
STEPHEN DEERHAKE:

Thank you, Kim. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening and greetings from Melbourne. I want to thank everybody for joining today's teleconference which was supposed to be our last prior to our upcoming face-to-face meeting in Cancun. For the record this is the 20th of February 2020 edition of the working group tasked with developing ICANN policy with respect to the retirement of ccTLDs from the root zone, and we've convened this meeting today at 05:00 UTC.

First off, I want to thank all those of you who either stayed up really late or have gotten up really early for participation in today's call. I especially want to [wish] Bart and Yoke for getting up early as well as Kimberly who is up late on our behalf. I'm going to assume that staff will take attendance in the usual manner so if there's anyone on audio only, identify yourself so that you can properly recorded.

With regards to administrative announcements, I have one major one which is for those of you who've just gotten up or who did not check ICANN website homepage on an hourly basis. A little over four hours ago the face-to-face meeting in Cancun is being cancelled due to the COVID-19 outbreak. So instead ICANN 67 apparently is going to be held using remote participation. I not quite sure what they mean by that but I assume they mean it will be on Zoom a great deal that week. I will note however that ICANN states in their announcement that they will "consult with community leaders and groups to focus the virtual program on the most essential sessions." Which sounds kind of like it will be an abbreviated meeting, and I have no idea at this point what's going on [inaudible] planned face-to-face meeting. I don't even know at

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.

this point... I mean, this just happened so whether we can have a Zoom conference of some sort that week and what form that would take as a substitute for the face-to-face. I don't think anyone knows at this point. We may well just carry on with our teleconferences. Bart, do you have any comments on this? I know this relatively new to you as well.

BART BOSWINKEL:

A few things. And that's the unfortunate thing or the fortunate thing, that we've been monitoring what is happening the last couple of days knowing the Board meeting was yesterday evening. One of the things, the first thing that will happen is probably the chairs of all working groups and Council will be invited for a call on Monday to discuss the current situation. We were thinking about today but that's too early, and tomorrow will be [resolved] that some people will have to do it through the weekend.

One of the things is, think through what definitely needs to happen, what can be deferred and what can be done in a regular fashion. And it's not just this working group but it's also newly to be created working groups. It's also a matter of, for example, Tech Day and the ccNSO members meetings and the Council meetings themselves, what we want to do with those. So that's a first step maybe for the Councilors and you Stephen as chair and Eberhard as chair of Tech Day but also as vice chair, please pencil in Monday, but you'll receive an invite. So that's the first step.

I also agree with your assessment. I'll put it this way. Fortunately, I think the major blocks of work have been concluded where we definitely

needed a face-to-face meeting, say like the initial discussions around stress testing, the duration, etc., so the breakout sessions and the face-to-face work was really, really helpful. We couldn't have done without it.

I think we, at least this working group, is past that stage so it's more almost once we've completed the stress testing, it's a matter of editing, etc., and that can be done online and through Zoom rooms and there is no need to use the [remote] participation type of meeting which I think is something like Zoom anyway, maybe with additional staff but I don't see that happen for this working group. So, I think I completely concur with you.

The other thing, and I haven't thought that through yet, so I don't want to rush into it as the issue manager on the second working group. Maybe as an informational – yesterday we had a webinar with the GAC. The same one we did for the ccTLD community on the review mechanism, and I was pleasantly surprised. We had a reasonable turnout of 27 GAC members and some of them showed, really, interest in participating. So, it's also a good way of, say, to quote a Dutch football coach, Mr. Johan Cruyff, "Every disadvantage has its advantage." We can use this time also to invite and prepare GAC members to participate in the second working group, one of the wishes this working group always had.

So, I don't see a reason to rush into the review mechanisms working group the next week or say, in the Cancun time frame. We can defer it one or two weeks. And probably the first meeting would have been around introducing the scope again, introducing the rules of

engagement, would be very administrative and we can do that online as well as soon as we've got a solid membership including, say, the PTI staff and including maybe other ICANN staffers and including you of course and others. So that's my view on the current situation.

So, to recap, Monday's going to be, most likely Monday is for you, Stephen and the Council, and other working group chairs to be on the call to discuss and run through what definitely needs to happen over the next couple of weeks and what can be put back to regular. And secondly, this working group could continue in its normal pace. If we would do it in two weeks again, probably we would be on the day we normally would travel, so that's the 5th of March. And two weeks afterwards, that would be the 19th of March. That would be post-meeting. So, in a way it's... Yeah, if you look at it from that perspective, for this working group, it's probably not too bad. Thanks.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE:

Thank you, Bart. That does sound reasonable and we can do all the administrative stuff for the new one via teleconference when we get down to it. But as you rightly point out, we do still have some solidification of the membership of that group. But I think you're right, we can carry on with our work here and push with it and get it wrapped over the next few teleconferences. So, I don't see an issue with that. So, thank you for your comments.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Maybe, anybody else. I see Eberhard, and anybody else wants to chime in, have questions. Eberhard?

EBERHARD W LISSE: I propose that when we have the document in a frozen state with only typing errors or maybe, what do you call it, grammatical errors are being corrected but nothing of substance, that we start looking at the glossary by was of everybody taking the thing out and marking the words that they feel we need to define with a yellow marker on hardcopy or in the document, and just e-mail the words to the list and then we sort them alphabetically, make the definitions, and add them to the document. That should be an easy way we can do this with a few iterations until we decide we have got all the words we need to define, defined.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you. I agree with that approach. Eberhard, I'm assuming that's an old hand? Yes, thank you.

EBERHARD W LISSE: But I wanted to do this when this document is frozen, when Bernard has finalized it in the other software, and when we have put it taken the line number out and put it in portrait and so have it ready for, sort of, distribution as a draft.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yes, agreed completely. Thank you.

EBERHARD W LISSE: I have learned from rolling the .na key at the moment that you can break complicated matters very easily into various small simple steps and do one at a time and that becomes rather easy then. So, I don't want to complicate matter by doing two things at the same time.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Not a problem, Anybody else? I don't see any hands. [Brent,] I'm not sure you can wave your hand. So if you have any comments, just step on everybody. Otherwise, I'm going to assume there is some agreement on that way forward. So, as Bart noted, the Review Mechanism Working Group call for volunteers closed recently and I am quite pleased to say we had 22 volunteers step forward, including 12 of us from the current working group. As Bart also noted, we're still trying to finalize, solidify the membership for that group with participation from IANA and hopefully participation from some GAC members that are willing to step up, which would be nice. With regards to that, I do want to thank those of you who are stepping away soon, but you can't go yet because we're not done with the first working group. So, don't take us out of your address book just yet. I want to thank those of you in the first group who stepped up for the second round.

In regards to action Items, I don't have any. Do you Bart, or Kimberly?
Yes, sir.

BART BOSWINKEL: Just to be very clear, this document we're working on is for what is called an interim or initial paper. And this paper will be, and is made ready for public comments.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yeah, I don't want anybody leaving for the next few months. Let's put it that way.

EBERHARD W LISSE: Okay, yeah. Okay. Then we're clear, because then once this is finalized, it will get rolled up into the overall policy itself, together with the results of the second working group. That's the way it's structured. So, Okay.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you for that clarification though. It is good that you remind everybody, and especially me because of my failing mind, that this is the way we're moving forward. Action Items, I don't have any. Do you, Bart or Kimberly?

BART BOSWINKEL: Nope.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Okay dokey. So

BART BOSWINKEL: Because they've been resolved.

Unidentified Male 2: Yep.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yeah. So, the focus today is to really work on a formal second reading of the stress test and the overall stuff and background and process. And with that, Bart is going to lead us through this. I think we're pretty, pretty, pretty close. Thank you, Kimberly, for putting that up. Bart, I will turn the floor over to you.

BART BOSWINKEL: Thank you. So again, Kim, let's first scroll down 6 3 number 15, that was the end of the stress testing document part of the document. Scroll down, please, in the table itself. One page down, and one more. There we are, number 15. The reason was this was discussed extensively on the last call, and it has been added. So, does the retirement policy apply to pending retirement cases? And this was brought up by Kim Davies and he explained the background which you can see in the notes from the meeting.

And what I've tried to capture in the column result is the results of the discussions of the working group. So, the working group is of the opinion that policy should not be applied retroactively. The proposed policy does not apply to cases that have already emerged or will emerge up to the point... Can you scroll down, please? In the time the proposed policy becomes effective. This does not preclude that IFO and the ccTLD manager may agree to use the proposed mechanism for retirement of the ccTLDs. And there is a reference and it was focusing especially on one particular case, as you can imagine, which is recorded in the notes and in the transcript, and there was a proposal to include text around or

clarify the text around the exceptionally reserved. I haven't done so because the [attendance] was very limited, but that is the adjustment, if any, that is required either in the text itself or as a footnote. Whether this really – and thinking about it. So, first question is, for those who attended the call two weeks ago, did I capture it reasonably? Any comments, please. Okay, that's Stephen. I don't see any. Anybody else who was on the call? Brent or Naela or...

STEPHEN DEERHAKE:

I don't see any agreements or disagreements, or anybody waving a hand.

BART BOSWINKEL:

So, let's assume this is captured properly. So then with this, I'd like to start with the second reading of the whole section, but at least we've got this clarified that it is captured properly. Can you scroll up again, Kim, to the first part of the table? Because now we're going into the second reading of the table, and what is relevant for you, the marked bits in gray, so, like the situation from items one to eight and results one, two, and adjustments, etc., which is marked gray, has been done for a second reading.

So, the first question I have, and I think that's the easiest way of doing so is, I'll run through the open parts and check if you have any comments so we can close this down, or do you want to have a [change?] I hope that works, but at least this way we do it systematically.

So, first of all, item number 1, the relevant section in the document. So that was added later on, Section 2. So, Section 2 is the section of the policy proposal. I don't see any hands or comments or any disagreements. Then I'll continue.

Item number 2, the reference is to Section 4.3 and to RFC 1591. Please note that after the discussion and going through it again, the reference is not limited to the policy proposal but also could be to RFC 1591 or in some cases even to the framework of interpretation, but we'll touch that one. So that's Section 4.3 and RFC 1591 as reference. Any comments on this one? I don't see any, so this is closed as well.

Now item number 3, the process, and the bit that is marked, "IFO may invoke revocation," has been added just as a clarification and to discuss. It doesn't need adjustment of the text but it shows the results of the stress testing and it makes very clear in my view that the stress test is not just [resolved or could not] by the policy proposal itself but also the other documentation is relevant, like the framework of interpretation Section 4 FOI, because that's where the revocation and the conditions for revocation are described. Are there any comments on this bit? I don't see any. Good.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE:

[Bart's] gone out to make us all coffee, that's all.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Then number 4, section – and I'll limit it again to the relevant section, it's Section 4 from the framework of interpretation. Again, this is a reference, then the next one is – I don't see any comments.

Five. The reference is to RFC 1591 and Section 3 of the FOI, and that's something that we need to deal with still, is to include a specific mechanism for the transfer with the goal of – during the retirement process. So, can you scroll down, please, Kim? So that was 5. Any comments on five? Please be aware that's something that is still open for discussion, so what needs to be adjusted and how the working group wants to adjust its policy to create this specific transfer.

Number 6, again the reference part. Any comments? Questions? If none, then I'll continue. Number 6, thank you Nenad.

Number 5. Sorry, it's too small for me. Number 7. Again, ISO 3166. Any comments? No. Okay, that at least closes the references, and that was the second read. We've already concluded the second read for items one to seven.

Now we go again to Section 8, and if you recall, this was raised by and at the time and I've added – and that's [marked] here, I've looked it up again for the discussion. There is, in addition to the text in the policy proposal, so Section 3 around functional manager, etc., I've added a second part which is taken from the framework of interpretation, and I'll read it. "In addition, Section 3.1 of the framework of interpretation provides the sound basis to expect that the IFO seeks contact with the ccTLD manager and relevant decision-making entity of the ccTLD manager."

The reason for including it this way, if you would look at the framework of interpretation, you see it is very clear that the IFO should only rely on the administrative and technical context. It's very unclear in some situations how the decision-making structure is. That being said, at the same time it's also the responsibility of the ccTLD manager, at least in my view, that they clarify how the decision-making structures and use cases is organized.

For example, in some cases you may have an operation with a foundation on top of it and the foundation is the real decision-making entity and it's more the responsibility of the ccTLD manager to clarify this, but at least the framework of interpretation provides a basis where additional steps and actions could be taken, but at the same time it's a nice balance between the responsibilities of the FOI and the ccTLD manager. So again, no need to change it, but this was an addition. Any comments to this one, and in particular from Nenad? Does it resolve your issue, Nenad? Comments, please. Nenad, I see your hands up.

NENAD ORLIĆ: Do you hear me?

BART BOSWINKEL: Yes, but it sounds like an aquarium.

NENAD ORLIĆ: Sorry, [inaudible]. First, just the relevant section is 4.1, not 3.1 for starters, on the policy text lines 80 to 86.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I saw that in your comment.

NENAD ORLIĆ: Just to make sure.

BART BOSWINKEL: It's noted, Nenad. Thank you.

NENAD ORLIĆ: Basically, then I think this is good enough.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, sir.

BART BOSWINKEL: Just to be on the safe side with PTI/IAN, Naela, Kim, any immediate comments on this one? I don't want to put you on the spot, or you want to defer it and have a look at it. I don't know if you had a chance, since you have to work with this. I don't see Naela...

NAELA SARRAS: Wait, I'm here. Sorry, but I couldn't seem to take myself off mute.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Given the hour I can understand that.

NAELA SARRAS: Yeah, sorry about that. So, I think this seems workable. So, if you – we're not locking this right now? Correct?

BART BOSWINKEL: No, we're not locking it down.

NAELA SARRAS: So, if you guys could give us just a chance to read this thoroughly by the next meeting, that would be really appreciated. As it is right now, I don't see that this... I think this is workable.

BART BOSWINKEL: Okay, thank you. And keep the FOI in mind, please, the specific section.

NAELA SARRAS: Absolutely, that's very helpful.

BART BOSWINKEL: That's the driving – yeah, because then we don't need to change anything but include the reference and that sets the direction. That was the intention here. Okay. Okay. Thank you.

Then we go onto number 9, breach of agreement. As some of you may have noted, yes, we got 9 and 9a. We split the two. 9, breach of agreement, this is more around the cases that were mentioned where court injunction and applicable law court order. I would say this is not

really – as Nick noted, not really a breach of agreement. It could result in a breach of agreement but it's almost – there is a legal concept but I only know the Dutch word so I won't bother you with it, but there is clearly a legal reason why a ccTLD manager or maybe even IFO needs to breach the agreement. They are forced to do it. So, that's a complete different area and situation than for example the breach of agreement in the sense of that you start registering domain names [whilst] in retirement or accept new registrations [whilst] in retirement and agreed not to do so. That's the behavioral side of it.

So, I've separated the two, and there is another breach of agreement as well. So, the retirement plan must be subject to legally binding court order. That is very obvious. There are solutions for it, the legal solutions. The policy text itself, it happens with all kinds of policies, ICANN policies. I think there is no need to change the text of the proposal here. So that was number 9, and do you agree with or have any questions? First off, have any questions around this specific item right now or comments?

EBERHARD W LISSE: My hand is up.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yep, go ahead, Eberhard.

EBERHARD W LISSE: Court order. What about if the regulator issues a ruling which is not a court order? So, should we put that into language?

BART BOSWINKEL: To what extent is it binding? You could add it as a separate case, I would say. This was raised at the time by the working group. Maybe we could have an additional discussion around it. So that's my first, and the second, does it really matter?

EBERHARD W LISSE: The point is it says a legally binding court order. Court orders are always legally binding. And what happens if the regulator issues regulations which is equally binding? It just came to my mind. I think we could work this into the language, perhaps.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah, but it doesn't mean that we need to change the policy.

EBERHARD W LISSE: No. In this stress test.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah, okay. I'm fine with that. Stephen, go ahead.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, sir. No, I was just going to weigh in in support of Eberhard's comment, because in fact, at the end of the day the laws are passed and the regulators can say, speaking out for the government, this is how we interpret it. And it may well have the same force as a court thing, so I

think we do need to expand that language a little bit, but it does not, as you point out, require a policy adjustment. Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Okay, thank you. Any comments from others on the call around this? I don't see any. Then we'll do it in the next version that way. Breach of agreement during extension period. Again, this was extensively discussed, and as you can see, again, there is a reference to the framework of interpretation, particularly in case of bad faith or significant misbehavior from the side of the ccTLD manager with this breach, and these are described circumstances in the framework. So that would mean that PTI or the IFO could revoke the delegation, so the revocation may be the way to address the issue.

Again, this is one of those areas where the framework of interpretation applies, and hence, there is no need to adjust the policy right now. And maybe that's something for you to check as well, Naela, whether this would be workable for you in the sense that you do have the policy instruments to deal with such a situation. Any comments, questions around this and what's in the table on row 9a? I don't see anybody.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE:

I don't see anybody.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Naela, please check this one as well. Number 10, [inaudible] state disappears. The code is – again, that was an extensive discussion. One of the changes, if you recall, it originally stated commercial interest. After

the discussion on the working group, it has been changed to interest in general. Code element is removed. That's the result, and the relevant sections, and there is no need. Any comments on this one?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Looking good.

BART BOSWINKEL: Okay. Scroll down, please, Kim. Number 11, unforeseen technical circumstances. Again, there was an explanation what was meant. No change here since the last reading. The relevant sections in the policy and [inaudible] documentation is included. That was on the previous version, we need to check, but definitely no need for adjustment here. So the basic reasoning here was that ccTLD managers and others using the particular ccTLD will have plenty of time to avoid a situation where they are hit by the removal. So there'll be technical issues.

And what is relevant here as well is that as part of the policy, it's clearly stated that the ccTLD manager is expected at least to have an extensive communication plan. So no adjustment here. Any comments on this one?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I'm not seeing any. [Going twice.]

BART BOSWINKEL: Then we move on. Number 12, country disappears, however there is a clear successor state. Again, you can read this. We didn't spend too much time, it's dealt with in the normal delegations and process, etc. No adjustment, and this is the core of the policy, I would say. So no adjustment from the policy proposals, the reference is to the ISO 3166 standard. So no comments, questions around this one.

Then we move on to the next one, number 13. So that was decisions by the ISO 3166 MA. The result is clear, the working group discussed it. That was the core of it. In principle, by referring in the ISO 1519 that IANA – read, ICANN – is not in the business to determine or to decide what is or what isn't a country, the power to decide, even the abuse of power, is at another entity outside of it. So the policy doesn't reflect this and we don't want to put ICANN or the community in a place to overrule the MA. So there is no need to adjust the policy proposal itself. So that is a very high-level summary of what's in number 13. Any comments, questions around this one?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I'm not seeing any.

BART BOSWINKEL: Then we go to number 14. Assets of the ccTLD go to another party. Again, you can read at your leisure. I'll wait. The section is 4.4, the proposed process, lines above. No adjustment needed. I don't see any comments, hand waving. Then I assume this is okay.

Number 15, the retirement policy [apply.] We discussed the results, and I've alluded to it right now. Hopefully, you had a chance to think it through, [as I said,] because it was discussed last time. Line [26 and 47, 46 and to 52] above.

Before we go into the adjustment, if any, is there an issue with the situation and result? And is there a need to adjust the policy as such? Not so much the text of the policy proposal but the policy as such.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Bart missing? Oh, you're back.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah, sorry. So a change of the policy is not implied by this because it was clearly stated – and it's clearly stated – this policy does not apply retroactively with the meaning attached to it during the discussion. Is there an issue with that approach? So that's the first point.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I don't see one.

BART BOSWINKEL: Okay, then the second one – and maybe we need to defer this. So what you see – and this is bracketed text I haven't included in the full text yet, I first wanted to check with everybody on the call whether I captured it properly. Can you scroll down, please, Kim? There is a proposal to include a clarification of the exceptionally reserved or the ccTLDs with

an exceptionally reserved code in the text. And it's specifically targeted at .uk, .ac, .eu and .su and clarifies when and how they were delegated, and implying that .su doesn't meet these criteria. That was the drift of it.

So that's the text, and also, the reference to the ICANN board resolution from 2000, that was raised and it was explained by Kim Davies at the time, two weeks ago. The question is, do you want to include this, either as a footnote or replace the text in the document online? Can you go up one page, Kim? In line 26 and/or line 46 to 52. And maybe you will recall the working group had an extensive discussion around these lines. And if you want to, we can scroll up, of course, to line 40, 26 and 47, 52 so you can imagine.

Maybe this is because we've asked Naela to get back to us around the framework of interpretation section 3.2, that we discuss this further on the next call around changing the proposed text of the policy as the only section that needs to be adjusted given the results of the stress testing. Is that a way forward, Stephen?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I believe it is.

BART BOSWINKEL: Because then you see it in context. I'll bracket it.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Okay. Go ahead. Yeah, I think that's fine. Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah. Okay, so then we'll do that on the next call. So we've got a few items open for the next call, but the rest is closed. I'll mark them in gray, so they went through the second reading, and we'll revisit the two or three that are still open. Say, one is with the asking the feedback from PTI, and this one with the change of the change of the text if that is indeed appropriate, yes or no.

Thanks. That concludes this bit. Back to you, Stephen, and to the agenda.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Bart, so much. Kimberly, if you can put the agenda back up. And thank you for scrolling through all that.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yes.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Excellent, thank you. I personally would still like to see if we can get a minimum interim policy document published as soon as possible, and we're making progress. We're getting close, and I think we have a pretty solid product here, personally. I hope you guys think so as well.

If we could move on to AOB, does anybody have Any Other Business?

BART BOSWINKEL: Stephen, can we go to – and maybe Kim, can you go back to the document? Because we've got one which we haven't discussed today. It's been on the agenda. Scroll down, please.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I'm sorry.

BART BOSWINKEL: Background and process to date. Let me explain the background and process to date. This captures why the ccNSO embarked on this mission, I would say, on the retirement process. So that's Section 7.1. My suggestion would be at the next call, we just go in – the sense we'll ask if there r any comments on line items 291 to 294. So please prepare and read this. If you have comments, raise them at the call. Can you scroll down please, Kim? We'll run through the text of this whole 7.1 and 7.2 that way in order to speed it up. There might be one or two typos, etc. Please mark them and then we can conclude.

I don't want to read them out individually each paragraph, but if you have issues with the text at the time, please raise them and be prepared for the meeting. So that's with respect to 7.1, and most of this – and you need to be aware – is quoted or is directly from the issue report. Can you scroll down, please? Then it's just capturing what it is.

Scroll down to 7.2. Again, this is process to date. Process to date is described, the actions and how the working group approached the – effectively describes a little bit the working method of the working group. Again, please check this. This should be very factual and dry, but

at least it's documenting how the working group has conducted its business, and we'll include – not yet, but we'll fill in the placeholders like X times, Y times and Z times, the number of conference calls, etc. you haven't concluded. And that would be just to inform the community about how the working group conducts its business.

So please read this again. I will run through it in the same manner. I'll ask you to comment on the first paragraph line, 356 through 359, etc., to speed it up, because this is just pure background information.

Any questions, comments on this approach?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE:

Bart, if I may, I just want to reiterate to the group that this is pretty – as Bart said, it's factual stuff. If you think a date's wrong or something like that, certainly bring it to our attention. But I don't see any controversy over this, it's just a matter of making sure the T's are crossed, the I's are dotted and the dates are right. Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Yeah. Okay, thank you, Stephen. So that is with respect to this document. Kim, can you go to version 3, please? And I have not shared this with you. Scroll down one page. What I've done based on the assumption that at least we would discuss the background and process again, I have changed the order a little bit and included a kind of table of contents as a working draft to come up with a kind of layout for the interim report. So that's draft number three, so even there, the number is [inaudible].

So forget about the numbering, it's just to draw your attention to it, and I will get back to this on the next meeting. One thing I want to show you is I've changed the order of background and introduction of process to date. The background is now an introduction for the reader of first the context, I would say the mission of this working group, and then introduces more in-depth the questions that we're faced. Can you scroll down, please, Kim? Go to page two.

So this is cut and paste from Section 7.1. And then scroll down to 1.2. So it more or less introduces the background, provides the context for the introduction, because the introduction – and this is where the real policy document starts that you've been working on. So Section 1.2 is requests for comment, [59 to] [inaudible], and this is where it starts.

So that's your original document, but if you would produce this to the community, I think if somebody reads this for the first time, people do not have the context that is needed to understand this section. That's why I fiddled around with it. I'll update this, but I want to already prewarn you that that's part of it. The text itself has not changed. Can you scroll down, please, Kim, to Section 7, I believe? So that's the process and everything. Scroll down. Sorry, that's too much. The stress testing bit, so Section 6.

We discussed today stress testing, so that's 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3. And if you scroll down, Kim, one more, you see that the table has gone and there is text there, but we will not discuss it. But as we discussed on previous call, the table is now in an annex to clarify. And as you can see, there is a reference to it, and for the interested reader, they can always go to Annex A but it puts the stress testing more showing that the working

group has done it and the results, and which stress tests you have conducted. So they're now numbered 1 through 16, so 9 and 9a have changed. But that's the way probably at the end it will look like.

So that's a layout. I'll tinker with it a little bit more to keep the text of the two documents aligned, and I'll circulate it next week as well for next call so that we can at least discuss the outline [inaudible] and then I'll hand it over to Bernie to do his magic on it. That's all for me, Stephen. Back to you.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE:

Thank you, Bart. Appreciate that. If you can put the agenda up again, I think we're at AOB. We were just about done with AOB. I don't recall seeing anybody waving their hands. Does anybody have any AOB? Going once, going twice. I don't see anything.

Next meeting is not going to be in Cancun, but we're planning on doing one two weeks from today, and that would be March 5th if I am correct. And given that this one was at 05:00 UTC, that meeting on the 5th of March will be at 11:00 UTC. So put that in your calendar and we will just carry on as though there was no ICANN meeting.

I think that's it for me pretty much. I just want to thank everyone for attending. You got the meeting dates. We're just going to carry on with our teleconferences. I don't see any issues there. Remember the list is there. The list is lonely because nobody posts to the list. So if you think of more stress tests, if you think of anything, any ideas on a way forward with the absence of a face-to-face for probably now until June, feel free to put your ideas out on the list.

And I think that's it for us.

EBERHARD W LISSE: Stephen?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Bart, yes.

BART BOSWINKEL: Eberhard.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Oh, Eberhard. [inaudible].

EBERHARD W LISSE: For some of us who have booked the travel and who intend to fly there or elsewhere, the date and the time is not convenient. Should we not perhaps look at a different time and date?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Let us make this tentative and let people who have an interest in both being on the beach and attending the next teleconference express their issues on the list and we can sort this out. But I'm reluctant to reschedule, to break our usual schedule. But we'll certainly consider it if people have an issue in that they're going to go to the beach anyway and they want to also be on the call and there's a conflict with travel. I

think that's probably the best way to leave it. Eberhard, what do you think?

EBERHARD W LISSE: I am smack at the airport at that particular time. But we'll see. Otherwise, I will tender apology.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Okay.

BART BOSWINKEL: I think maybe –

EBERHARD W LISSE: But I thought I'd bring it up because it may affect not just me, it may affect some people who decide to go anyway. And if so, if it interferes with plans, I thought I'd bring it up. That's my only point.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Okay. Thank you, sir. No other hands being waved. Kimberly, I think I will declare this teleconference adjourned. And if you can stop the recording, that would be great. I just want to thank everyone. Have a great day, evening or night.

BART BOSWINKEL: Thanks. Bye.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]