
STEPHEN DEERHAKE:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. I want to thank you for joining today's teleconference, which is the next to the next to the last I believe prior to our coming face-to-face in Cancun. For the record, this is 23 January 2020 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 meeting today at 17:00 UTC.

Since I was not present on the last call, I do want to take this opportunity to wish everyone a belated happy new year. I also wish to thank the vice chair Dr. Eberhard for stepping in at the last minute and running the last call. I want to thank those who either stayed up late or really late or have gotten up really early, such as Brad, for your participation in today's call. I also wish to thank Bart and Joke for giving up some of their evening for us. Their work is not yet done because there's a council call immediately after this one.

Given that we do have a teleconference for the council an hour from now, we're not going to have any extra time today as Bart and Kimberly and Joke and myself need to pitch up on that call. I believe we probably have some apologies for this call, and I suspect likely our two working group members who are also Board members will not be participating. I know Nigel is not because he's [inaudible] on his way to L.A. I'm assuming that staff will be taking attendance in the usual manner. So if there's anyone on audio only, identify yourself so you get properly credited with pitching up.

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.

With regards to administrative announcements, I'd like to remind everyone that Joke recently sent the call for volunteers for the second working group regarding ccTLD retirements, which is identified both as PDP 3 "Part 2" and also as "ccPDP 3." The focus will be on the appeals mechanism that John Postel makes reference to in RFC 1591 wherein he describes it as "the Internet DNS Names Review Board." The opening date for volunteers for this add-on, follow-on working group is Friday, tomorrow, the 24th at 23:59 UTC. I would like to encourage one and all to consider staying on for round two.

With regards to action items, at this point I do need to publicly apologize to Bart for missing the webinar on the ccPDP 3 that was held earlier today by him. I completely misread my paper schedule this morning when I got into the office. But, Bart, if you can give us a quick review of the webinar.

BART BOSWINKEL:

The slides will be available on the recording as well. It was just a recap of what's in the issue report and in the charter. It was more for newcomers who are interested in and thinking about participation in the new working group so to have a bit of a background and understanding what is expected, a little bit on the working methods. I've used the work of this working group as an example of how it could be done, including the rules of engagement, etc. I would say the working method that this group has developed [this one year] going into in-depth discussions at face-to-face meetings then define and detail the outcomes of the face-to-face meetings in between sessions and document the results, and I think that was a fair way forward.

Also presented a tentative timeline, which is very tentative and very probably too aggressive. It's two years, or one year effectively. As you well know, the timeline is amendable. So when need be, it will happen. Also alluded to the fact that the new working group has to nominate a new chair and vice chair, so that's the other thing.

With respect to the context, etc., it's not just RFC 1591. It's also other mechanisms that are in place which [have] not been detailed. It's clearly mentioned, the IDNB, but the working group will devise a policy and has to come up with its own review mechanism. Whether it's an appeal or it's another way of dealing with it, that's up to the working group to determine in the end.

I think these were the highlights. I said presentation is available and the recording will be made available. Maybe one thing that might be of interest: we are working with the secretariat of the GAC to see if we can do the same introductory webinar for members of the GAC at least to inform them this is upcoming and to see whether one or two people are interested to join as participants in this effort. So that's one side of the coin. The other side is they are kept abreast as of the beginning of the effort, so that's also probably an advantage.

So that's all I have to say around the webinar. I see one or two people who are on the call were also on the webinar. Maybe they want to speak up or say how they perceived and experienced the webinar.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I also see a hand from Eberhard, so we'll start with Eberhard. And anybody else who wants to chime in on the webinar, feel free to do so. Eberhard, the floor is yours.

EBERHARD LISSE: With regards to interesting the GAC, given my experience with that, good luck.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Well, we realize that, given my experience [inaudible].

EBERHARD LISSE: I am also quite willing to do it again with the GAC and with the group in any way.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Anybody else have any comments who participated in the webinar? And again, Bart, my apologies. I just completely misread my calendar. If not, let's focus on what we want to do today. What we want to do today is to dive further into the stress testing process that we began in Montreal and have continued since then. Having read the transcript of the last call, I see that some serious progress was made in this regard. I also noted a couple of interesting exchanges: Nenad's comments as well as Patricio's. It's also clear from the transcript that we still have some identified situations where the outcome is unclear, and that's what I would like us to focus on today if possible.

In that regard, Bart is going to lead us through his table of situations as he did on the last call. It's my understanding that we have closure on Items 1-7, but things are more fluid with respect to Item 8 and above, including some first readings. So what I hope is we can make some progress today so that we'll be well positioned to publish an interim report on the working group's progress ahead of the Cancun meeting. I have nothing further myself. I don't see a big wave of hands, so at this point I think I will turn the floor over to Bart. Bart, the floor is yours, sir.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Thanks, Steven. What I've done is, as you can see, I've updated the draft policy document. So it's now called Version 2.01, and the proposal is to use this one moving forward because it now has the stress testing included and a bit of background and process description so you have a sense of how the interim report may look like.

With respect to Section 6, so the stress testing, let me recap what I've done so you understand, and then we'll go into where we got stuck last time. What I've included in 6.1 is the description of stress testing that you discussed and we've used as a working group since Montreal. So that was the headings with the questions and the description of what it meant. So that's Section 6.1.

Section 6.2 is the identified situations, so the corner case situations. If you can scroll down, Kim, that runs from Roman 1 to 15 (i to xv). Can you scroll down? You can see these are the descriptions of the test cases to date.

Please note that with respect to Number 9, and we will revisit this one today, Number 9 is breach of agreement due to conflicts of laws. In the previous version, we had breach of agreement and then three different cases. Two were, I would say, related to legal procedures. One is a court injunction and then the second one is applicable national law or court order. I've included a heading called conflicts of law because I think the bottom line is, and it was a part of the discussion you had on the last meeting, but the fundamental issue here is there are conflicts of laws and one way or the other it needs to be addressed.

And then the other one is additional cases of breach of agreement, say breach of agreement during extension period. That was one that was identified. If we would scroll up, or it's not necessary, Kim, you see there are other cases of breach of agreement as well, but we will revisit.

Then the others we still have to deal with based on the discussion. As you can see, Number 10 has been adjusted as well. It's not just limited to commercial interests but interests in general intend to keep the ccTLD alive, and then the rest. So that's where we stopped last time with respect to the different situations. Could you go to the next page please, Kim?

What we've done in the meantime is if you recall from the previous document we had the situation, some language, the result, and then the conclusion whether something needed to be adjusted or not. There was also a comment from Patricio to include a reference to the section when discussed. The reason for including the table and everything else in this document is to make it easier to scroll in between and to find the reference to the document. So I hope that at least it makes it easier to

link the situation and the stress test with the text or any other documents.

So as you can see, there are some references to RFC 1591 but also to the Fol, and these are not in the shaded area so they are still open for discussion, including breach of retirement agreement. Thinking it through, and we'll revisit it in a moment, is for example the revocation mechanism from the Fol or effectively from 1591 but interpreted as such by the Fol may apply. So that's Section 4 of the Fol. So the shaded part is what you've discussed to date. Please scroll down, Kim. And the next page.

So the shaded part is what we've done, what you've agreed upon. As Stephen said, starting with 8 which is [inaudible], that was discussed the last meeting. So today either we need to refine it or we leave it as it is and then just start the discussion with the open-ended ones 9a, breach of agreement during extension period. And then scroll down please, Kim, to Page 16.

Starting with 11, these are topics or situations that we still need to clarify, first of all, and secondly discuss what does it mean under the policy, the situation. So what's the result of applying it and stress testing it. And then the question is, is an adjustment necessary and what is the relevant section in the proposed policy and/or other documentation if necessary?

Before we start with this, are there any questions regarding the layout of this table? If none, is this a way that you can work with?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Does it make sense? I think it does. Anybody want to weigh in on this? Feel free. Not seeing a giant waving of hands, I'm going to assume that the group agrees with this approach, Bart, so I think we've got [inaudible].

BART BOSWINKEL: So I'll leave it up to you, Stephen, what you want to do. Today, we can continue with a first discussion of starting with 11 or revisit what was discussed last time. I don't have any preference. Maybe from a logistical point of view it's easier to do the sections we haven't discussed yet because then the next call we can revisit all at once for a second read.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I agree with that. I like that approach, Bart. I was going to suggest the opposite, but you sold me on that. So I think that's what we should try to do and set ourselves up for a second read on the next call, which should put us in a good position then to crank out our interim report for spring break. Okay?

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah. Okay, thank you. So we'll start with Number 11. As we did last time, and this is also for the notes, this topic maybe first I'll ask—and I know Jaap suggested this one—ask him to explain what he meant by this so we can add a little bit more color and depth if necessary. Jaap, could you explain what you had in mind when you proposed this in Montreal?

JAAP AKKERHUIS: Yeah, this is an exceptional case. Suppose that there is a name server to be retired a TLD and that name server has actually a lot of domains outside that TLD. So on the moment to be retired a TLD disappears, that name server will disappear. And on that moment, [inaudible] all the other domains that were served by that TLD. It's kind of a corner case. It's more hypothetical than anything else.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah, but that's what we're dealing with ultimately.

JAAP AKKERHUIS: Yeah, I know it happened once in Germany that there was a name server that was a [inaudible] domain which was serving half of the German domains because it was kind of the default server in [the begin time]. And when that one fell out of the air for technical reasons, suddenly all these domains started to hammer the German top-level domain. Where is this name server we cannot find? That caused some problems. So that's where it comes from.

BART BOSWINKEL: Okay, and do you have any idea of if, given the duration of the retirement procedure, whether that would grant enough time to avoid any major issues?

JAAP AKKERHUIS: Well, [inaudible] before you really [inaudible]. People should be aware. People who are using that domain for name servers or similar

essentially services would have been pretty ignorant if they didn't see it coming. They could have moved the servers to something else way ahead of time before it really goes down.

BART BOSWINKEL: Okay, so from your perspective, if you think about it and also in combination with the communication plan that is either strongly advised or should be part of the plan, there should be no surprises.

JAAP AKKERHUIS: There should be no surprises. This situation probably only happens when everybody....

BART BOSWINKEL: Is asleep for ten years.

JAAP AKKERHUIS: Yeah, people have been asleep [inaudible] for a long time. It is something like remember 20 years ago when the ISPs started to fall off and it was [inaudible].

BART BOSWINKEL: Oh, the [inaudible] case.

JAAP AKKERHUIS: The [inaudible] case, yes. Locally, it was not—by the time the DNS was way weaker than it is nowadays and there were quite some TLDs or

ccTLDs who had that as their only name server. It was not a problem with the name. We managed to move the [machine] to a completely different place without anybody noticing by doing some routing tricks and some help of people in [inaudible]. But that's a very weird case and very short-term. So if you have essentially services, people should know where they are.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah, okay, thank you. Eberhard, go ahead.

EBERHARD LISSE: There can be no surprises because countries don't disappear or change their names overnight. After this happens, then it takes a while for the ISO code to get removed or changed. Then we get five to ten years. Nobody on earth can convince me that there is a surprise, that this comes 15 years after the first time the government mentioned it, that this comes out of the blue. It's just nonsense. So I fully agree with Jaap and what Bart says. No surprises.

BART BOSWINKEL: Anybody else with respect to this case?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I don't see anybody.

BART BOSWINKEL: So we may agree that we'll include the relevant sections or include a reference to the relevant sections. Based on this brief discussion and that may be the conclusion, there is no need to adjust the proposed process. Is that correct? Is that a fair assumption?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: If anyone in the group feels otherwise, please do not hesitate to waive your hand. We got an approval from Eberhard. Perhaps just asking for approval on this is [inaudible]. Let's go down that path. I see Patricio. Yeah, Eberhard. Brent. Good morning, Brent. I don't see anybody saying no, so I would argue that we've got buy-in on this one.

BART BOSWINKEL: Okay, we'll revisit it anyway.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yeah, we will next time around. Thank you, guys.

BART BOSWINKEL: So over to the next one. The country disappears, however there is a clear successor state. I don't know who proposed this one. Maybe somebody can speak to it. Brent, you still have your green tick.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: You're agreeing. You're being an agreeable Kiwi.

BART BOSWINKEL: Can somebody talk to this one? Does somebody have a clear understanding of this one? You can go two ways with this one. Yeah, Stephen, go ahead.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I'm assuming this one is similar to the Czechoslovakia splitting into Czech Republic and Slovenia situation, but I don't recall specifically the discussion that we had on this. But it looks to me like it's equivalent to what we saw with that.

BART BOSWINKEL: In that case, there are clear successor states, plural.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: [inaudible] rename.

BART BOSWINKEL: I think the way we can divide it, so you could have the case—and the most recent one was with the Netherlands Antilles—where there were “clear successor states.” At least clear successors to the Netherlands Antilles. So Curacao, the municipalities, and Saint Maarten, and they're all different ones.

I see your hand, Nenad.

So that's one case. The other case is a significant name change as well where there is no change but there is a clear successor to the ccTLD. And then the third one is, maybe that's almost the same one as the

Netherlands Antilles, is the Czechoslovakia where you've got Slovakia and the Czech Republic and former Yugoslavia which is another case. So I don't know, Stephen and Eberhard, where you want to take it. Do you want to deal with all the different scenarios? Think about it, and let me first go back to Nenad.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Nenad, the floor is yours.

NENAD ORLIC: Yeah, I think that [inaudible] I remember vaguely our conversations in Montreal this was something about the—I don't know who proposed this—but this was something like point I think 10 but it says about clear interests. For example, Iceland gets [inaudible] but other state says we'll take all the [inaudible] or something like that. There is successor but there is no original country. It's not renamed. It just doesn't disappear. But I don't think if there is a successor state in any case it's a clear case. I don't see any problem or something [inaudible] in this policy about it.

BART BOSWINKEL: Thanks, Nenad. I see Patricio's comment in the chat say, "Do we really need this case?" It's up to you whether we need this or not. Nenad, I think the way I interpret what you said is we don't need this case because it's dealt with already and by definition it's dealt with in the policy. Eberhard, the floor is yours.

EBERHARD LISSE: We don't need this because it's clearly stated. Whether it goes away with a successor state or without makes no real difference. An example that I would think is, for example, if Puerto Rico became the 51st state and the U.S. government decided they want Puerto Rico to be dealt with the same way as Hawaii and then removed the PR from the ISO table. Then there is a clear successor state to that. But it makes no difference. If the ISO code goes, the ISO code goes.

BART BOSWINKEL: Okay, yeah. Bernie agrees. Nenad, your hand is still up. Is than on old or a new hand? That's an old hand. Stephen, I think based on the discussion today people do not consider this a problematic situation, so probably we can even strike this one based on this one. But we'll revisit this at a later stage, so definitely no adjustment needed. Stephen, go ahead.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yes, let's make a note to revisit this, but I believe the consensus view of the working group is that we can strike this when we do our next read.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yep, okay, thank you. So over to the next one, the decision by the ISO 3166 MA to remove country code is completely out of line in breach of ISO 3166 itself, so the standard rules, or ISO rules itself. I don't

know who brought this up, if that person is on the call. Stephen, go ahead.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I did not bring this up. This is a really interesting question. I'm not sure how we can put into our policy document a provision to handle what is being described here as misbehavior on the part of the ISO maintenance agency. So I leave it up to the group to sort this one out. I see Bernard has his hand up, so I will give the floor to him. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yeah, this reminds me when we were doing the accountability group and all the discussions around who watches the watcher. We're getting into some very, very difficult waters here because....

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Bernard, your audio is [inaudible].

BART BOSWINKEL: It's like you've inhaled helium.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Sorry, my audio is really bad. [inaudible]

EBERHARD LISSE: Bernard, your audio is on life support or your audio is using legal weed.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: It is Canada.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Is that better?

BART BOSWINKEL: Nope.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: That's odd.

EBERHARD LISSE: Maybe unplug the headphone, unplug the microphone.

BART BOSWINKEL: Before Bernie comes back, even if this were the case from looking and then preparing this document, does it matter? Because at the end of the day, the policy we say there is a discussion or there is a decision and the work of this group is based on the decisions made. And maybe there might even be corner cases or anything else, but does it really matter if the MA makes a certain decision whether the effected parties agree, disagree, or think it's a stupid decision?

So, Bernie, maybe it works now? Can you speak up, unmute? We can't hear you, Bernie. You're still on mute. Eberhard, in the meantime go ahead.

EBERHARD LISSE:

I don't think we need this either. First of all, the ISO makes its own rules. Second of all, the members of the ISO are not necessarily governments but agencies nominated by governments, the national standards organization. And Jaap can speak more about it. While we are not always happy with decisions or understand decisions or understand exceptions, in all of the last 30 years they have been reasonably predictable. And there is a large number of people involved in the decision-making and voting, so the chances that they get drunk and go overboard is nil in my view. So we don't need that either.

BART BOSWINKEL:

At the same time maybe list it because this way even in the remote—put a little bit more language around it—but even in the remote case this is not an issue for the policy. It's an issue with the ISO 3166 MA and ISO itself. If that's okay with you. But at least there is no need based on your feedback and the feedback from others today, there's no need to adjust the policy for this one. Is that correct?

EBERHARD LISSE:

That is correct.

BART BOSWINKEL: Anybody else want to chime in on this one?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Anybody else feel to the contrary? I'm not seeing any hands. I think we have agreement on this as well.

BART BOSWINKEL: Thank you. Maybe Bernie wants to say when he's back. Otherwise, Bernie, please type in the chat. And we will revisit it anyway on the next call.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Bernie is in the midst of a reboot. When he's next available, we'll come back and ask him that question, but let's carry on.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah, so now over to Number 14, assets of a ccTLD go to other party during the removal process. I don't know who brought it up, but is there anybody who wants to speak to it and add some more color and depth to it? Who brought it up and/or wants to talk to the situation itself. I don't see anybody chiming in.

My understanding, and this is just my understanding, is that this is the case effectively. The ccTLD itself ceases to act and another entity or another person steps in and takes over and only the assets. The question is, is that person also bound by the removal process and/or the retirement process? And if there is an agreement to the agreement,

what happens to the ccTLD manager itself? Is it still able to live up to the expectations? That at least is my understanding what is meant with this one. So when assets disappear or go to another party during the process the question is, if you're in a removal process, would that affect the removal of the ccTLD itself? And if so, does the result [inaudible] unwanted, unwarranted? Stephen, go ahead.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE:

If I may give a hypothetical about this, let's assume a ccTLD sits within an academic department at a national university. They're two years into a five-year retirement program. Legislation is passed that moves the ccTLD management out of that academic department at the national university into the national telecommunications agency within the government. In the midst of a "retirement" of that ccTLD, what happens? The agreement was made between the ccTLD and the IANA successor. Does that need to be revisited? Think about this and please give some comments on it. That's just my hypothetical, but I think that's kind of what we're looking at with this. Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Maybe, Stephen, you have a view and not wearing your chair's hat coming up with the hypothetical?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE:

That just actually came out of my head, but in terms of a view if you want me to offer one I would argue that the agreement between the IANA function operator and the ccTLD that was operating in the

academic department of the national university would have to carry over into the governmental agency that the ccTLD ended up in. Of course, subject to local legislation to the contrary which takes us down another rabbit hole. Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Thanks. May I? I also think, and going back to the situation we discussed previously with the [inaudible], at the end of the day even whatever is the reason for the transfer of assets the receiving end and also the ccTLD manager will be very aware of the issues or the retirement of the ccTLD. So there can't be any surprises for them if this comes up. Even if, for example, the ccTLD manager would go bankrupt and somebody comes in and they will sell off the assets to another party, there are no surprises because people in country will definitely know about the removal process and the retirement process.

So the question is whether this should affect this asset plans or should affect the removal itself because if people do it's almost a way of gaming the system knowing that a transfer of assets could and would impact the removal process. You can almost see what will happen. You go from transfer to transfer of assets even if it's not even a physical one but it's only in the legal sense of transfer. So I think, again, asset transfer, yes. It could happen and maybe it should happen in cases where the ccTLD management is transferred to another entity. But at the same time, people involved should and will be very aware of the removal process. So, again, there should be no surprises. Stephen, your hand is up.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Bart. I'm assuming that contractual obligations would move in my example from the academic department that had contractual obligations with respects to retirement with the IFO to the governmental agency. But I see our lawyers on the call are lurking and being quiet, and I would love to have one or both of them weigh in on this. Thank you.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Hey, Stephen. Sorry, I'm just in the car at the moment. But I don't really characterize this as a contractual situation particularly. We don't tend to have contracts as CCs ourselves and the IFO. I think there's an agreed plan and I think that if any successor organization comes in, they're bound by the same plan. They have notice of it, and they're stuck with it. So I don't really look at it with a very legal lens, but I think in practice if there were good reasons for having to change it, then there would have to be a discussion between the IFO and the new inheritor of the CC. But there's no obligation on anybody to change what it was before, and I think it's best for everybody if we reduce options for unilateral or capricious or unpredictable changes in the plan once it has been made. The ISO code doesn't exist anymore. It's headed for the departure lounge, and I don't think we need to [inaudible] unless there are really, really good reasons and I don't see this as being one of them.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Nick. I appreciate that. Eberhard?

EBERHARD LISSE: You see when companies are taken over due diligences are being performed to look at assets but also obligations and contractual obligations form part of this. So I do not think that in any legal system it is tolerated that another entity takes over a previous entity without their obligation. So my view is totally in agreement with Nick's on this. If the owner of the company or of the entity for example changes, no drama. If the ccTLD is administered by another entity, they're still bound by—the don't have a legal status with IFO to put it like this. They can take it or leave it the way it is. But to change, for example, the manager every 4 years and do it ten times to get 40 years out of this is not happening.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you. Naela, I see you've got your hand up as well. [inaudible] IFO. Go ahead.

NAELA SARRAS: Yes, thank you, Stephen. Did you call on me?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yes, I did.

NAELA SARRAS: Okay, so if I understand your example correctly, Stephen, I think this is analogous to what we have currently. What we call—the transfer

process currently allows for situations where the manager of the TLD is moved exactly very similar to examples like you're saying from, let's say, a national university to a government entity.

At that point, we go through all the documentation to see that it's the will of the government and there's legislation that supports it and it's the same entity or at least the same [inaudible] are being moved from what entity to another. Then the process continues and we acknowledge that change in the IANA root zone database. So I see this as very similar to that case. The obligation of who is going to continue the retirement changes to another entity, but it's a continuation of the existing understanding we already have, if that makes sense.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Okay, thank you. Appreciate that. Eberhard, is that a new hand or an old hand?

EBERHARD LISSE: Old.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Okay, thank you.

EBERHARD LISSE: I'm trying to take it down.

BART BOSWINKEL: It is down.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Bart, I believe we've got closure on this, and perhaps we can move on to our last item [before we run out of time].

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah, again, this is just for the record no adjustment needed. I think that's the sense of the working group. Maybe before we move forward, Bernie, do you still want to talk to Item Number 12.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I'll give it a try. See if my technology manages.

BART BOSWINKEL: It does. You sound more normal.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you. Yeah, as I was saying, the problem with trying to second guess ISO is that if there is no clear appeal process, you have to create one. And then you will be overseeing the thing which is managing the resource which you didn't want to get involved in the management of, and I think you can get into some very bad situations very easily. So if we rely on ISO to define what is a country, we rely on ISO to define what is a country period is what I would suggest. Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yes, thank you. I think maybe that's the best way to include it in the relevant section. Refer back to RFC 1591 there as well. Thanks.

Going to the final one, Number 15, this will also be the end from my end and I think others as well because we need to go to the council call. I know this one was brought up by Kim in Montreal. I don't know, Naela, otherwise we'll leave it at this point. Naela, do you feel comfortable speaking to this one, or do we want to defer it to the next call when Kim might be on the call? Because this is a very specific one, and I think it warrants further discussion. Okay, we'll defer it, yeah. Naela, do you want to?

NAELA SARRAS: Yeah, I would feel more comfortable if we deferred this because I now Kim would like to be part of this discussion.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yes, that's why I asked the question. And he raised it in Montreal, so let's do it that way.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: That's a wrap for this.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah, so just to recap, based on today's conversation, we'll fill in the Number 11 to Number 14. And we'll start the discussions the next time with Number 15 if Kim is around and revisit the [parts] and start again

with what we discussed starting last time. So not the gray parts but the non-marked parts for the second read. And this will be the first read.

I have one more item, and then I'll hand it back to you. That was you had a chance to look at this new document. When we started I said that this could look like the interim report. One question is whether we want to include tables in Section 6 or just language and use the table in an annex. That's another point, but at least it shows you how the interim report could look like. So the executive summary and then the introduction and moving forward with process description and then going oversight and review and then the stress testing. So if you do have any comments on this one, on the outline, please use the email list to set these comments and we'll take them of course into account and discuss it next time.

And secondly, with respect to the background and process section, staff started drafting it. If you could have a look at it and if you already have comments on it, please send them to the list as well. So that's an action for everybody. So we can adjust it where necessary and discuss it and update if we do have time on the next call. Because I think that's relevant as well. And then have a final read in the meeting before the Cancun meeting of the full document.

That's all. Back to you, Stephen.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE:

Thank you, Bart. Really appreciate it. Kim, if you can put the agenda back up. Next steps Bart has outlined, so let's go to any other business.

Does anybody have any other business they wish to raise? Because I do not, but I'm happy to entertain. I don't see any waving hands.

That being the case, next meetings, we have two before our spring break in Cancun with all those college students. The next meeting is 6 February at 23:00 UTC which is a little late for you guys near the meridian. And 20 February is the last one which is at 05:00 UTC which is also an ungodly hour for those near the meridian.

I do implore you to please make an effort to attend at least one of them so that we don't pour concrete around something that you find particularly objectionable as we work through the end of the stress testing.

I think that's it for me. I want to remind everyone that the mailing list is up and running 24/7 and is feeling very lonely from a lack of intra-meeting activity. That's a hint. That being the case, nobody is waving hands, I want to thank everyone for attending. Have a great day, evening, or night, and I declare this teleconference adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]