KIM CARLSON:	Today we have on the call Barrack Otieno, Debbie Monahan, Eberhard Lisse, Martin Boyle, Nenad Orlic, Peter Koch, Stephen Deerhake. Apologies from Peter Van Roste, Allan MacGillivary and Katherine Markinson and Nigel Roberts.

As a reminder, these calls are recorded and transcribed, please state your name before speaking for purposes of the transcript and keep your phones and microphones muted to avoid any background noise. Thank you and back to you, Eberhard. |
| EBERHARD LISSE: | Okay, thanks. Should I drop off because I'm calling [inaudible], Stephen can carry on running it. Action items, can you please report on the action items? |
| BART BOSWINKEL: | The document [inaudible] has been circulated and completed. Working map and document has been returned by Eberhard and recirculated, and the secretary has been working on two scenarios for the calls, both [inaudible]on the six hours and eight hours rotation scheme and avoiding this time for a call, so the 1am UTC calls.

As soon the chair and vice chair have agreed, we'll circulate this so it can be decided at the San Juan meeting, but that was with respect to the action items. One more, Nenad, he noted from the notes that he would sent language to be included in the scenario two and he has circulated it just before the call to the list. Back to you, Eberhard. |

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.

EBERHARD LISSE: Scenario of working methods. Not a problem, we'll figure it out when I'm awake and I will edit the document as an in-land mark up and then we can approve it on the next [inaudible]. Let's put up the scenario two document, we will discuss the hours under any other business. Okay. Any comments regarding this? Now is your chance. I don't see any hands.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Stephen has his hand up.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Eberhard, I'm happy with this as it now reads.

EBERHARD LISSE: Nenad had a hand up very shortly.

NENAD ORLIC: Yeah, I've sent a text, sorry for being late, frankly I was skiing and totally forgot when it was. There is a part that's on the line, I gave additional text, I propose additional to be inserted in a part of the retirement of YU domain and I think I may have missed the line, now [inaudible] again. Okay, this is the same document that was circulated, sorry, just a second. Yeah, it's not the same document. Did they made the mistake? It's not the same document.

EN

EBERHARD LISSE:	Don't worry, submit it to the list but can you give us a short abbreviation of what you want to propose?
NENAD ORLIC:	Yeah, I propose to enter the consequences of the domain retirement, that was a drop-in traffic for the certain domain names. For all domain names because links became defuncted [inaudible] with the old addresses and that type search gave wrong links for websites and it produced a visible drop in traffic.

And the other consequence was that because of the list of domain names, that was reserved for the registry and for the state, some of the websites that had a substantial number of users became unavailable, users lost them. Those are the rules, I did not agree with them but they are such.

Also, what I wanted to speak about is the part that says, this might be important and as I said, I don't think everything is for the record, that there is a line now, it's the line switch on the text that I was looking, number of lines, it says number 152153 is based on reports available; it is not clear what is meant regarding the raised point by the managing [inaudible] for the ICANN for better guidance in the future of how to process retiring ccTLD's should be concluded.

I was a member of the board and I was one of the [inaudible] demand, and I know very well exactly what is meant. It's a long story and I was not sure, should they replace one dead sentence with a long story and I decided not to.

Question is, do you want a side documents explaining this for your reference? Maybe you may find something important for the process in it, or how do you think it's appropriate to proceed regarding this?

EBERHARD LISSE: I am putting all documents that we are referring in a bibliography from which [inaudible] documents, so if you have [inaudible] that are relevant, send a link, send a document so that we can refer to them in the document and my latest software will automatically put the reference in the back [inaudible].

NENAD ORLIC: I check my archives.

EBERHARD LISSE: Let me finish. What you are talking about in some detail is abbreviated as [inaudible] for us. We have been discussing this in the past, it's very good that you show an example, others paraphrase this perhaps into a little bit shorter language but [inaudible] is an important consequence of a removal of a domain and basically all other documents that we thought to be linked will arrive as broken links, and it will result in a content that needs to be taken into consideration, I fully agree with that.

So propose some language, send it to the list; I will probably paraphrase it and put it in, send any interesting links that anybody has, send them. I keep the bibliography completely intact as a file so that we can refer to -- that we don't have to lose the documents [inaudible] one location, that's what I mean. So later we can refer to this one location and if you

want to site it and then we have current documents, we know when they have been accessed, we know that the link is correct and so on, so this is going to work like that.

NENAD ORLIC: Okay. I will try to [CROSSTALK]. Yeah, I started writing this text like more than two hours ago because I was consulting my archives, just not to skip anything or give a wrong information. So, I can see what is fitting to maybe these archived materials with this, to choose from it, but like I said, what I wanted to consult with you right now is the [inaudible] text that says -- the line in this text is line 152, 153, based on the report available, it is not clear what is meant. I can give in detail what was meant. I'm not sure, it's just [inaudible].

EBERHARD LISSE: Be as detailed as possible so that we have as much as information as possible and then we can paraphrase it anyway. I also saw in your email that you referred to version 1.14, please redo your thing and refer to the line numbers in version 1.21, so that we all have the same document and we know exactly what we're talking about.

NENAD ORLIC: Okay, I will revise.

EN

BART BOSWINKEL: Just for your information, I've inserted and I think this is based on what Nenad said, it should be inserted in his proposal in between line number 155 and 156, that's in the meeting notes.

Another point and this is more for the working group and a question for Nenad is, Nenad I believe you work from your personal archive, at least that's what I understood you said, and the question for the working group is -- and maybe there is nothing pro or against, but just to be clear that people are submitting documents which are not readily publicly available, so I think that the question -- the group needs to answer whether the group wants to include documents that are not publicly available and come from somebody's own archive. Thank you.

EBERHARD LISSE: Good point. Nenad, go ahead.

NENAD ORLIC: Good point. That was what I was trying to say, not everything is for public view and I'm not sure that I could publish everything because I had acted as a member of the board to the document and information that's not public. To sort out what can be -- I need to sort out what can be --

EBERHARD LISSE: Nenad, go ahead.

NENAD ORLIC: Nenad, can you try [inaudible]. Do you hear me?

BART BOSWINKEL: No, your line is very bad, could you try to reconnect again?

NENAD ORLIC: Okay. [Inaudible].

EBERHARD LISSE: My view on this is that if there is a document in the archives that can be published, send it to the list, we can put it onto the WIKI and then we can refer to it in the text on the WIKI. If there are documents that cannot be published but you have information to it, send it to the list and we can refer to it as an opinion by a member. Okay, anybody else have comments on the scenario document version 1.21?

PETER KOCH: Yeah, thank you. Good morning. There's one minor thing in -- I think it's line 16, 17 in the very early stages of the second section or paragraph, in the ISO 3166 standard section 7.3 and then it says, "Article 6 of the standard." Just for the clarity of wording, is that section 6 or do I misread this remark?

EBERHARD LISSE: We will revise this, we will review this and revise this. I agree I overlooked that.

EN

PETER KOCH: No problem. Thank you.

EBERHARD LISSE: Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah, of course you could review it, but be careful in the sense of say this one is -- if you really want to do it and put it in article 7 section 3 and then article 6, the section 7.3 is shorthand for article 7 section 3, and article 6 is effectively the core of the standard.

EBERHARD LISSE: We will make it ambiguous so that it is easy to refer to. Okay, anybody else? Okay, then we can move on to the next item of the agenda. Can you put up the agenda, please? It's scrollable so that I can go to overall working plan. Can you please put on the overall working plan, the document that has circulated today? It's not scrollable yet for me, but it's still downloading.

Okay, I have made a few inland remarks to it and we need to find out what we do with those. For example, line 28 on the second page is what does the sentence final stage of registration on ISO 3166 mean actually? Any comments? Is there any comments to the document? Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL: I don't have any comments. Something is, it's very slow.

EBERHARD LISSE: Is there any comments?

BART BOSWINKEL: Martin has his hand up, Eberhard.

EBERHARD LISSE: Okay, Martin.

MARTIN BOYLE: Thanks, Eberhard. I'm not sure who added the comment in orange but the one you referred to as an example in line 28, I think that in the eyesight it's difficult to understand what that particular phrase means. I think it really leaves the idle stage, the lifecycle of a registration in ISO 3166, that's my best guess, but certainly that text [inaudible] revisited.

More importantly, I think is the next comment and that's repeated elsewhere in the text at line 42 and that definitely does need a clear revision because the ccNSO I do not think has any role in setting policy on especially [inaudible] section reserve list. That is something for ISO, we have to live and work with the results from ISO. Thank you.

EBERHARD LISSE: Okay. It was difficult to understand what you were saying from the loudness. But I see under notes that you basically agree with me that we need to change the language there. Can you perhaps propose some language and send it to the list?

EN

MARTIN BOYLE: Which one, or for all of them?

EBERHARD LISSE: Stephen, we can't hear you.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I was waiting for Martin to reply to your question before I asked him my question.

MARTIN BOYLE: Sorry didn't you hear me. I did try and respond. What I said in response to Eberhard was, did you want me to comment on or provide wording in all cases or just to that I'd made reference to?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Okay, now I understand what's going on, thank you.

EBERHARD LISSE: I would prefer you two make comments on whatever you feel like. If you have got additions, improvements, please do so. Okay. Stephen, did you have to make any contribution?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: No, I was just trying to get clarification from Martin on what he was discussing with regards to line 42 and ccNSO policy making role there but I think I've got the answer to that, so thank you.

EBERHARD LISSE: Okay, anybody else? This is almost as easy as pulling teeth. I saw there is a comment from Peter on the chat, we will incorporate this from the notes. Stephen?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Going down in section 2.2, we've got references here from IDN CCPDP, can we get some clarification on this going forward because I'm in the weeds on this one, I'm lost on this frankly at this point in this particular section.

EBERHARD LISSE: What line?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: 143 and 147, we need some references. Please go back and look at this again.

EBERHARD LISSE: This is also flagged from my side. I would like to have a reference, I would like to incorporate it into the reference in the bibliography with a clickable link so that we can easily read this from the document. We will work on this with Bart when we are finished, until the next meeting.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Okay, thank you.

EBERHARD LISSE: Okay, since I don't see any more names, we can then move on to the comparative analysis, according to the agenda. I have got the item number five on the agenda, initial discussion comparative analysis. Comparative analysis is in the working methods, documents that we have from line number 120, next phases comparative analysis, so we can maybe put the working method document up again.

BART BOSWINKEL: Eberhard, are you still…?

EBERHARD LISSE: [Inaudible].

BART BOSWINKEL: Your audio is breaking up.

EBERHARD LISSE: [Inaudible].

BART BOSWINKEL: Your audio is still breaking up, Eberhard.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Bart, do you have any idea what his audio status is at this point and whether we can recover him?

BART BOSWINKEL: According to Kim, he still is connected but otherwise let me take it, otherwise we wait. As soon as Eberhard is back on the call he can take it over. The goal of this session is, if you look at the comparative, the section 21, it's on page five, at the bottom of page five, you see a set of questions to start initiating or to start the comparative analysis.

On previous calls you agreed we would start with a comparative analysis of the two scenarios and check where there are differences and the similarities or commonalities between the two.

Based on that see if we the group could get a better understanding of the retirement processes. To structure the comparative analysis, we've included some questions in this document to as I said to structure the analysis itself and my question for you is, whether you see any additional questions or whether you agree with these questions?

You want to refine them before we start working on the analysis because I think with the two scenarios almost complete we can really start doing and digging into the retirement work itself by starting this analysis. Have a read of the questions, you seen them before, that hasn't changed, do you want to include additional questions?

Do you think you can send them either online or already have a discussion about it? Do you want to delete any of these questions?

EN

That was the drift of item five for today. Any comments? Stephen, go ahead.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Bart, with regards to the comment, regarding line 132 through 134, what are we asking there and how do we use this? What really are we trying to ask here I guess is my question? What role is the ICANN board play at this particular juncture? Thank you.

ABERHARD LISSE: Bart, can you answer this?

BART BOSWINKEL: I'm looking at the point. What you see is -- if you look at the document on the scenario documents it's formulated flimsy I know, but there has always or to date or lately, with the last couple of retirements, there's always been a kind of arrangement between either ccTLD's individually and Nenad is very aware of this around who will grandfather the previous ccTLD, that one and secondly there has been a bit of an arrangement and you will see the reference in the board decisions as well, to an arrangement between around the delegations of TLD's.

In the case of YU for example the delegation of .RS in the case of. CWG, from NA.   CW, so that what this is referring to, these types of arrangements. So, they were included and these are a -- should we look or should the working group look into this?

NENAD ORLIC: Well, it's partly political question in terms of internal politics of the inter community in the particular country. Not sure should we -- I still do not see the point on this, not clear on the point but the question should take the grandchildren or the old domain and who should take on the new domain in case retirement for transition, that's internal question for the country to solve, for the IN concern, what was the problem in what was not clear, there are two main points that were not clear in transition from you to [inaudible].

The lines of communication where not clear, neither to ICANN, neither to [inaudible]; who's from ICANN talking to whom, even if there was an organization that was delegated, and also [inaudible] was not clear who should be talking ICANN board, is it somebody else, is administrator technical stuff, there is no pre-line of communication, who talks to who? I think there is more question here for a player guidance then who should take on the domain. I'm sure, did I get my point clear?

EBERHARD LISSE: I think we have noted that in different instances of retirement different ways of handling this has been adopted the main one which. Stephen?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Eberhard. Bart, if you could put your ccNSO historian hat on, I am assuming that with the past retirements that have happen subsequent to the formation of ccNSO's some seven plus years ago now, that the counsel has never been involved in any of this and I personally don't see a role for the counsel in any of this but I would like to hear your perspective and opinion on this matter. Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL: No, council has not been involved in any particular retirement or affect in any particular delegation or transfer for that matter, so that's one. It's more a matter of question whether if you look at and I know we had a debate, I think it was at one of the face to face meetings and around the issue report.

If you look at the sum of the decisions, the board decisions on retirement, you could see them as a kind that it includes a condition for delegation. So, the way retirement of .YU was structured it was part of the decision around delegation of .RS and .MV, the way the retirement of .AN was structured I'd say at the ICANN board level and that's publicly available is it was included in the decision around the delegation and is part of the delegation and is an arrangement with the manager of .CW, so for Curassow and again, Stephen, the council had nothing to do with this because these are individual cases and there is no role for council or for the ccNSO in individual cases. Does that answer your question?

STEPEHEN DEERHAKE: Yes, thank you. I just wanted to get clarification.

EBERHARD LISSE: I also agree that council has no role to play because it's an issue between ccTLD manager and the PTI/ICANN. Nenad?

EN

NENAD ORLIC: Like I said, I'm not sure I was clear. I don't think this, I read this line and this question, it implies that this working group should make an opinion on what is the role of the current or future ccTLD manager in some country. I'm not sure that's our scope. What I do think should be our scope, who is exactly in ICANN? Is in charge of following through, monitoring reporting on the progress of ccTLD retirement?

EBERHARD LISSE: I can agree with you part of this but it is very clear that at retirement the ccTLD manager of the retiring ccTLD the party on the one side, that's what I'd like there.

NENAD ORLIC: Yes, but ICANN has many bodies, which one is in charge of the process or retirement in ICANN? Is it board?

If you put this in perspective, what is retirement? Not in terms of documents and politics, procedures, in technical terms? You can delete domain or disable it in several ways, it can be done on the side of ICANN, it can do on the side of ccTLD manager, how is this done technically? I'm saying this because a technical solution is tied to who monitors and enforces the process, let me put it that way.

EBERHARD LISSE: It is for us to purpose a policy who is going to be dealing with this on ICANN's side. My view on this is that PTY is dealing with this, however

EN

the ICANN board is going to make, to be the final decision maker. I do not know whether the ICANN board will be decision maker on starting to have enforcers but they will most certainly be the decision maker on finalizing the retirement process. Anybody else have anything to say to it? Martin?

MARTIN BOYLE: Yes, I agree with what you say that the ICANN board will be involved but surely the whole purpose of this exercise is to identify where [inaudible] need to be made and in this particular case I think Nenad is entirely right, that we're looking at is a decision that is a decision made at the national level and we need to write rules in such as way that this clear as to where the responsibility of these decisions lye rather than just saying, well actually at the end the end of the day it goes to the ICANN board and the ICANN board has the last say. I don't think they do, they just have to make sure they are carrying out the policy being laid out and that's what our role actually is. Thanks.

EBERHARD LISSE: We need to identify what condition or status or whatever you call it, figure out, that is something that is beyond the control of ICANN and the ccTLD manager because if an actual government decides they want to change a name and they want dissolve or they want to reunite or whatever, then they have the impact on the changes that part of the trigger.

The responsibilities for triggering cannot be changed because they are beyond our control. Once the mechanism has been triggered, the responsibilities can be identified by us. Peter is next.

PETER KOCH: Yes, thank you Eberhard. I think in addition what you said just a few seconds ago, whenever the local government decides to dissolve or rename the country, this is something that is a step before things happen to ISO3166 and I think something that triggers the decision or maybe just triggers the decision process, starts when the changes apply to 3166. We can talk about early warnings and so and so forth but some insight in the inner workings of the MA but at some point, in time the code is going to go.

Difficulty today seems to be that in contrast to previous practice where they had a newsletter, you had an external action, a newsletter would be received and then you knew that the code was gone or was changed, today there is only a change to the online browsing platform or to the code repository and at some point in time that's probably operational at some point in time this needs to be monitored to be sure that the changes are observed and then there's a process and we can discuss whether this immediately triggers the retirement or there is some process started that ends in deciding that there should be a retirement but that's probably detail to be worked once we have the work plan ready. Thank you.

EN

EBERHARD LISSE: I agree with you but a change of code elements follows a change to the country. None of this is happening out of the blue, this is always taking some time, it's not happened that the government decides on the spur of the moment, without any warning, we are going to dissolve and please change the name and then nobody knows about it.

I think we should agree that once the code element changes, that a retirement process should be triggered. How we do this implementation but the main point needs to be, what is starting the process? And you're quite right, it should be a change in a code element. Nenad?

NENAD ORLIC: It's not just how do you start the process, it's how you finish it. So, in the terms, I would like add a point for 2.2, how to ensure that retirement process is finished. What ccTLD doesn't listen or the board decisions and they turn off the domain and ccTLD says, no we won't.

EBERHARD LISSE: -- cannot refuse or is not -- because it's a hierarchical delegation from the root down, if the ccTLD is removed from the root zone, it doesn't matter whether ccTLD manager wants to act or not, it will not be seen in the DNS any longer. The question is not so much whether a ccTLD manager can decide now he TLD remains delegated, in the past what happens in the case of .SU was that the code element was removed until exception reserved and in other words if a ccTLD manager wants to keep the domain alive, he must find one way or other to move the code element instead to transitionally reserved on to exceptionally reserved.

EN

What we need to decided whether if that happens it automatically results in the TLD remaining. In the case of .US this happened but there is no real policy or rather the ICANN boards practice has been to do this if there is reasonable use, like EU and SU was an exception of the exception I think. But I always find it's easier to start the beginning and finish at the end, so that as far as the process is concerned we should maybe also start at the beginning.

Look what triggers this and when we have got that then we go on there but I don't think we can separate delegation of the ccTLD from the status of the corresponding code element. The code element goes into transition, transitionally reserved, the ccTLD has to be undelegated or retired. If it goes to exceptionally reserved, that's matter for debate, so we have to write a policy on this. But, the removal of the change in code element is not for us to decide, this is something totally beyond our scope. Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL: Just for the record, Eberhard. If you look at the dates of say the change of code element or the removal .SU from the article six list and inclusion in the expectation reserve, there are quite a few years in between. So, that is probably blurring some of the lines around .SU as well.

I think .SU was added somewhere in the late 2000's, so around 2008 I'm sure but around that time and by that time .SU was removed from article six or say from that list of country names for quite some time. That's another complexity around .SU.

EN

EBERHARD LISSE: The timeframes from which what has to happen with regards to retirement are another issue that we can deal with once we have the principles right. I personally find that the timeframe used for .AN was very short and when CW wanted an extension the board or PTR was actually difficult, very reluctant to give them a long extension and they only give them a short extension.

I would consider arbitrary and for that maybe we also need to a policy but as far as our work is concerned, we should start at the beginning and first get the policy, what needs to be done, right, and then we can discuss when what needs to be done.

BART BOSWINKEL: Eberhard I agree. I just want to mention this that you referred to the change of I would say from .SU from as included in the list of country names so this article says and then moved to the exception reserved list and that created a special case, that was quite some time between say the between the removal of the code element for SU and then moving into the exception reserve, I think there was almost 15 years in between and so there was no -- it wasn't retired in the meantime so, that's a new set of circumstances, so combining the two is just a word of warning, in that respect and say whatever the time, if the retirement process is triggered and how long this should take, that's another question. Probably in the case of maybe this to stress my argument, take the case of .AN, .AN was the code element was removed in 2010, assume no action was taken like in.SU and in 2025 it was added to the exception reserved list and that is the reason it's still included but you have this

really period in between 2010 and 2025 where in principle the retirement process could have been triggered. I just wanted to clarify.

EBERHARD LISSE: I want predictability, so that when it happens everybody involved knows what's going to happen and roughly when this going to happen. If we cannot agree on timeframes now, then we must write a policy that both parties need to agree on a timeframe. But what's important and what the role of our working group is to write a policy so everybody concerned knows this is going to happen.

Okay, we have reached the full hour mark and not that I want to limit the debate in anyway but that leaves us 30 minutes for this and the rest and unless I hear or read important contributions or see hands going up, I think we can move on to the next topic.

BART BOSWINKEL: Just going back to the point about the comparative analysis, may I ask the working group members, I will include it again as a kind of action item, if you think there are questions that could drive the comparative analysis, please send them to the list so we can starting working on them and look more in depth into scenarios and take them as a lesson learned from the past and then we still have an understanding, what needs to be addressed by the policy.

If you have any questions or you want to change the questions in the document and we do have some comments already, please send them to the list. That was it.

EN

EBERHARD LISSE: As you can see, I agree with this and the way we are going to do this is as we discussed from now on, is that longer documents will be drafted by Staff and then sent to me for putting into [inaudible], otherwise so that we have a document that we can work off on the list that we all have the same document and we all have the same version and we all know where we are departing from.

Okay, for any other business I would like to short of discuss shortly the rotation scheme. Kim has sent out to the chairs and co-chair and manager a proposal for a six hour and rotation which we're currently discussing. We are looking at the times with regards to members so that we can find out what a most convenient time for everybody concerned in the other time zones, so that everybody gets affected but only everybody get's affected as little as possible or as little as necessary.

The final scheme that we will arrive at in management enforce it to the list so that we can discuss at the latest at the San Yuan meeting and be done with it at completion of that meeting. Are there any comments on that? Stephen, no it's an agreement, okay. Stephen raised your hand, you're on.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yeah, I looked at that and I think we really need to take the approach that based on the geographic locations of the majority of the membership relative to UTC, that we try to optimize meeting times so that we get maximal participation and if that means I'm a fringe person and have to get up late or get up early, I'm happy to do that but the

important -- the overriding thing here is really to get maximal participation from the membership and make it most convenient most of the time, not all of the time but most of the time for the majority of the membership so we maximal participation in these teleconference calls. That's my two cents on that. Thanks.

EBERHARD LISSE: Thank you. I believe in maximum participation but I'm also believing in sharing the pain and making it as painless as possible.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I also believe in those concepts. We got to sort this out.

EBERHARD LISSE: I note from Peter in the chat that we must consider the daylight-saving times. We will put the meetings out in UTC but we will -- we're looking at spreadsheet where we put the timeframes so that we can see. We also look at where the members are so that we can try to make it as convenient as possible foe everybody and I don't think -- it's really nice for say there is one person in New Zealand and one person on the West Coast so therefore to suffer, which is not what we're saying.

We try to find a scheme where everybody has to get up at least once in the middle of the night but at a convenient hour. Okay, I think that's it. Is there any other, other business? Stephen?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE:	I just would like to make the group aware that the next scheduled meeting are 22 of February coincides with the ATTLD meeting in Katmandu Nepal and those of us who have been on this meeting, including myself, will be somewhat bandwidth impaired, so I'm not sure what level of active participation we will be able to achieve at the next meeting.
	I just want to make Staff and the group aware of that. I know of at least three members of this group that will be Katmandu at the APTLD meeting and we may or may not be able to participate depending on what bandwidth we can muster. Thank you.
EBERHARD LISSE:	Please send me email when the meeting is. Maybe we postpone by a week. Send me some details. I don't know exactly when that meeting is. It should be possible to postpone the meeting if that's the case but we can look at it.
STEPHEN DEERHAKE:	A one-week postponement probably might be in order. I'll send you the detail, Eberhard. Cheers.
EBERHARD LISSE:	We discuss it with the list and with management because I feel it's important that we should have maximum participation. Is there anything else with regards to any other business?

I see this is not the case. So, then barring a change in date regarding the APTLD meeting, we would meet at 9 o'clock UTC on the 22nd but we will review this as discussed. Okay, if I don't see or hear anything else, I would then declare this meeting closed and thank everybody for participating.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]