EBERHARD LISSE: Fire it up.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you. So, good morning, good afternoon and good evening. I want to thank everyone for joining today's teleconference, our third call of the month of August when everybody takes a month off, so I feel we should give ourselves a pat on the back for that. I call this one our blue moon teleconference, I feel it's a nice way to conclude the summer season here, at least in the Northern Hemisphere.

For the record, this is the 29 August edition of the ccNSO PDP working group tasked with developing ICANN policy with respect to the retirement of ccTLDs from the root zone, and we have convened this call today at 1900 UTC. I note that North and South America has hit the sweet spot for this meeting as it's 1300 here on the US East Coast and 10 am on the US West Coast. So I'm expecting strong participation and if anyone doesn't make the call, we will know who you are.

I also want to thank our colleagues living on or near the anti prime meridian for joining us this evening; that's you, Brent, as it's pretty early, late at night. And I have not seen any written apologies to the list, perhaps, Kimberly has some. I'm also assuming Staff will be taking attendance in the usual manner. So if there's anyone on audio only let yourselves be known, and I believe we just have Allan at the moment, so you're duly noted. Further I'd like to note, we do not have Bart or Moses with us today as they are on a well-deserved holiday having a

much better respect for work/life balance than I do, since I ran our last call whilst I was on holiday.

The main goals today for this teleconference are to dive back into the actual draft policy text that Bernard has been working on and to also have Eberhard briefly introduce and discuss the GAC onboarding session, which is scheduled for the Montreal meeting, which Eberhard has been working on diligently for the last couple weeks. Before we dive into all this, I do have a couple agenda administrative announcements and action items. I'd like to begin reminding everyone of our upcoming face-to-face meeting at the Montreal meeting, which is now booked into blocks 4 and 5 on Saturday, the 2nd of November. No firm details yet on how our time will be structured within those two blocks. We will dive into the revised ISO-3166 document as it has some terminology changes. So stay tuned for updates on that and those will go out to the list and also be brought up at the next meeting.

With regards to Action Items such as mentioned, we're going to schedule part of our time in Montreal to take a look at that new ISO stuff, and we're counting on you for some support there. Additionally, we came away from our last call with an Action Item that indicates that the review mechanisms will be "built into the policy" and I presume we're all in agreement on that. I'm not clear how that popped up as an Action Item, but it's in the notes.

We got a couple others but since one involves Bart and he's not on the call today, and the other related to having a discussion regarding exceptionally reserved names on the list between our last meeting and this meeting, which didn't really occur, we can defer discussion on

those. And I think with that, I'll turn to the heart of today's call, which is a further discussion on the core draft policy document being built by Bernard. Bernard, do you wish Kimberly to have the clean or red line version displayed? I'll let you work that out with her and I'll turn the floor over to you, sir.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Red line, red line, please.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I assumed that, the floor is yours.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, sir. Alright, first of all, as I mentioned in the email, there are significant changes and we will walk through them. I tried to piece together, Bart drafted some of this language right before going on holidays and I did my best to translate it from Dunglish in certain cases, when he writes very fast, Dutch-English, and so don't shoot the messenger, we're going to get through it. This is the first cut at some significant changes. With this forewarning, let's walk our way through it. Alright, next page, please. There are no changes there. And next page, please. Alright, now we've got a few pages. Do you think you could scroll up just a bit so we get all of 2 on one page? No, it's not going to let us do that, okay.

So the initial part, "The objective of the policy is to provide clear and predictable guidance and to document a process that is orderly and reasonable from the time," next page please, and that's where we have the change.   Basically originally the text was only about when about when a ccTLD was being retired from the ISO-3166 list and we've got some new text in here. Is Naela on today? I didn't see if she had made it, because I know she emailed me.

NAELA SARRAS: I'm here.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yes, she is.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: So you'll be able to interject that at the right moment. So, what I'll do is I'll just walk us through from 26 to 32, and then we'll take comments and points. So the first one was a modification of the one we had there originally, which is "A code element is removed from the ISO 3166-1 list by the ISO 3166-MA." The second one is, "A code element is removed from the list of exceptionally reserved codes by the 3166-MA," so we have been talking about the exceptionally reserved list over the last few months.   And finally, "An IDN ccTLD string of characters no longer qualifies as an IDN ccTLD string (to be defined under ccPDP-4)," "up and to, but excluding the removal of a ccTLD from the Root Zone.

So, the gates are open. Yes, there are typos, sorry folks, we were running against the wind, trying to get this done, then we had some technical difficulties. The next version should be a lot cleaner. Alright, Eberhard, you're first on the list.

EBERHARD LISSE: Peter made an email comment which I agree with in substance, but not in the language. We can fix this, he said, and we shouldn't write removing it from the list because the list is not actually the standard. ISO 3166-1 is a standard. And I think we can solve this problem by looking at it from a perspective of status. A code element can be assigned can be reserved, it can be not part of the standard like these 42 that they have listed, which may change. The point, and Peter has his hand up so he can come in just now, the point that he and I, I think are in agreement on, that we should use the right language to describe what we are trying to describe here.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, Eberhard. Peter, you're up next.

PETER KOCH: Yes, thank you. Am I audible? I'm in a public space, so I can't talk too loudly.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: You sound fine.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: You sound like Brenda Vacarro on a good day.

PETER KOCH: This is a culture mismatch, I'm sorry.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: No problem.

PETER KOCH: I think that the final remark that Eberhard made is true, we can agree that, yes, we need the correct language, but I think we have a strong disagreement of what the right language is. I submitted my comment to the list. I strongly believe that we need to get rid of any normative reference to "exceptionally reserved" because the ISO working group didn't make things better and didn't make things clearer with a new draft. The old document actually only has an on or off, the standard is binary about the things that are on the standard.

And the new version of the draft, excuse my French, creates a mess, and to avoid that we should get rid of this exceptionally reserved, and we ought to phrase it in a way that is neutral, that covers the few, the handful of TLDs that we may need to take care of, but avoids this language. And I think in the interest of time, so if we get through the whole document we might want to postpone it until the end of this session or to the mailing list because I think the statements have been

made, we now need to work on the language that just avoids the difficult parts.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, Peter. Okay, Stephen.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you. If I could go back to Peter, if I understand your feelings correctly, you feel that the revised language in the ISO document has made things even more murkier than they already are?

PETER KOCH: Yes, Stephen, from my perspective, after reading, I got a copy of the standard, I read it two or three times, I think this draft is unfortunately kind of inconsistent in its use of the status of the code, in terms of being in or out of the standard and being in or out of online browsing platform and yeah, we're kind of in a bad state here. But, the good news, I think, is we can just avoid that by saying that those codes that are delegated are not on the standard, which means that they're not in the online browsing platform language, they are not assigned. And that covers any reason except that they have been deleted, that those TLDs need to be dealt with on a case by case basis, and language to that extent I think can be wordsmithed on the list better than right now here.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Okay, thanks for that clarification. Bernard, I turn the floor back over to you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, sir. Eberhard?

EBERHARD LISSE: Thank you. I'm not sure I can agree with everything Peter says. What we cannot have happen is a situation where we refer in a policy to the ccTLDs which are now exceptionally reserved, where the code is exceptionally reserved by name. We also need to make provision for what happens if another country code becomes exceptionally reserved for which a ccTLD is delegated? So, I think we should - I agree with him that the draft standard is a draft, it is inconsistent at one stage it uses the word "indeterminate," when it means "indefinitely," or the other way around.

So I think we really need to wait for a standard to become the official policy and then look at it, how we write it. In the substance, I agree with Peter and therefore we could maybe agree to disagree on the language and wait for that to be finalized and then come up with a mutually agreeable language.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, Eberhard. This sounds like a perfect opportunity to use the GAC technique or technique used by governments of square bracketing things, until we actually get to some understanding on the language. Alright, thank you very much for comments on 26 and 27. Any other comments? And Naela, I'm expecting you to come in on 29.

NAELA SARRAS:	So, hi everyone this is Naela. On 29, the only reason why I added the comment I did is that I felt that the document is very clear that when it comes to the ASCII two-letter codes, everyone understands that we're talking about delegated TLDs, whereas in the IDNs, we're talking about strings and this policy only applies if that string is actually delegated. So I just wanted to make sure that that's somehow clarified. I also think that throughout the document, as I said in a later comment, I think there's a disconnect between the IDN ccTLDs and their qualification criteria and then ASCII ccTLDs, and if you recall an IDN ccTLD can only exist if the country or territory it represents is also on the ISO 3166-1 list. So, it would be good to tie those together.
	So, if a ASCII TLD loses its designation on the ISO 3166 list, let's say Egypt, for example, I would imagine that Egypt and its IDN [inaudible] would also become disqualified right away. That's my assumption of how this would work, but I would like clarification because as the implementation person for when this comes down the road, this is the understanding I have and if that's not correct, I'd like clarification, please.
BERNARD TURCOTTE:	Thank you very much for that, Naela. Good question. Eberhard?
EBERHARD LISSE:	The operative word here is in round brackets (to be defined under ccPDP 4). I can anticipate, for example, a Kingdom of something to change to a Federal Republic of the same name, which means the name changed maybe the ASCII Code element will change, country code will

EN

change on the ISO list, but as far as the IDN string is concerned, it only referred to the name without mentioning the word Kingdom and now Federal Republic. So I don't think we can just say if a country code becomes unassigned, that the IDN code immediately becomes unassigned. In a pure renaming, yeah, and I noticed this today, we haven't really dealt with renaming. If a country disappears, obviously, then also the IDN goes away. But the operative word should be here that we let the ccPDP sort this problem out for us.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you very much, Eberhard. Nenad?

NENAD ORLIĆ: I hope you can understand me. Well, I may say that I'm finally happy to see the IDN coming into the policy. And basically, more important than part 29 for me is the part 46 to 38 of the text of the policy, and what I do not like in the 29, 30 lines is future tense of the sentence to be defined. I think we should find some wording to include the future policy as a standard. We always grasp the problem of finding the right trigger event for retirement of the IDN ccTLD, and it is really a problematic subject, I agree, but since it's been outsourced to the ccPDP-4 group, part of our problem is solved and the good solution is this 46 to 48, we say okay, we treat it as equal, basically.

But, just we need to find some other language, I think this is the first time I hear speak about the language of the policy, and that is to avoid any future reference because okay, this policy should last, in a few years

we shouldn't be having texts, this will be defined. So much from me, for now.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, Nenad, and I think you raise a good point. Let's not forget that this is a draft and some of the comments that are included such as to be defined under ccPDP-4 are not things that would end up in a final policy document. So I agree, we would come up with another way of putting this, but let's remember this is a working document for us to give hints to everyone about how we're doing things. Alright, great round of comments. And any last takers on Section 2? Okay, not seeing any let's move on to Section 3, where we again have some new text.

"This policy is developed in accordance with Article 10, section 6 (a) and (b) of the ICANN Bylaws and accordingly is directed at ICANN." I don't think this will cause, we're going to take them one at a time. I don't think this thing should cause any heartburn anywhere, but I'm ready to listen to it, if there is any. Going once, going twice, sold.

Alright, 36, for the purpose of this policy, an IDN ccTLD is deemed to be a ccTLD, and an IDN ccTLD is considered to be a ccTLD Manager, unless explicitly stated otherwise." So, we'll clean up the language, you get the idea, we're saying that an IDN ccTLD is a ccTLD and an IDN ccTLD Manager is a ccTLD Manager, unless explicitly stated otherwise, is what it should say. Again, I apologize for that. It made sense at some point in very early morning hours. Any comments on 36 to 38? At least on the intent? Okay, I'm not seeing any. Thank you very much. Next page, please, Kimberly.

Alright, a few minor things here, managers, and then at the end we have, "code has been removed from the ISO 3166-1 list or in the case of IDN ccTLDs which no longer qualifies as such. Now, I agree that from our previous discussion, the reference to removed from the ISO 3166-1 list, we will have to find the right term, and I don't necessarily want to go into a debate about that. I will accept that right away and say that in the next version you'll probably see that in square brackets. What's more of interest is the last part, "or in the case of IDN ccTLDs which no longer qualifies as such." Are we okay with that, 41, 42? Seeing no major objections, we're doing.

Alright, 43 to 46 "For the purposes of this policy a Functional Manager is the entity listed as "ccTLD Manager" now that we've agreed earlier that it works for both IDN ccTLDs and regular ccTLDs, "or any later variant used in the IANA Root Zone database, and who is active with respect to the management of the ccTLD or with whom the IFO can officially and effectively communicate."

So, you will remember that our big discussion was that this was originally written with an "and" there, and Eberhard made the point that could cause problems, we agreed with that. So, really the only change here is that we're giving ourselves an out in case the term 'manager' changes in the IANA Root Zone Database. So we're saying, or any other variant used, so that we can future proof this a bit, should there be a change of terminology. So, 43 to 46, any issues? Going once, going twice. Sold to the lady with the brown hat.

Alright, 47 to 55, minor capitalization. I don't think we want to spend our time on that, 56 to 60, alright, "In the event the retirement process

is triggered by the removal of a code element from the list of exceptionally reserved codes," understanding there is going to be a lot of square bracketing here, "the removal process shall be decided on a case by case basis, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case. As an example, if a code element is removed from the exceptionally reserved list and transferred to the standard list and remains assigned and associated with the same country name to which it was assigned and associated with in the list of exceptionally reserved code elements, then the ccTLD should not be retired."

Now, as I said, let's not argue about what is the right term or status. I think we all understand we're talking about elements on the exceptionally reserved list. If they come off the exceptionally reserved list, we're saying we're going to have to go on a case by case basis and really understand all the implications of that. And the example that is given is that if that happens to an exceptionally reserved code that was for representing Country X and is now moved over to the standard and is still representing Country X, it might not need to be removed or retired, is what we're saying. Alright, Eberhard you're first on the list.

EBERHARD LISSE: That happened to .gj, Gurnsey and Jersey, they were exceptionally reserved and became assigned. The one for which that could happen is probably .ac, that's exceptionally reserved, and it could happen that that becomes assigned. The others are .su and .uk and .eu, and we don't foresee that they become assigned.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: That is correct, thank you for that, Eberhard. Naela?

NAELA SARRAS: I see the statement in this blue section right here, up to section 62 to be contradicting with the definition at the top that Eberhard and Peter had a discussion about. So, maybe when the top section is clarified for me, I can live with this one, but I see that there's a conflict between, we define exceptionally reserved coming off "exceptionally reserved as a qualification criteria to enter this process," but then here we say "on a case by case basis." I understand that example, but I think there's a conflict in my view.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Noted, thank you Naela. Peter?

PETER KOCH: Yes, I understand, Bernard, you said that there will be lots of square bracketing around this and that would also address Naela's comments and I just wanted to reinforce that. My hope is that if we get rid of the bullet item in section 2 that much of this is either superfluous or can be moved into an explanatory or appendix footnote, or something like that. But we don't need it normatively here, anyway, thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yes, it all depends how we're going to resolve the stuff in Section 2, I absolutely agree and as I said, we'll be making generous and judicious use of square bracketing going forward in the next versions. Alright,

thank you for that. Any last comments on this Section 3? Going once, going twice. Alright, sold. Next page, please, Kimberly. No changes here, next page, please, no changes here, I like no changes. Next page, please. Editorial Comment. I'm not going to get hung up on this. Next page, please. Again, editorial , it does not change the meaning in any way, shape, or form. Next page, please. Alright, here we go. Yeah, probably should look at the previous paragraph, back up one, please. Thank you.

So, starting at 140, so, we're talking about, you will remember that the ccTLD manager may produce a retirement plan if it wishes to do so, it has got 12 months and if this does not happen in 12 months, there can be an extension of an additional 12 months for a total of 24 months. And here we're talking about the response from the IFO after such a request has been made, so starting at 140. "The response by the IFO, if positive, shall state the length of the extension which has been granted." It's not an automatic full 12 months, we're saying there can be variations there.

Why? Well, if someone has almost finished a retirement plan, you know, maybe you just need three months and everyone's going to be happy, "If the response is negative, the IFO shall include the specific reasons for the refusal. The approval of an extension request shall not be unreasonably withheld. The WG anticipates that if the request for an extension is rejected and the ccTLD Manager feels that the rejection has been unreasonably withheld or is inconsistent with the rules it will be able to use the review mechanism that will be developed in part of the ccNSO PDP-3."

So, basically what we've been saying this essentially 144 to 147 was the original Footnote 6 and it essentially has been migrated up into the text. So, we're saying if you're not happy with the decision on trying to get an extra 12 months to produce a retirement plan because it was unreasonably withheld or inconsistent with the rules, you will be able to appeal. Peter, your hand is up.

PETER KOCH: Could we have the previous page, please? The earlier lines of 4.4? in 132 to 136, I think the language needs clarification. Like, for example, if the, IFO grants an extension, it shall promptly notify the manager. Of course, I think, the expectation is if the IFO does not grant the extension, then there should also be a notification, and things like that. So we don't have to go into gory detail, but there's some internal logic that might need a bit of streamlining

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay, thank you, noted.

PETER KOCH: And on the next page, page 10, yes, so, starting with Line 144, and I vaguely remember that we had that issue in the previous section, the working group anticipates it is kind of a language that might be confusing in a policy document. So either we polish that, as well, or we move it into a footnote to clearly make it, well, it is already in the footnote, kind of, to clearly emphasize that this is not normative text and then so on and so forth, just edit for as a rationale section. I'm

raising it now, because at some point we will have the final version and then of course the brushing is too late. And so apologies for my adherence to detail.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: No apology needed. We appreciate it, thank you very much. Probably what I see in 144 to 147 is referring to an appeal and then in the footnote, talking about the other process which will actually deal with the appeal itself, since it's to be developed elsewhere, but as I said, right now we're just trying to get the big pieces together and in the right places. And once we get to that, I'm sure we'll come up with the right language. Thank you very much. Any other comments or questions? Alright, not seeing any, thank you very much.

Next page, please. Alright, the big thing here is oversight and review mechanisms, and this was Bart's creation. I've tried to do it justice and turning it into something we can all walk our way through. And let's go to it, 165 to 171.

"Oversight - This policy is directed at ICANN and the IFO as the entity that performs the IANA Naming Functions with respect to ccTLDs. This includes but is not limited to the delegation, transfer, revocation and retirement of ccTLDs. This policy is not intended and should not be interpreted to amend the way in which ICANN interacts with the IFO and the delineation of their roles and responsibilities. With respect to the delegation, transfer and revocation of ccTLDs, this delineation is documented for the current IFO - Public Technical Identifiers (PTI) - in the IANA Naming Function Contract. However, it is expected that the

IANA Naming Function Contract will be amended to refer to this policy with respect to the retirement of ccTLDs.

In addition, this policy is not expected to change or amend the role of the ICANN Board of Directors as with respect to individual cases of ccTLD delegation, transfer and revocation, which is understood to be limited to a review to ensure that the IFO (staff) has followed the proper procedures. For purposes of this policy it is strongly advised that the ICANN Board of Directors limit itself to a similar review with respect to the decisions of the IFO regarding the retirement of ccTLDs."

I'm going to continue just a bit, because those next few lines are just part of it. "It is important to note that the IFO's decisions to notify the ccTLD Manager of the retirement and remove a ccTLD from the Root Zone are out of scope for this policy (see Section 2)."   Alright, let's open it up.   Questions, comments, please.   Oh come on folks, you're disappointing me. Alright, Eberhard.

EBERHARD LISSE: Can we make this much shorter?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: It's a first version, Eberhard, I will take my scalpel to it, yes. Naela?

NAELA SARRAS: I put a comment here and I need to go back and check the naming function contracts because this seems to be saying that it specifically says, follow these policies for the delegation transfer and revocation of

TLDs and therefore we're going to modify it to also apply this policy for the retirement, but I didn't think that the contract would entail those details of saying use this policy or that policy. So, I need to go look at the contract, because I'm not sure why it's saying that the naming function contract will be modified to say now we have this new policy to follow. If it doesn't specifically call out policies, I don't know why it would be calling this one out specifically.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Good point, and we would appreciate you looking to that and getting back to us. Thank you.

NAELA SARRAS: I will do that, I'll take that Action Item.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: alright, thank you Naela. Peter?

PETER KOCH: I think I sent it to the list already, but talking about 180 to 183, I saw Eberhard's response to this, I still am confused by the notification part, should be out of scope for the policy. I think I understand that this is trying to say the right thing but the harder I try, the lesser way I find to interpret it in that correct way, so, a bit of enlightenment would be appreciated.

EN

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yeah, and I think I understand your issue and I just started playing with that text. Eberhard?

EBERHARD LISSE: What we want to say is we are not going to tell IFO when and how to find out that retirement has to happen and after it has found out when and how to tell the ccTLD Manager concerned. Since the clock starts ticking only when IFO tells this to the ccTLD Manager. I don't think it's a major issue, we can sort this out this language.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yeah, I agree, it's not a major issue, as a matter of fact, as I'm reading it now, I'm thinking that maybe 181, what possibly could help this is the IFO's decision to notify the ccTLD Manager of the retirement. Peter? Incident form a one at one Possibly could help. What could help. This is the decision, the decision to notify the CCT LD manager of the retirement. Peter?

PETER KOCH: So without reference to the current IFO, I just wanted to say that a malicious IFO or a politically sensitive even paranoid IFO, I'm not saying the current isn't, as necessary, so anyway, a malicious entity could carefully try to avoid the problem by just ignoring the fact that the code disappears from the list and not recognizing this, so they wouldn't have to send a notice and wouldn't have to enter into negotiations, just say because they happen to be in the jurisdiction or former jurisdiction of the territory that got deleted or whatever reasons they might have. So,

I think if the IFO was sleeping, the process should give the community the tools to wake them up, that's my point. And again, without reference to the current IFO, of course.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Alright, thank you very much. Personally, I think that's stretching it a bit, because if we go back to the top, we're being very clear about a ccTLD that gets removed from the list has to be removed from the root zone and I think my lawyer friends would probably have a field day with this. But, alright, let's think about that, noted. Thank you, Peter. Any other comments on this segment? Okay, moving on. Last one, folks, we're almost there. Oh, no, no, back up the page, thank you. It's a short one.

Review Mechanism. "The Review mechanism for decisions pertaining to the delegation, transfer, revocation and retirement of ccLTDs shall be developed in part 2 of the ccNSO PDP-3. In this policy on retirement, decisions have been identified which shall be subject to such a review mechanism." Alright, so we're saying the things that can use the review mechanism have been clearly identified here. Alright, the floor is open, thoughts, questions, comments?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Wake up people.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Alright, not seeing anything, next page, please. And we're done. Stephen, back over to you.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Bernard, thank you everyone for participating. I guess we will turn now to the next agenda item which is The GAC onboarding presentation that's under development which will be presented at the Montreal meeting in lieu of a formal CccNSO GAC meeting. That time slot will be devoted to bringing GAC membership, which has a rather high turnover rate, as you know, up to speed on where we are, and again, making the insane appeal yet again for some GAC participation in this group. And so with that, Eberhard, if you have a few remarks you wish to say I will turn the floor over to you, sir.

EBERHARD LISSE: Yeah, we presented last time to the GAC meeting and it was apparent that many of them have no clue what we're talking about. They don't even know what the ISO list is. So, I think it is good for us to give them a systematic presentation starting right from the beginning how the DNS was developed, what the difference between gTLDs and ccTLDs in practice is, with a little bit of background how it works, and then clarify a little bit about terminology and when that's done, move over to explain why retirement is necessary.

And then, not so much going into the details on how it's to be done but showing a few points that came up that are important. For example, the time it takes when they should stop taking renewals that are later than the date, that kind of thing. So the GAC members especially the new GAC members have a bit of understanding on what we are talking about. I intend to make a bullet point presentation and have found a

way of including this into sort of a master document which then triggers notes that I have in the main presentation which will not show up on the PDF screen on the screen when I make the presentation, but will show up on the handout, so when I write the presentation and Stephen and I work on the presentation, that we put our thoughts and comments basically in a readable narrative, which the people can have beforehand, and they can read it and then we go through the presentation and have enough time to answer questions.

Last time we could only take two questions, and I found that was a little bit short. I personally would have preferred to do this on a day before the GAC meeting starts, so that they could have a proper onboarding for new members the Board does and things. But obviously, these people are not available until one minute before the meeting starts, they will not put in another session because it's on their own time, probably.

I intend also when we have got this in a reasonable manner to circulate it by the group so that we know whether we're making some really serious boo-boos. We need some technical input with regards to the description of the DNS and the domain name space and some input with regards to ISO so that we use the right concepts, while terminology is important, we may not focus too much on the right terminology during that, but that they understand the concepts and fortunately it's the end of August, and we only need to have it in two months, so we have enough time to get it done properly.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you Eberhard, and as you pointed out, this will be presented to the group and reviewed by the group to make sure we've got our story straight on that. Any questions from anyone on that to Eberhard? Seeing none, that being the case, thank you Eberhard. Let us move on to Any Other Business. Is there any other business? Does anybody have anything they wish to bring up?

I do not see any hands. I'm going to assume then that the answer is no. Then with regards to our next meeting, the next meeting will be on the 12th of September at 2300 UTC so as you can see, we're shifting into worse times for people near the meridian and better times through for those out in Asia Pacific, and that's as it should be.

And I think that's it. I don't see any last minute waving of hands. I just want to take the opportunity afforded me here as the Chair to thank all the participants and to extend my sincere thanks to Bernard and Kimberly for their excellent work and that they make it possible, so we can close 12 minutes early. Last chance, anybody have anything? I see no hands. Kim, I believe we're done. I will declare this adjourned, you can stop recording. Thank you again, everyone for participating. Bye bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]