
STEPHEN DEERHAKE:

Okay. Thank you, guys. I apologize for the slight delay in getting this thing organized. I just want to say good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. And for the record, I'm Stephen Deerhake, Chair of this working group. I thank you for joining today's teleconference. For the record, this is the 15th July 2020 edition of the ccNSO PDP Working Group that's been tasked with developing ICANN policy with respect to establishing a review mechanism for ccTLDs as mentioned, RFC 1591 Section 3.4. We have convened this meeting today at 20:00 UTC, continuing to adhere to our recently adopted meeting time rotation schedule.

I do want to thank those of you who stayed up really late or have gotten up really early for your participation on this call. Call time is the sweet spot for the Americas, less so for Europe and Asia-Pacific. But looking at the list here, it looks like we've got a fairly good turnout and I'm happy about that. I want to thank Joke and Bart; I know they're giving up their prime of the evening to be on the call. And thanks, Bernard, of course. Special thanks for Susie Johnson from ICANN Staff who has temporarily stepped in for Kimberly to work the Zoom magic. Anyway, thanks to all of you for participating on the call. Staff will be taking attendance in the usual manner, so if there's anyone on audio only, please identify yourself so that you're properly recorded as being present.

So it's been nearly a month since our last teleconference and months longer since we actually met face to face. Hopefully, we can see each other again in Cancún early next year. It remains to be seen, of course.

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.

Moving on to administrative announcements, before I get to them, however, I would like again, for the record, to express many thanks for ICANN Legal and Becky Burr from the ICANN Board for pitching up at our last teleconference. And in particular, I really want to thank Amy Stathos for her presentation on ICANN's Independent Review Process and the cooperative engagement process that she gave us.

So with regards to announcements, ICANN Legal has reached out to us through our Staff and has request observer status on the working group. Personally, I could not be happier with those developments. As I thought for some time, SO/AC working groups developing policy administrative procedures offer the respective SO/ACs could really benefit from occasional input from ICANN Legal. And if for no other reason than to not do something stupid that might jeopardize statuses and in corporate associations in the California law which all the SO/ACs are actually, and as a consequence, jeopardize ICANN Org's standing as a nonprofit public benefit corporation. Really, certainly our work has significant legal aspects to it, so I welcome interest in engagement with ICANN Legal in their work. I do know yet who from ICANN Legal be formally joining us. Bart, do you have any news on that front?

BART BOSWINKEL: No. Apologies, I don't. But keep on asking and I'll inform.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I would assume it would be either Amy or Sam.

BART BOSWINKEL: It could be. Or Elizabeth I think was her name. She gave the presentation from the first session.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Okay. Well, we'll find out but I think it's a welcome development. I see from the chat there's agreement on that. Thank you, Allan.

Second announcement. Perhaps it's less of interest for those of you who do not sit also on the Retirement Working Group. It's not directly relevant to you but it is of some importance to you since you are on this working group as well. But since there's considerable overlap in the membership between the two groups, I thought it would be useful to share this with you all at this point in time. That announcement is that the public comment period for the work product of our evil twin brother working group, otherwise known as the Retirement Working Group, closed on the 10th of July and we actually got some comments from the community. We got five of them in fact. I don't want to go into detail on this topic here other than to make those of you who are members and observers of both these groups in the Retirement Group aware that we have some work ahead of us and thus as they in the music industry here in the U.S., it's time to "get the band back together". So this is basically a heads up to those of you present who also sit on the Retirement Working Group that we will need to reconvene the Retirement Working Group in a bit to go over the comments received. My understanding is Staff is reviewing, categorizing the submissions, like they usually do, that were received and we'll be able to have a summary of the study prior to reconvening.

Current proposal, in my mind, is to have us reconvene on the 6th of August, which is early in the Northern European vacation month. So hopefully we'll get some people to pitch up. It's a Thursday as per usual for the Retirement Working Group as opposed to this group, which meets on Wednesday. The plan is to have the actual time determined by Doodle poll that Kimberly will be launching shortly.

I just skimmed the comments really. I haven't gone into them in depth but I think the general view from the comments we did receive was we got it "mostly right" in my mind. Bart, again, how badly did I summarize that because I know you've been looking at this in more depth than I have? Any comments you wish to add, sir?

BART BOSWINKEL:

No. I have it [inaudible]. I think Eberhard did but it's forthcoming. So I don't want to burden everybody who's not on the Retirement Working Group with the comments.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE:

I don't either. Because there's significant overlap between the two groups, I just wanted to give a heads up since I had their ears, so to speak. That's it for me for administrative announcements. If I missed anything, Bart or Bernard, speak up now or, Joke, speak up now. If there are no questions at this point from the group then – and I don't see any hands raised on this point. Let me turn it over to the substance of the call today which is item 3, identify decision points. If we can get Bart's materials put up then I will turn the floor over to Bart and it's yours, sir. Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Thank you. Apologies. This document was not circulated yet to the group, so I've been rather busy with other things but I needed some time to go over it and think this through. So we discussed it with Eberhard and Stephen. So Bernie and I and Kim discussed it with Eberhard and Stephen how to approach this and what would be the next steps and what would be valuable for this group.

As you can see, recently and I think that was not the last one but the call before, so on the 3rd of June, PTI gave a presentation on the main step of the delegation and transfer process of ccTLD, so the overview. And in that process, they identified effectively I would say four major steps. In their presentation you will see five or six major blocks where consent and regulatory check were combined in their presentation and they've also included the final step, which is implementation but that is beyond the scope of this working group. You can go back to the presentation which is available on the wiki space anyway.

If you look at it and combine it with the discussions we had initially around how to identify decisions to be subject to the mechanism is if some of you will recall from those discussions, they first go through the process of the IFO and identify the points of decisions by the IFO and so that's currently PTI and the ICANN Board of directors list them and then start to have a discussion about them, which would be subject to which are relevant for the work of this group because some of these decisions are rather trivial, which of the more relevant discussions or decisions should be subject to a review.

So going back to the presentation of PTI, they've identified in their processes a first step or the initial evaluations of the request for delegation or transfer. So technical checks the consent and/or regulatory check, and then finally evaluation and findings in which includes the presentation of the IANA report to the submission of the IANA report to the ICANN Board of directors. Can you go to the next page, please? Thank you.

Step two is, as I said, identify those decisions which are within the scope of the policy on review mechanisms. There were two basic questions that we discussed at the time, which you agreed upon, was should they be included or excluded due to the limitations of the scope of the ccNSO policy development process. For example – and this is just an example and an assumption or an example as it is – whether or not a ccTLD manager has WHOIS available for its own domain name is out of scope because a policy at least for the review mechanism and for the ccNSO because WHOIS by a ccTLD manager is out of scope of the policy development process by the ccNSO. As a requirement, etc., the decision should not touch upon it. You can consider some areas out of scope for other criteria as well but then this criteria needs to be developed.

That would be the second step and then the third step is identify who takes the decision, who provides oversight, if any, and included you'll find some working definitions of oversights which have been developed at the time for the Retirement Working Group because this method was developed by the working group on retirement. Then related is, and finally, which is decisions should be subject to a review mechanism. Again, this is probably the most important questions in the discussions leading up to these final discussions or the decision by the working

group. This working group you'll find – we'll touch upon a lot of topics which will be included. If you can scroll down, please, Kim? One more.

If you look and combine what I just said – and this should look familiar to those of you who've been involved in the Retirement Working Group – you end up with a table with first of all the step in the process and the first step in this case was the initial evaluation of delegation and transfer requests. There's a brief description again taken from the presentation, and then who takes decision. Then the other two questions are, is that oversight and review? Based on the presentation from the 3rd of June, it's very clear that, first of all, PTI takes all these decisions and all these because they run through the steps, and the ICANN Board of directors is involved in the final decision which will touch upon at a later stage.

So my suggestion is, Stephen and all, I just ran you through the tables and maybe ask to explain a little bit what I've done, and then my question for you is, should we proceed down this path and then at the next call go into the discussion of whether any of these decisions or which one should we subject to review, first of all, whether this is a reasonable approach, of course, and then, should we subject through review and why in that process with comments? Eberhard, go ahead.

EBERHARD LISSE:

I was thinking maybe we should have some brainstorming. Everybody who thinks what decisions in this process should be reviewed. We should maybe send it to the list so we can pull it.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yes. This is the starting point but that's something for discussion. Maybe we could use like during the face-to-face meetings, use some of the facilities of Zoom live discussion and then go back as a plenary. But that's what needs to be prepared properly. But that's a way to go and use some of the comments, our first one to introduce this as a start of a more substantive discussion on the work. One of the good things is I sometimes walk the dog, I have a dog and some of you know this, because it's the honorable member of the working group. One of the reviewing what I've done with this table, it's maybe we should add a column, it's not just review but there are, as you recall, we've not just only touched upon review but we also touched upon complaint procedures and processes. So maybe should add something like an [inaudible] included in the comment field, whether a decision identified should be a subject to a complaint or subject to the complaint processes or should be subject to the complaint process. Say the PTI complaint process which was I think, yeah, that was introduced and explained by Kim Davies at one of the earlier calls. That's again – Bernie, go ahead.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I would really support something like that because if you look at the IRP from ICANN, all the steps that lead you to an IRP sort of are important in getting you there and understanding the mechanism. So I would strongly support that. Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL: So in the next version – and I'll circulate it, I will circulate this tomorrow as well – I'll include an additional column if a complaint process or

procedure is applicable as well. So, not just oversight review but also complaint as a column, which is to be discussed by the working group, of course. Then we maintain the comments field. Bernie, is that an old or a new hand? Thank you.

That gives you a bit of the background of the tables. And following the presentation of PTI, you will find included four tables in this document. So I'll run you through them. So the first one – and this goes back to and please check it against the presentation, I will send the URL as well with the updated version of this document – it's the initial evaluation. This is, if you recall, is when a request is submitted to and reaches PTI and they do some checks. One way of looking at these checks, a check is you meet the criteria, yes or no, and that is a decision. That's the way I've looked at it. So check if the request is about delegation or transfer. So that's clearly yes or no. That's a decision. Who takes the decision, PTI, and it's already getting into the – it's a decision whether you entered the process, yes or no. So in a way it's important but whether it's a review on and subject for complaints, that's something for further discussion.

String eligibility – is the string eligible for delegation? Again, that's been explained again on decision for PTI. These are provided documentation, etc. I will not go through the details of this one. This is probably very straightforward. This is the way to look at the initial evaluation and the request. Can you go to the next slide, please?

Table 2 is around the technical checks. I think the way I structured this one – and again this is a first attempt – I think the main question is whether the request meet the basic technical criteria and this has been

broken down into various sub-questions. You can read for yourself. Again, from the presentation, this is the reference to the current documentation around this. Again, it's very obvious these are PTI decisions and the next step is oversight review or complaint review, and then the common column is to capture your views on this one. That is Table #2. Can you go to the next one, please?

The next one is, I would say, the consent of regulatory check. Specifically the consent is very specific for the transfer and this was the result as most of you will know from the Framework of Interpretation work. Again, this is, as I said from the slide, PTI takes the decisions. I don't know whether – I just noted – as a point of context and maybe I forgot about it – if you look at item #1, and this is probably also an illustration of how you could use the table, due to context agreed to be [changed] exist in context. And then you have the incumbent manager provide consent. This is more of a question, what is the difference between the two? Does that make any difference with respect to the potential of complaints, who could complain reviewability, etc.? That's a way of looking at it. That's why I've included these two points and probably it's something for a discussion with and a question for PTI and with you. Next slide, please.

This is the evaluation and findings. This is where it becomes really interesting. I think item #1 is what you will find in the report, specifically in the IANA reports. Again, this is, I would say the summary in the reporting going to the IANA reports based on the checks and decisions in the previous phases. So we're talking about this is the end phase around the decision of the process and this is where – if you go to the next slide, please – you can see where the ICANN Board of directors

comes into play as well, and this is what most of you will know is the time when the ICANN Board of directors takes a formal decision on the delegation or transfer or in other cases, the revocation and the retirement of the ccTLD. I think that was the last part of the table and the transferring the presentation of PTI into the method that you have agreed upon.

So what I will do as well include the next and the updated version. First of all, include additional column about complaints, so between oversight and review. I will include two additional tables. One is around what has already been suggested regarding the revocation by the Framework of Interpretation, which is also already included in some of the materials, so after that in a table as well. Also the work of the Retirement Working Group, they've identified some decisions that should be subject to review mechanisms as well. So that should be captured in this document as well as a start for the substantial discussions, etc.

Going back to my initial questions to you and, Stephen, I'll hand it back to you. First of all, do you feel comfortable and do you think it makes sense to use this method or applying this method on the presentations from PTI? That's the first question. Also, following the suggestion from Eberhard, do you think this provides you enough basis for some online work and use the e-mail list and then during the next two or three meetings have a fulsome discussion around it if necessary, even in breakout rooms. So, back to you, Stephen.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Bart. Muchly appreciated. Do we have – yes, we have Eberhard at least. I know it seems like we’re way into the weeds here but I think we are – for non-Americans, that’s an expression. It basically says we’re getting into a level of detail that may not seem to be readily apparent. But I’m not sure it’s not in terms of trying to structure our discussion of the review mechanism going forward. With that, I will give the floor to Eberhard because I see his hand is up. Eberhard, the floor is yours.

EBERHARD LISSE: I am a little bit concerned about second guessing decision on a lower level. I’m more interested in reviewing outcomes rather than internal decision-making processes. That said, it is maybe a good idea to structure the process of delegation, a new TLD or doing a transfer to structure what decisions are being taken and what order, and then look at where can we put in an anchor and say, “Here’s a point where we can start looking at it.” In a way, I feel ambivalent about all of this.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Okay. Thank you, Eberhard. Anybody else have any thoughts on this or how to proceed? Wow. We have tremendous turnout today, I’m really excited. I’m scrolling and scrolling. Anybody else have any thoughts on this? Does this seem a reasonable approach going forward? Bernard, I see your hand is up and that will be followed by Allan. So the Canadians are thinking about this. Bernard, the floor is yours, sir. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Just following up on Eberhard's point. I understand his point on chasing down lower level discussions. I don't think as much as about chasing down or peeling those discussions. It's properly understanding what those mechanisms are so they can influence properly what we're going to want to do at the higher level. Thank you.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Bernard. Allan?

ALLAN MACGILLIVRAY: Thank you, Stephen. I understand where we're going with this right now. Personally, I was quite taken with the discussion we had on the IRP. I think it was last time or maybe the time before. Certainly from my point of view, and I think there was a couple of comments at that time to the effect of why don't we look at the IRP as the template for the mechanism we want to do? And I guess from that perspective, I would suggest we do that, look at the IRP and discuss what adjustments we might make to it. And I think there's compelling arguments to go down that road because it's important for people in the community to understand the mechanism. I think once we have that done then later come back to the question of the scope of that and which decisions, actions, claims – there's a lot of words around this – would be captured or not captured by this – let's call it a parallel mechanism. I for one would like to build on that kind of high level thinking we've been doing before we – to use your Americanism, Stephen – get down into these weeds. Thank you.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Allan. Bernard, you've got a hand up, or is that an old hand?
It appears to be an old hand.

BART BOSWINKEL: Stephen, may I? Because I could not put up my hand.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yes?

BART BOSWINKEL: I do understand your point. You say you can go both ways. In preparation of this call, we discussed both approaches. You can build up on the presentation from ICANN Legal with respect to the process and procedures but then you have to be very careful that you not go off track as well. And this focus you again and refocus you again, and that was the intention, focus you again what are we really talking about? Once you got the decisions and all the points in focus where you need a review process then you can start thinking about what is a relevance review process and what other mechanisms are available?

At the end of the day, you get what you want and at one point you need to go down the path of the reviewing the IRP again and evaluating whether it provides what is needed. Also, I think in preparation of that discussion, you need to go back and Bernie and I will need to provide the material, is why initially the ccTLDs were opposed, say one was captured in the survey of one of the [inaudible] but say there were some very strong arguments in the public comments on the initial proposals as well, and at that time it was very obvious that it should be excluded. That needs to be reviewed as well. At the end of the day, both will happen. The choice was now to go back to what are we really talking about, what are the processes, and which decisions are we really talking about and what is needed? Both approaches are available to us. Bernie?

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Thank you. I think we might be better served by the current approach we're going through of looking at what are we trying to find in an appeals mechanism for. And I'll explain why I think the group might want to do that. You have to remember that in the IRP, which I have now been playing with for over three years, the core requirement of the IRP, if you will, has the ICANN Board follow the bylaws. I mean, the simple version of that. I think we may be limiting ourselves because as we know with ccTLDs, life is a little different. So I think that it makes more sense, at least to my mind, to look at the decision points and where we're going to want to ensure a mechanism is present for an appeal as Bart has said, whatever that mechanism is for whatever level of appeals, and there may be more than one because let us remember that in ICANN, there's a whole series of things that you can go through and should go through before you get to an IRP. So for those reasons, I think our current approach will probably benefit us. I agree with Bart. I mean, we'll probably get there either way, but for me it seems to make more sense to go this way. Thank you.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Bernard. Anybody else have any comment? Eberhard has got his hands up again, so the floor is yours.

EBERHARD LISSE: As I put it in chat, I was looking for the right word. I don't want to micromanage IFO processes. The problem is the more detailed we become and the more we hook into internal processes, the more difficult it is for ICANN IFO to change the internal processes. We must identify milestones. To say that we don't go into too much detail but we set certain milestones, these are the ones that will always be there no matter how ICANN IFO comes to that point, but that's the point where we need to look for review. We should be careful that we don't sort of become prescriptive.

BART BOSWINKEL: Stephen, may I?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, sir. Bart, you may. I don't know why you can't wave your hand.

BART BOSWINKEL: Because I'm a co-host. It's one of the things of Zoom if you're a co-host.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Okay. The more we play with Zoom, the more we learn about Zoom. Go ahead.

BART BOSWINKEL: Eberhard, I fully agree with you. However, I think to get to that point is – this is, again, if you start with the details and you move away from the details, then at least you had made a conscious decision that this should not be included precisely for the reason that you just mentioned. And that’s why I’ve used a method or proposed a method that the Retirement Working Group was using because they follow exactly your reasoning and they follow this procedure. First identifying almost the most minute decision and listing the most minute decision and then looking at the list, that’s not relevant, at least not relevant in the sense of for review mechanisms. For the reason you don’t want to micromanage, there is need for more flexibility, etc. Thanks.

EBERHARD LISSE: I am quite in agreement and I don’t have an issue with the process. It’s just that I want to make it known and that we are careful about it that it will make no sense if we get become too detailed. We should look at the current weigh in as much detail as we want to. But as far as decisions that are reviewable, we should come to a sort of more higher level than just every decision.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Eberhard. Exercising the prerogative of the Chair, I think I will resort to a rather Socratic method at this point and I will be calling upon members, those who are subscribed to this call for what they might have to say about it. And I will begin with Peter Koch. Any comment, sir? Apparently no comment, which is surprising. This

conversation has revolved around about four individuals. I'd like to expand it a bit. Mirjana Tasic, do we have anything to weigh in on this? I'm not on mute. Over to Kim Davies. Do you have anything to weigh in on this?

KIM DAVIES: Thanks for putting me on the spot, Stephen.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Look, you got forewarned because you were number three.

KIM DAVIES: Honestly, not really at this point. I mean, I think you're talking about the right kinds of things. I'm happy to defer to the wisdom of the group.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: All right. What else we're going to pick out of this group? Irina, do have anything to say from – because you're up late. Are you still there, even? Irina does not appear to be there. Sean Copeland, do you have anything to say? Is anybody actually on the call or did they just sign up? I'm not seeing any hands. I'm not getting any responses.

BART BOSWINKLE: Stephen?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yes, sir?

BART BOSWINKLE: Let's be fair. People haven't seen this document. This is the first time they see it.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Okay. I wasn't crazy when I [inaudible].

BART BOSWINKLE: I think, in this sense, there is no strong objection to go down this path. So people need to chew on it and I think as of tomorrow we'll circulate it well in time and include what I said the additional column and two more tables, one with which will be fairly simple, the revocation as proposed by the FOI, which would be subject to review, and then the decisions identified to date, which is tentative, by the Retirement Work Group. I think that will give you a good starting point. Maybe as a reference for those who are – we'll also include a link to the documentation the Retirement Working Group has been using to get to that point.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yeah, that makes sense. I can go with that. All right. Well, that being the case, I think we're off to a start here. Certainly as we get into autumn, can we bear down and make some serious progress? That is the question. Bart, thank you for that. I guess this brings us to the next part of the teleconference. Kimberly, if you can bring up the agenda again, please. Can we focus on our next meetings? And thank you for that part. That will be circulated next day or so presumably, yes?

BART BOSWINKLE: Yes, indeed.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Okay. Where are we? I don't have any action items unless I've missed something. Bart, Kimberly, Joke, can you inform me if I missed anything? I don't think there's anything outstanding in the action item department.

BART BOSWINKLE: No. We just started again.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: And do we have any other business from any of – what?

BART BOSWINKLE: These are the recorded action items of this meeting.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Okay, my apologies to the group for being a dunce on this. I call it COVID brain at this point. What are we looking at here? Updated version, digital column about complaint, blah, blah, blah. Okay, fine on that.

Is there any other business from anyone on this call? Again, I thank everybody who's on the call. Great turnout. Any other business? I'm not seeing any hands wiggling.

Next meetings, as you can see, we got three meetings scheduled over what is mid to late summer in the northern hemisphere. My question to you as a group is, do you think it makes sense to try to hold all three meetings? I'd like to go ahead with all three personally, since it's not like I'm going on holiday this summer, given how well my government is managing the pandemic, but that's selfish on my part so let's not consider that. Personally, I'd rather not see the cancellation of the proposed 29 July teleconference. I'd like to keep the momentum going from this one, given we've been away for a month. So if we can assemble again in two weeks, that would be better in my view than not meeting in two weeks. I realized that the time for that meeting is horrible for people in the European region. But I also realized that a lot of you guys in European region disappear for most of August, where we have two meetings scheduled, which have actually decent times in your region. I don't want to slight our Asian-Pacific participants either and my focus on European region, I'm just trying to figure out – I'm just trying to put out there, basically. Start thinking about this collectively and we need to come to some conclusion on this. My questions are really twofold. How many of you might be available for the 29 July meeting and what do you think your availabilities might be for the two schedule August meetings?

BART BOSWINKLE:

Stephen?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I don't want this to be European region-centric discussion. Yes, Bart? Go ahead.

BART BOSWINKLE: Can we do this by checking the green and red boxes? This is only indicative. Could you check the green box if you will attend the 29th of July meeting? So check the green box if you would.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Brilliant idea. I might check it. There we go.

EBERHARD LISSE: We could do a poll.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Well, we're going to refine that, yes.

BART BOSWINKLE: It is what we're doing. If you'll not be able to attend the 29th, could you check the red box, please? So it looks like you've got a meeting on the 29th. Some people will not be able to attend, unfortunately. Let's go follow the same process and procedure for the meeting on the 12th of August. Who will be able and will most likely attend? Again, this is indicative on the 12th of August.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Kimberly, are you able to capture all this somehow magically?

BART BOSWINKLE: Who will definitely not be able to attend the meeting on the 12th of August? Please use a red mark. I would say the majority of the people who are both on the 29th and the 12th. I think the 26th is – that's at least for the northern hemisphere, it's almost beyond holiday season. So you got three meetings, Stephen.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Okay. I think then we will plan for three meetings. Thank you, everybody. [Inaudible] hasn't gotten mine off yet. Allan, Bernard ... Slackers. Okay. It looks like we could do all three meetings, which would be great. I'd really like to start pushing this forward. I don't want to be 85 when I'm done.

Having done next meetings, I think we're on to our favorite part, which is closure, which we're coming up to the top of the hour. What's that, Kimberly? After AOB is closure. We've done the next meeting.

KIMBERLY CARLSON: Stephen?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yes?

KIMBERLY CARLSON: Did you want to mention the length of the next meeting? Maybe going 90 minutes.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you.

EBERHARD LISSE: No, I can't do 90 minutes.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Well, don't be a poor sport because what we're looking at is doing is we want to try out this new Zoom thing. What is it called, Kimberly?

KIMBERLY CARLSON: Breakout rooms.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yes, breakout rooms. We want to schedule that and those will probably exceed 60 minutes. I'll cut my introductory stuff down to the bare minimum. But the breakout room stuff is something we need to explore because we're not meeting face to face and using flip charts and so on and so forth, breaking out into groups, and that's what this is trying to replicate. That's probably going to take 90 minutes. Eberhard, if you can't make it, you can't make it. But I do want to advise the rest of the group, be prepared for a 90-minute meeting the next time. We'll go into extra time, so to speak, and try to see how we can get this to work for us because we're getting to a point in this discussion regarding the review mechanism, where we need to go, where we went when we were face-to-face in the Retirement Group. With breakout groups and

people discussing among themselves, this and that what they see our issues, concerns, etc. Then coming back as a collective group, which apparently Zoom will allow us to do and discuss those. Because we're not meeting face-to-face anytime soon and this work could not be delayed anymore than it's already been delayed.

Thank you, Kimberly, for reminding me that. Be prepared. That's probably where we're going to go. As Chair, I promise I'll give you a heads up on the list as to exactly what we're planning there. This is going to be a new, interesting, unique meeting for us but I think it's something we need to try to do. So that's where we're going with that, hopefully. Yes, Bart?

BART BOSWINKLE:

Maybe it's more that say whether it's the 6.1 or the 6.2 meeting, but at least one or two of these meetings will be with breakout rooms, whether it's the next one or the meeting afterwards. My suggestion is that you and Eberhard will need to prepare properly with stuff.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE:

I want to pick one where I think we got the most participation potential as well because that's what makes it works. If people pitch up then we can break out, get reasonably size groups, etc. And a reasonable size group allocation is, I think, kind of key to success. I have no idea how any of this stuff works. That's what I want to do because I really want to push us forward on this even that it is over the summer too. We'll see what we can do and see what we can do with this technology, frankly. Heads up to everybody there for that.

That's it for me. I think we're done. I want to thank everybody for pitching up today. Thank you and good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, wherever you are all again. Please stay safe. For those of you who can actually go out to restaurants and beaches, etc., let alone being able to go on a reasonable summer holiday, I'm jealous of you guys. We can't do that here. Just be careful wherever you are. I want to thank Joke, Bart, Bernard, Kimberly. At this point, Kimberly, at 17:00, we can stop the recording. We are done at the top of the hour. Thank you all.

BART BOSWINKLE: Bye all.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]