

TRANSCRIPTS

Framework of Interpretation Working Group Meeting London

26 June 2014

Attendees:

ccNSO:

Martin Boyle, .uk
Becky Burr, .us
Keith Davidson, .nz
Stephen Deerhake, .as
Daniel Kalchev, .bg
Eberhard Lisse, .na
Desiree Miloshevic, .gi
Patricio Poblete, .cl
Nigel Roberts, .gg & je
Dotty Sparks de Blanc, .vi

ICANN Staff:

Kim Davies
Kristina Nordstrom
Gabiella Schitteck
Bernard Turcotte

Apologies:

Jaap Akkerhuis, ICANN/ISO
Cheryl Langdon Orr, ALAC
Paulos Nyirenda, .mw
Bill Semich, .nu

Keith Davidson Okay, good morning, everybody. Whose sound is that? Are we recording? Thank you. This is the meeting of the Framework of Interpretation working group here in ICANN London. And while we don't have any online participants in the Adobe Connect room, I think for the record, since we have a number of observers in the room. Can we go around the table and give your name and affiliation for the record, starting with Martin?

Martin Boyle: Martin Boyle, .uk.

Kim Davies: Kim Davies, ICANN.

Daniel Kalchev: Register (ph), .bg.

Jorg Schweiger: Jorg Schweiger, .de.

Becky Burr: Becky Burr, .us.

Bernard Turcotte: Bernard Turcotte, staff.

Keith Davidson: And I should have used my own name, I guess Keith Davidson, .nz.

Nigel Roberts: Nigel Roberts, .gg.

Patricio Poblete: Patricio Poblete, Chile.

Kristina Nordstrom: Kristina Nordstrom, ccNSO

Gabriella Schitteck: Gabriella Schitteck, ccNSO

Stephen Deerhake: Stephen Deerhake, .as.

Keith Davidson: And, if there's anyone behind me who would like their name recorded in the records, please come forward.

Unidentified Participant: (Inaudible)

Carlos Liuzzi: Carlos Liuzzi, NIC Argentina .ar.

Debbie Monahan: Debbie Monahan, .nz.

Jacqueline Morris: Jacqueline Morris, .tt.

Ron Sherwood: Ron Sherwood, .vi

Keith Davidson: And just joining us through the door, Dotty Sparks de Blanc, from .vi. And Eberhard Lisse from Namibia, .na for the record.

Thank you. And so—and there is somebody in the Adobe room, oh, came and went. Okay, we have some apologies. Kristina or Gabi?

Kristina Nordstrom: We have apologies from Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Jaap Akkerhuis, Paulos Nyirenda, and Bill Semich.

Keith Davidson: Thank you. Any further apologies, Eberhard?

Eberhard Lisse: Yes, Nigel Roberts said if he's late he has overslept.

Keith Davidson: Yes, thank you for that. I see there's a microphone on, Stephen. Thank you. And so that's present and apologies dealt with. Approval of the agenda, or approval of the agender, as I mistyped in my agenda. Then any additional items? Any changes? Everybody's happy. Thank you.

Approval of the meeting reports, Bernie has circulated meeting reports for the 27th of March, 22nd of May, 27th of May and the 5th of June. And I've had a look through all but one of them, and trust the eyes of others. But are there any issues arising from those meeting reports and otherwise going to be covered today. If not, we'll consider all those four meeting reports agreed, and now move on to discussion on the final report.

Bernie, I think we've two items outstanding. Do you want to take us through in the time-honored traditional and yes, Eberhard?

Eberhard Lisse: Can we please send for housekeeping, bring us a hammer and some nails so we can nail this shut today, please?

Keith Davidson: Yes. Is there any disagreement with the sentiment? Can we bar the doors? Nobody leaves until we agree. I hope this isn't too hard. I hope we can get through things reasonably quickly. But Bernie, can you step up through?

Bernard Turcotte: Yes, sir. Thank you. As usual, we'll skip the introduction. We'll refer to it later anyways. As unfortunately Bill's not here, in the introduction I've gone through and replaced policy statements period, with policy statements and guidelines, as requested. So I think we're good there. I'm actually running on a clean copy right here. So I'm actually not trying to scroll up there.

I can run from the Adobe room if you want me to. If that will make it simpler for everyone.

Keith Davidson: Yes, please. With observers in the room, I think we ought to show them what we're talking about.

Bernard Turcotte: Okay. I will just find Kristina's address so I can—okay.

Yeah, I think you better send it, I'm just for some reason, not finding it.

Keith Davidson: It was the message that went out on the 25th of June at 9:25 (inaudible).

Bernard Turcotte: So for some reason, just not there. Did you send it, Kristina? Yeah. If it's going through the list, it takes a few minutes.

Alright, almost perfectly on time. Somebody muted my speaker and my microphone, and we should be good. So that's not the right version. That's the June 3rd version. I believe we're trying to work from the June 23rd version, which Keith sent out, and I sent out earlier, version 1.3.

Do you want me to resend it to you? Okay.

Keith Davidson: Apologies all for the slight technical delay.

Bernard Turcotte: Okay.

Keith Davidson: It's an unusual agenda for our meeting. And for the record, Desiree Miloshevic has joined us.

Bernard Turcotte: Excellent. All right. I've got the right version of the document, and it's 9:29, so we're just about perfectly on time.

Keith Davidson: Okay, take it away Bernie.

Bernard Turcotte: Thank you. All right, now. Where was I? So introduction; I've replaced- the policy same as with policy in guidelines as per my promise to Bill. And this will be reviewed with Becky. There is a few places it's actually tricky whether it should be policy in guidelines, or we're just referring to RFC 1591. I didn't take a chance. I put it in everywhere. But we'll go through it together and make sure it's okay.

Now moving on to the interpretations, one, two, three were good last time. Four, nothing to show. 5.1, ah yes, so these were the adjustments from SIP (ph). Basically, I listed the text from the meeting transcript, as it seemed like everyone was happy with Martin's suggestions. And it now reads- the FOI Working Group interprets the requirements for approval from significantly interested parties, section 3.4, RFC 1591, to require applicants to provide documentation of support by stakeholders and for the IANA operator to evaluate and document this input for delegations and transfers.

Keith Davidson: I'd make (ph) that bigger, so we can read it.

Bernard Turcotte: Yes sir, I can make that bigger.

Keith Davidson: Okay, here we go. Any issues? Any questions, any comments? Is everybody happy? Going once, going twice, agreed text. Daniel?

Daniel Kalchev: Okay, I have a particular question here on the particulars (ph). If the applicant is not aware of this opinion of significant interested third parties, how are they supposed to be required to provide this documentation?

Bernard Turcotte: If the applicant is unaware of it?

Daniel Kalchev: Yes.

Bernard Turcotte: Okay. As part of the process that's described by IANA, and IANA will be adjusting these processes. Probably Kim can talk more to that. But people don't wake up just one morning and say, I'm going to ask for a ccTLD transfer or something. There is actually a full document on the IANA site that describes all the steps.

Daniel Kalchev: No, this is not the incident about the question. (Inaudible) there was the text, as I read it required applicants to provide this documentation.

Bernard Turcotte: Yes.

Daniel Kalchev: So the applicant must now somehow, the opinion of every possible significant interested parties, even if we did not list them specifically, so that they can check—

Bernard Turcotte: That's correct.

Daniel Kalchev: -- they have everybody's opinion. So probably here it should be not the applicant to require this, but somehow IANA to find a way to get the—

Bernard Turcotte: Ah, I get your question. Okay.

Do you want me to?

Keith Davidson: Yes, please.

Bernard Turcotte: I mean, the whole point of defining significantly interested parties was to do a generic definition so people in each jurisdiction could apply it so that it meets the tests that were defined by Becky. So there is no way for us here to define specifically in each jurisdiction, significantly interested parties, and I don't think there's any way for IANA to do that. The point is we've said there's only two that will always be there. There's the government, and there's the incumbent manager. Those are significantly interested parties. Those are the two that are named, and you can't go around that.

The other ones, we've described the specific tests for what you meet. So how this actually gets turned into an implementation process is going to be one of the jobs that our friends over there are going to take care of.

Daniel Kalchev: Okay. So the way we interpret this point is that the applicant is required to provide some documentation of support from some of the significant interested parties they know about, because otherwise it's not possible to compile them.

So as long as the applicant provides documentation of support from significantly interested parties, but not from all of them, because they could not know everybody, this requirement is satisfied?

Keith Davidson: That's correct. I don't think—I think you're reading it exactly as written. (Inaudible) interpretation, so I think they're clear, but Kim, just to be sure?

Kim Davies: Yeah, I mean just for your background more than anything. Apart from changing terminology and so forth, I don't think this significantly alters the way we're doing things today. Today we ask for letters of support and with the letters, we ask applicants to explain why they feel the sum of those letters is sufficient. So that's where they make the case that it's locally appropriate that the endorsements that they've provided are reflective of community interest.

One other point I would note is that we committed last year that we're going to publicly announce pending requests in some fashion. And that will provide an additional opportunity for someone that feels they're significantly interested to put on the record any concerns or support that they have prior to a decision being made.

Keith Davidson: That seems to satisfy, or more than satisfy the criteria that the FOI is setting. So that's really quite useful. I'm not really wanting to go into any discussion on the implementation at this stage. So do you want to discuss, and could I remind all speakers, especially first time round, to say their name.

Nigel Roberts: Yeah. This is Nigel Roberts. This is just minor thing. It says-including the incumbent manager. That should say including incumbent manager in brackets or (inaudible) as bracket.

Keith Davidson: Any? I think that's just a tidy up. So I don't think that needs another round of consultation. Is everybody happy, then? Can we put this piece of text to bed? Thank you very much. We've not shut number one issue, and Bernie, what's next?

Bernard Turcotte: Thank you, sir. Essentially you get the same thing in 6.1 and 6.2, which were the other points we did. So we'll read them, just to put them to bed. 6.1, the FOI working group interprets the requirement for interested parties to have some voice, section 4.3 RFC 1591, to require applicants to provide documentation of support by stakeholders and for the IANA operator to evaluate the document. This input for delegations.

Keith Davidson: Okay, any question? Any problems with the new wording? Everybody happy? Nobody's online looking for the floor, nobody in the room, everybody's happy, excellent. Thank you very much. And on to 6.2.

Bernard Turcotte: The FOI working group interprets the requirements for concerned or effected parties in transfers to communicate with the IANA operator, section 3.6 of RFC 1591, to require applicants to provide documentation of support by stakeholders and for the IANA operator to evaluate and document this input for transfers.

Keith Davidson: Again, any? Daniel?

Daniel Kalchev: Okay, it's again, the same kind of issue I see. It's probably just the wording of it, but it may be different. The way we interpret this is that we make the applicant think of point of contact to all the channels through which communication between IANA and the interested parties (inaudible).

And this in some way, no? But look at the text. You require the applicant to provide this documentation. So why then require the applicant to do this? I mean for example, you are the applicant. You identify some interested parties. You get some documentation from them, submit to IANA and it so happens that those interested parties submit some other kind of feedback to IANA. What then?

Keith Davidson: I don't understand the issue. The issue is to elucidate together from the local community, whether or not they agree with the delegation underway. If there's disagreement, if people at this point choose to provide some documentation suggesting that that shouldn't be dealt with, then IANA has to balance that.

Daniel Kalchev: No, my point is not about agreement or disagreement by the committee. My point is that we require the applicant to be the channel of communication.

Keith Davidson: That's what we were saying on the earlier point that the applicant gathers the documentation that they feel supports it, but if other people, other parties, want to support it, they can through Kim's mechanism, can make their own message of support as well. It doesn't have to come from the applicant. Thank you, Nigel.

Nigel Roberts: All right. Let me try this. Reading this, this document, what the applicant must do in order to have more than a random chance of being successful in its application. If he doesn't do this, it's unlikely to be successful in its application. It does not require anything, or any other party. It simply says, this is what the applicant needs to do.

So it's documenting what the applicant must do. But it's not prohibiting any other party from doing anything else.

Daniel Kalchev: Yeah, but Nigel I agree with the spirit of this thing. I just try to read 6.2, for example, and it sounded strange to me. So it says that the requirement of some parties being capable to communicate with the IANA operator is solved by requiring the applicant to provide that communication.

Nigel Roberts: If I can just try this a little. What you're saying is that we are not addressing the issue of additional input in the text. That's correct. But we're restricted—not restricted, we're not totally restricted. But we are attempting to restrict ourselves to interpreting the words that we see. And the words are that the affected or concerned parties should communicate with the IANA operator.

So the affected and concerned parties, including other parties, and communicate with the IANA operator. But in addition, it requires applicants to document their support, otherwise the application falls at the first hurdle. That's how I see this.

Daniel Kalchev: Yeah, but the wording is that our working group interprets the possibility of other parties to communicate with IANA, to require the applicant to provide that documentation. This is my point.

Nigel Roberts: No. I think the word missing is the. You're reading word the in there, and there isn't a word the. You're saying to require applicants the documentation of support. That's not what it reads. It must provide documentation of support, which has a quite different meaning.

Keith Davidson: I think the other way to look at this, the complete reverse way of looking at this, is we do not want IANA to do (ph) delegate unless there is documentation supporting. So if you're happy with that as the base premise, and I think happy with Kim's explanation of what the process will evolve to, then I'm wondering if it's actually a live issue for you. Okay?

So we've got clarification, you're happy? You're not happy, Patricio.

Patricio Poblete: No, it's not that I'm unhappy, but the way I see it, there's nothing in what we're saying that for this anybody to communicate with IANA. What this is saying is that the burden of the proof that there is community support or significant affected party support is on the applicant. That's what it's saying.

Keith Davidson: Exactly. I think we're all clear. So we're all now happy? Can we now, this one is shut? We're on a roll, last chance? Okay, agreed on 6. Thank you. And we have one more Bernie.

Bernard Turcotte: Oh, sorry. Section 8; the FOI interprets the requirements that the manager serve as a trustee. Our issue around here was originally that it was, I believe, administration policies. And so Eberhard, on the second reading, had an issue around that. We looked at various ways of playing with this.

I believe from going through the original documents we had—the intent was actually to write registration policies. We then got into a discussion with Martin, what happens relative to what we said in the final reports. But the final reports are not written, so we can actually adjust the final reports. And we'll remember when we started on this final, final report, I made that statement that from the SIP (ph) and revocation documents, we have not published the final, final reports.

So the process we had used was to go through this to see if there were any niggling issues that would remain, we could fix them. If we agree with the text here, I would adjust the text in the final report which would then be published. So I don't think there's a huge issue. We do meet the test from Martin, I believe, that this is not a major change. It will be in the final report on revocation where this text comes from, and then we've got the change to registration policies, which according to meets was the intent of what you're trying to, and I think that meets Eberhard's requirements.

Keith Davidson: Okay. Any discussion. I see Martin first, then Eberhard.

Martin Boyle: Yes, Martin Boyle from .uk, thanks. I'm struggling a little bit, because registration policies seems to me to be quite a restrictive area that might be, should be, of concern to significantly interested parties, let alone actually the average registrant.

And so I suppose my question is- how do we interpret registration policies? Are we just saying that these are the rules that allow registrant X to be able to register? Because it would seem to me that things that significantly interested parties are going to be interested in are things like stuff that affects the security and stability of the local country code registry.

So essentially what I'm struggling with is understanding why we are being so specific to just tie this down to the immediate interface with the registrant, rather than the environment in which the registry is working?

Keith Davidson: Okay. I think Eberhard, then Nigel.

Eberhard Lisse: Eberhard Lisse, I have three things. It's not just my objections. There were a few others. The point is I don't care what we write, but never mind that RFC 1591 need not arise to this interpretation. I cannot have anything that I'm willing to not necessarily willing to die in the ditch of on writing something like this. But we cannot have input into operations. We must find a language, and I think that language to me acceptable that we don't have a problem with policy oversight. We do have a problem with ICANN specifying that there is something that can be interpreted locally as input into operations, because they're going to come wave this us and use it as a leverage.

And whether ICANN (inaudible) on the high (inaudible), that's beside the point. What we're doing here has-- it's going to be used locally as well. So if it's clear, we did not say it's operations. We don't need to get too much into detail what we mean, as long as the concerns that we have that it can be used against ccTLD managers, as long as that's addressed, the language is not so much important to me.

So I can live with this. And I have no objectives. I can hammer the nail in on that one.

Keith Davidson: Thank you, Eberhard. I think yes, we had reasonable agreement that we were uncomfortable with the idea of having operating policies as being way too wide, but let's see if we can't—I think so if I'm reading it right, Martin is saying he feels registration policies might be a little bit too tight, in fact. But anyway, Nigel—

Nigel Roberts: Okay, actually, I wanted to get in before Eberhard, but never mind, because he said part of what I was going to say. But he said it in a different way that allows me to go on one stage further, so actually, it turned out quite well.

The thing we're struggling with here is the mandate of this group. The mandate of this group is to construe and interpret existing policy. It is not to bring in new policy under the guise of interpretation. And this is what's called creative interpretation, when a high court judge or somebody stands up and makes it up as he goes along and says, the law was this way all along. And that's what we're doing here.

Now, I said I would not object to this wording, for a number of reasons. One is I don't think that RFC 1591 can be interpreted to mean anything like this. But I think it's relatively harmless. And if somebody comes in and looks at this again in the future and says, well, that's a load of rubbish. We'll just ignore it. But I will not have making up of policy, widening it out, when even this, what you've got written here, is practically a load of rubbish compared with what RFC 1591 actually says.

So I will not object to these words, but if we start widening them out and making anything else, I will disassociate myself from this part of the final report, because it's frankly nonsense.

Keith Davidson: Okay. So I think Eberhard and Nigel have said they can live this wording. And Martin probably hasn't said he can live with it. Could you? I mean, would it concern you, would—could we say we have consensus around, but a slight discomfort with the word registration?

Nigel Roberts: I mean I understand Martin's position here, because it is rubbish.

Martin Boyle: Well, I think Nigel has just explained what I think. I didn't know I thought that, but I'm sure he's right. Essentially, I think the—if I remember correctly, this lot came from the area of the manager having a trustee sort of relationship, the looking after the delegation and making sure it was fit for purpose. My concern is that—and I agree that operational policy is not part of that. It's just I'm concerned that the registration policy restricts what might be a well-run ccTLD.

But having said that, it's now on the record, and I'm not going to stand in the way of consensus on this particular text.

Keith Davidson: Okay. Well, I have Nigel, then Becky, then Eberhard.

Nigel Roberts: I suspect Becky might be thinking to say something that I was about to say. I think we've reached the point. I mean we either say, we take it out altogether, or we leave it in as is, and we take the temperature of the room. But I'm intruding on the Chairman's privilege.

Keith Davidson: Becky, yes, Becky.

Becky Burr: (Inaudible) it obviously is going to prohibit a manager for further soliciting if I find more things in registration policies.

Keith Davidson: Of course. Eberhard?

Eberhard Lisse: I'm quite that we're hoping to tell you what you mean in the future, and secondly, why is everybody so hoarse in here?

Keith Davidson: Singing last night, perhaps, I don't know. Anyway, okay, so I think we have actually a bit of un-consensus. I think we have unanimous agreement that we can actually live with this. So can we agree the text and now move on? And Bernie we do have another, 8.2 was it?

Bernard Turcotte: Sorry. That's it for the interpretations. So after that, we're into the recommendations. The—I'm actually going to read the introduction text. Because I think we only had one part that was a little bit of concern, and I think we've put it away. But I'm just making sure.

So, the country names supporting organization tasks the Framework of Interpretation working group with developing and proposing a framework of interpretation for existing IANA policy and guidelines, governing the delegation (inaudible), now transfer of ccTLDs.

The FOI working group's goal was to give IANA-- and it should be IANA contractor-- and the ICANN Board clear guidance on the meaning of our RFC 1591 in order to clarify existing policy and to facilitate consistent and predictable application of this policy. I cobbled from a few things, but I think it's fairly standard.

Okay, in reviewing the FOI working group recommendations, it's important to keep the following context in mind. The FOI working group had no authority to develop or recommend new or changed policy. And the recommendations reflect the limited scope of the FOI working group's charter.

To the extent new or changed policy may be appropriate or desirable, it must be developed through a formal policy development process. I don't think anyone is going to argue with that. Those are the ccNSO bylaws.

The text that we ended up agreeing to last time was- recognizing that ultimate authority on public policy for any country—I believe we should change that to country or territory, given the formal language that we usually use—for any country or territory is as government and legislature. Nothing in this working group's report is intended to, or should be taken to constrain or limit applicable law in respect of matters relating to country code top-level domain names in the country or territory represented by the particular two-letter code or IDN string, or in the state of incorporation, place of business of the IANA operator.

Now, with the minor change of adding country territory on the top. That was the text we agreed last time. We're putting it to bed like that. Finally, nothing in the framework of interpretation limits or constrains the applicability of GAC principles, guidelines for delegation and administration of country code, top-level domains.

Keith Davidson: Okay. Any dissent from the text? Are we happy, everybody happy? No comments? All right, done. Thank you. More agreed text?

Bernard Turcotte: That was it. The rest is agreed text.

Keith Davidson: So we have a framework of interpretation. Well, congratulations, team. Fantastic. Just when you thought it was—Eberhard?

Eberhard Lisse: So we put it on record now that our—so there will be no more substantive changes. Spending hours not will be typing how things will be precluded, and we have an agreed upon text that will be as a draft form and forward it already now to interested parties? Do we need to have now a consultation process? What's the next steps?

Keith Davidson: Okay. I think firstly—yes, I think Becky and I, as the Chair and Vice Chair, have the editorial prerogative to put in a comma or decide on what color paper clips we're going to use, risking upsetting the entire group. But I think we always should have that right to tiny edits, but we will signify those to the group rather than seek approval from the group.

But anything that changes any hint of meaning we will have to come back to the group. But I think we now have agreement, so we can go forward with it.

In terms of the process, I think that potentially we don't have anything to consult, because this is a summary on top of what has been consulted. So I'm suggesting we put it to the vote of the ccNSO members to approve the framework of interpretation.

Does that sound like the process that we should be going through? I see Eberhard looking for the floor.

Eberhard Lisse: What does the charter say?

Keith Davidson: The charter says to develop a framework and deliver to the ccNSO for approval.

Eberhard Lisse: We do that. We deliver it to the ccNSO for approval. We do nothing else. If the council wants to bring it to the membership, that's not our problem. We should not exceed our charter.

Keith Davidson: That's exactly what I'm saying. I mean if someone is desperate to have a consultation round with just this summary, we could, but it serves no purpose. It doesn't impact on the actual work that we've done and consulted on. Nigel?

Nigel Roberts: Yeah. I have two things. First of all, I think that's teased out, really. I think we have completed our work. We seem to have a little bit of time left in the meeting room, so we're filling the time. So as we've just discussed, I think we deliver the final version to the council and formal steps are a matter for council. But I'm pretty confident that council will do the right thing and including all formal steps that might be needed.

The other thing is, and this is probably—if we've got a little bit more to do, it might better come later on, but as long as I've got the microphone, I'm going to do it anyway now. I'd like to place on record my tremendous admiration for the work of everybody involved on

the organization side of this, as Chair, Vice Chair, staff who've been involved. Without you, we couldn't have—we'd just be running around like idiots for six years. Thank you.

Keith Davidson: Thank you. I think we should hold here. Thanks, anyway. But I think the working group has been, and (inaudible) say it's been a fantastic experience, the arduous nature of multi-stakeholders and then finding consensus. But fully supporting—I feel well supported by the staff and my esteemed colleague and Vice Chair. And I think the working group members have done their bit to achieve consensus at every step. Eberhard?

Eberhard Lisse: I want to agree with in my usual manner by saying now that we have conquered the world, why don't we sort out the IANA transition?

Keith Davidson: It seems to be a looming task. But I think just in terms of the actual process, I think we make our recommendation of the final report. So this, appended with the chapters that we have concluded, is the final framework. We submit that to the ccNSO council for their approval via a voting mechanism if they feel that's necessary with members.

I think we also need to be working closely with the GAC along with way, to give them the final document as early as possible. And say, while this is going through its approval process within the ccNSO, we invite them to discuss any arising issues and so on, so that by the time we get to ICANN Los Angeles, there would be the translated copies. They've had a full opportunity to review and to hopefully then approve in Los Angeles. So we together, the ccNSO and the GAC can walk together to the ICANN Board with the document for submission to the Board.

So that's the proposed methodology. And then I think there is a separate stream of work around the implementation that this committee might still, this working group might still be required to pay some attention to. So we're not off the hook yet. Stephen?

Stephen Deerhake: Am I correct in assuming that once you guys decide on the font and the point size and the kerning, et cetera, et cetera, that we will get a complete copy finalized to look at as a group before you submit to council, et cetera?

Keith Davidson: That would be impossible, sorry—of course.

Becky Burr: Yes, to you, but not Nigel.

Eberhard Lisse: Nigel doesn't need it. Martin will get one.

Keith Davidson: Okay, enough frivolity. This is a serious working group. I just—I think in terms of the other agenda items, the—I should probably put on record the activities that the working groups had here in London. We reported on Tuesday to the ICANN Board. We noted strong support from the Chair of the ICANN Board and our ccNSO, members on the Board for the framework of interpretation, and their comments that they would take forward to the GAC. Requests to enthuse the GAC to approve, and seeing this is a very important aspect in the overarching NTIA transition process, we then went to the GAC. Can I finish my report on that?

We reported to the GAC later on Tuesday, and other than our report to the Board about us intending to finish the framework here, we also thanked Frank March for his role as the lead on the GAC for the Framework of Interpretation working group, because this is Frank's last attendance at an ICANN meeting, and he's no longer the New Zealand government representative.

And then we reported—and then the GAC and the Board met, and unfortunately the GAC and Board session was dominated by other issues, so Steve Crocker's comments that he would be supporting the framework to the GAC didn't happen in the formal sense, but he is following through in discussions with the GAC Chair and senior people.

So I think the paving of the way that the ICANN Board does see the importance of nailing this shut before we get too far down the NTIA transition lens. And I think that was it. And we didn't report into the ccNSO council meeting because working group reports were left for the next council meeting. There wasn't time on the agenda yesterday.

So that's the update of where we are. Eberhard?

Eberhard Lisse:

I have been speaking with two GAC members, and as we have been discussing previously, we should all discuss it with our respective GAC representatives. And the ones that I've spoken with have indicated that they actually were not really—this was not on their priority. But then I sent them some stuff, and they have actually promised to read the stuff.

Then I have taken the deputy under permanent secretary for paper clips and my government to lunch, and it seems there is an indication that peace may be breaking out. He's also sending for Vice Chair for the GAC. The way I see it is that applicants have come—they usually come up with a consensus candidate, so that puts us at the good opportunity to bring this to their attention and get their support.

Actually, I'm quite convinced that we will get this, our situation solved, in a very acceptable way for all sides.

Keith Davidson:

Well, it's not the purpose of this working group, to the interest in any individual cases at delegation. It is pleasing to hear that, at least from my personal perspective that you're making progress, Eberhard, well done.

With that—oh, just one item I just recalled is that the GAC will be replacing Frank with somebody on this working group, if there's any necessity for this working group to go forward. But certainly there will be someone from the GAC who will lead the processing from here. And it sounds like, but it's not official yet, but it will be Norway, which will be quite good, because they've been an active and interested bystander to the process all the way through. And I think they're a relatively useful government to be taking it forward with.

Becky Burr:

Strike that from the record.

Keith Davidson:

Okay. No such thing as a useful government. I'm sorry. Strike that from the record.

With that, I don't believe we need any scheduled meetings going forward. But there may be some ad hoc meetings between now and ICANN Los Angeles. So we will give as much notice as we can, and try not to interfere with the Northern Hemisphere summer too much along the way.

With that, if there's nothing else, can we conclude our business? I'll declare the meeting closed, and thank you all for your participation and hard work over the last three years. Thank you.