
STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the last call of the year for the ccNSO Working Group on Retirement ccTLDs. Good night/early morning, depending on where you are. I appreciate it's early morning for those who [quest] around the zero meridian. So, thank you, Eberhard, for getting up. Good afternoon and evening for those of you in the Pacific region who have joined us. I'm not [looking] to this, so I don't know. In any event, thank you all for joining.

With regards to administrative announcements, there's one action item that carried over from the last teleconference, and that was the matter of the letter to the ccNSO Council that we've been discussing over the last couple of teleconferences.

That action item was assigned to me and is half-complete. The letter has been tweaked per our discussion on our last teleconference, but I've not yet sent it to the Council. I shall do so by week's end. So, this will give something to the ccNSO Council to deal with next week.

I don't have any other additional administrative announcements, so I ask Bart and Bernard if there's anything I've missed. Gentlemen, have I overlooked anything? Can you wiggle hands if that's the case?

I'm not seeing any wiggling hands.

BART BOSWINKEL: No, you didn't. Good morning, [Stephen]. Good morning, all.

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.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Good morning, Bart.

BART BOSWINKEL: No, you didn't miss anything. It's just we keep it as an item on the agenda. And, if there's nothing to record or mention, then there's nothing—

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: No, right. Carry it forward so I can document completion at the next meeting. Yes. Got you. Thank you, Bart, for bringing that up.

I think that's it for administrative matters. So, our main topic of discussion during this teleconference, as was mentioned on our last call, are the questions summarized in the document – questions pertaining to the total duration of ccTLD retirement process. That was distributed on the mailing list. Thank you, Kim, for bringing that up.

So, in summary, we're moving on from the mind maps prepared by Bart to help capture various thoughts and broad aspects of what a ccTLD retirement policy might look like, as well as [reviewing options and] documents prepared by both Allan and Bernard that we discussed on our last teleconference. Both helped, I think, structure the discussion, and I sincerely thank them both for taking the time and effort for submitting for the group's discussion. Particularly, thank you, Allan, for that strawman proposal.

If there are any questions from the group at this point regarding the way forward, I'll entertain them now if I see any waving hands.

I'm not seeing any waving hands, so, given that, do I ... no, I don't. Okay. Adobe looks like it's working tonight. How nice.

So, I guess, at this point, let's dive into the heart, which is to examine the questions summarized in the document in front of you, which, Kim, I believe is scrollable? Or, [inaudible]? Or, you scrolled it? Excellent. You got it to where it needs to be. Thank you.

Okay. So, this was the companion document to the policy and considerations document. It was distributed to the list on the 30th of November. Note that the numbering in this document on the screen is off by one because Bernard had an earlier section in there on conditions [inaudible] of the policy. So, bear with us with the numbering.

At this point, let me express apologies to the working group who are not getting these documents. We find, in the usual sense, that Bart's been able to do it with line numbers, etc. I think, for the record, we'll have all this created.

So, the plan at this point is to turn the floor over to Bernard, who will walk us through the document on the screen and provide some context to the questions. When he's finished, then I will retake the floor and solicit comments and concerns from each of you as we walk through the questions in the document.

So, Bernard, if you're up to it, I will give you the floor and let you walk us through the questions. Then, I'll come back for the [PTI] questioning of the questionings, if that works for you, sir.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: It does indeed. Can you hear me properly?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: We can. Thank you, Bernard.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Excellent. All right. Good day, everyone. Hopefully, we'll run through this fairly quickly and then have a fair amount of time for questions and comments. I think this is the meat of the subject that, as we all know, is about setting a maximum period and maybe some variations within that to give some flexibility, if not a bit of leverage, to PTI to ensure that we can have the most ... [four of] the best transition arrangements for everyone.

Anyways, let's get onto it. So, should there be a policy by the ccNSO that [sets aside] an absolute maximum period for a retirement process from end of cc assignment to country name to removal from the root file after its active manager is notified that its two-letter code has been unassigned?

The consensus of the working group was that there should be such an absolute maximum. So, basically, in the various meetings we've had, we've had that discussion. The general feeling is, yes, and this is what we're working on.

What follows there is some of the criteria that we've looked at and considered and what could come out of it.

1.1: Should absolute maximum be contingent on the size of the retiring registry? You'll remember in Barcelona there was some discussion that the consensus in the group [was that it would] be difficult to ensure an effective and applicable measurement of registry size for this purpose because there would just be too many fashions to game this.

It's worth noting that, under an STPR between the manager and PTI, the retirement can be as short as the parties agree to. This could be useful in the context where the retiring registry [has to do] with any registrations and the manager is cooperative, [that you have a] retirement for those who are fond of history: the place with many penguins.

1.2, another criteria we looked at: In an effort to encourage ccTLD managers or retiring ccTLDs to negotiate an orderly retirement process, PTI should have an absolute maximum and depend on the retiring registry jointly agreeing to a retirement process with PTI to ensure an orderly decommissioning of the registry.

There seemed to be general support for this proposal at the ICANN 63 meeting of the working group. This would imply that, if the retiring registry cannot and will not negotiate [STPR] with PTI, PTI could impose a shorter time than the absolute maximum that can be. Any consideration of an STPR scenario must include handling a breach of STPR.

So, basically, what we had been discussing is, if there is an agreement between PTI and a retiring registry, then there should be some

recognition of that. If there is not, then there should be a recognition of that also. And, maybe ensure a shorter period.

Our third point: Should the absolute maximum be contingent on the type of retirement? Retirements which provide the option for registrants and the retiring registry transfer to a new ccTLD should be of particular interest in helping to maintain the stability of the Internet and supporting registrants.

Example of transfer scenarios include [one-for-one .zr to CD or Congo, or one to many] [inaudible]. We all remember that one.

If a partial or total transfer is possible, should additional time be allowed for the transition if required? There are essentially three scenarios of interest: a total transfer – all existing registrations in the retiring registry will be offered the opportunity to transfer their registrations to a new ccTLD – a partial transfer – some of the existing registrations in the retiring registry will be offered the opportunity to transfer their registrations to a new ccTLD – and no transfer, meaning the retiring ccTLD is not being replaced by any other ccTLD, and, as such, there is no possibility of any process to transfer the registration in bulk to a new ccTLD.

This was discussed in Barcelona under the heading of name change, but there was no clear consensus. It would be consistent with the ICANN values to allow for additional time, if total or partial transfer or registration is [inaudible]. Even if the retirement of the ccTLD is associated with a name change, there may be a number of issues which limit the possibility of a total transfer.

A possible corner case with respect to total transfer is where, in a name change scenario, the retiring registry accepts its specific IDN registration while the new registry will not. Another variation of a corner case would be if the retiring registry accepted international registrants while the new registry will not. So, there are all sorts of issues associated with this. [Not one] can consider that.

Didn't really come up with any – oh – other specific, huge items which could apply. So, then we get into what should the absolute maximum be. At the group exercise held at ICANN 63, there seemed to be consensus that the absolute maximum should be ten years, which could be contingent on a number of factors.

There were also discussions of three- or five-year periods as being sufficient to wind up these operations. Periods shorter than three years were generally not considered realistic. This generates a window of three to ten years.

If we look at the various options, considering one absolute maximum – no encouragement to negotiate an STPR and no consideration of total transfer, if any – is not considered a viable option, as it would go against the option to encourage the manager to negotiate an STPR and would provide PTI with no leverage to ensure an orderly retirement of the ccTLD, which would seem to be against the core ICANN philosophy of ensuring the security and stability and resiliency of the Internet.

Default minimum and absolute maximum. It would seem logical to opt for a default minimum of either two or three years, based on the discussions at ICANN 63, and [we'd] set the date for the removal of the

retiring ccTLD from the root, unless there is an STPR agreed to by both PTI and the manager of the retiring registry. The absolute maximum would be established at ten years [which] could only be granted in the context of an STPR agreed to by both PTI and the manager or the retiring registry. A set of guidelines for negotiating and STPR would be established to ensure fair and consistent application to retiring registries.

So, basically, from our discussions previously, a lot in Barcelona, these seem to be the criteria that we have and what kind of possibilities they offer.

Back over to you, Steve.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE:

Thank you, Bernard, for that ... I can't scroll. [inaudible] scroll. Kim, can I – I guess I need whatever you do in Adobe Land, [here at the top].

All right. So, now, my questions for the group are ... we'll just run through, beginning with 1.1, 1.111. Can we work through this and come up with a [refinement] so we can try to put some of this, at least on a question-by-question basis, to bed?

So, I will entertain comments from the floor on what Bernard has just run through.

I might take the Chair's prerogative on this and start calling on people if nobody has anything to say.

Brent, you're in my sights. Comments?

Brent, you can't hide. You're on the call.

BRENT CAREY: Sorry, Stephen. I was having phone dramas here. Can you hear me?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yes, we can. Thank you very much. [Awesome to be in] summer. We're having winter here, but ...

BRENT CAREY: So, just starting on the first bit around the maximum and the size, I think, yeah, it's too difficult to be too prescriptive. So, I like [the flexibility by sealing an out-of-term] but allowing the parties to, within reason, to be able to work either quicker or leaving a little bit longer, depending on the circumstances, or trying to draft it using words like "reasonably practicable circumstances," or some of those sorts of turns of phrases, so that there [is] still a drop-dead date but it allows a little more flexibility, depending on – because you're trying to cover up so many different scenarios. So, I guess that's my first observation.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Well, Brent, do you think, to come back to you on that, that the absolute maximum should be contingent on the size of the retiring registry? Should a smaller registry have to get their stuff tidied up and out of the way quicker than a larger registry, for example?

BRENT CAREY: It's just the operational aspects of it. I guess we're tying a length of time to the actual practicality of winding up such a large operator versus a smaller operator. Then, I guess, maybe, technically, is there any differences between the size? And, given everyone runs their systems differently, I think, yeah, under circumstances, there could be reasons for it to be done quicker or not, depending on what the country's situation is like.

I think we will [inaudible] that point, like, if people are transferring away or liquidity of the registry is an issue, then it might be an incentive to do it faster if the staff are all leaving and those other things.

So, yeah, that's why I thought [either to] allow for an out-of-[term] but come up with some sort of phrasing practicable or something. That's just one idea.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: So, your viewpoint is – and, I won't say that I don't disagree with it – that size does make a difference in terms of the length of time to termination, both from a management of the registry standpoint and management of the staff standpoint, etc. Is that a fair—

BRENT CAREY: Yeah, I thin that's a fair summary.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: All right. Thank you for that, Brent. Anybody else with any comments on that? I see Nick has got his hand up. Nick, carry on.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Hi, there. Can you hear me okay?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yes, we can. Thank you, sir.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Can you hear me okay?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Great. So, just very briefly, I would say I really like this paper, and I think it captures accurately the essence of the [differences] in Barcelona. Very clear and helpful. So, that's a good reference point to, as you say, try to put some of the questions to bed.

On the specific – well, obviously, I look at this through the lens of a large registry. If we, hypothetically –]I'm supposing people don't agree on things (my frame of mind at the moment)] – suppose they didn't reach agreement with PTI and the lower limit was only three years and we've got twelve domains, some of them on ten-year registrations, then I'm a bit concerned that it's too low. So, that's my [preferred] thing.

The second thing I wanted to say was that we had long discussions around the impact of the size of the registry on the time needed to decommission or sunsets or move over to a new [inaudible] registry.

I think it's very difficult to try to put a formula, and it's very difficult to say that even a small registry might have similar complex issues as a large registry in the sense of that the volumes may be smaller but you still could have ten-year registrations, for example, and other political or complex factors, which might militate against a very short two- to three-year decommissioning period, even if it was quite a low number of registrations.

Fundamentally, I don't think the timing should be difficult. Or, rather, it's very hard to crystallize in a policy how you would be able to predict all of those variables in the abstract.

So, my gut feeling is you pick the same timing, whatever the size of the registry. But, that needs to be able to accommodate quite a large and complex registry. I think that's kind of where I'm at on this.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE:

Thank you, Nick. I think whatever language we actually come up with is going to be really tricky on this. So, if we could start thinking about it, that would be great.

I feel like it's one thing if it's 500 names or something else. If it's 10,000 names, then it's something else again, like .uk., in terms of winding down. So, I'm not quite sure at all.

I think Bernard has really structured the questions quite well, but it's, like, how do we actually try to structure language for a policy for ICANN to follow on this? It's our responsibility here, and this is a tricky question, as you rightly pointed out.

Anybody else in regards to comments? Allan, you look quiet.

Allan, you've got your hand up waving, so thank you. Appreciate it.

Allan, you got your hand up—

ALLAN MACGILLIVRAY:

Hello. All right. Thanks. Well, I, actually just to build on what Nick or Brent were saying, thought Bernie's paper was quite good. It captured a lot of the discussion. On the point of does size matter, yes it does. But, there are a large number of other factors that matter as well. That's why I think that was one of the rationales for having perhaps a two – what did Bernie call it? – default minimum and absolute maximum, with PTI having discretion to weigh on these many factors and determine what additional time is needed beyond the default.

So, that's kind of where my thinking was in the strawman paper. I'm still there, and I noticed that is captured. So, I'm really down at 1.4.2.2, with a default minimum and an absolute maximum, with PTI having discretion to enter into agreements with the outgoing registry operator, [on an] additional amount of time to take into consideration the many issues that could be at play. Thank you.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Allan. I appreciate that. Before we move on, does anybody have any comment on this? [IANA (PTI)]?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Hi. Yes, sorry. I was on mute. No, I think I just agree with what Allan and Brent and Nick said. I think this is workable. It lays out, as Allan just said, [inaudible] that we can certainly work with. Then, [inaudible] a number or negotiate a number based on the needs of the registries.

So, I think this is very well- said and very well laid out. I think this is good.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Sweet. Thank you, [inaudible]. Thank you.

All right. Moving on then to 1.2, with regards to having managers negotiate – scroll [inaudible] – comments on that [from] the group?

This issue with 1.2 is encouragement of managers of retiring TLDs because they'd dropped out of the ISO list – to negotiate the retirement process. We had general support at ICANN 63 with regards to what to do, whether or not a given manager will or will not begin negotiations for the retirement of their ccTLDs.

Are there comments on this from anybody on the working group? [I can] see how we might want to structure language about this problem because this is really a potential problem.

I see Eberhard has got his hand up, so, Eberhard, the floor is yours, sir.
And, Nick, you're next.

EBERHARD LISSE: Morning. Can you hear me?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Good morning. We can hear you, we think. Carry on. Can we—

EBERHARD LISSE: Okay. We must remember we're making policy for ICANN [or] the naming function operator. We are not making policy for ccTLDs. So, we cannot force any ccTLD into an agreement or something. We need to have a structured way laid down for which ICANN and PTI at the moment, or whoever is going to be the naming function operator at that point, will follow. Whether the ccTLD manager is bound, will be bound, by themselves or not is a separate issue.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Eberhard—

EBERHARD LISSE: That will also help us a little bit because we don't have to be too panicky about what the different ccTLD managers do and want. We have to have a bandwidth that is reasonable, but we don't have to do become too detailed.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Okay. Nick, the floor is yours.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Yeah. Just in relation to how you put in language, I would suggest something along the lines of the following around a non-exhaustive list of factors, which might lead to a presumption that PTI ought to have a larger number of years to retire, and non-exhaustive list of factors which you might think would lead PTI to reach the lower end of the scale.

But, I think they have to have non-exhaustive factors, non-binding, to be put into the mix. It's the things that we've already discussed, like the volume of registrations and the IDN complexities. I think duration and I think the nature of what is happening next with that ccTLD should all be listed as a non-exhaustive list of the factors and that there should be [one with] a number of the factors which you think tend to need a longer time to deal with. There would be a presumption of PTI going at the higher end of the scale, to the absolute maximum. That would be a sort of way to capture the essence of this without tying hands too much in the future.

So, I would like to see sort of language in there that an unreasonable PTI would not just say, "Right. It's three years. Take it or leave it," if that was the default minimum period. That's a suggestion.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Right. Yeah. I don't think we want to give them that big of a [sword], personally.

Anybody [other comments] on this particular point?

The issue of absolute maximum is, to me, really fluid. I just don't see how we can do that.

Bernard has got a hand up. Bernard has got a hand up. Yes, he does. Bernard, go ahead, sir.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you. Following on to Nick's comment, that's how I saw it, too. I think that, in line with what Eberhard was saying, we need a simple [inaudible]. Once you start getting – there are just so many elements that we don't know how they can creep up or what they could be sometimes, that it would be difficult to have a hermetic policy statement on this. I think we're going to be stuck with crafting a policy, a generic policy, and that we're going to have to have a companion set of guidelines that are factors for PTI to consider when trying to arrive at a decision for how to structure the retirement with the registry.

Thank you.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Bernard. Nick, your hand is still up. I don't know whether you want to announce vote of confidences or – oh, he's—

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Thank you very much. No, no. It was an old hand.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: He's gone away. Anyone else on this particular point, or can we move on to the next point?

EBERHARD LISSE: My hand was up.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yes, Eberhard, your hand is up. The floor is yours.

EBERHARD LISSE: The point is we can leave a lot to negotiations between the parties. We should be in [inaudible] that this needs to be negotiated according to size and complexity and so on so that we don't have to have too much detail. The shorter a policy, the better. Guidelines is one thing, but guidelines don't help us because we need to write a policy.

The point is we can always say we leave it to negotiations, taking into consideration complexity and size and [something]. So, we have a lightweight mentioning of it.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Eberhard. I think the intent of what Bernard was saying is that we do in fact produce at the end of this process a lightweight policy with guidelines for PTI as to how to handle this and that and this and

that that is not in policy because it's just beyond any concept of being able to nail down, "This is absolutely what you have to do in this situation."

EBERHARD LISSE: We can't produce guidelines. Out of scope.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Well, a lot of it – it's not so much out of scope, Eberhard, I think, as much as, "Here's the core policy on retirement," and then, "Here's suggestions/guidelines for PTI to follow, based on our discussions during the development of the core policy." Does that make sense to you?

EBERHARD LISSE: Not really. The thing with the guidelines is, when we come again into the fluid system, that no really knows what's [on]. The way out of this would be to put a lightweight mentioning in the policy, that these complexities or whatever must be taken into consideration, and then leave it to the parties.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Okay. Thank you.

EBERHARD LISSE: But, this can be sorted out and reflected upon on the mailing list or later anyway.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I would very much encourage people to take to the mailing list to have this debate. I would love to see some activity on the mailing list, in general but particularly now with this one that Eberhard has brought up.

Brent, you're next.

BRENT CAREY: Thank you. I was just going to make the observation that, whatever we've got here, too, we've got the scenarios, so we can run through and test our thinking against all the already-known scenarios that we've got here. I think that that will also stress test what we've done as well. So, as long as [we have] those different types of retirements that we already know about, [we're re-reading] through the policy, then just checking if it would be fit for purpose. So, I think that's also an opportunity. Thank you.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Brent. I think Allan's hand is – Brent, your hand needs to go down. Allan, your hand is up. The floor is yours, sir.

ALLAN MACGILLIVRAY: Thank you. I'd just like to comment on this notion of guidelines. I'm a bit encouraged by what's being said in the chat, that the use of the term is only in the context of, I guess, an extension or something like that. But,

I'm not sure that "guidelines" is the term. Maybe "factors" or something like that.

I think, looking down the road, we will likely have some kind of appeal mechanism, whether within the policy itself or overall, when we get into Phase 2 of the working group. I think, if there's any vagueness in the policy, then it just leaves the registry operator an opportunity to appeal and having an appeal process that could extend longer than perhaps even, actually, the sought-for extension.

So, I would encourage the use of maybe "factors." So, if we're talking about language, I think we have to document, as Nick said, "Here are the many considerations that have to be weighed in PTI, determining whether to grant an extension or a period beyond the default minimum." But, I'd stay away from some suggestion of guidelines that, if they're this size, maybe a period of A to B would be reasonable. I would not want to see something like that. Thanks.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE:

Okay. Thank you, Allan, for that record. Anybody else have any comments on this issue here?

Seeing none, let's move down a little bit and see what else we have some controversy about.

[inaudible]. Kim, can you scroll down a little bit to – wait, I can scroll. Who's scrolling? [inaudible] scrolling.

I can scroll. Am I in charge? [inaudible]. Can we go to Section 2 on this document?

Well ...

[inaudible]

Technical issues here. Hold on.

[Thank you]. With regards to Section 2, are we at a point now – we’ve discussed this enough ...

BART BOSWINKEL: Stephen, this is Bart.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Bart. Help me.

BART BOSWINKEL: The reason for including this one is effectively to [seal off] and to show the importance of reaching a conclusive consensus on the duration or the maximum time and say how you want to structure it, because, once you’ve got this in place, effectively – I think everybody has got this sense already – then all the other aspects are fairly easy. Then, we can start focus on the oversight process as the next item. That was included in the original paper Bernie produced.

So, the reason for limiting this to Section 2 is in fact to focus on the duration of the absolute maximum and how to get there. So, I don’t know if anybody has some additional thoughts about the absolute maximum. For example, what should be the consequences? Do you

agree, once the absolute maximum is reached, that it is the time of removal? Because that was suggested in the introduction.

If that's the case – you've discussed this in the first round until now – I think, yeah, we know where to move, say, with the next document. Thanks, Stephen.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE:

Okay. Thank you, Bart. Appreciate that.

With regards to that, we have had some correspondence from former participants in prior working groups that have been working up to this working group that have some issue with our proposed timeframe. I proposed to the group – should we reach out to them for a semi-formal input, I guess – that's how I would describe it – into our work at this point or not?

So, let's see your comments on that. Anybody have some thoughts on that? Let me know. I'm referring to members of the FOI Working Group (Framework of Interpretation Working Group) who have retired from the field of play but have expressed some questions about what we're doing.

Bernard has got his hand up, so I will defer to Bernard to see what he has to say. Bernard, the floor is yours, sir.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Thank you. Just a reminder of the process [inaudible], I think we have to keep in mind that it's not that we're going to sit around this virtual table

and come up with a decision and hand it off and it's done, unless I'm missing something. Our usual process is that, if we get this group to come sort of consensus on something, then we would take that position then, present it for wider consultation and input, and then we would take input from that consultation to see if we actually had hit the nail on the head properly with what we were trying to do.

So, that's a long-winded way to say that going out too early just to ask a few people sometimes causes more problem than not. We've got this group that is focusing on issues that we agree about a number of points that have been brought up. We're trying to come to some sort of [consensus]. And – I don't know. Personally, in my experience, it can end up muddying the waters. Thank you.

But, that there won't be a chance for people to weigh in before we come to closure on this.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE:

Thank you, Bernard. I appreciate that because, yes, in fact, at the end of the day, it all goes out for public comment.

[That's weird]. Is that mine or somebody else's?

Not mine.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Continue, Steve. It's gone.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Okay. That wasn't mine. I'm like, "What?"

BART BOSWINKEL: No, it isn't.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: All right. Okay. Moving on then, does the group have any other issues, considerations, or questions regarding the group of questions presented in front of you with regards to duration?

Do we consider this a semi-consensus, a full consensus, or scratching our heads? Because I will consider this as consensus on this core document without anybody in the group objecting otherwise. So, is there anyone else here who wants to say anything about all this? It's the first reading, so we get to play with it. We were very early in on the process.

BART BOSWINKEL: Stephen, may I suggest a way forward? I think this was a very ...

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: [inaudible]. Go ahead, Bart.

BART BOSWINKEL: I think was a very fruitful discussion. Unfortunately, this is the first reading. We just had a few participants. My take is we need to revisit this document it is, but we do it in a lightweight [expression], as we

always do, if there are any comments. Then, we take it and use the comments you've made to the paper and start to insert some of the responses and, where there are additional questions, revisit that on the next meeting.

So, in that way, probably by the next meeting, you have an updated version of this paper with some of your responses included. Then, we take it from there. I think by then, at least you can see the framework of how the policy plays already with this topic. So, that would be my way forward.

The responses are a good way for us to work on the document and get back to you in January with an updated version. We revisit the questions current in the proper way, and then we move on to the next iteration, which includes the responses to date. Thank you.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE:

That works for me. Does that work for the working group? Any comments on what Bart has proposed?

Seeing none, let's go forward with that. Thank you, Bart. I really appreciate that, by the way, Bart.

I think, as a result, we will close the discussion of this item and move onto the next agenda item, which I guess is the AOB.

Does anybody have any other business that they would like to bring forth? Any dissatisfactions or concerns or whatever?

Seeing none, the next meeting, I believe, is going to be at – now I’ve lost my notes in front of me ... hmm. God, help me out here. I’ve lost ...

BART BOSWINKEL: The 17th.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: The 17th of January at – I forgot – 1300 something [inaudible] UTC time.

EBERHARD LISSE: [inaudible] It’s in the chat.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: It’s in the chat. Okay, great.

EBERHARD LISSE: It’s in the chat.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yeah, I see that, Bernard. Thank you. Yes, thank you, Kimberly, as well.

So, if nobody has any other business – we’ve determined the next meeting – I want to thank everyone for participating. I want to wish a happy holiday season. I hope we all get some good time with family and friends. We’ll see you in 2019.

I think, with that, barring anybody else waving their hands – I don't see anybody waving their hands – I wish you all a great end of the way, a great holiday downtime season with your families. We'll see you next year. Thank you very much for participating.

With that, Kim, I can close the call. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]