact with each other. But there is no other entity involved making declarations than the IANA functions operator in our reading, and also nobody in the group felt that there should be additional items on the list, so it looked very much complete. However, wherever there is a conjunction in the wording, like in sentence #1, this should be clarified, either split out or stroke out for more clarity.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Any questions for Peter? Seeing none, thank you, Peter. Let's go to Group #3.

BRENT CAREY: Our group was pretty similar, actually, except for unlike Allan, we actually had a lot more no's around the appeals. So, just working top to bottom, we had IANA pretty much along every column, as well. Ones that we sort of tripped up on a bit were #3, where we thought #3 and #4 possibly could be merged because again we got into this discussion about if something is

passed, is that an appealable decision, or are you just noting that period has ended, so what are you actually appealing? And so we talked a little bit around extensions. Also, for the special transfer one, #5, we wanted to also note that there are often existing processes for what goes to the Board for noting, so where possible to use those existing IANA processes, especially if there was a special circumstance transfer.

Like Peter said, we were a bit confused in our group around #7 and #3, we thought they were a bit repeatable and at #10, we thought #9 and #10 could possibly just be merged as well to talk about whether the period has passed. Also, for us at the end of everything is the one almighty appeal process about the decision and then what would that look like? Is that a fair summary, Group #3? Okay, the appealable retirement plan approval, the decision extension, the special transfer, and the retirement plan breaching we all said were appealable. But for everything else we either had a 'no' or question mark.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Brent. Are there questions for Brent?

BARRACK OTIENO: Barrack Otieno for the record. I still don't understand why you don't think an appeal is necessary, because this process is more like a workflow.

BRENT CAREY: The discussion we had was that the ones that were not appealable were more like observable facts, like a certain amount of time had elapsed, so there wasn't anything material to that part of the process that was subject to debate, either five years had passed or it hadn't. So, we reserved the appeal for things where Staff will be making some kind of subjective decision that might contain some kind of error, whereas Staff might make an error in calculating the year or something like that, but generally speaking, factual, objective, and it should be fairly straightforward to administer.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Allan?

ALLAN MACGILLIVRAY: Yes, Allan Macgillivray. The view as expressed in my group by me, supported by me, which is, I would prefer to have an appeal based -- where there is contention, I prefer to have an appeal on the substance of the contention, because one can expect to

have an appeal about whether the contention is indeed subject to appeal. So I look at it from the point of view you're probably going to get an appeal anyway, so let's just have the debate on the merits rather than on the procedure or question at the outset.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Allan. I think we have Nigel next.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yeah, thanks. Just to comment on what Kim said. On a procedural basis somebody who is affected by a decision, even if the decision is a decision to send out a letter, such as a the five years have expired, they could send out the letter when the five years haven't expired, and that's a mistake, so there must be some form of recourse in the event of a mistake. Now, that can be just simply a matter of writing back to the decision makers, saying you made a factual error. But sometimes, and I'm not expecting this happened in IANA, but sometimes in organizations decision makers refuse to accept they've made a mistake so you have to have the ability to say okay, want an internal review from a different decision maker to just double check that you've made the factual assessment correctly. So there has to be something of the nature of an internal review,

but certainly not necessarily of the import of an IRP style appeal mechanism.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Eberhard?

EBERHARD LISSE: I don't think we need checking whether factual assessment is correct, we need checking on if there is disagreement on whether this is the case. If both sides agree on something wrong, it's fine with me.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Eberhard. Bernard?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yeah, and I think in the group when we had the discussion, that was why we noted in point #10 that as Brent mentioned, there is regardless of conditions before a ccTLD is removed, there is a right to appeal, it's the governor's call right before you walk down death row, if you will, so that should be the catchall in case there is some sort of question.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Okay, thank you for that. Are there anymore questions on Group #3's proposal? Seeing none, I will turn the mic over to the Group #4 presenter.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Thank you. I don't think we've got much original to add, but I'll say what we came up with. We didn't really talk about whether it's the IFO or the IANA functions operator whose decisions are subjective to this appeal or review process, but I think it was assumed that it was in all cases the IFO is the body whose decisions are going to challenged or overturned or reviewed in some way. We similarly thought that some of the issues on the list could be put together in the same category, so for example #3, 4, and 7 are all about whether or not the retirement plan is satisfactory and the extension given and whether or not it's agreed to by the IFO, and effectively that's all part and parcel of the same issue, and clearly one which would be reviewable or appealable, because that's subjective or disagreement on the merits of whether or not the plan is good enough.

I think it was Group #2, where we talked about things like whether or not a two letter code is removed from the IFO list isn't really a subjective point upon which people could disagree, and therefore want an appeal, either it is or it isn't, and so that should be obvious. But we did have a bit of a discussion I think,

as well, about supposing the IFO mistakenly sends a retirement initiation letter when the two letter code has not been taken out and whether that ought to be theoretically within the scope.

We also talked a bit about how it's not that straightforward to talk about this when we don't know what the appeal review mechanism actually is, and that creates a little bit of uncertainty in our discussion. We agreed that things like the decision on the administrative transfer, the decision on what the timeline for extension, and so that's #5 and 6, would be subject to appeal. Similarly #8 and #11, which is following the agreement of an extension whether or not the registry operator has fulfilled its commitments made in its retirement plan and what the sanctions are if it has not, and presumably you get your extension on the basis of a plan.

You don't follow through with your commitments, then maybe perhaps your extension would be rescinded and you would go back to the default 5 year period, and any argumentation about that. We did observe that as worded within the policy, this isn't something the policy actually touches on and so maybe it should, or that I think was suggested previously, that point #11 should be rephrased slightly. So in summary, #1 and 2, #9 and 10, we saw this fairly sort of mechanistic objective dates and other data points which aren't really going to be in debate and

probably not within the scope of the appeal mechanism, but the other things ought to be.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you Nick. Are there any questions for Nick on what they came up with? Bart, do you have something?

BART BOSWINKEL: Thank you very much, I think if you go back, this is very helpful when we take it to the next step. We'll summarize this and put it in the usual way to capture it, circulate it on the list, outline document, and maybe even look at the process itself to insert it somewhere. I know it's on my to do list for quite some time. But now we do have some more meat on the bones to do this. So, expect this by the next meeting, the summary of the results, et cetera. Thank you.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you Bart. I want to thank everyone for their participation, I think this was a very useful exercise, and I think we made some serious progress. As Bart said, Staff has got some work to do to try to pull all this together. I have no doubt that by the next teleconference call we'll have some systematic presentation of this for further discussion. I think we can close this particular

part of this face-to-face meeting, and that will allow us to move on to the next portion, which is discussion of exceptional reserve two letter names. And as I alluded to in my introductory remarks, on the last teleconference we were hoping to have at least one guest speaker so to speak to briefly present on this exceptional reserve issue and it turns out we now have two.

Our first speaker will be Jaap to give us a very brief walk through, explaining exceptional reserve, not all are the same, and he may have some perhaps additional news about the maintenance agency and the direction they are going in, which will be useful to us. And that will be followed up by also a brief presentation by Nick with some thoughts about UK and its position/role in the exceptional reserve. So, if I can turn it over to Jaap, the floor is yours. Thank you.

JAAP AKKERHUIS:

Hi, Jaap Akkerhuis for the record. First, news from the MA meeting, there was a working group meeting a couple weeks ago in Montreal and working group #2, the owner of the standard had its meeting and the result called for a new standard. The standard is going to be replaced by a new version, it's due to do that for a long time according to IFO rules, but it never happened. IFO systems are due to review every three years and it might be that meeting says fine, let's continue, or let's redo it.

And [inaudible] is pretty old and really needs to have some adaptations. The other thing is that IFO rules and now they're trying to combine all parts of the standards into one part, and that is major overhaul for IFO. So, the compromise was just to review and a small overhaul of all three parts separately.

The working group has decided that the draft is ready for the whole technical committee and that is yet another 3 months of consultations and other stuff, and then there is a 3 month holding period, just the day before Christmas, all those periods will end, so then will be new official standard if there is no delay during the process. There is new terminology definitions, strong clarifications, but not a lot, because these are going to get some basic discussions in the technical committee itself. What will happen in December after this gets published, immediately a new round will start with the standard and actually then the standards will be merged and the terminology will be re-discussed completely. It might be that some of the terminology completely disappears, like exceptional reservations, and things like that. So, that's the news from the IFO. Any questions about that?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Jaap, appreciate that. Are there any questions for Jaap?

PETER KOCH: Just one clarifying question. In previous discussions it turned out that while the exceptional reserve list is not really part of the standard, but it's kind of an MA internal thing that got published by probably the decision of the MA rather than the MA being instructed by the standard. Has anything changed in that new version?

JAAP AKKERHUIS: No, no, nothing has changed. But it might be changed in the next revision, that's what I'm saying.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Jaap. Bernard, you had a question?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Alright, so to summarize, this new change that will be implemented at the beginning of next year, we'll have few changes, but they will be starting the process where we expect there will be changes in the round after that.

JAAP AKKERHUIS: After the new one gets published, which is probably going to be January, the working group #2, not MA, but working group #2

will actually start with a new project, taking a critical look on all the different definitions in the terminology and so on. But that might be a process which could take a couple years. So, to be in time for the next official review.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Jaap. Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL: This is just your personal and subjective assessment? Are there core definitions within the standard that you expect to remain the same over that process and some are more subject to change? What's your sense. And if so, does it mean maybe that's something to discuss at a later stage. We are building on some of the terminology, this working group is building on some of the terminology, which we hope is reasonably stable like the sign code, et cetera, will that remain the same, is that your expectation, or will that change again?

JAAP AKKERHUIS: I expect the things which are properly really high within the standard, like a code is assigned or not, will stay the same. But with more murky definitions which also differ from the parts of the standard somewhat, that will be a hard look at, that might

change. It might be that for instance all the reservations classifications will be removed and it will be only a reservation list, that's one possibility. The other thing that will also change, and that's starting at the same time, is the term of reference for the MA, which is a completely separate process, and that might cause that way some of the terminology is interpreted by the MA changes as well. So the new version, I won't be surprised if things will change unexpectedly.

BART BOSWINKEL:

The reason for asking is that this group should stick to the real core terminology as much as possible and move away as we have done to date from whatever unclear definitions under your guidance. Okay, thanks.

JAAP AKKERHUIS:

Yes, and that's actually the MA itself or some members of the MA, we do know that the murky definitions are there, and so they want to get rid of it themselves, as well. Because it all the time shows the problems, not only with TLDs but also with other users. It's a source of confusion everywhere, so that's why a lot of cleaning up will help that. There might of course in the new version be new things popping up, but that's part of it, I mean, I'm part of the working group too, so I only see just a little bit for

what's going on there, and that's only because I keep on asking questions.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Jaap. Thank you Bart for the question. I've got Peter followed by Kim. Did you have your hand up Peter? Okay, then Kim.

KIM DAVIES: I have another subjective question. In your best estimation, what's the lead time we have between when there's a new draft or a new version of the standard that would be impactful in our work to when the actual repository would be altered and implemented? Are we talking days, months, longer?

JAAP AKKERHUIS: Given the current schedule for working group 2, revision takes at least nine months. And that's when there is just a small change. I think the next revision will take about two years.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you Kim, thank you Jaap. Are there any further questions? Alright, seeing none, Nick, you're up next.

BART BOSWINKEL: We go now into the meat of the discussion, the exceptional reserve. So, Jaap has the second part, this was just introduction and the MA. Go ahead, Jaap.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Sorry about that, we switched things.

JAAP AKKERHUIS: First, exceptional reserve is also for the MA, which is an exception to whatever the rules are in the terms of reference or in the standard. It is really something which doesn't really fit anything. This is exception to whatever the rules are. It actually shows in the motivation by exceptional reserve. There are about 12 at this moment and I've got them listed here, but you can find them on the [inaudible] database just as easy, but I've listed here on paper. So, alphabetical order. AC, Ascension Island. Ascension Island is actually part of St. Helena which is top level domain and it is subdivision of St. Helena. But it is kind of a long way from way the major island is, and so it is on the request of the UPU, the international postal organization, it is placed on the special list, so this why it's there and it's there from the beginning. It is on the reserve list apparently on request of the ITU.

To be honest, I probably might be able to find out even more about it by diving in the archives, but that takes a long time, so I didn't have time to do that., but if there are auxiliary questions I might find it, or not, because not all the archive is actually dead. Diego Garcia, DG, is also on the reserve list on request of the ITU. I don't understand either why the ITU wants to have counterculture, because they only do numbers, as far as I know.

Then EA. We were talking about EA last night, as well. It refers to Ceuta, the Spanish part of Morocco, not far from here. It's actually reserved at the request of World Customs Organization, a completely different organization, but sometimes they actually, that's actually how some of them got their own codes as well, due to some customs regulation.

Then we have EU; the EU has been reserved a couple times and the definition has been sharpened over time. Originally it was requested by IFO 3166 maintenance agency and 4217, that's for having the URL, because you realize that all the [inaudible] have a two character code, so the EUR, I think it's R, I forget, it's kind of the European ruble. So that's how it got reserved. And then policy started to come up. IFO-6166 is the standard for securities and other financial instruments. They have a numbering system called ICE and in the end a footnote was placed that it also might used for anybody who wants to denote

the territory and that's kind of why ICANN made an exception to their rules and actually put it into the DNS.

There is EZ, which is also for Europe. It is for the counting derivatives also part of the 6166. It is special because actually it's fairly recent, a couple of reasons. ISIN is changing the way they do encoding and they needed a temporary code for Europe and actually it is going to disappear whenever they're done, but that's special.

Then we've got FX, that's one of the two that actually has territory connected to it. FX is for French Metropolitan, which is the European part of France, so it doesn't include islands in the Mediterranean, it's just the European part. It is there, it's never used, and I don't know why it's there.

IC, the Canary Islands, again on the request of the World Customs Organization, but it's actually not really used for anything.

The next one is the famous SU, which is still territory of the USSR, and it refers to the former USSR and it got reserved at the request of the Foundation of Internet Development. It's kind of weird that it got promoted or changed status from the standard reserve list.

The next one is TA, Tristan da Cunha, which is reserved on the request of the Universal Postal Union, it is also part same as .hc, part of St. Helena, subdivision, but it's yet another couple thousand miles from the mainland.

The next one is pretty recent, UK; UK refers to the United Kingdom and it is reserved at the request of the United Kingdom. How it came to be a top level domain is actually a completely different story. As far as I remember it was a top level domain before it got reserved, and it's got an interesting story attached to it. In the early 80s when the first top level domains in the internet started to appear, .com and those things, it was a couple years discussion how countries get their own stuff, because it was all US based, all the top level domains had to do with .edu, .gov. So, they were kind of sitting on it for a long time to make a decision what to do. A complicating factor at that time was whether or not we should use the 2 or the 3-letter. Suddenly in the top level domain .uk appeared. This caused a storm of protests from other people, we wait for two years and you do that? So within weeks actually it was decided, okay, let's do the two character codes and .uk was pulled from the root and replaced by .gb, which of course went fairly well.

I'm not sure why the MA wanted to have Exceptional Reserve, they could have just put it on the reverse list. Anyway, questions ?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you Jaap, appreciate that very much, very informative. Are there any questions for Jaap on this? Really, none?

BART BOSWINKEL: Maybe one, again going for your own opinion, your subjective opinion. So you sketch the list of entries on the reserve list and why they were included.

JAAP AKKERHUIS: It's only the exceptional reserve.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah, the exceptional reserve list. In your opinion, how would a code be removed from that list. Can you point out, has it happened in the past and what circumstances could lead to removal?

JAAP AKKERHUIS: There are no codes removed from the list, as far as I know, it's been lingering along in the archives of the MA. It was not public for a long time, all those reserved codes, and only on request, special letter to the MA, you could get them. But since a lot of the stuff started to pop up on the IFO website, also the reserve list, so that's when it got people's attention. But it has been mentioned at the last MA meeting that it's very much time to start to clean up this stuff.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you Jaap. Peter?

PETER KOCH: Thank you, just another clarifying question. Jaap, you mentioned that some of these codes on the reserve list stand for a certain country territory or something, I just want to ask you to clarify that, of course. Do I understand correctly that these are just exemptions so in the strict sense it is binding of the MA to itself that it will not assign this code to somebody else rather than saying that this is for [inaudible] Island, but it's only a shadow entry on the real list? So it's an unavailable code. Is that the meaning?

JAAP AKKERHUIS: That is what it is. The original idea of reservations if you go back to edition one of the standards which is still one part, I think the second mention it was meant as a list for the MA, please don't use that for assignment. That's why the road signs are there, the road signs are the two or more letter codes on the back of your card, and the origin of the 3166 is a couple of lists merged together and one of them was the [inaudible] list. And so to let it gracefully die out, that's why it's there. It was mainly only used by internal use, and that's why you could get it on request by writing to the secretariat.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Jaap. Any other questions? None? Jaap, I want to thank you very much for that, for both presentations. I think it was very helpful and informative. Nick? You have a short presentation on the .uk situation and how you think about it, and we'll go for a break after that.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Do you have a particular time you want me to speak for? I can speak for this about a day.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Keep it to 10, maybe? That's minutes, not hours.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Thank you very much, it's Nick Wenban-Smith for the record. Thanks to Jaap for his explanation about the exceptionally reserved codes. So if you go onto the online browsing platform you'll see there are 12 exceptionally reserved two-letter codes. Four of these, if you look in the IANA database, match with what is described as a country code, so that's .ac, .eu, .su, and .uk. So, if you think about it in the retirement context, none of these are going to be removed from the IFO standard because they're not part of the IFO standard, they are reserved, and not part of the standard.

So, in theory, it's been very lovely participating in this retirement process, but from the perspective of the United Kingdom ccTLD it's irrelevant, because we're not going to be taken off the list, because we're not on the list and the status as a ccTLD doesn't derive from the fact that it's the two letter code for the UK. I should say that anecdotally, the story goes that there was a British computer scientists called Peter Casting at University College London, and he happened to be personally very good friends with John Pastel, and they just kind of made a verbal agreement that UK, there was some discussion about should it be .gb or .uk, he preferred .uk, and so that's what they got in the allocation as the country code in the IANA database. It was after

that initial delegation of the first what was to become ccTLDs, that it was decided to follow the 3166 standard.

So the delegation of the creation of .uk predated the decision to have a standard to determine what the two letter codes should be for countries, and leading into some years later the RFC1591 about IANA is not in the business of deciding what is and what is not a country. So, I think in addition to the exceptionally reserved codes, there is also the question about the IDN ccTLD codes which we haven't come onto yet, but they're in a similar situation in that they won't be removed from the IFO-3166 Alpha II list, because they're not on it in the first place, same as the exceptionally reserved codes. But I think whilst it might be hypothetically interesting to say that retirement is never an option for these country code ccTLDs which are not IFO derived, in practice we should be exempt from some sort of retirement process.

And I think that the retirement process that we have obviously been discussing now the five year default going up to 10 years, in the event that the country code manager agrees an orderly retirement plan which is agreed to by the IANA functions operator, that the same process is logically to apply to IDN ccTLDs and exceptionally reserved ccTLDs. It's just that what needs to be put into the policy is what is the triggering event for

that retirement process. So I think, not thinking about it overlying deeply, it would seem logical to me that situations in which the United Kingdom goes to the maintenance agencies saying we no longer want the UK to be exceptionally reserved and it ceases to be exceptionally reserved would be the analogous triggering point for the retirement process as the removal from the IFO list for a country which is a usual IFO code.

I don't know about the IDN ccTLDs, but if the symbols they have picked as an IDN no longer become a meaningful representation of that country's name, then maybe that's a similar sort of process. If the UK ceases to be meaningful to refer to the United Kingdom, and is therefore, at the request of the United Kingdom, having it removed from the exceptionally reserved list, that would seem to me a logical starting place to be the triggering point for the same retirement process that we've talked about for every other ccTLD in existence. I think it's as simple as that, and I wouldn't overly complicate it.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you very much Nick for that. Any questions for Nick? Bernard?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Nick in the way you were presenting that as the trigger point, and thanks for listing that, you're saying if the government applies to the maintenance agency, but I guess just to normalize that point a bit, it would be when the maintenance agency would accept that request, right?

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Yeah, agreed. If you look at the exceptionally reserved list in the browsing platform, .uk refers to the United Kingdom and reserved at the request of the United Kingdom. So I'm assuming, it may not be right, but if the United Kingdom actually requested its reserve, it goes to the maintenance agency and says we don't want to reserve it anymore, please take it off. And the point that the maintenance agency go through the process, receive the request, and then agree to it in the fullness of time, whatever it is, takes a few cycles of meetings or process, but that's the point which has a time stamp and could be used as a reference for the rest of the retirement process to flow from.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you Nick. Any other questions? Jaap?

JAAP AKKERHUIS: I have comment. Since it is not assigned, my guess will be when the letter comes, it will be gone. So it also won't be in part 3 because that's only the assigned codes, it won't be in the historic, it might be still lurking on the net in some documents, but since it's not assigned, the traces will be lost. And I think MA will, if the UK asked for it, I mean, it's fine, they got it and they don't want it anymore so let's remove it. So, again, it's exceptional. So there is no real rule for this unless the term of reference is starting to change, but there is nothing there.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: It's very hard to predict things, isn't it, especially in the future. I don't know what's going to happen in terms of the United Kingdom and Brexit and Scottish independence or whatever, but it seems unlikely that the United Kingdom or whatever is left of it would specifically ask for it to be on exceptional reserve if there was a risk of it being confusingly used afterwards, but it seems to be that if it were to do so, then the country code would retire in accordance with the normal process.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you Nick. Peter?

PETER KOCH:

Yeah, this is Peter, thank you Chair. This is probably more a comment than a question to Nick. So, since we've learned that basing anything on the status of exceptional reserve is risky at least, have you thought about, I mean, picking you in particular because you represent one of these exceptional exceptions, to have one off in our own policy and procedure rather than relying on the maintenance agency again.

The reason I'm asking is that not only do we have country codes, country code top level domains that are only on the exceptional reserve list, but there is also the risk that we motivate people to get on that list to escape the retirement plan, and I think that's something that we really want to be really careful about, and to avoid that, it might be useful to not explicitly reserve to the exceptional reserve list, but to declare certain TLDs or to declare the relevance of the to be developed policy process here in relevance to these exceptional ccTLDs, but doing that within the ccTLD policy making rather than referring or borrowing it from IFO, question mark.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE:

When you started off, you said it wasn't going to be a question, it was more of a comment. So it's slightly mean to verbally add a question mark at the end of your long comment. Could you be clear what your question is? Sorry.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: I'm sorry, I think I said, or let me rephrase it in a way, have you thought about that being another option.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: But the point is that you were looking for triggering event to be in line with the rest, if I understood correctly.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Yeah, yeah, that's exactly right. I don't think that exceptionally reserved ccTLDs should be exempt from the retirement process. It's just a question of what is the trigger point for the retirement process to kick off, and it would seem logical that it's at the point that the maintenance agency removes the designation as exceptionally reserved. I take your point entirely that perhaps there shouldn't be policy incentives to avoid the retirement process by getting yourself on the exceptionally reserved list, but that's not a problem I can solve, I don't control the maintenance agency or the exceptionally reserved list. It seems to be a slightly dark art to get into that. I don't know what happens behind the scenes, all I can see is that .uk is a country code in the IANA database, and it's designated as exceptionally reserved, and that's that.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you Nick. Nigel, and then Kim.

NIGEL HICKSON: Thanks, I don't want to keep you from the break. Just a couple interesting little asides. The first reference I can find to the IFO Country 3166 two letter code list being used is RFC-920, which was published in October 1984. And the first ccTLD .us was created on 15th February 1985. Curiously, .gb and .uk appear, and I'm not sure this is reliable, to have been created on the same day, the 24th of July 1985.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: I'm sure that's not right, I'm sure they were created before then, but that's just the point where the database, that's a time stamp.

NIGEL HICKSON: That's the current information as supplied by IANA. It would be kind of interesting, it doesn't matter if it's IANA or IFO, it was iana.org that we got this from.

JAAP AKKERHUIS: I can answer that. One of the most ignored part of 1591 is that it says, I'm paraphrasing, here's reflection of the current practices, part of the current policies, in assigning. This question really started in 1984 and that's when this stuff happened. So 1591 is not a document making a policy document in the sense of what ICANN has as document, it is just a reflection that people who are doing, people like [inaudible] who put together staff of other people around him, dealing with this stuff, and I forget her name, Joyce, she's now passed away, so that's David getting tired of the request and the discussion and finally we got 1591. But the discussion was going on and all this stuff happened much earlier. So that's why it looks kind of strange, but it's just the way it is. I actually find this in 1591 kind of interesting because it also states it's just part of the policies they were using at this time. It's going to be an interesting debate if somebody is going to really push this.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Kim?

KIM DAVIES: Before my question, just an aside, I wouldn't put much stock in the dates in the very early years in the IANA database. Australia used to be .oz, so I mean, there's a lot of early history there

that's kind of been lost. So my question to Nick was the approach you just mentioned you were putting forward, do you think that couldn't be broadly applicable for all exceptionally reserved situations? Or are you just advocating it would work in the UK situation?

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Nick Wenban-Smith for the record. I suppose it's an implicit assumption the reason and justification for the four ccTLDs which are in the IANA databases, the ccTLDs are there because of their exceptionally reserved status. Therefore it's a change in that status which should be the triggering point in general for all four of them, not just for the UK. So, yeah, I would say that would be right, it's a general principle. But each one of these are highly unusual, by definition they're exceptions to the normal rule, right? The EU has its own political creation, it's obviously not a country, but it is a country code top level domain.

The Soviet Union has a specific around that, Ascension Islands, that is another historical anomaly, I suppose. You would have thought in this day and age that it would be hard to envisage new ccTLDs to come into creation, because it's more common practices around, you take the IFO list and you have the Alpha II assigned through the maintenance agency. So, it seems to be unlikely that there will be an increase, these are historical

exceptions and it seems to me that if the Ascension Islands, I don't know, maybe it changes its name to St. Helena B and doesn't want the .ac anymore, and it gets removed from the exceptionally reserved list, the same principles should apply, in the same way if you have an idea and the idea chooses to cease to be a meaningful representation of that country, then logically they should be subject to the same retirement process, I would say.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Nick. Kim, do you have a followup?

KIM DAVIES: Yeah, just briefly. You mentioned four that have been delegated to exceptionally reserved. I think there has been five, of which Nigel's were two, which reduces it down to three, .su being the exception. The .su was never delegated on the basis of being exceptionally reserved, it was delegated on the basis of being assigned. So I know we'll get to the details there later, but I think the history there is important.,

NIGEL HICKSON: Yeah the other one was .im, which drops it down to two.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Bernard?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Just picking up on what I thought I heard Peter saying when he was commenting, just trying to clarify, were you suggesting that we should consider grandfathering those that are in there now to avoid and just avoid having any kind of a rush if a cc is removed, and just trying to transition to the exceptionally reserved or whatever it becomes. Dsi that one your point?

PETER KOCH: This is Peter for the record. Yes, I think that reflects the motivation. First of all it's to get rid of this exceptionally reserved, in any reference as far as possible, except for the anecdotal mentioning the same way that Kim just did. But in particular we should have in mind that we do have the currently existing TLDs four or five, depending on how you actually count. But my concern is putting pressure on the IFO3166, that you cannot control it as it appears there is cannot even control itself.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: One last comment from Eberhard and then we're going to suspend this conversation for a break of 15 minutes and if we want to take this up after the break, we'll do that.

EBERHARD LISSE: I think we are getting way out of scope here. I'm only interested in what happens if a country code is removed, not what happens if a country code is added to a list. If a country manages to convince to the IFO that its code must go on exceptionally reserved list, then it must deal with delegation with IFO. There is a Board resolution which states how this has to happen on an exceptionally reserved list. It's not our problem, if they manage to get themselves out on there or if they find themselves on there, we basically only have to deal with what happens if they get off there.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Eberhard. As I said, we're going to suspend this at this point in time. We're going to have a 15 minute break which is overdue, I apologize for that. So we'll be back at 25 after the hour. Thanks. [AUDIO BREAK]

Alright, thank you. I apologize again for the scheduling snafu on the break, it should have come earlier. News on the Zoom front, it looks like it's up and running, and better than ever. So we have that back under control. So, what I would like to do is reopen the discussion and if there are any further questions, comments, Nick has a comment, thank you Nick, go ahead.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: So, I've got a comment for myself, or is it a question? I would add that I am totally open to any alternative suggestions in relation to the exceptionally reserved codes which are country code ccTLDs, thing one, and thing two, I'm not sure whether it's useful to spend a huge amount of time discussing them in the sense that they are quite exceptional and certainly I don't think they are going to impact the substantive part of the policy for the vast majority of ccTLDs. So I am quite relaxed in general, whether or not it's included. If it is included, if there is anyone with a better idea, then I'm very open to that, as well.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you Nick. Any other comments, suggestions? Go ahead, please.

JAAP AKKERHUIS: There was comment and that's about what Peter said, whether you work to get yourself declared being exceptionally reserved to get out of this whole retirement business and keep going on. Well, let me pose a similar question, let me first say that MA is carrying every week request from various places over the world, where you never heard about. So they could go to ICANN and talk. Apart from the exceptionally reserved, the rules for

carrying reserved are really straightforward and only the exceptional is kind of exceptional. MA routinely answers these requests with standard letter, we are not going to reserve anything to be used as a top level domain.

Furthermore, even if you get it reserved, ICANN will not use that and also has to make an exception. So this is really that will save a lot of people a lot of time, if you stop trying to argue that. So I really want to make sure it's really a standard of MA, it used to be on the website, if you go to MA trying to get code for carrying assignment, I mean, don't. So I really want to emphasize that, using reserve, exceptionally reserved, whatever, for using as domains, it is routinely completely discarded by the MA

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Jaap. Any other comments, questions? If not, I'm going to turn it over to Bernard. Our plan with this is to take away what we have discussed today and Staff will get it in more organized form so we can get it out on the list for discussion on our next teleconference. At one point we were thinking of going to the flip charts on this, but I feel on the basis of this discussion, we need to probably look at it a little further and get it a bit better structured before we do that. There is also the question of how much meat is here to actually discuss. I think Nick has

brought up some good points. If you're not on the list, then what do we do, kind of thing. Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL:

Just one, I fully support your suggestion, but one more thing about, Nick mentioned IDN ccTLDs and the retirement of IDN ccTLDs. If you may recall at one point, I think it was two face-to-face meetings ago, there was suggestion to push this off as part of the IDN discussions because of the different criteria, et cetera. And the decision of council appointed a preliminary review team and as part of their mandate was also looking at whether or not to include the retirement of IDN ccTLDs in the sense of what could cause a trigger event. So this policy that is developed by this working group applies. And as you will see during the policy session on Tuesday, the preliminary review team will suggest this to the community and to the Council that it's taken on board by a new PDP, to look at what is effectively defining the triggering event.

And the reason for doing this is fairly simple. IDN ccTLDs were created, or the process for the string selection is in a way mimicking what the ISO 3166 standard is doing, assigning codes to a country and territory name. The criteria for doing this is defined in the IDN policy. That's the way it was designed at the time, that's why it's called the string selection proposal. And so

unselecting the string is almost creating the triggering event and it's an idea that the IDN ccTLD working group with people knowing what they're talking about at the time, look at what causes the selection, or what leads to the trigger event to start and trigger the retirement process. I hope I made myself clear.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you Bart. Kim?

KIM DAVIES: You said the word mimicking, I would use the word predicated. My understand is it's more or less leveraging the standard for a lot of the weight and then as mentioned, just string selection is part of the IDN process, but it's on a basis that the country is in the RC standard.

BART BOSWINKEL: That's the condition, sine qua non, to put it that way. You have to be eligible anyway, the country actually needs to be listed on the ICO-3166 list. That's the fundamental basis. So as soon as that's no longer there, then yeah, you have quite an issue. But there are other conditions that need to be met, and the question is which condition should cause a removal or retirement.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: As Stephen has said, we're going to sort of create a wrap up of what Jaap presented and Nick, and then some of the discussions, and we'll try to tease out some of the questions that came out of this so that we can tackle this in a more organized fashion. So, that will be part of this that will come out of this meeting. and when you get that you can have a look at it, and if we missed something, we'll just fix it accordingly. Thank you.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you Bernard. Given that this room is going to be required at noon and it's been a bit stressful with the Zoom and everything else, I really don't think we can begin.

BART BOSWINKEL: Maybe put this, so we have the room until noon, because then the Council will meet in this room for their prep meeting. Doing a breakout session on stress testing, we could do it but that is only 10 minutes, probably not worth it. What is probably important especially for the Chair and Vice Chair, is what you want to present to the community on Tuesday, because that's on the agenda, as well. So that's item #7. Maybe Stephen and/or Eberhard, have you been thinking about what you want to present to the community on Tuesday and potentially to the GAC? And then we need to decide on the next meeting.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: If anyone has got some input on what specifically they feel we should present both to our community and also the GAC, I'd love to hear it now. We'll definitely build on the approach we took at the last meeting, especially with regard to the GAC presentation on progress. Basically it will be a progress report and a little less of the history lesson that I gave them last time, at least for the GAC. So if anybody has got some comments on that, what they might specifically feel we ought to cover since the last presentation, feel free to throw them on the list, but throw them on the list very quickly because we need to see them, because we need to make that slide deck sometime later today or tonight. So, thank you for that.

I think we're going to call this a wrap. Again, I apologize as Chair for the technical difficulties, it's no fault of our secretariat staff here, I think Joke did a great job under extreme pressure, as did our nameless ICANN techies in the corner. I want to thank Joke, Bart, and Bernard for their able help today. We were shorthanded without Kimberly, as well. As noted previously, our next meeting is going to be on the 19th of July, time to be determined, but I would assume we'll probably make it 6 hours from UTC from the date of the meeting we had just before coming here. But again, that will go out on the list very shortly.

And with that, is there any other business? I'm assuming there is no other business from the remote participants, is that correct? Okay, I think with that I'm going to call this meeting to a close. I again want to thank everyone for participating. Look forward to having you on the next call. There will be a fair amount of material on the list between now and the next call so that we can move forward on a lot of stuff that was discussed here today. So, with that, thank you all very much again. Really appreciate it, for your attendance today, and with that I declare this meeting adjourned, thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]