

20180301_ccPDP_Retirement_Working_Group

Bart Boswinkel: I'll do the honors. Kim is not on the call. It's too early for her. So we have Maria, who we just heard. And I'll do the roll call. So--

Nigel Roberts: Okay.

Bart Boswinkel: So good morning, good afternoon and good evening, wherever you are and what is your time zone. This is the PDP RAT Working Group call of the 1st of March, 2018.

Is there anybody just-- who's just on audio only? I believe none--

Maria: No, there isn't.

Bart Boswinkel: Is there or isn't there?

Maria: No, there isn't.

Bart Boswinkel: Maria? Okay, thank you. So the Adobe room is-- it records all the people present. And you have apologies from Peter Vergote and Michele Neylon, Peter Van Roste, Annebeth Lange, and Maureen Hilyard and Naela.

So over to you, Nigel.

Nigel Roberts: Thank you, Bart, and welcome to-- again to what is probably, in fact almost certainly, the last telecall I'll be chairing and the penultimate meeting of this working group I'll be chairing. As you all know, Stephen will be taking over in Puerto Rico at the end of the face-to-face.

Action items, please, Bart.

Bart Boswinkel: All action items have been completed, so that's taken care of. I'll take the notes in a minute, but I need to (inaudible)--

Nigel Roberts: Yeah. Thank you for confirming that, Bart. So we move on to the next agenda item, which is scenario document. Who'd like to speak to that?

Bart Boswinkel: Maria, can you change the documents, please? Go to the scenario document.

Eberhard Lisse: While she's doing this, I've just been kicked off Adobe. I'm re-logging in, but I'm on the call so I can hear.

Nigel Roberts: We seem to not have very many interventions on the subject of this agenda item, scenario

document.

Bart Boswinkel: I'll make it scrollable. Yeah, it's scrollable now.

Nigel Roberts: Okay. And Eberhard has very, very helpfully done the legal style line numbering of this, so it'll be extremely easy to get your comments and relate them to the document using the line numbering.

Bart Boswinkel: I know Jaap is opening something.

Eberhard Lisse: Yeah. I've sent another version, version 1.25, actually, which has Nenad's comment in, so can we perhaps upload that one?

Bart Boswinkel: Let me check.

Eberhard Lisse: It's the name-- the numbering is in the file name and in the subject line, so it should be easy.

Bart Boswinkel: When did you send it, Eberhard?

Eberhard Lisse: This morning.

Bart Boswinkel: Oh. Maria, have you received it?

Maria: No, I don't have it. Can you send it to my email, please?

Bart Boswinkel: No, I can't because I can't log in at the moment.

Eberhard Lisse: Can you type your email address in the chat and I can copy and paste it and email it?

We can start. It was basically-- on the scenario document it was just this item that-- it was just this item where I proposed some language about the .yu removal. Basically, it reads-- he proposed some language and I wordsmithed a little bit shorter and then he agreed on it. And it basically reads: "One consequence of the .yu retirement was a noticeable drop in website traffic due to link breaking. It is fair to assume that this impact would have been greater today. Another consequence was that some .yu domain names could not transition to .rs due to names available in .yu being reserved in .rs. This even affected popular websites."

And then he gives two examples: "So freeserviceemail.co.yu could not be registered in .rs as all variations of email were reserved and eventually had to shut down. A well-known ISP could not transition net.yu as net.yu was reserved by government and had to use a completely different domain name."

And that's basically the language that was proposed to the list, and that we basically need to read it for the second time so that we can finalize that document.

Bart Boswinkel: And you're talking about line item 141, around?

Eberhard Lisse: He said insert it after 149. And in document 1.25 it's inserted after 149.

Bart Boswinkel: Okay.

Eberhard Lisse: And on this one, on section 1.22-- sorry. It goes-- 149 reads: "On April 1, 2010 the .yu ccTLD was removed from the (inaudible)" and after there it goes in. It was sent to the

group so everybody should have it. And I will quickly email it to Maria.

Bart Boswinkel: Eberhard and Nigel, what you see right now, say Nenad again add some comments. Would it be a good way of-- say if Nenad and the others would send something and put it in the annex? Because this way you keep on adding material, which is probably very relevant in time; however, the document cannot be completed if you look at it this way.

Peter, you have your hand up.

Peter Koch: Yes. Thank you, Bart. I was just wondering whether we would stop at these, like, anecdotal facts, or whether we would want to capture those on a more abstract level, like mentioning that persistence is not a property of ccTLDs as demonstrated by this case, and that change in policy between the previous and whatever successor TLD is there might change the availability of names, apart from the fact that the names are different in any case because the TLD is different, but also at the second level. So listed-- leave the facts in there but (inaudible) up a bit.

Nigel Roberts: Yes. Thank you, Peter, that's a good comment on this. I'm not sure how we can fix all ills, but knowing what the consequences are of retiring a ccTLD has got to effect-- I mean, principally, I think the length of time that we prescribe. And we've seen that the ICANN retirements in the past have been a little hurried, to say the least.

Are there any more comments on the scenario document?

Bart Boswinkel: This is Bart. Peter, could you suggest some language to that effect? Because I like the way-- but I couldn't-- my typing is not as quick.

Nigel Roberts: Okay. Eberhard, your hand's up.

Eberhard Lisse: First of all, whoever wants to cough can please mute beforehand.

And secondly, I fully agree with what Peter says, but is this not for the comparative analysis?

Nigel Roberts: Peter, you want to come back on that?

Peter Koch: I don't have a strong opinion in any of the directions. It should be done somewhere. I could agree that this is more an analysis part. I'm not sure about the comparative analysis. It's kind of a conclusion. I have no strong feeling.

Nigel Roberts: Thanks, Peter. I think one thing we can take from this discussion is that, however we document and capture this, there are some important lessons that we are teasing out of the discussion; which I think, no matter what the policy crystallizes to be, ought to be, should we say, a little bit more widely promulgated so that it's not just a bare policy that we come up with, but we actually have some background information so that when people read the policy they can see real-world consequences.

Any more comments on scenario?

Okay. Bart, what do we do with this document now since we seem to have got all the comments on this call?

Bart Boswinkel: Peter has his hand up.

Nigel Roberts: Thank you. I just see Eberhard has his hand up. I don't see Peter has his hand up.

Bart Boswinkel: He got his hand--

Nigel Roberts: Ah, your hand's just gone up, Peter. Go ahead.

Peter Koch: Okay. Apologies for the confusion. I have a question rather than a comment, because it said on the agenda, if I recall correctly, that this is (inaudible). So we have section 3.3, a headline in all the bullet items and with question marks. And I'm not completely sure that this is the final state for this document, so just ask for clarification here.

Nigel Roberts: Thanks, Peter. Eberhard, your hand's up.

Eberhard Lisse: I was thinking about something else, so I sort of lost the topic. Do you mean line 48 from section 2.3, who initiated the retirement process?

Peter Koch: No, sorry, I probably misspoke. 3.3, lines 82 and following in version 1.25.

Eberhard Lisse: So how is retirement initiated?

Peter Koch: Exactly.

Eberhard Lisse: I'm only capturing and trying to put it in a nice format. I like language. If you can send me some language for your previous remark, I'm perfectly happy to put this in. And I agree with you that we should generalize this. And if we want to change this, please-- let's propose language that I can just add it in.

Nigel Roberts: Okay. Thanks, Eberhard. Any more comments or are we done?

Eberhard, your hand is still up. Are you going to say any more?

Stephen, while Eberhard's making his mind up.

Stephen Deerhake: Nigel, I think on the basis of the last minute tweaking on this we're going to have to kick this one down the road for a second and final reading at the face-to-face.

Nigel Roberts: Yeah, I'm in agreement with that proposal. Any objections to that?

Stephen Deerhake: Thank you.

Nigel Roberts: I don't hear any, so I think that's what we're going to do with this. We will revisit this for a final time at the face-to-face in Puerto Rico in a couple of week's time.

No more comments? Stephen, your hand's still up but I guess you're about to put it down. I guess--

Stephen Deerhake: No, that's a new hand, actually.

Nigel Roberts: Oh, okay. Go ahead.

Stephen Deerhake: I just-- the section 3.3 that Peter's brought up with-- I think between this meeting and the next meeting, we spend a little time trying to flesh out what we're trying to do with that section. That's all. Thanks.

Nigel Roberts: Sure. Thanks, Stephen. Okay. Shall we move on to section-- agenda item 4, working methods?

So we're waiting for the screen to update.

Bart, do you have something for this?

Bart Boswinkel: No, I don't. I think the last changes were made by Eberhard, unless you're on mute.

Nigel Roberts: Okay. Eberhard's hand's up, so that was a good introduction. Eberhard.

Eberhard Lisse: I take it then that Nenad's intervention that I have in orange, plus the one he mentioned in the chat, I can add this to the text as-- into the-- not as a note, but into the text. Just I want to hear approval for that.

Nigel Roberts: I'm in accordance with that, personally. Anybody else got a comment? The only hands I'm seeing up at the moment is Eberhard still, so I'm going to take that as being a negative approval. So you have a free hand, Eberhard.

Do we have any further input on agenda item 4, working methods?

Bart Boswinkel: Maria, could you open the document, please?

Nigel Roberts: And again, this is in this rather wonderful lined format so we can-- and I'm referring to the one that's on the screen, draft 2018, 28th of February.

Bart Boswinkel: Eberhard, could you allude what you've changed here, what the changes you introduced? I see one on--

Nigel Roberts: Line 28 is the first one.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah, yeah.

Eberhard Lisse: Okay, let's go through it. We are looking at version 1.1 (inaudible). Martin Boyle suggested via email, and I think we discussed in a precept, this line 28 can be removed. Unless I hear otherwise, I shall remove it.

He then made a comment on line 40, to which Jaap Akkerhuis responded on the email list. And because of this response, I put it in a different color so that it makes a little bit more sense. I think we need-- Jaap makes a very important point here and we need to discuss what we're going to do about it. And I haven't figured out how to wrap my head around that. So, for the floor.

Nigel Roberts: Thank you, Eberhard. I'm just having some trouble getting mute off.

Any more comments? Jaap?

Jaap Akkerhuis: Well, I mean I guess this whole-- I hope I am-- you can hear me. Anyway, I guess this whole idea, talking about reserves, is something which is actually not necessary at all because it's not anywhere in the ICANN policy, so why would (inaudible) in discussing in what's not really the ICANN's manage? That is actually my first reaction on my own comment. Do we really want to consider something what's happened internally in a different body to make it part of ICANN policies?

Nigel Roberts: Yeah. Thank you for the comment, Jaap. I think this opens up an item for discussion here. Your comment is that the idea of reserved is not in ICANN policy. By saying that - and I don't necessarily disagree with that position - we are saying that the Board

decision unilaterally making policy - I forget the exact date it was, but it was sometime around 16 years ago or so - the Board decision that did refer to ccTLDs and reserved code elements is not actually ICANN policy and only RFC 59 is. Is that where we're going with this?

Eberhard, your hand's up.

Eberhard Lisse:

I'm deferring to Jaap.

Nigel Roberts:

Okay. Jaap, you have the floor.

Jaap Akkerhuis:

Notice that this is the actions one can have when-- I am not suggesting anything we should do. But I think because this wording (inaudible) MA, I was wondering whether or not we should go into that. I mean whether this is going to be a Board decision. Whether this should be in a policy statement, I don't know, but I mean there are some things to consider-- I mean with that. Just as everything which is in policy, there's always exceptions. And apparently one time (inaudible) took an exception for .eu, but for the rest, exceptions are what we are--

Nigel Roberts:

Yeah.

Jaap Akkerhuis:

There are exceptions.

Nigel Roberts:

Thank you, Jaap. Before I pass over to Eberhard on this, I think this is an important one that we need to discuss. The source of all binding policy on ccTLDs is only the ccNSO, and it's only binding on ccNSO members and only for the duration of their membership. So we do kind of possibly need to address the use of the word "reserved" in-- and it may even be not-- in a fortnight it may not be in policy that we create, but it's something that we'll need to look at.

I've got Eberhard and I've got Peter. If there's anybody else, can you please put your hand up? Eberhard, would you like to go now?

Eberhard Lisse:

The problem is, first of all, we make the policy, we'll write the policy or we'll adopt it and then the Board will adopt it as formal ICANN policy. So what we come up with in the end will, after a few iterations, be what will be policy.

I agree with what Jaap says in a way, that I don't really know what the hell is going on at the maintenance agency. And we cannot predict the future what they're doing because it's a multilateral government body and they do whatever they want or whatever the current government of any country there wants at the time, which is flexible. But how do we wrap our head around this?

We need to-- the ccTLDs correspond to a code element and, in other words, what do we do if this code element disappears, or it (inaudible) disappears on the exceptionally reserved list like .su? What do we do for these cases? I don't want to tell the maintenance agency what to do, though I would rather know-- like to know if they could sort of figure out a number that we can rely on. (Inaudible) that can mean 2 years or 50. If they could say it means at least 25, then we have a fixed number to work with and then they can say 25 to 50 depending on what. But if they say it can be 50, but it can be 1 year, then it doesn't help us at all. And I don't know how we can do-- how we can write a policy on this.

Nigel Roberts:

Peter.

Peter Koch: Thank you. I would like to-- yeah, echo or share Jaap's concerns regarding the reserved seat. At the same time, I would suggest we do not attempt to judge or rewrite history or make statements-- at this point in time make statements about prior board decisions.

The concern I have with this is that the reserved list is not a reliable source of information as far as we know today. We have no communication outside the maintenance agency or the ISO as such, or the technical committee in charge of the standard, regarding the stability of the reserved entries. To the contrary, Jaap has a couple of times mentioned that the timelines may shift and the decisions regarding exceptions or transitions are kind of arbitrary. And unless we get information that's supports that this is a stable issue, would rather not see us base policy on this.

The current exceptions, like the .eu and .su codes, we just have to live with, but a good issue here, the positive about this is that we don't need to deal with those in particular. My understanding is that the policy we develop is for future cases and not for things that have been in progress already. So I would rather avoid reference to reserved status here. There is no such thing.

Nigel Roberts: Okay. I have a lively list. Nenad, you've been waiting patiently so I'll put it over to you. Then to-- and I'm not sure-- Martin was first and then Eberhard. Nenad.

Nenad Orlic: Thanks. Well, as Martin pointed out, we have several translations. (Inaudible) why is there a problem with consistency and languages. Well, I don't know how we should-- what's the best way to proceed to--

Nigel Roberts: Nenad, can I interrupt you? You can't be heard. It's almost impossible to hear what you're saying.

Nenad Orlic: Okay. Let me just check.

Nigel Roberts: Can you get closer to the microphone or something?

Nenad Orlic: Yeah. So let me arrange this. I hope that now-- can you hear me now? Is it better now?

Nigel Roberts: Yeah, but there's also a lot of background noise now.

Nenad Orlic: Oh. I overdone it. Just a second. Just a moment. Sorry for this. Let's try to do it like this. Is it better now?

Nigel Roberts: I think--

Nenad Orlic: Is it now okay?

Nigel Roberts: That will be best.

Nenad Orlic: Okay. As Martin pointed out in several places, this document has a problem with consistency and some strange texts that, I don't know, have no beginning or the end and I don't know how we should-- what's the best way to try to sort this out. But what I was focused on was it's the same thing as it was on the last meeting with the 2.1, with the comparative analysis. That also has some bad language in terms of inconsistency and, like I said, Martin pointed that out.

But if we are trying to sort out the corrections for the comparative analysis, I think that this one that only point the role of the ccTLD in the case of incumbent or ccTLD (inaudible), I said it last time, it just-- for me it's like-- it's pointing out there's a problem

that might not exist or it doesn't point out to the problem that (inaudible). This is the part that I think should include different types of questions. These are one-sided. And-- well, I really have no idea what to develop. You have more experience, just I tried to point out to the things I see, the way I see it. Thank you.

Nigel Roberts: Yeah. Thank you, Nenad. Martin, you're next on the list.

Martin Boyle: Thanks, Nigel. I have to put my hand up (inaudible) quite with the issue. But the reason I flashed this initially (inaudible) what I would see as a transition period, and this is a transition period that we need as an organization using the codes before we would be ready to allow a code to be assigned again. My concern was going from an assigned code straight into available. And I take Jaap's point that that then gets us into the problem of a term that is undefined.

So essentially, what I am looking for is that we put some-- try and find some words here that then become our hook for trying to work, and what we do and how we do it, to go from something seeking to be assigned and that then being ran down and going through the retirement process that we are starting.

So, I'm wondering whether what we're really looking for is the trigger point being ceasing to be assigned, and that that then is the implication that we need for moving on, because that triggers the retirement process, or might be the thing that triggers the retirement process. And we then need to do the rest because it's our policy and processes that would then define how long we might need, depending on the case, for moving finally into retirement. So I wonder whether-- essentially what we're doing is being too detailed in this particular section. But certainly I accept Jaap's point that the traditional-- the transitionally (inaudible) of-- of traditionally reserved (inaudible).

Nigel Roberts: Is that it, Martin?

Martin Boyle: That was it, Nigel.

Nigel Roberts: Thank you, Martin. Okay. I think, Eberhard, you're next on the list.

Eberhard Lisse: Thank you. I'm just wondering, do we mean all when we say all reserved list? In other words, transitionally reserved and exceptionally reserved? And if that's the case, do I understand this to mean we're not looking at what happens to a domain name after it's not assigned anymore because how do we deal with .su or .uk? If for example .uk or .su would be removed from the exceptionally reserved list, what would happen to the ccTLD that corresponds to it? So we have-- and I'm not looking at it as-- so much as a list, but these are the possible states that code element can have. It can be assigned, it can be transitionally reserved, it can be exceptionally reserved, it can be available for assignment, and then there is another reservation for it cannot be assigned because it's used for private use.

We need to find out a way to wrap our head around the current situation, the possible situations, or the likely situations. And we can't-- even though I fully agree with Jaap that it's very difficult to predict something, we can't just say only the assignment-- loss of assignment is a trigger point because that wouldn't capture, for example, what happened to .su or-- .eu is a totally different case because it was not a retirement involved, it was just a new delegation. But if for example we have another ccTLD where the code element is going to (inaudible) do we do then?

Nigel Roberts: Yeah. Thank you, Eberhard. I think you've expressed very clearly the dichotomy that we have. We can't just simply abandon it to the MA because, as Jaap and Peter are correctly

pointing out, there's a certain undefinedness that causes us problem in this. On the other hand, we have to have a policy that covers all ccTLDs that exist, and preferably-- somebody would need to answer their phone.

Anybody's hand up that want to make any more comments on this section, or shall we continue this discussion in Puerto Rico? Any thoughts?

Bart Boswinkel: Nigel, this is Bart.

Nigel Roberts: Go ahead, Bart.

Bart Boswinkel: I just wanted to suggest what you just suggested. In addition, may I remind the working group members also about the terminology document, revisit the document as well because I think what we already start to do is mixing up some of the comments. Some of them have been defined. Some of them are less defined. And you, staff as well, revisit the document in preparation of the San Juan meeting and base the discussion, as agreed previously, on the definitions and terminology document. Maybe we need to reopen that document, but at least that we start using shared concepts. Like transitionally reserved, if I correctly recall, it's still in this working document, but it's-- as you say, maybe you recall as well, this-- transitionally reserved is not a state defined in the ISO standard itself. It's used in the online browsing platform, but that's not an official term.

Nigel Roberts: Yeah. Thanks for that clarification, Bart. Any more comments? Don't see anybody's hand up. There's a little bit of useful dialogue in the chat so I direct your attention to look at that. And if there are no more comments, we can move on to the next agenda item, which is preparation for San Juan.

Eberhard Lisse: Sorry. We haven't finished the document yet. That was just one item on the changes of the document.

Nigel Roberts: Well, I did ask for further-- so let's continue with the next item on the document then.

Eberhard Lisse: Yeah, yeah. Let me just make it a little bit wider.

72 is basically the same as above.

Line 81 to 87, it's a quote, but in the quote there is a broken link, so I wanted to point out that I have removed this link for correctness case because it's the wrong quote then otherwise.

Line 134, that's-- we have discussed today in the working group, in the mailing list. I don't understand this paragraph and can we please-- this needs to be rewritten. Naela agreed with it and Nigel agreed with it. Can Bart maybe, who wrote the initial document, send to me some language what this is supposed to mean or what this means, and we put it in better language.

Line 149, it's just a technicality. It says overall IDN ccPDP recommendations, but the document is-- there is-- I can only find draft recommendations. If there is a final one, Bart can - or whoever - can find it and can send me the link.

174 is a pure cosmetic change. And that's about it.

If there is no objection, I would propose that we follow with all amendments or changes as indicated in the document.

Nigel Roberts: I'm not hearing any objections anywhere. I'll give a couple of seconds for hands to go up or squeals to be made.

Anything else on this document? Stephen.

Eberhard Lisse: Stephen has his hand up.

Stephen Deerhake: I'm just agreeing with Eberhard that we should proceed as he has indicated.

Nigel Roberts: Okay, great. No more comments? No more things further down the document that we need to look at?

Eberhard, you highlighted everything that we should be highlighted on the document?

Eberhard Lisse: In the end there is a-- on the last page there is a list of all changes in sort of like a tabulary form, which I think makes it fairly easy to work off.

Nigel Roberts: Excellent. Okay. Then in that case, I think we have dealt with agenda item 4.

Agenda item 5 is preparing for San Juan. Bart, have you got some input for us here?

Bart Boswinkel: (Inaudible), and I think I'll leave this up to the Chair, the Incoming Chair and the Vice-Chair, is how you would like to run the session in San Juan. We got-- the working group has three hours on Thursday morning with a coffee break in-between, and which is probably very important.

I think the-- being able to meet face-to-face and having a structured discussion around some of the items we have and move forward around a comparative analysis is-- yeah, there is an opportunity for doing this in a-- other way than we used to do. So in the sense of we don't have anything around a comparative analysis right now, it's-- I think at least some of you have followed the evolution of the document very closely and may have-- and there are in the working document already some initial questions around how the comparative analysis could be conducted.

If the individual members could think through what they want and share their views, say in a kind of roundtable fashion on the San Juan meeting, at least we start soliciting ideas and views of the members around a comparative analysis and it's not driven by say a document. So it's more changing the pace and changing the working method today. We do have a lot of background information and I think the discussion we just had around transitional reserve, etc., is already a good starting point for such a more in-depth discussion based on some working items.

So this is on the agenda just to solicit your views on how you think we could make the best use of the time in San Juan, as we've got three hours. Yeah, we can do it in three-quarters of an hour, of course, and have it done and then we have a nice Thursday morning. But at the same time--

Nigel Roberts: I don't think that will happen. I think we will be using the time. And in fact, I think we ought to try and make good use of this time.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah. That's one extreme.

Nigel Roberts: Yeah.

Bart Boswinkel: At the same time, to make it worthwhile for everybody and maybe get the working group

going, maybe people do have some ideas and do want to share them right now at this call or share them online.

Nigel Roberts: Yeah. That--

Bart Boswinkel: (Inaudible).

Nigel Roberts: Thank you. I'll just sort of-- as there's no hands up, I'll expand on this and-- from what I am taking from this suggestion.

We have three hours and we want to make the best use to this. We'll split this into two sections. I don't quite know how long the coffee break is. I'm assuming it's going to be 15 or 20 minutes. So we have roughly one hour 20 minutes in each session.

So what I would suggest, that the first session is split into two and that we have a little bit less structure, as in we're not going to be going through dots and commas and line numbers on documents, but we're going to try and see what we can provoke by way of ideas in that section in a backwards and forwards discussion without the formality of the Chair, shall we say, regulating things. And when we've collected that, we can then go back into the normal rest of the meeting, coffee break, and then hopefully the second session we should be invigorated and able to flesh out where we're going with the rest of this. And at the end of that meeting I'll be formally handing over to Stephen.

Is there anybody else got any suggestions on how we're going to be doing this in Puerto Rico? Because suggestions are very welcome in this.

Stephen.

Stephen Deerhake: I think what you propose is a good way forward. I just want to reiterate to the members of this group that they really need to give some thought as to how we can work going forward on both the method document and the comparative analysis and how they think we should handle that. And if we could get some message traffic with ideas on the list between now and the San Juan meeting, I think that would be really useful so that we could hit the ground, if not running, at least walking and not crawling with some ideas on how we can proceed going forward. Thanks.

Nigel Roberts: Yeah. Thanks, Stephen. I see, Nick, you're next on the list. Go ahead, Nick.

Nick Wenban-Smith: Hi, there. Yes. Given that we will all be together in San Juan, I wondered whether one of the things you look at while we have that long meeting would be the original project plan and just to check in on how (inaudible) and whether we think we are still on track with the original timeline and just have a little bit of a check in. Because I think (inaudible)-- and probably the staff are more on tune to this, but I feel that it's like some months ago since I last looked at it. It would be nice just to check in to see how well we're doing versus the plan we originally made and just-- just as a progress check, really.

Nigel Roberts: Okay, Nick, that's great. We'll include that. I'm presuming, Bart, you can take a note and include that at an appropriate point in the meeting, that we can talk about that prior to the meeting.

Working schedule post-San Juan. I think that kind of ties up with what Nick's just suggested. So item 5.1. Any comments on this? Or, do we think this is something that we should determine in the face-to-face?

Bart Boswinkel: Nigel, this is Bart.

- Nigel Roberts: Go ahead, Bart. Stephen, after you.
- Bart Boswinkel: Oh, Stephen-- oh, sorry, Stephen is-- you can go ahead first.
- Stephen Deerhake: No, go ahead, Bart.
- Bart Boswinkel: Okay. The reason for including this, and this goes back to what Nick just said, is that if you look, the working method is-- one of the things is it shows a - how should I say, it's more a phasing document than anything else. If you would look at the overall planning, there are not really any hard deadlines. And I think given that the nature of this cycle work, a hard deadline document or a hard deadline project plan is going to be very difficult to maintain. At the same time, what would be probably helpful, if there is something like an overall schedule, and so which you can work against and what you think is reasonable. But it also means that-- a schedule is only maintainable if everybody does what he's supposed to do. So probably that's linked to the working schedule as well, is what are your expectations on your own role and the role of staff and the role of the chairs in moving the process forward.
- So I don't mind-- I do have it available somewhere. (Inaudible) if you pull it up, going back to the issues report and present it to you. I know by now that some of the timelines included have been passed anyway. But it's at least-- that's why it's on the agenda. It's at least part of the discussion I think you should have in the San Juan meeting, is how to move forward and put a bit more structure and schedule around it. We've been meeting for two weeks and-- every two weeks. And we make progress, but-- yeah, there's another way of doing it. Okay, thank you.
- Nigel Roberts: Thank you, Bart. Well, I think that brings us pretty much to the final item on the agenda. I see Nick's got his hand up.
- Bart Boswinkel: Yep.
- Nigel Roberts: Nick, go ahead.
- Nick Wenban-Smith: I totally agree with what Bart just said. And I just think that-- I mean (inaudible) I think that we are making steady progress. It's not like we've had a huge area where people who participate in this PDP are divergent on positions. It's more really about being thorough and collecting information and diligently going on with it. So, I just don't want us to sort of drift along where we might be going more expeditiously and just checking in. And-- or if there's more the people in the PDP need to be doing between meetings to progress this along a little bit more, then it would be nice just to be a bit more aware of it than I feel I currently am. And I just think that we're doing some good work and we need to try to continue the momentum to changing chair, to make sure that we do diligently progress because we are-- and time is passing and there are no real ideological splits or differences. It's just something that we have got to crack on and get through all these various scenarios (inaudible).
- Nigel Roberts: Yeah. Thanks, Nick, and I thoroughly support the comments there. Perhaps the outgoing chair could have cracked the whip a bit more. But I think it's important that what we've done is we have got a group who understands-- we have a common goal. I think what will come out of this under Stephan's chairmanship is going to be exactly what we need.
- Any more comments or any more hands before we come to the final item of item 6? Not seeing any.

Item 6 should be relatively straightforward and I referred to it at the beginning. We will be meeting face-to-face at the ICANN meeting Thursday morning, I think you said, Bart, for three hours. We've discussed a little bit about the format of the meeting. And at the-- I will take the chair in the meeting by, shall we say, agreement with Stephen. In fact, that I think is the most convenient for him as well, and that Stephen will be formally installed at the end of it.

I haven't really got any more comments about this meeting that we haven't already discussed in the earlier discussion. I'm going to hand it over to Stephen in a second for any comments that he might have and then I'll throw the floor open for any further comments about the San Juan meeting.

Stephen, is there anything that I haven't covered?

Stephen Deerhake: No, you've covered it all. I do think we need to spend a little bit of time discussing the work that Kim did with regards to trying to optimize meeting times in that spreadsheet (inaudible) around, which I don't know whether it was shared with the entire group or not. But I just think we need to--

Nigel Roberts: Yeah. So the meeting times should go on the agenda for the meeting.

Stephen Deerhake: Yes.

Nigel Roberts: Yeah. Brilliant.

Stephen Deerhake: But that should take like 10 minutes max, I think.

Nigel Roberts: Okay. I can see Bart's waiving his hand.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah. This is about the meeting times. So one of the action items was indeed that Kim would look into the two scenarios - six-hour time difference, eight hours time difference - to optimize-- especially participation around the 1:00 a.m. UTC call. Get rid of it or do something else. It's been shared with the Chair and Vice-Chair and the Incoming Chair. And leading up to the San Juan we will be sharing this with the full group and it will be on the agenda so you can have a discussion post San Juan around it. So that was the action item. That's why I said it was completed.

Nigel Roberts: Okay, great. So I think we're in good shape for our meeting in person. Any more comments before I throw it open for any other business? Well, nobody seems to be rushing to the microphone. Bart, do you think there's any other business? Is there anybody in the floor who wants to take a point of any other business?

Bart Boswinkel: I don't have anything on behalf of the secretariat, so--.

Nigel Roberts: Thanks. I don't see any hands going up. So with that, I think we adjourn the meeting until we meet in-- face-to-face in sunny Puerto Rico. Thank you all for coming today and see you there.