

20180409

Operator: The recordings have started.

Bart Boswinkel: Okay. Thank you. Welcome to the PDP Working Group on retirement. And I'll hand it over to the Chair of this session, Stephen Deerhake. Stephen, the floor is yours.

Stephen Deerhake: Thank you, Bart. Welcome, good morning, good afternoon, good evening, and good night, depending on where you are. Good morning specifically to Bart. Good late evening to Kim. I want to thank them both for participating on the call. And it's 2 a.m. my time.

But, in keeping with the tradition of our predecessor working groups, I feel it's important that we rotate the call times, and thus share the pain equally over the course of our work. And as an aside, I'm not aware of any other working group, within or without the ccNSO, that does this meeting time rotation. That we do so I think reflects positively on our respect for one another, and I compliment all of us for agreeing to do this. And I mean that in all sincerity. We all suffer at different points.

So, recapping the face-to-face meeting in San Juan, we had an invigorating session where we sought to flesh out who the stakeholders were when it came to a possible ISO code change, code retirement, and also to start looking at the comparative analysis that have arisen from the two scenarios that we have been investigating to date. So, today's call is primarily intended to review the results, the -- face-to-face meeting that we had in San Juan and to try to build on that.

However, before we get underway, there's a bit of housekeeping with regards to the fact that we're now using Zoom as opposed to Adobe Connect, and we also need to sort out our upcoming work schedule. But, for the issue with Zoom, I'm going to turn this thing over to Kim for the moment so she can explain how Zoom works for us. So, Kim, it's yours.

Kim Carlson: Okay, sorry about that, have to unmute. Just -- and just so you know, this application, this particular presentation I used for something else, but I'm just going to use it as a quick guide for us to kind of get a quick introduction into Zoom. As you know by now, that the Adobe Connect, it's still offline. We have been asked to evaluate two of the virtual tools, WebEx and Zoom, as some of you have already been on WebEx and have strong opinions. The ccNSO will be evaluating Zoom. We -- on the next call on the 19th, we will be evaluating WebEx, so that call will be on a WebEx. So, we want every and all opinions on this. So, if you're happy with it, you don't like it, please let us know.

And this is kind of after the fact since you've already made it to the call, so you already know how to enter a call. Joining audio, the phone call, there's a list of phone numbers you can use yourself (ph), so a list of international toll-free numbers you can dial into. Using your computer audio is another option, using your mic and your speakers. Again,

using a good-quality headset helps quite a bit. And then, the other option is to call me. So, if you enter your phone number, the system will dial out to you.

During the meeting, right now you are on a screen share, so it's -- you can actually see -- so, if you look at the top, there's a "View Options." So, if you don't want to go full screen, I've got this set to force a full screen. If you don't want to go full screen, you can exit the full screen. If you can -- you see the little icons on the screen. You can click on participants, and that'll pop up the participant list. Here's where you're going to be able to raise your hand, lower your hand. It's the same button to raise your hand. It just says "raise hand" or "lower hand." (Inaudible) a chat, so you can also use the chat feature while you're in full screen. Now, contrary to what's been floating around, you can actually use the chat feature while you're watching a presentation. So, that is possible. And you can -- similar to Adobe, you can send a chat to individuals or to the entire group, and it looks like that most people have been able to find that chat feature just fine.

Special notes, again, like I mentioned, you can still raise your hand and chat. You can exit full screen. For now, we're not using the video for these meetings. Like Stephen said, it's not a great time for some of us, midnight and 2 a.m., but that is at the discretion of the Chairs. They may decide at some point they want to use the video. Again, we are in an evaluation period, so we do have -- and I'll put this link in the chat, as well. Any and all feedback would be greatly appreciated.

Quickly, just a couple of comparisons with Zoom. Obviously, and it's a screen share, so that's the only way we can share content with you, whereas the Adobe, it has the ability to upload the content. Prior to the call, we had a discussion on whether that's good and bad, and in some cases it's good, in some cases it's actually freeing not to have to deal with that. The meeting audio, Zoom has an integrated audio, so you do have the phone, the VoIP, all of that within. We have tested a workaround that we can use in third-party audio, such as the Adigo. Adobe Connect is the integrated VoIP, with the exception of if you've every had a PKI (ph) call or (inaudible), that's the integrated phone line, as well. And a third-party audio provider is required for Adobe.

So, really, I don't think there's one better than the other. Zoom, there's no notes pad, as you can see. There's a whiteboard where annotation is possible, and both host and presenters can annotate. The Adobe Connect, obviously, has various pods that are available, including doing notes.

Sharing a document, we can put a link to share documents, whereas Adobe also has the Share File pod. Polling, we can do polling. If you -- if the Chairs decide to want to poll on something, we can do that. Unfortunately, with Zoom, it needs to be set up ahead of time. There is no on-demand, whereas Adobe Connect, you can schedule them. You can on-demand. You can -- and both do have post-meeting reports. But, that's it in a nutshell. If anybody has any side questions, you can send me a note if you have any questions or concern. Again, I will put that chat -- I'm sorry, I will put that link in chat for the evaluation.

And that's it. I'll turn it back over to the Chair.

Stephen Deerhake:

Okay. It's now -- has me completely screen width. I can't figure out what's going on. All right. Well, thank you, Kim, for that. Now we're all experts on this. I assume I can run Zoom and get the agenda under control here.

So, I would like to note for the record that we have a new member of our working group, Liz Williams, from Auda (ph). She's, unfortunately, on an aircraft en route to Melbourne as we speak, and so she is not able to be with us on this particular meeting and join us. So, I think now can we move to the work schedule?

We've got calls scheduled on the 19th of April, the 3rd of May, the 17th of May, the 31st of May, and the 14th of June. And all of those lead up to -- those five calls -- to our face-to-face meeting in Panama in late June. And I don't have the actual date for the face-to-face meeting in June, although I think it's probably available.

So, frankly, what I'd like to accomplish during these teleconferences is as follows. Today is a review and summary of what we will all put together in our requests, recent face-to-face meeting in San Juan. We had an interesting -- we got an interesting mind map of that work to review. And hopefully, this will lead us into a discussion of the comparative analysis that are before us.

For the 19th April meeting, I would hope as a goal that we could do a second round on our comparative analysis and get that wrapped up. For the third May meeting, I hope we can get a handle on what the actual retirement process procedure should look like. And for the 17th May meeting, I hope we can get a second reading on that, where we can also define the roles and responsibilities associated with the retirement of a ccTLD code string. And lastly, for the 31 May meeting, which is our last one before we start really going into the Panama meeting, I hope we can get along on development of actual policy document. So, I think it's a bit of an ambitious schedule, but I hope it's doable. I would like to try to, like, push this forward and get ourselves applied to this.

So, the next thing on the schedule, besides work schedule, is tracking participation. So, let me now address the question of participation. Secretary will be tracking participation, going forward. This is really for transparency purposes. It's not for flogging you for not being around. As you know, our newest member's not here tonight, but she's on an airplane, so there you go. And it happens to all of us. It's really for transparency. There's no risk of being tossed off for lack of participation at this point. But, it should be noted that participation will be documented and published.

So, at this point, I think I'm going to turn things over to Bart, who will walk us through the summary of the face-to-face meeting in San Juan, as well as this mind map, which captures the discussion that we had there. So, Bart, are you available?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, I'm available, but Stephen, we first wanted to do the -- or you and Eberhard, so first wanted to conclude the discussions of the scenario, so that's agenda item five.

Stephen Deerhake: Did I -- excuse me.

Bart Boswinkel: And put it this way. We had a final reading in the call before the -- or the second -- yes, native (ph) second reading of the scenario (inaudible) was the call before the San Juan meeting. The question is whether there are still other scenarios that need to be identified, yes or no, and dealt with the working San Juan was based on scenario document one and two, but there is a question whether that's now completed and whether we need to add anything else. And I believe that you and Eberhard identified a potential scenario.

Stephen Deerhake: Yes. We didn't have -- for the group, this issue that arose when -- excuse me -- EU effectively said we're going to throw out 300,000-plus registrants from -- that were domiciled in UK as part of Brexit. And we thought, okay, Eberhard and I had this discussion the other day. Is this a outlying scenario that we should discuss, and so we throw it to the group to think about whether or not the fact that we now have a governmental authority, intra-governmental authority, I think really, ordering a registry .EU saying, okay, throw out all these registrants from this particular locale. Not clear us in our remit for what we're looking at, but maybe something we should at least think about. So, that is now proposed. Bart, back to you.

- Eberhard Lisse: My hand is up.
- Stephen Deerhake: I don't know how to handle hands on this platform, so go for it.
- Eberhard Lisse: This would be the scenario - country splits. ISO code elements remain the same, and no new code element is assigned. So, that does not lead to a retirement. However, we don't know how the 300,000 would be affected. I personally don't think that this scenario fits into retirement, but maybe we should write a short document stating what we noticed, and that it doesn't fit into retirement.
- And I also would like to hear Nick Wenban-Smith and Martin Boyle's thoughts about this particular situation with the UK participants -- registrants.
- Stephen Deerhake: I would, too. Thank you. How does this work?
- Bart Boswinkel: Martin, any comments at this stage already, or--?
- Martin Boyle: Well, I must admit -- sorry, it's Martin Boyle here -- I must admit I think that Eberhard is right here. I haven't got the full details of exactly what triggered and who is making the decisions on the .EU case, but it would sound to me like this is directly related to internal policy for the local operator, and therefore actually not to do with us. And secondly, as Eberhard says, this is not directly leading to there being a retirement. .EU carries on, except that some registrants from the UK may not any longer have the right to register domain names within that registry. So, that's just my initial thoughts, and certainly I can't see that it belongs in the remit of retirement and the work of this group. Thank you.
- Eberhard Lisse: The only thing I--.
- Stephen Deerhake: --Appreciate that. Thank you.
- Eberhard Lisse: The only thing one could imagine under -- with this could be if it would be substantial misconduct, but it is not because this is all documented and comes from the local authority.
- Bart Boswinkel: And I don't -- that would mean there has -- yes, there is no bearing on the retirement of ccTLDs.
- Stephen Deerhake: I do not think it does. Just raising it because it happened, and I think we need to at least address it, and it appears we have. So, thank you. Thank you, Martin. Any other comments on that?
- Nick Wenban-Smith: No. Just to echo what Martin just said, I don't -- (inaudible) thought that it could have any impact on this group, and I still don't. And it is an open question. There's a couple of points, really, which is the .EU was already looking at changing its nexus requirement so that it wouldn't have to be quite as strict as it is at the moment. So, that may mean that UK registrants of EU domains may continue. But, in any case, it may be one of the questions for the transition and exit negotiations, is to whether there should be some sort of grandfathering provision. Doesn't just apply to .EU domains. There's a whole bunch of stuff around the geographic coverage of EU trademarks post-Brexit and all of these sorts of things. There's a whole bunch of rights and questions like this which are sort of quite similar in character, and I imagine they're somewhere down number 200 in the list of difficult things to sort out in the Brexit process. But, I don't see any relevance toward - - to retirement and those sorts of questions for us. So, interesting questions, but for someone else, luckily.
- Stephen Deerhake: Sweet. That was Nick, I assume, yes?

- Nick Wenban-Smith: Yes. Sorry, I haven't worked out the -- how to raise your hand and stuff. I've just about worked out mute and unmute.
- Stephen Deerhake: Yes. I'm still trying to manage this tool myself, so that was you, Nick. Okay, perfect. Bart, then, do you want to continue?
- Bart Boswinkel: Yes. Let's go to the next one. What we'll do is we'll record what we just said, just to be complete about this, and include it in -- maybe as an annex to the two scenario documents we have. And with that, I assume we covered all potential scenarios at this stage, so we do not have to revisit these documents now.
- Stephen Deerhake: I agree.
- Bart Boswinkel: Now we can -- yes. So, let's go to the comparative analysis. Could you change the documents, please, Kim? Okay. So, I'm -- yes, we can use this one. I meant the 6-1-A document. This is the--.
- Stephen Deerhake: --This one's driving me nuts.
- Bart Boswinkel: It shouldn't.
- Eberhard Lisse: And if you mute yourself, it drives only you nuts, and not everybody.
- Bart Boswinkel: Leave it as it is, Kim. It's -- I'll turn around what the intention (ph) was. So, if you'll recall the document -- the workflow document, it included a section on comparative analysis. And the section, define the purpose of the comparative analysis, and also the -- some of the questions, and based on the -- these questions we started in the comparative analysis in San Juan.
- Now, maybe this is more a point at the end of the session. It's -- the questions raised in the workflow document are more or less -- they were intended to drive the analysis. And at the time, we didn't spend too much time on them. But, to take it to the next level and to really drive the comparative analysis, it is more we were thinking that we might have some additional questions, or we need some additional questions that we could use in completing the comparative analysis.
- So, what you have in front of you is the extract of the workflow document with, effectively, only three questions. And if you would look at the next presentation, you'll see we've covered more grounds than these questions. So, maybe at the end of the -- going through the documents, I'll ask this question again, and you have time to think about additional questions that we could use to conduct the comparative analysis. So, looking at the two scenario documents and what else, and the underlying material, and check whether -- what needs to be included and where are the differences between the -- especially the change of name and the -- effectively change of a country scenario.
- So, I'll get back to this one in a minute at the end of the next document, or documents, recapping the discussions in San Juan. So, if you could please change to the overview document, Kim? Yes, that was the one, with the table. Yes, thank you.
- Okay. I don't know if I can scroll, but it's something for me to learn, as well, (inaudible). Otherwise, I'll ask you to scroll down, Kim. So, one of the -- what I've done is, and what you see in front of you, is effectively a recap of the flip charts. And this was the summary flip chart at the end of the session in San Juan, and where the group or the people present in San Juan identified effectively, looking at all the scenarios, one single trigger event, and that is the removal of a code element, so that's these two letter codes,

from -- and there's not four -- but from the list of assigned codes, so that's in line four. At the same time, the group identified that the IDN ccTLD is more -- is different and more nuanced, but there is a relation between the removal of a code element and the scenarios, and the IDN ccTLD.

So, the next one is -- oh, here we go. Yes, this allowed me to scroll the document. I hope you can see it. Kim, you'd better scroll. It's easier, because otherwise I have to do two things at the same time, and not very good at multi-tasking. Please scroll up again.

Eberhard Lisse: Tell her what line number you want to see on top.

Bart Boswinkel: I want to go to the table, so that's line number six on page one. Thank you.

So, if you say the second bit, and that's a summary as well, is the stakeholders group identified by the different groups. And also, what you've done, to the extent feasible, you've identified the stakeholders groups that you thought were very important and would be effectively normal. And then, as everybody can see, yes, you can read it yourself, so that's the code behind it, and that's the summary of the stakeholders' discussions to the extent we had time in San Juan.

The next pages, so processes stakeholder scenario two, three, and so the next pages are more or less this summary, or are the -- I've typed up the flip-over. So, I assume you can -- we don't have to go through them. I hope you can read them at your leisure. If I miss something, if you want to add anything to these -- to the text or to the text from the flip-overs, please do so. It's just capturing what was discussed in San Juan. So, that's the remainder of the document. I would say page one, so line item one, two, seven, are the really important -- is the really important part of this document. So, any questions so far, or comments? If not, then could you change -- Kim, could you go to the mind map now? Yes, thank you.

So, here we go with the mind map. And unfortunately, yes, it's detailed. What I've done, based on the flip charts, is starting to -- as most of you will know, mind maps, you constructed them any way you want, so this is just my way of summarizing the flip charts in a mind map, and with -- the starting point is, of course, the retirement of ccTLDs. And then, I started to look (inaudible) that was clear from the flip charts as well. You've identified -- all groups identified stakeholders. So, I just listed them.

What I've added, because some of you did, some of you did not, is potential roles of these stakeholders, and based on this, what you could also see, when and how do they get involved into the process, because that was one of the questions in the comparative analysis. So, again, going back to the flip charts, and you have to look at it at your leisure, and probably something for the next meeting, is to look at the completeness of the stakeholders, whether we missed anything, or you missed anything, whether their role is captured properly, and then have the discussions when and how they got involved in the retirements to date, because that will provide you the basis of -- for the discussion and analysis with respect to the policy itself.

So, secondly, it's -- the comparative analysis, you were asked to focus on the process. And so, again, you see subgroups results. That's a link to the document itself so that's not lost, so that's one of the things you can do with this mind map tool. But, the process steps identified to date is -- and this was the starting point, and this is where at least the people, or the participants in San Juan agreed, say the deletion of the code element on the ISO 3166 list is effectively the starting point. It could be caused by various incidents and who executed, et cetera, but that's more with respect -- and I don't know whether this is relevant if you go back to the discussions you had today, but at least you have the deletion of code elements. That is the starting point.

Then, the next step you've identified was notification, and that's probably notification to or from. Notification from, I assume that is meant because it's -- the executioner (ph) is the MA, and that, one way or the other, it becomes public. And then -- and as soon as it's public, or the MA or somebody or in another way, the IANA function operator ccTLD manager, the admin tech contact and others might need to be notified with respect to the deletion of the code element, because, say, yes, if you don't know what had happened, that your CC has disappeared from the list, you might be in a bit of trouble.

So, that's what you've identified as well, and again, this is summarizing from the flip charts. And then, some of you already started to look at, once notification has come, the next step would be the ATLD manager plan with respect to the retirement. So, that will include -- and there is a role for the local Internet community, so not the interested party or specifically the local Internet community, that was mentioned. The IANA function operator, the significantly interested parties, and of course the incumbent, or the ccTLD manager itself.

And then, the next phase identified would have been the execution of the manager's plan, and then a question mark would have been because is monitoring needed, as that came back in one of the other documents. And it's targeted at the local Internet community, the registrants, and the other TLD managers, assuming the other TLD manager is probably only in case of -- like with the .AN moving from -- and .YU (ph), where you have the retirement of one ccTLD ending up in two or more new ccTLDs, whereby one of the new ones is effectively a new TLD manager. So, not one of the original organizations. Excuse me.

So, that's with respect what came out on process steps identified. And I would say, in the -- we'll use this, as you will see, in the next document as a basis for further discussion. But, I want to move on to the timelines involved, again, because that was interesting. Based on the discussions, you've identified different timelines and, related to timelines, some suggestions.

So -- and one of the points is why include the way to look at it, why include a timeline at all, is to -- and what's the purpose of a timeline, is to set expectations, and to set expectations of the registry or registries involved who go -- contact way back. I don't know what was meant by that. I can't recall. But also, it's a schedule for action. So, effectively, it has two purpose, two goals, or two objectives, the timelines. And the timelines do play an important part in the transition plan, in the notification, and also in the -- in general in the -- they should be reflected in the policy itself, so in the sense of some of you suggested there should be fixed timelines in the policy, so regarding transition plan notification, et cetera, but negotiable depending on size and other factors.

And I know somebody, or one group, with respect to timelines, referred to the allocate and renumbering of area codes and postal renumbering. Either this was intended as a comparison, or because this takes time, and that influences the transition plan, and so (ph) the execution of this -- the execution of the transition plan. So, changing codes in your registration systems takes time. Also, renumbering takes time, if at all possible. So, that's with respect to timelines.

And what was interesting, the timeline code change that some of you discussed as well, may take six to 18 months. And this is not from the transition plan and execution of the transition plan and notification, but at the level of, I would say, the ISO 3166 change. So, .AN was an example, Zaire to Congo was the other one, and YUKs (ph) was the other one. So, effectively, the way I read this, but this is my interpretation, is that there can't be a surprise. You can see this coming, especially in country where there is a expectation of change of code, say due to the process around the ISO 3166 itself.

And then, finally, there was some tips mentioned, temptation to push back time, to push time back. So, I read this as people have the tendency to stall and only start running at the final stages. If time is short, there is a technical solution. An interesting one is the registration window and/or the impact -- and mentioned around this one was probably the impact of DNS SEC (ph). So, this is what I tried to do to recap. What I tried to do in this mind map is to combine the different threats of the three groups in a general overview. And undoubtedly, there are better ways of doing this, and as I said, this is -- because it's a mind map, it's only my own, but it's my way of summarizing it. But, I thought this would be a interesting starting point at least with respect to stakeholders and process steps, and separating timelines out, because that will define the duration of each of these steps. Any questions, remarks, so far?

Stephen Deerhake: Thank you, Bart, for that. Any questions, remarks, comments?

Eberhard Lisse: Yes, I have some, or just a comment. From a technical perspective, Bart and I, we are working on--.

Stephen Deerhake: --This is Eberhard, yes--?

Eberhard Lisse: --In a more or less automated way to put use of workable outlines in a decent font and so on from outlines from these mind maps. And I put -- I posted in the chat, if anybody uses a mind map software for themselves which is not listed, please e-mail it to me, because I would like to be able to accommodate or to read all those formats so that, if people do their own mind maps of things, that we can make use of this. Mind maps--.

Stephen Deerhake: --I understand that you can -- that you're reaching out to the community to get that code (inaudible) format.

Eberhard Lisse: What I like about mind maps is not so much the presentation stage of what we're doing here, but as an easy way to collect one's thought, like when you brainstorm. If you remember something, just put it in, so then you'll get a graphical picture where you can see everything. In the entire (ph), we need to put -- use a -- like an outline or something, and I would like to have this automated so that it is just loading the thing, flipping a switch, running, if necessary, a little script on the output, and then produce a PDF.

Stephen Deerhake: I agree.

Eberhard Lisse: And I'm working on this. We can do the four formats that I've listed in the chat we can do already. If anybody uses mind maps for their own business and the format is not listed, just let us know, please.

Stephen Deerhake: I agree. Thank you. Thank you, Eberhard. Anyone else? Or can they -- cannot hear me?

Bart Boswinkel: They can hear you, Stephen.

Stephen Deerhake: Okay. Martin, you're being very quiet.

Bart Boswinkel: Sorry, I was on mute. Kim, could you change the document, please, to the outline, so the next one? As Eberhard said, this is a graphical presentation, and because the one I use, I can pull out an outline document, as well. And I'll show you and run through it, because, based on that, you can -- oh, here we are, with line -- here we go, and it's scrollable.

Based on this already, you can see the numbering there. It captures the stakeholder group, so the title is the Retirement of ccTLD. That's the central part. So, one element is

all the stakeholders, and you can already see, say, the role is defined, ccTLD managers, registry service providers, et cetera. This is just recapturing what is going on. Please scroll down to the next page, please. Yes, and the next.

So -- you can stop there. So, what you see right here, and if you can -- one of the interesting things, at least, with what I've been using, is there are -- if you recall, the second major topic was the process steps. And one of them was the deletion of the code element. And the reason for using the term "code element" of deletion is because -- and this is what you can see, and this is copied from the glossary and terminology document the working group has produced today. Deletion is defined as -- and you can read it from your -- by yourself. Code element is defined. List of country names is defined, and country names is defined, as well. So, this way, you can easily, at least with the one I use, associate it with other documents and already have a very nice, almost definitional step, say, of the process itself. Notifications, yes, you could use notifications from one to another, and maybe even go back to the FOY (ph), because there is some language in the FOY around notifications, et cetera.

So, this is one of the things you could do, and I intend to do, and maintain over time to support this working group. So, this way you build on the outline level. You build up a document already resulting from the comparative analysis and what we could do over the next two or three calls.

So, yes, I took you through the mind map, and I think, say, you will see the same listings here. And Eberhard, this is magic on this document as well, and so that looks far better and is far more better decipherable. But, at least you got an idea of why we have included the outline document, and this could be the basis, as Eberhard suggested, to start working on the document itself. Any questions regarding this item?

Stephen Deelhake: Any questions? Peter? Anybody out there? Martin? That seems pretty quiet. Does anybody hear me, actually?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Eberhard Lisse: Yes, we do.

Stephen Deelhake: Okay.

Bart Boswinkel: Okay. Then--.

Stephen Deelhake: --Then, I am going to take lack of any response to being affirmation as to what we're trying to do here. So, going once, going twice, going three times, done. Bing.

Bart Boswinkel: So, if you could have a look -- this is Bart again -- if you could have a look at the document, and then if you have any additional comments over the next week, please send them to the list or to me directly, and I'll include them. I'll keep on -- where possible, I'll add the elements from either the terminology document or from the FOY, or from other basic documents to the different elements in this list, like through notifications, et cetera, as I said. That way, we build up a repository of terminology quite quickly.

So, that's -- if you could look at it. Kim, could you go back to the document you shared initially about the comparative analysis, et cetera?

Stephen Deelhake: Agree with Bart. If there is any issue from any member of this group, express yourself in the next seven days. Thank you.

- Bart Boswinkel: So, going back to the document I shared at the start of this block, the extract from the working flow (ph) document, you see what you've done to date. You saw the questions. This has been circulating quite some time. It's about, I think, are there any questions you think would be relevant to dive into over the next two or three sessions with respect to the comparative analysis so we can add more detail to the mind map and to the outline? And this goes to the -- effectively to question four because, in my view, I'd say we started to look at question one, two and three. It's more are we -- are the -- number four. Are there any other questions you want to raise, that -- and that the group needs to address in its analysis?
- Stephen Deerhake: And Bart, I assume you can hear me, yes?
- Bart Boswinkel: Yes, I do.
- Stephen Deerhake: Excellent. Are there any other questions from other members of this group? We're hearing none. Bart, I believe we can proceed.
- Bart Boswinkel: Yes, and this goes back to the next step would be -- because the reason is, say, we're now going back to the schedule you introduced at the start of this call under item three. Maybe this makes more sense now, the overview of the discussions, as we discussed in San Juan, or the people present in San Juan. So, this is the timetable to look at the comparative analysis and how it will start filling in the policy. So, today was the overview of the results of the face-to-face meeting. If -- again, if you have any idea -- did I miss anything or that we miss anything, please let us know. Second round -- and if you have any questions that you think are relevant that needs to be addressed, run through the comparative analysis, looking at the documents, please send them to the list or to me directly, or to Stephen or Eberhard. We'll take that up in the next call, but preferably within a week. So, that's--.
- Stephen Deerhake: --Great--.
- Bart Boswinkel: --an action item for you. And then, the -- and you can look at it, at the schedule, but hopefully the schedule now makes more sense to you. And this could be doable if everybody puts in one or two hours a week to look at the documents, et cetera, and response.
- Stephen Deerhake: Yes. I would really like to encourage my fellow working group members to pay attention to the documents that will be circulated forthwith and have some input on those, because it would be really nice to get this wrapped up sooner rather than later. Thank you. Bart, any other comments?
- Bart Boswinkel: Not on this one. Kim, could you go back to the agenda, please? Over to you, Stephen. So, we've concluded six-two-two.
- Stephen Deerhake: Next meeting is I believe, as I wrote down in my notes, if I can find them, continuation of the discussion we had tonight, hopefully a better time for myself. And back to any other business. Is there any other business raised by anybody on the call? Hearing none, I will assume there is no other business, and therefore, I will move to close the call. Any objections to that? Hearing no objections, we will consider this call closed, finished. Thank you. Please, Kim, whoever else is involved, close the recording, and thank you for your participation.
- Bart Boswinkel: Thank you. Bye all.
- Stephen Deerhake: Bye.