

1469282

Unidentified Participant: Okay, we can basically start. Nigel is not there, so he asked me (inaudible) for him. I understand Kim is not on the call, so can -- Bart, can you or somebody else (inaudible) on the call please take the (inaudible)--?

Bart Boswinkel: --I'll take the (inaudible), yes. So, Gilson (ph), could you please start the recording, please? Thank you.

Gulten Tepe: Yes, of course, Bart, recording is (inaudible).

Bart Boswinkel: Oh, there is a lot of echo. Please, if you're not speaking, go on mute. Thank you. So, for the record, is there anybody on the call who is not in the Adobe room? If not, then I'll consider the list of participants in the Adobe room as the attendees of this call. And as you can see, apologies are received -- have been received from Stephen Deerhake, Nigel Roberts, Debbie Monahan, and Maureen Hilyard. So, back to you, Eberhart, to run through the agenda.

Eberhard Lisse: Okay. Can you go through the actual items? I wasn't on the call on the 14th of December, and we -- due to our vacation, holiday things, we haven't really had a prep meeting, so I'm not really totally clear on the action items, what is issue for the Secretariat (ph) anyway, if I'm not mistaken.

Bart Boswinkel: So, first action item, but they all have been completed, is comments, if any, description of the renewable from list of country names document, so that item four on the agenda. To date, we haven't -- say up till yesterday we haven't received any comments, but these (ph) notes say Ada Will (ph) may have one or two comments on the document. So, that's on item number four, and that's the second reading.

Comments on the working method, again, that's item -- on item number five on the agenda. There was a discussion on the list, and that's been incorporated, so to be discussed on the item number five of the agenda.

And the final item was for -- again to respond, et cetera, on the nomination of a new chair. And it's a unanimous, or without any objection, Stephen Deerhake has been nominated, and this is item six on the agenda. Back to you, Eberhard, so all the action items are complete.

Eberhard Lisse: Unmute first, okay. Thank you. We'll come to this in order. I have got significant issues with some stuff on the -- on item four on the document, but that's not a problem. Let's take this in order. Document -- glossary terminology document, does Jaap have any updates for us?

Bart Boswinkel: Gilson, could you change the document, please?

Gulten Tepe: Yes, of course.

- Bart Boswinkel: So everybody knows what we're talking about, and it's scrollable. Jaap, could you provide an update from the discussion from ISO 3166, maintenance agency? Jaap, are you there? Should be on the call. We can't hear you, Jaap.
- Eberhard Lisse: We can't hear you. We can't hear you, Jaap. We still can't hear you. Okay, can you quickly indicate in the Adobe whether you have got any updates to make? Okay, so how do we do this when we can't--?
- Bart Boswinkel: --Jaap, could you dial in, please?
- Gulten Tepe: Or we can dial out to Jaap, Bart, however you like.
- Bart Boswinkel: Not necessary, Gilson. Let him dial in.
- Eberhard Lisse: Okay. Is there -- in the meantime, any discussion going on on -- does anybody have -- wants to enter any discussion of the current document, or what has been said so far?
- Bart Boswinkel: Eberhard, may I suggest that we go to item number six first and wait until Jaap has -- so, the Chair (ph) 2018 next steps, then revisit once Jaap has dialed in.
- Eberhard Lisse: That was actually my next thought. I was starting to think about which item we should take now. As we all know, Nigel has been elected to take up the Board chair vacated by Mike Silva in October, and he has decided to relinquish the Chairmanship of this group a little bit earlier than that so that the new Chair can hit the ground running. The Chair does not have to be a council member, but it should be, otherwise we should have a liaison, and I think it's better if there is a council member as the Chair. And since Stephen is already on the call, he is very familiar with the topic for many years, he was the natural choice for a proposal. He was seconded. There has been no objection, and a lot of support. So, I assume we can take this as second reading, that we propose him to be appointed by the ccNSO council to take over when Nigel steps down. Anybody wishing to say anything can raise their hand now. Bart?
- Bart Boswinkel: Just for your information, assuming this -- say this is the second reading, the appointment of Stephen will be on the upcoming council call, which is scheduled for today in a week, so on the 18th. And the date that he will take the seat is -- the proposed date is at the end of ICANN 61, so at the -- after the next call, after the face-to-face meeting in Puerto Rico.
- Eberhard Lisse: Okay. It is a formality, but it's important because our charter is quite clear. We elect, council appoints, and as there has been no objection, we anticipate him to be confirmed by -- on the next council meeting. And we -- Bart and I have spoken about that we will try to involve him already in any preparation so that he can hit the ground running and doesn't have to take over unprepared. Any more comments, or is -- if Jaap is in, can you let us know? So that concludes item number six. Why don't we then go to item number four, description removal from list of continent, scenario two documents?
- Bart Boswinkel: Gilson, could you change the document, please? And I'll make the document scrollable for everybody. There you go.
- Eberhard Lisse: Thank you. There you go. Okay. I have been going through this with a fine-toothed comb, whatever the proper English expression is, and I've got some things that I notice. One of the things is that this is written by a Dutchman, because the approval (ph) of scenarios in Dutch is with an apostrophe (ph), as in English it is without. It's a typing error, so that is easily corrected.

I also noted what Peter e-mailed just now. In the first line there, that the -- I don't have the same document. I have a document, version four, 30th of November 2017. Which one -- the one that was sent out was the version for dated 30th of November, which has a different preamble. And my document reads on one of the scenarios potentially resulting in retirement of a ccTLD is the change of country name or the two-letter code. I don't really know how this is going to work if we don't have the correct document, or we don't have all the same document.

Bart Boswinkel: This one was -- Eberhard, this one was circulated just before the December call, so everybody should have it. I think, unfortunately, we did share the wrong -- say the wrong version. I don't know if you -- how to approach -- maybe we could change this to the version you sent, and then see what happens. I'll change the document.

Eberhard Lisse: No, I think what we should do is that we will -- I propose that we table this discussion, circulate the proper document for everybody to review in their good time, and then take it up on the list or on the next meeting. I don't think we should argue or (inaudible) an outdated document, like the November document. It's a mistake that can happen. This is no problem. Nobody is difficult about it, but I think we should not discuss the document on the screen or an outdated document that we all have. That doesn't work for me.

Bart Boswinkel: Okay. Yes, no problem. Right after the call, I'll--.

Eberhard Lisse: --What is the feeling in the room to -- about this? I don't hear anything. I see some typing, but I don't hear anything. Since I don't hear objections, I would propose we circulate the correct document and take it from there. Okay, Peter Koch seconded this on the chat, so unless there is objections, Bart, what do you think?

Bart Boswinkel: No, I fully agree. I'll change the title as well so everybody's clear, and include the date.

Eberhard Lisse: It's really not a problem. These things can happen, but we want to make sure that we make this work easy for everybody. Okay. So, then if Jaap is here (ph), he can indicate so by raising of a hand. Otherwise, we go to item number five.

Jaap Akkerhuis: Yes, well, I'm in, as far as I know.

Bart Boswinkel: I can hear you loud and clear.

Jaap Akkerhuis: Okay, that's phone number three I'm trying here.

Eberhard Lisse: Okay, then please put up document -- glossary -- the discussions -- glossary terminology document again, please?

Jaap Akkerhuis: Yes. Let me explain what happened while you're doing that. This was a meeting of the MA 3166 in Geneva (ph) at the same time as the IGF (ph) was there, which is kind of unfortunate. But -- and there was a lot of discussion about the terminology as being -- as it is online and as it is in the standards, and looks like there's quite some history attached to some of the things. And I actually use this list we see here now as to related comments to the MA, and so -- and only looked at the ISO things. So, I didn't look -- I didn't mention the specific IANAS (ph) things, because that's IANA policy.

And one of the things is, for instance, we discussed about what actually (ph) -- that there is no definition what assigned (ph) is, and yes, it was probably seen as an omission. And especially -- well, that (inaudible), but unassigned, which is not defined in the standards. And this is -- this actually opened a can of worms, which is some old (ph) stuff in the standard, because it has to do with the -- whether or not what is known as the user-assigned (inaudible), whether that's an assignment or not from a standard. And some

very old policy stuff immediately popped up, and that's probably the reason why it's never got assigned there.

And so, but there are more of these terms there. One of the more important thing was that the whole idea of classifications (ph), where that mechanism comes from, and the mechanism (inaudible) actually has two causes. And one cause is that's actually the main reason why there isn't a classification (ph) table in the first place, is that it -- the ISO 3166 is actually composed of a couple of different standards which were floating around at the time. And among the (inaudible) standards for names, the NATO (ph) standard for account (inaudible), and so we don't get, oops, I bumped the wrong country, and things like that. The (inaudible), that is actually the whole basic reason for having the (inaudible) list, so you don't step on old existing standards. And so, there's more an historic reason that it's there than anything else.

And it is actually never been the purpose that there should be assignments to these lists, or, I mean, new entries added to this list. And that basically -- so, only when it's felt necessary for the proper working of the maintenance agency, and for things as when we see the transitional (ph) reserved (ph) and things, if codes are getting unassigned, this will be a cooling-off period for the code (ph). So, that's really the main purpose of (inaudible) list. And adding stuff to it is never actually -- this is really an exceptional thing. So, that was one of the big takeaway of it.

And so, what is happening actually at the same time, because this is causing problems, and certainly it's causing problems for other users of standards, and not only for ICANN, but also for the -- I mean, people dealing with the standards in other ways, airline pilots (ph), economical -- financial documents, things like that. And so, the standards itself is actually due to its five yearly revision, which -- and so, these things will be taken up by the working group two of GC (ph) 46, which is the actually owner of the standard, and they will try to find with the other -- find some way out of it to make more clear what has happened.

At the same time, somewhere (inaudible) inside the maintenance agency for clarifying some stuff for -- in the internal documents in term of relevancy (ph), stuff like that, things which are only -- so, that's actually took a whole afternoon discussing this at the MA 3166. And so, I don't want to cause (inaudible), but I probably can answer some questions in case people have them. And so, I was wondering whether there were any questions.

Bart Boswinkel: Any questions? Peter, go ahead.

Peter Koch: Yes, thanks, Bart, and thank you, Jaap. Can you hear me?

Jaap Akkerhuis: Yes, yes.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, we can.

Peter Koch: Thanks. Jaap, you mentioned the five-year revision phase for the standard. Now, getting this kind of in sync with our efforts that we are working on right now in here, do you have any informed guess, so to speak, what the timeline for the revision is and how much we should wait for this? Or from the other perspective, how much we could influence the outcome by talking to our national standards bodies, for example, or what should we do?

Jaap Akkerhuis: Yes. I mean, the timeline is that the proposal is supposed to be at least on the table for the technical meeting 46 plenary, which is happening in Lisbon in May. And I am official liaison to that committee, and although I highly don't see any information coming

out of it due to some screw-up inside the ISO, so mainly -- so I was supposed to be on, but I am not.

So, what the proposals are and how they look like, I don't know, but I've been asked to join in in that meeting, at least, and give input as much as possible. So, if there is some specific things you want to change, it's probably useful to have that before May with your proposals. And I think the proposals for the meeting closes at 30 March, so -- which should be -- so we have setting up a window of two months to influence this.

My experience with plenaries of GC 46 is that it will only take probably a couple of hours, and that's it, for working group two, because there are way more working groups in which people find more interesting or important. And yes, there are at this moment 46 or 47 member-states part of working group two with voting rights. And as a liaison, right, whatever it is, I'm not allowed to vote. More than that, I am actually only allowed to join it if I'm -- that meeting if I am asked, so in this case I can be there.

And so, if you want to have influence on the process happening, changing the standards, you really should contact your local representative. For Germany (inaudible) for the U.S., it's MC, so there is a whole list of these on the GC 46 page.

Bart Boswinkel: Any other questions for Jaap?

Eberhard Lisse: Thank you very much. Any questions further? I see no hands. Going, going, gone. (Multiple speakers) -- hang on. Anybody on the call who has no access to Adobe? Don't hear anything. Jaap?

Jaap Akkerhuis: Well, this not directly to this, but -- to work in this group, but I'm also looking at what's happening in the -- in the GNSO about the new GTLD domains, which is -- and what policies they are doing there. And if you look what they are doing, and I should probably react on this very quickly, is that they have complete misinterpretation from the 3166, and as you can -- actually can see in the applicant (ph) (inaudible), I mean, it's a complete mess there how they interpreted 3166. But the (inaudible) interpretations, they are going to put into stone as well if you see some of the (inaudible) received there. So, people want to -- so in case you don't want to have a big battle at hand at the GTLD, somebody should take a look at this from this group and what's happening there.

In work deck five of the new policy for the new ccTLDs, it's where -- probably worth a look to see what's happening there.

Eberhard Lisse: Before I recognize Bart, Michele Neylon is on this group, so is not on the call, I think, but we'll figure something out that somebody -- and we can also ask Ben Fuller from Namibia, who is the liaison to council, to pay attention to this, because I meet him almost every day, and we talk every day, so that we can get some input in there. And Bart?

Jaap Akkerhuis: Yes, I mean, at least -- well, yes, have a look. I will (inaudible) -- don't put any comments there, but it's worth a look, prevent accidents happen in future.

Bart Boswinkel: All right, Eberhard. In addition, some of the working group members of this working group are also on that group, for example Ann Katrine (ph), who just joined, and Nick Wenban-Smith, active participants in the working group. That being said, I think -- and depends a bit on how the notes evolve, that one of the things this group might do is send out at least a -- and I'm pre-empting on the next item, but at least use this terminology document and share this with the broader community ahead of the ICANN 61, because my assumption is, looking at tentative agendas, the use of at least geographic names is on the agenda of a lot of groups, and it could be one of the cross-community sessions, sharing the outcome of this group and the research, et cetera, it has done might be useful

to inform. And as you said, Eberhard, on previous meeting, it is an opportunity to start using the right terminology, like the removal of code elements, et cetera. And are we talking about code elements and the reservation of code elements, et cetera, and not use the loose terminology that most people have been using around ISO 3166. Thank you.

Eberhard Lisse: I've proposed in the past that anybody discussing this, or anybody hearing somebody talk about this with wrong terminology should take the time and the effort to correct the wrong use of terminology in verbal discussions, on documents anyway. Jaap has the hand up. I see Nick Wenban-Smith is also on the call. Maybe you can also put some in. Jaap?

Jaap Akkerhuis: Yes. Since Bart mentioned the word "code element," this is actually even inside 3166 is not always clear whether they use code or code elements and what is the right terminology. In formal speak, code and code elements are actually used often interchangeable, but they are actually not. And before you know, we end up in a complete (inaudible) and a food fight about principles of what is a code and what is a code element. But, that's one of the things that is hopefully going to be clarified with the revision of standard. So, you see that even--.

Eberhard Lisse: --Hang on. My view on this is that code elements are part of the codes -- a sub-part of the code. Each country has got codes, three-letter, two-letter, numbers, and so the two-letter is one of the code elements. But, this is terminology, and for us, only the two-letter codes is relevant, in my view. I heard somebody. If it was Nick Wenban-Smith, you have the floor.

Nick Wenban-Smith: Hi, can you hear me okay?

Eberhard Lisse: Yes--.

Nick Wenban-Smith: --Can you hear me?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, but you're (inaudible).

Nick Wenban-Smith: Okay, just checking. I just wanted to say I have been quite active on the work track five, which looks at the geographic in the next round of top-level GTLDs. And actually, that work is still at a very early stage, but I'm really sort of sensitive now, I guess in the light of the sorts of discussions that we've had in this group, around the terminology from 3166. And actually, very soon, we haven't actually finalized the terms of reference for work track five. It's taken about two months to do that. But, one of the things that we are going to do is to look through the definitions of what is a geographic term in terms of a GTLD, and that includes all of the 3166 categories. And I'm fully prepared--.

Jaap Akkerhuis: --But the 3166 is not about geographic terms.

Eberhard Lisse: Sorry, Jaap, let him finish and raise your hand so that we can do this in an orderly manner, please.

Nick Wenban-Smith: So, the applicant guidebook contains restrictions which are based off the 3166 list. And so, they define geographic terms by reference to the 3166 list of those is the right way that that is expressed. But, that is all going to be looked at in quite some detail. So, that work hasn't yet started, but it is going to start, and it's something that I think it's worth keeping quite a close eye on, specifically around this confusion of terminology question. I mean, that was (inaudible) just add to the discussion since we're talking about the two different pieces of work.

Eberhard Lisse: Okay, Jaap?

- Jaap Akkerhuis: Well, the problem is, and that's -- oh, the wrong one, the (inaudible) hand button -- the problem is is that a lot of people are already for years aware that ATB (ph) is using complete wrong definition, and people just ignore that. And they're now -- and so, that's really the danger (ph) what's happening there. And I mean, I've explained it so many times to the same people who are repeating this mess (ph) and nonsense all over again. And I know that (inaudible) is only the term of reference for the work deck five, and that's comforting (ph) for (inaudible). But, in the meantime, people are talking about completely different things, and it's a mess there.
- Eberhard Lisse: Okay. As I said, every member of that work track I see is also on that, should take every opportunity they have to correct the wrong use of terminology, as far as I'm concerned. And I will do it in every discussion that I have. If I hear somebody using the wrong term, I will politely correct them, that this terminology is outdated, and we have defined differently (ph). Any more hands for this particular topic? Okay, then we are done for the time being with item there. We're finished with item four, or postponed item four rather, so we go to item five. Can you please put the appropriate document on the screen?
- Bart Boswinkel: Here you are, Eberhard, and I will make this scrollable again for everybody. So, this is an update from the previous document (inaudible).
- Eberhard Lisse: Yes. I have a few small things as far as typing errors (ph) and code elements are concerned, which we don't have to really bring to the whole forum at this point in time. But, for example, I note the use here, delegated ccTLDs retirement process undelegated, and you note somewhere that undelegated is not defined. Should we maybe just use the word not delegated? A domain -- a ccTLD can only be delegated or not delegated.
- Bart Boswinkel: I'll leave it open to you. See, up till now, we've used the term "undelegated" also in the previous scenario document. This is -- the reason for using this that we explained is that you go from delegated into, say, the ccTLD is either retired or, say, another step (ph), change of status, like (inaudible) UM. And to capture (ph) this in a -- say a broad category, say the term "undelegated" is used. So, moving from delegate to undelegated, not delegated ccTLD could be something might have -- yes, you could actually expect, say, there is a ccTLD to a country code top-level domain that has never been delegated, but that is my sense.
- Eberhard Lisse: Which there are, South Sudan (ph), for example, double-S is not -- I'm not very strict on this, but undelegated sounds a little bit like -- in a direction like previously delegated and revoked and things. So, I thought I suggested this.
- Bart Boswinkel: And that's precisely what we tried to capture there, Eberhard.
- Eberhard Lisse: You wanted, and to -- the group once (ph) said that. I see Peter says that "not delegated" would also capture (inaudible) has never been delegation. I said I'm not -- this is not very serious for me, but I thought I've -- and because we have to footnote the word in the other document, the undelegated is footnoted as not being defined. If we were to use "not delegated," we don't need to explain that we used an undefined term. I'm just suggesting this. I'm not really having a big drama on this.
- Then, Roman number three is something that I have an issue with, or I have a -- can you -  
- I have an idea about this. My view on this is -- so let me go to the next page -- that it reads how is retirement initiated? Letter, ICANN Board, letter from government. And maybe it's a process of several issues. In one sense, it's automatic because the code element is removed from the list. The Board -- PTI (ph) informs the Board of this when it comes to their attention. The Board initiates votes, would vote on starting the process.

And then, PTI informs the ccTLD manager, and then they follow the policy that we develop. That would be one way of dealing with this. No comments on this? Is there any comments from the group on this? No?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, Eberhard, Jaap has his hand up.

Eberhard Lisse: Jaap, I see you (inaudible) now. Thank you. Jaap?

Jaap Akkerhuis: Yes. Well, I had my hand up anyway talking about delegation and undelegations. And what I think the problem is, and what makes the terminology confusing here, is that there's a state of being delegated, and there's a state of not being delegated, but doing an undelegation is actually a process, so it's going from one state to another one. And that's some action, and that's why these terminologies kind of conflicting itself. I mean, going to delegate something is actually an action. Being delegated is something else. So, maybe that's why this confusion pops up. That's what I would add. I guess that's -- it's for more of this terminology, there's a difference between the process from getting from one state to another one, then defining a current state.

Eberhard Lisse: As we all said earlier, or agreed earlier, terminology is important, and not just because for the sake of it, because it makes using the right words, makes things easier to understand. You're absolutely right. A state or a status is a particular situation in time, but a process is a longer enduring (ph) thing to arrive at a service (ph). That's totally correct. Maybe we will figure a way out to work this in.

Any other comments on this area? I would, if not, go to -- sorry, where was I? My main problem is at the end, in the stress test, because let's move to F, where according to RFC 1591 as interpreted through the FOI, significantly interested parties have a relevant role in the transfer of a CCD revocation. I do not agree with that statement. That is not my understanding of the interpretation of the FOI. The revocation is triggered by substantial misbehavior and not by significant interested parties having an interest in that matter. Transfer selection of the new one is quite correct, but I have an issue with putting the word "revocation" in there, and that's a serious one. Any comments on that? Okay, so we'll leave that as is.

And then, there is some mentionings, too, that since the group was taken out (inaudible) report on its findings, I think we can take this out because the group -- and doing analysis doesn't have to report to itself on its findings. But, that's just stylistic changes. Is there any substantive input by way of a raising hand? I see this is not the case, so I propose we revise this a little bit. We'll figure the typing errors out. There is some small misunderstandings as far as typings, and we'll -- the Chair, Vice-Chair, and the Issue Manager and the Secretariat will work on the words missing without changing the content too much. And then, we'll propose this to the next meeting. Is this acceptable today? Do I hear any opposition, rather? I hear some movement, so I'm still online.

I hear no opposition, so I would think we conclude section -- item five now, and we come to item seven, any other business. Is there any other business? We were talking about -- in the past about having two meetings, but I think that has been decided on the list not to do this because it would, on the one hand, be a problem with scheduling. On the other hand, it is a big issue for the Secretariat. They're not just providing documents for our working group, and having to do that for 10 or 15 working groups and then would make it almost impossible to provide the documents. So, we have the whole morning on Thursday morning, from early until lunch, so we should have enough time to ventilate everything.

Bart?



- Bart Boswinkel: Yes. I guess, as you said, it tentatively is now scheduled on Thursday morning, block one and two, so there will be a break in between the -- after 90 minutes before your convening, so -- and just before lunch.
- Eberhard Lisse: Okay, thank you. Is there any other business? Going, going, gone. We come to the next meetings. I must confess, I don't like the eight-hour intervals. I would rather have six-hour intervals. The eight-hour intervals mess seriously with my work. I know I can't force my own singular work situation on all 15 or 20 members of the group, but if we have a six-hourly, I found it was much better for attendance. Peter?
- Peter Koch: Yes, thank you. I think we didn't necessarily improve the situation by the changes we applied, but I'm not sure that is due to the eight-hour interval rather than by picking the exact point in time of the day. And I sent an e-mail end of last year saying, when we suggested the change in scheduling, we were looking at the lack of attendance from the people around UTC plus-minus two or three hours. But, with sticking to the 1:00 UTC time, we didn't change the situation for those of us, including myself, so I'm speaking a bit (inaudible) here. And I'm not sure how we change the situation for others. So, I don't have strong feelings about six versus eight hours, but it'd be 1:00 (inaudible). It's happening more often now. This is not necessarily improvement.
- Bart Boswinkel: Eberhard, are you still there?
- Eberhard Lisse: Sorry, I'm muted. I'm not going to impose my wishes on the group. This is -- we do this via consensus. But, I fully agree with you. Every three -- 1:00 UTC is 3:00 my time Friday morning, and I have to go to clinical work with patients or lectures at 7:00. So, for me, that's really a nuisance. And it's every third meeting. It's also the time that we're having now, 9:00 UTC, is smack in the middle of my consultation time. That I can schedule around and block it out on my schedule. I'm just saying, from my personal perspective, that I would propose that we discuss, on the least, a better scheduling system. Whether we have it three times or four times is not my issue. The times are very inconvenient, and the change, as Peter said, that we suggested to avoid this issue with 1:00 UTC has not been avoided.
- So, the next meeting is on the 25th at 5:00, which is not a problem, and on the 8th of February at 1:00. I will suffer and I will do it anyway. But, it gives us a bit of time to sort of, on the list, come up with a schedule either four times or three times so (ph) rotating so that everybody has the pain, but only as little as possible. Bart?
- Bart Boswinkel: May I suggest that the Secretariat (inaudible) after this call, so early next week, sends out a -- maybe two or three different approaches, say one is based on the eight hours, maybe shift a little bit, one is based on the six hours, and see if we can avoid the 1:00 a.m., 2:00 a.m. calls UTC, and then have a discussion on it at the next meeting, and then the second meeting two weeks afterwards. So, we are all prepared by ICANN 61, so the Puerto Rico meeting, to change and stick to that change.
- Eberhard Lisse: I think it's a good idea that the Secretariat can maybe propose they work on many groups, so maybe they have a schedule that works well for other groups. We can adapt it, in any case. As I said, again, I don't want to (inaudible) my pain on others and more than I have to. I would like to spread the pain, or the wealth, equally on everybody so that one -- if it's one every four weeks, it would be better. If we can avoid this particular time at all it would be even better, but I'm just one of 20 members, so we must find a way around this.
- Bart, I think your approach of having the Secretariat propose one or two schedules from other groups that works would be helpful. Any other hands? Going, going, gone. So, that leaves me seven minutes before the hour to -- I see from Bart whether there has been any improvement after we change the time. I think that has been discussed. Actually, it

has not been improved. Otherwise, I think I can close the meetings. If there is nothing else to say, I would then say we're done for today.

Bart Boswinkel: Okay. Thank you. Bye all.

Unidentified Participant: Okay, thank you very much. Bye-bye.

Bart Boswinkel: Gilson (ph), you can stop the recording now.

Gulten Tepe: Thank you, everyone. Have a great rest of the day.

Unidentified Participant: Thanks. Bye all.

Unidentified Participant: Bye all, thanks a lot.