

1357 - 1

Bart Boswinkel: Start the recording, please.

Guten: Yes, of course, recording just started.

Bart Boswinkel: Okay, thank you. Over to you, Stephen.

Stephen Deerhake: Welcome to the 19 April 2018 edition of the PDP Retirement Working Group. Good morning, afternoon, evening, and late night greetings to everyone. I want to thank you all for attending. It looks like we got a nice turnout today. It's mid-morning where I am this morning, so it's a nice change from the last meeting. And a shout-out to our Asian and South Pacific-based colleagues, who I know are up late.

As you no doubt noticed, we used Zoom for the last meeting. However, the ICANN Genius Bar has decided that we now must become WebEx experts, and so today we're using WebEx. And I'll reserve judgment on both of them, other than to say that I miss Adobe Connect.

So, when I'm finished here with introductory remarks and the plan of the day, Guten (ph) will give us an overview and introduction to WebEx, similar to what Kim did for us with Zoom last time. Just as a sidebar, you should also know that we're now tracking attendance, but not with the intent to hand out demerits or throw you off for absences. The hope is that, if we can collect some attendance data across -- both from this working group and other working groups, we can try to develop some metrics with regards to volunteer burnout.

So, we've got on the agenda today some action items, including a follow-up to the .EU Brexit question that was raised in our last call. We'd also like to complete the second reading of the overview results workshop, and when I looked last, there were no comments on the list, so hopefully we can do that without too much incident (ph) in today's meeting. And I hope that we can spend the bulk of today's call continuing our dive into the comparative analysis. We're getting closer, I think, to a comprehended understanding of the processes involved.

We're also going to review the work schedule leading up to ICANN 62 in Panama. We have four meetings prior to Panama. I think we can make some substantial process (sic) prior to our face-to-face. It would actually be nice to have some text (ph) to be discussing in Panama.

I think that's it for me at this point. Based on my past experience in managing speaking to you with WebEx, it can be a bit of a challenge, so please bear with us while we try to work our way through this. Unless there are any immediate concerns or questions, I'll turn things over to Guten, who will give us an introduction to WebEx. Any immediate questions?

Guten: Thank you. Thank you, Stephen.

Eberhard Lisse: I cannot -- I could not at all understand what you were saying. You were speaking very faintly in the background. If I turn the volume up and somebody else speaks, it blasts into my ears. You're very far away from your microphone, or your microphone is not picking it up very well.

Stephen Deerhake: Is this better?

Eberhard Lisse: No.

Guten: Stephen, if you can provide me your number, I can dial you out. Let me write your (inaudible).

Stephen Deerhake: All right. Is this any better?

Eberhard Lisse: It's getting there.

Stephen Deerhake: I'm yelling at my Mac at this point, so it should be--.

Eberhard Lisse: --Yes, you must go -- you must then go and increase the microphone pickup.

Stephen Deerhake: We had this sorted out before this started. My apologies, everyone.

Guten: Stephen, I can dial you out if you can provide me your number to the chat, private chat.

Stephen Deerhake: Well, then I'll just mute.

Eberhard Lisse: Yes, but that doesn't help. We need to fix this.

Bart Boswinkel: Let's just (inaudible) in the meantime while Stephen is working on his microphone. Can you start doing the introduction?

Guten: Yes, of course. Thank you, Bart. Hello, everyone, (inaudible) speaking. As you already know, we had some technical issues with Adobe Connect in San Juan during ICANN 61. Therefore, we're now using a new tool for the remote participation. So, thank you very much for your patience and your willingness to experience it. And we will share a survey in the chat at the end of the call. Please share your feedback with us by completing that survey.

Just a couple of points to take into account while you're using this platform. There is hand-raise option by clicking on the hand icon located nearby your name and surname on the participants section. In the meantime, I just saw Nick connected. Hello, Nick, you can turn your video off by clicking the camera icon nearby your name. Thank you. Perfect. There's a blue camera icon. You can just click on it, and your video will be off.

So, going back to hand-raise option, only the host and presenter can see who raised hands and wants to take the floor. So, Bart and myself will be monitoring that during the call, and informing rest of the participants about the queue. Notes can be taken individually, and there's a notepad icon on right corner of the top bar. About video and microphone functionality, there's a camera and microphone icon located nearby your name. You can activate or deactivate them by just clicking on those icons. And please, remember to mute your microphone when you are not speaking to avoid the background noises and echo. I would also like to draw your attention to zoom in, zoom out, and (inaudible) functionality. As you all might see, these are possible options for you to use, and these arrows are on top bar, as well.

So, for the sake of time, that is all from my side. If you have questions or comments, please feel free to share them on the chat box. Thank you. Over to (inaudible)--.

Bart Boswinkel: Thank you, (inaudible). And Stephen, back to you.

Stephen Deelhake: I've gone ahead and adjusted my mic. Is that any better?

Guten: You sound much better.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, it is.

Eberhard Lisse: It's much better.

Stephen Deelhake: Okay, great. Great, great, great. With regards to action items, Bart, can I hand that back to you?

Guten: Bart, we cannot hear you. You might be on mute.

Bart Boswinkel: I was on mute. With respect to the action -- there were two action items. One is for Eberhard and me to come up with a kind of summarized scenario around the exit of a geopolitical area from a -- or an area from a geopolitical entity. We've done -- I just shared it. I forgot to share it -- excuse me -- on Monday. We briefly discussed it, and we'll show it in a minute. And the other one was for the group members to look into the - - say the material we sent to you two weeks ago, and look into the -- check whether there are any issues with what we've recorded from the workshop and/or add any questions, et cetera, around the comparative analysis. To date, as Stephen already indicated, we've seen none on the list, nor in any private e-mails. So, in that sense, actions were completed.

Going to the action item one around the Brexit scenario, Guten, can you change the documents, please?

Guten: Yes, of course.

Bart Boswinkel: So, what you see in front of you and just shared, it's just a summary of what we -- oh, that's the other one. You need to go -- no, it's--.

Stephen Deelhake: --You want the Brexit one, don't you?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Stephen Deelhake: Not there yet.

Bart Boswinkel: The one I just shared with you, Guten. Oh, maybe I didn't share the--.

Stephen Deelhake: --Welcome to the world of WebEx.

Bart Boswinkel: I need to share them well in advance. Otherwise, there'll be -- it's called "Exit Scenario." There we are. Thank you, Guten. So, as you can see, it's very brief. So, we got two examples, effectively, of (inaudible). One is -- and that triggered the discussion two weeks ago -- was the Brexit. And another example you could -- or yes, another potential example is the - when Southern Sudan left Sudan itself, and if you think about especially the last one, is as the remains in the ISO 3166 list, and Southern Sudan was added to the list, one could argue you don't know how and when, or how the Brexit will look like, but with Great Britain leaving the European Union, nobody expect that that would lead to a

significant change of name of the European Union and/or the UK or Great Britain. So, effectively, from an ISO 3166 perspective, there will be no changes, so no change in the code element, or removal of a code element. And then, the -- so, they both remain on the list. So, from that perspective, there is no impact.

There's also no impact in terms of -- or there is an impact in terms of the ccTLD itself, but that depends very much on the registration policy and other things. However, that is clearly out of scope, and for various reasons, first of all there is no triggering element, but more principal, you could argue that the ccTLD registration policies and everything dealing with it is out of scope of the ccNSO policy remit (ph). And hence, there is no work for the -- say there is no role for the ccNSO dealing with something like the Brexit as long as the country code, the code element, is not affected. So, that's the brief summary of this scenario. Stephen, back to you.

Stephen Deerhake: Thank you, Bart. I agree with the analysis that this is really an EU registry problem and is way out of our remit with regards to overall ccNSO policy development as it's defined in the bylaws. So, I don't think we need to concern ourselves with this, and I was just wondering if there is a differing opinion in the group. So, if anybody would like to contribute to this, I'd be happy to hear them. Thank you.

Seeing none, I think I can conclude that we are in agreement on this, and so we can put this scenario aside at this time.

Work schedule, going forward to Panama, we've got four meetings after this one, and I think we can get a fair amount of stuff done. I mean, I would love to see us actually have some text (ph) to discuss at the face-to-face in Panama. I think that may well be achievable. You'll see on the mind maps coming up that some of the boxes are numbered, and that hopefully will lead us from fleshing out discussion on the mind map into actual wording in the same numbering structure, so we will have words behind the various items in the mind map as we go forward, with any luck.

So, today, we've got the second round of discussion of comparative analysis. Like to dive into how the processes should look like in the May 3rd meeting, flesh out roles and responsibilities in the 17 May teleconference, and have a deep-dive discussion hopefully on the 31 May meeting of what should be included in the policy, with the last meeting in the run-up to the Panama face-to-face being more of a prep meeting as to what we really want to try to accomplish in Panama at the face-to-face based on where we've gotten to by the 14 June meeting.

So, that is pretty much the work schedule. Are there any questions, concerns, comments on that?

Guten: Stephen, you have Eberhard on the queue.

Stephen Deerhake: Eberhard, go ahead, please.

Eberhard Lisse: Okay. We have been working little bit to create a nice outline out of the mind maps, so that actually makes it quite nice and easy. The numbering on the mind maps will help, so it will sort it into the proper order. So, in other words, if -- whatever mind maps we do, we want to work -- to start working from that into a document. It's more or less fully automated. We can save it, run a script, and it will create a nicely formatted outline.

Bart Boswinkel: Back to you, Stephen.

Eberhard Lisse: Stephen, you may be muted.

Stephen Deerhake: I was muted, I guess. The problem with WebEx is the red means it's muted, and I'm used to red meaning you're on the air. Thank you, Eberhard, for that more coherent explanation of what we're trying to achieve here with the numbering. If there are no more questions or concerns regarding the proposed work schedule, then let's move on to the second round of discussion. And for that -- comparative analysis -- and for that, I'll turn it back over to Bart. Thank you.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, so we're in the second reading, and I will not share that mind map again. So, that was capturing the discussion from the meeting in San Juan. As we had no comments to date, is there anybody on the call who wants to raise additional, or has additional questions, concerns, around the documents that have been shared on the previous call? So, they are high level. That was the first capture. And if you had a chance to look at the documents that we'll be discussing in the next item, the refinement of the outcome and the results of the workshop session in San Juan. But, are there any concerns on the previous one? If not, I suggest that we close the output from the workshop and continue with the comparative analysis as suggested under item six of the agenda. I don't see any hands (inaudible).

Stephen Deerhake: Objection to that proposed? Any objection to that proposed course of action? Okay, seeing none, I say we continue. Thank you, Bart.

Bart Boswinkel: Okay. Thank you. Now, we go to item six on the agenda, and that's the next phase of the comparative analysis. Guten, yes, thank you. So, one of the nice things about this, about WebEx, if you look at the top row, you see you can zoom in if you want to on the -- to the mind map itself, so you can run through it. And as you'll see, there are some items that were included based on the discussions in San Juan, and this is an overview of the retirement process, by the way, that was included in the workshop overview, and it's now separate and turned into a high-level overview.

And what you see is, after some discussion, three items were added, which are from a process point of view, probably very logical, but let me first run through it. One, and that was a conclusion of the workshop, is that the removal of a code element on the ISO -- from the ISO 3166 is the starting point of the retirement process. So, that's number one. There will be some notifications, and this concept needs to be refined, but we'll get to that in the next one.

What you see is -- and this is based on the -- looking at the two scenarios. What has been included in the two scenario documents from the current practice, and is now posed as a question, is, is there a need for specific arrangements as (ph) documentation on a -- marking the trigger point, et cetera? If you look -- go back, you see that, over time, the practice has evolved, that roles and responsibilities with respect to the retirement process are documented early on in the process. So, that's the background of this one, but it's been added, and it's marked with a question mark, but -- so that's up for discussion.

Then, the -- an additional item, and you should recognize this from the workshop, was there should be something like a TLD manager plan as a kind of process step, and then the execution of the manager plan. And that should result -- and again, this is a new one identified -- is effectively the removal from the TLD from the root zone database, et cetera. So, that was not included, and there will be a lot of material around it.

A step that has been identified by the group that was process management, and it's more who should do it, when, and what are their -- what's the -- what are their roles and responsibilities. And finally, and that's an interesting one which is not included, is the process oversight. And that's probably process management is more a -- this is more a governance role, et cetera, and looking at decisions. So, that's been added, as well, and maybe there is overlap between process management and process oversight, but I would

say one is more a executional operational role, and the other one is more a governance role.

So, based on the discussions to date, these are more or less the steps and elements that we propose should be included in a retirement process, and of course this could be, and should be, refined as time evolves and the work of the working group evolves. So, this is a first high-level overview. Any questions on this overview?

Guten: Stephen, would you like to take the floor?

Stephen Deerhake: Yes, I'll take the floor and follow up with Bart's question. Is there general agreement of the group that this is the approach we should be pursuing? And my second question for the group is do you see anything that we're missing that you think needs to be included in this? And I'll revert -- mute and see what we get from the floor. Thank you.

I'm assuming that the lack of any input is agreement, and given that, Bart, you want to continue, then, with the--?

Bart Boswinkel: --Yes, please.

Guten: Stephen, Bart, before we move on, I see Alan's hand is up.

Stephen Deerhake: Okay, thank you. Great. Alan, the floor is yours.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you, Stephen. I trust everyone can hear me. I'm just -- I'm going to say right off the bat, mind maps are not something that I feel comfortable with, but I know I'm the old guy here, so I'm willing to carry on. But, by the same token, I just -- this process manages and process oversight, they're kind of dropped in there. And I more just want to flag that I want to understand better what they mean, so I don't want to see this as taken as agreed, because I'd like to -- I really don't understand what process oversight might be in this context. So, let's just see that -- has this -- evolves, unless Bart wants to clarify that. Thank you.

Bart Boswinkel: This is Bart, for the record. Alan, thanks for your remark. And we'll add more detail to this in the next mind map. And as Eberhard said, this -- that's why you see the numbering. This will turn into an outline document where you can start looking at it. But, going back to your initial question about process management, this was identified by the group in San Juan already, and process oversight, that's what we've added based on the logical steps. But, Guten, can you change to the next mind map please, 6-1, the mind map?

Now, you have to bear with me for a moment, Alan, with the mind maps. Now it's getting more -- it's getting more detail. And what you could do is please zoom into the number one. This should look familiar. This is the same one as from the mind map from the San Juan session. Number two, the notifications, this is, if you start looking at it and detail them -- again, this is from the San Juan mind map -- there is the discussion around timing, when should these notifications go out.

And who and how needs to be in full. That's one question around notifications. And then, you go into the roles and responsibilities of the different parties involved initially. But also, and that was not identified, and that's the nice thing about this, because there you can group it, is who is supposed to notify who, so who should inform somebody else. Again, you could argue should it be the ccTLD manager, should it be somebody else, or should the ccTLD manager start informing the local Internet community, et cetera. So, that's the flip side of, if you want to be -- somebody needs to be informed, then there should be a sender, as well. So, that's the bit around notification, and this could be -- and

this should be more refined, but we'll get to that once we go through the outline document, because then -- and going back to Alan's point, that's where you can start adding text and references to other (ph) documentation, as well.

So then, again, need for specific arrangement and documentation. Again, there are some -- effectively, there are two options. There is no arrangement, or should there be arrangement. If there is no arrangement, what triggers the -- let me move this a little bit to the side -- and I need to increase the size of it, so this is where -- what triggers the -- a manager plan, and what is the role of the stakeholders, et cetera, if there is no arrangement. If there is an arrangement, is that the trigger for a TLD manager plan? Does it define -- should it define the roles and responsibilities, and if so, of whom, ccTLD manager, PTI-IANA, a related ccTLD manager, so -- and other stakeholders, and are there any specific circumstances that need to be included. Again, some were listed as around timing, et cetera, what needs to be, and the content of the special arrangement documentation again is included in this scenario document. And what we'll do -- and probably I'll get to that later on.

The TLD manager plan is, if you look into the details of this one, and again, this is just based on the San Juan results and of the scenario documentation. Who is the owner of this TLD manager plan? Is it -- who needs to approve it? Does it need to be documented, and by when? Who should be informed about it? And if you talk about the TLD manager plan as part of the retirement process, what should be in the policy? Should everything be in the policy, or -- including the requirements for such a plan, or should we just -- should it just be referred to?

Now, once you've got the plan, you go into the execution mode. And again, there are a lot of questions around the execution of a manager plan, who should -- who is responsible, who is accountable for the execution, what does it mean, being accountable, should there be a compliance, et cetera, which is not included yet in the -- as part of that step in the process.

And then, the -- what I just add, if you just take these as step in the process, it's the removal of the -- once the manager plan has been executed, at some point, and this is, again, documented in the IANA report today, there is a removal from the TLD from the root zone database, and it was not included in the overview from San Juan. And again, there are a lot of questions or issues, topics around the removal of the TLD from the root zone database, including, for example, notification, the execution of the removal, the PTI-IANA report, and ICANN Board decision. So, these are effectively the real steps around -- or the process steps.

Now, going back, Alan, to your questions around process management and the process oversight, as I said, process management is now -- because it looks -- and the reason for making these topics floating is they look at the total process to date, so they're not as -- you can't consider them as process, or steps in the process. They more overlook -- it's more something around processes that you need to define, so that's process management and oversight.

So, as I said, process management, and this is taken from the San Juan meeting, is overall process management. So, who is responsible for managing the retirement process? Should it be PTI? Should it be the ICANN Board? Should it be an external entity? Should it be the ccTLD manager? It's just listed as an item that needs to be addressed at some point.

And then, finally, the -- effectively, the process oversight, so, again, this is the difference between governance and more execution manager -- management of the process. The oversight is more around decision and the decision review, and this is a thinking about it,

and this is just my view, this could be, for example, the link with the second part of this PDP around decisions taking in this process, not by all but by some of the stakeholders, could be part of a review process, the decision review process. But, you -- and that's why I put in a question-mark. Maybe one could already start thinking about principles that should be included around in this part of the PDP, so the retirement -- around the decision review for decisions pertaining to the retirement of ccTLDs.

And again, then you have direct oversight of process management and the role of everybody, so that's the direct oversight. And then, should there be any remedy involved, et cetera, so it's -- so the process oversight is something -- as I said, it's more the governance structure of the retirement process. And so, this is the refinement of the mind map and another way of the refinement of the mind map I just presented, and of the results of the San Juan meeting.

Guten, can you now go to the next document, please? So, keep this, please, in the back of your mind.

Stephen Deerhake: I might point out, I have to print these things out so I can understand what's going on. I encourage you guys to do that.

Bart Boswinkel: Can you go to the outline document, Guten? Yes. So, going back to your question and to the point Eberhard raised, you see the numbering in here, so the retirement process, and it start with the notifications, et cetera, need for specific, and then effectively the removal of the code element as the triggering point. And scrolling down, can you go the next page, Guten? You see that all the sub-elements that were included in the mind map are now in outline format in the document. And based on this one, and using this document, it's could be a starting point for a write-up of the different elements around these different process step, again based on what is included already in -- and that's more the analysis side of it. What's included in the scenario documentation, but also -- and that would be the next step -- is what the working group would want to see as the process, so more the process or the policy development, so what should be and what should not be included in the policy itself. And again, adding these different elements.

So, yes, we can take you through each of these steps, but I don't know if that's helpful. But, let me get back to Alan. Alan, did this answer some of your -- takes away some of your concerns with respect, first of all, to the mind map, and secondly, with respect to the issues you raise with respect to the role of oversight and -- process oversight and process management?

Alan Greenberg: Thank you, Bart. Certainly in terms of the mind map, translating that into the document, yes, I think that's straightforward, so thank you for that. I still haven't wrapped my head around process management and process oversight as kind of a separate new category. I guess I see this -- maybe just I'm too simple, but I see this as developing a new policy, and the new policy will have to be carried out like every other policy. And to the extent that there is oversight or management, wherever that exists already, so I don't see it as a separate and new aspect of this policy. And I guess that's where I'm kind of tripping. Are you suggesting that there's something inherently different in this policy that would require different arrangements than the other policies that we have in the community?

Bart Boswinkel: I'm not suggesting this, but what I could imagine, one different aspect is, especially with regard to oversight, yes, there is, because this is excluded, for example, from the IRP, and that's the second part of it. So, this is where you see a link with -- whether you call it oversight or review of decisions, but at least you need to capture it one way or the other in the policy itself and hook it to the second part. That's why we started with the retaining (ph) process.



With respect to process management, yes, look, it is probably -- if you link it to the usual roles and responsibility of stakeholders, it is inherent. But, on the other side, if you do not capture it, or it has been captured by some of the members of the working group, because especially process management was listed, it's easier to delete it than to include it later on and think about it. And if it's superfluous, then we just as well delete it, and if it flows from the document. So, that's the second point.

So, I don't have a view on either way whether to include process management and process oversight. The only think is what is the -- and that's what we couldn't capture, and I would say that that's linked with oversight, is the review of decisions, et cetera. And we need to -- the working group needs to include a hook at some points in the process where it will link this part of -- or this policy will link with the second part of the PDP, and that's the review of decisions. Does that answer your question, or your concern?

Guten: Bart, this is Guten speaking. I see Stephen's hand is up.

Bart Boswinkel: Stephen, go ahead.

Stephen Deerhake: Thank you. Alan, I think the way to look at this is, first, in the mind map, we have both the process oversight and process management guys floating there because we have done very little to flesh what those might involve, as you rightly point out. But, the reality here is our retirement policy's got a lot of moving parts. There are a lot of players involved. And we're just at this point, I feel, trying to capture as much at a high level as we can, as you can see from the detail, though (ph), with regards to retirement process. We've fleshed out a lot. But, with regards to how the oversight and management of it goes, we really have not addressed that, and so we're just using those really, I think -- correct me, Bart, if I'm wrong on this -- as placeholders at this time to remind us that we might want to think about that.

And again, I believe the group needs to consider what the limits are to this policy, and maybe Alan is going down a consensus path that maybe we're trying -- we're overstepping with trying to go into details of process oversight and management. I'm not sure yet. And again, the other question I have for the group is what's the appropriate level of detail as part of the overall first question. So, any comments on that? And Alan, if you have any comments, I welcome them, as well. Thank you. Alan, are you comfortable at this point in time, or do you have anything else you want to add?

Alan Greenberg: Well, let me say I'm -- I certainly agree with continuing to discuss it. It's more the point of I don't want to take it as the group accepted that there will be process oversight and process management. Rather, I think we have to understand better what that means before we agree to it. So, I certainly agree with discussing it. I just don't want it to be taken as a given that that is -- we've already agreed that that's an integral part of the policy that we're developing. Thanks.

Bart Boswinkel: Alan, this is Bart again.

Stephen Deerhake: Go ahead, Bart.

Bart Boswinkel: (Inaudible.) That's one of the things. That's why, if you go back to the work plan, this is the separation between the analysis phase and development of the process phase. Although it's a bit artificial, it's -- at one point you need to say this is based on what you see to date in the scenario documents. And probably what is a good next step, and I've waited (ph) with this one, is now we've got the outline, the process documents, is use what we have in the scenario documents and start to fill in these different outline areas with what we see to date. And this is, again, just based on experience to date. It doesn't - - and based on that, you could take the next step, is okay, we know what has happened to

date. We know if there were any gaps at all, because you could assume this is a reasonably fulsome picture, a full picture of the -- how such a process could look like. And based on that, then you start looking at, so how would the working group really want the process to be -- to look like, what should be included, and, more importantly, as I said, what should be excluded. So, my suggestion with respect to this exercise around the comparative analysis is, okay, we've got the highlights. We've got the headings. Let's see what's the experience to date, and if there is any difference between the two scenarios, and if there are any gaps, if at all, and then have -- and that would be the next step in the analysis of the process.

And then, later on, we start looking at how should the process look like, and this way, at least, we start to get a real understanding, what happened in the past, how it evolved in the past, if there were difference between the original, the working group started with these original different cases, whether these differences are really significant with respect to the process, or if they aren't. So, that will be my proposal as a next step. It's easier to delete than to add later on. Thank you.

Stephen Deerhake: Alan, does that help you out any?

Guten: Alan, you're on mute.

Alan Greenberg: Sorry, I just put something in the chat. It occurred to me that not everyone will have the chat available. I just said I'm fine. Let's carry on. I have nothing more to contribute at this point. Thanks.

Stephen Deerhake: Thank you, Alan, appreciate your input.

Guten: And also, Martin just typed in the chat, saying, "Like Alan, I have concerns about taking as read. Happy to understand it as we go along, but we do need to be careful of leading to a group oversight in what will be a national or local process. There are very fine lines between what is appropriate and what is not." Thank you for your comment.

Stephen Deerhake: Martin, that's a very good comment. Thank you. Any other comments, questions? Otherwise, I'll let Bart continue.

Guten: Eberhard just raised his hand.

Stephen Deerhake: Okay, Eberhard, go ahead.

Eberhard Lisse: I propose we mark this particular topic, this process oversight, in the document properly that everybody can see that this is for debate and not as read.

Stephen Deerhake: I agree. I don't think we're reading it at all at this point, not these two guys, no. So, that's not a problem for me.

Eberhard Lisse: So, we can make this an action item.

Stephen Deerhake: Yes, agreed, make sure that it's explicit that this is floating out there, but not necessarily going into policy at this point. Any other hands raised? Because I can't see them from here.

Guten: Not at the moment, Stephen.

Stephen Deerhake: All right. Bart, do you want to carry on, then?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, just one question, because it's relatively easy for me to include--.

Stephen Deerhake: --Bart, you're pretty faint.

Bart Boswinkel: Sorry. Is this any better?

Stephen Deerhake: A little bit.

Bart Boswinkel: Then I'll do it this way, see if this is better. I'm almost eating the microphone now. Do you think it's worthwhile to include references to the different items to the scenario documentation, and even reference it? Because then this will become a little bit more -- it's not as abstract as it is right now, and included in the outline document, because then we really start adding me-too developments (ph).

Guten: Thank you, Bart. Eberhard, would you like to take the floor?

Eberhard Lisse: Yes. I find it's very important to reference any source materials we're debating. I have not (ph) been trying to reference any document, any Web page, and so on, so we're at a little (inaudible) PDF is even clickable so you can go and then you click on the link, and you can read the document for yourself. I think this is very important that we do that.

Bart Boswinkel: So, I'll take it as a action item to add the references, at least a start with the references in the outline document and in the mind map, so that makes it easier for people to check and follow, and also for free (ph) to discussions. Okay.

Stephen Deerhake: Thank you, Bart.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, go ahead.

Stephen Deerhake: No, I said thank you on that. The more tie-in to source material, the better, as far as I'm concerned. So, I appreciate that bit of work you've got to do. Thank you.

Bart Boswinkel: Before we move on to the next part of the comparative analysis, because that's related as well, any other additional questions, remarks around this part, around the process definition?

Guten: Stephen?

Stephen Deerhake: Bart, you're still really faint. This is one of my big complaints about WebEx, is the volume levels seem to go all over the place. So, if you can adjust your microphone a bit upwards, that would be great.

Bart Boswinkel: I'll try. But, if there are no other additional questions, Guten, can you change to the next set of mind maps and outline? I hope this is better. Can you hear me better now?

Stephen Deerhake: Not really.

Guten: You still sound the same, Bart. And I just shared the stakeholder analysis on the screen.

Bart Boswinkel: Thank you, Guten. This should be better. I've increased my volume, at least on this end, and I'm eating the microphone.

Moving forward, the next step, and again, this is based on the work you've done in San Juan, is starting to describe the roles and responsibilities of stakeholders. And again, I've used the original mind map we've produced from the output and added the different numbers to it to make it easier to understand. And with respect to the different parties, I've included effectively the same questions that need to be completed in the view, as we

discussed, to define the role of the different parties and whether or not to include those parties in the -- and their roles in the overall policy at the end.

So, moving forward, one of the groups at a time identified the significantly interested parties as defined in the framework of interpretation, and what is interesting, in my view, so it's governments, registrants, what is interesting is what was also included was the LIC, so the Local Internet Community. And if you go back to the -- as some of you will recall, the significantly interested parties and interested parties were effectively -- and the concepts were effectively expanded to replace Local Internet Community. So, that's just an observation from my end.

So, what is -- again, you can see for each and every of these parties, of the SIP, what is the role, when and how to get involved, and how should they be involved in the process. The same you can see with -- and that's one concept, one grouping, effectively, is IANA, PTI, ICANN. Maybe it should be differentiated at some point, but at least it's that group. Again, some of you defined them as the guardian of the process, so that could be part. What wasn't defined is when and how to be involved. Again, the ccTLD manager, its role has been initially identified as implementing exit and executive and operational of the management plan or the retirement process, again, when and how to get involved. And then, you see the registry service providers, registrar, governments, registrants, and what has been added.

And again, I don't know whether it's a useful addition of course from the stakeholders. These affected the broad -- the users. So, they were not mentioned before, and if they should -- what should be their role at all -- if any at all in a retirement process, and when and how to get involved. So, this is detailing what has been included in the original overview, and this is something that needs to be addressed and could be done initially on the basis of the two scenario documents and the reports, but that just captures what has happened to date.

But, it's a starting point of looking at the role of the different parties.

Guten, can you change again to the next document?

Guten: Bart? Before we move on and change the slide, we have Martin, and then Stephen on the queue.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. Martin, go ahead.

Martin Boyle: Thanks very much, Bart. I had a couple of questions about this particular mind map, firstly, the significantly interested parties. And firstly, I was surprised to see that the ccTLD manager, who are inevitably a significantly interested party according to the FOI, are not in there. But, I'm sort of a little bit confused why we have significantly interested parties, and then we enter the people -- the groups later on in the mind map. So, I'm not quite sure what you're trying to get at there.

And my second difficulty with it is you've come up with the concept of users, but you're not actually explaining here what you mean by users. Are you actually just saying anybody who's an Internet user would then be considered as a stakeholder for any retirement process? Because that would seem to me to be rather wide. So, if I can clarify on those two points, that would be helpful. Thank you.

Bart Boswinkel: With respect to the significantly interested parties, I completely agree with you. I'm just capturing what has been discussed by the working group to date. And the only thing what you see right here, and this is effectively what you produced, what the group produced in San Juan, and maybe one of the reason why they were not included is

because they listed the ccTLD manager as a separate entity, the incumbent and/or new manager. Users is a new addition, and again, it's just been added because if within this environment, or the ICANN environment, users are particularly mentioned, I just wanted to make sure that you as a working group look at it this -- whether you agree or not they should be included, at least make a conscious decision about it. So, that's in response to your questions.

And if -- and I say, again, going back to the FOI, so we could include, for example, a link to that document and clarify the role and the parties listed in that document and their roles in delegation, re-delegates, and check whether these roles should be updated, or should be -- say they have a role in the retirement process whereas (ph) the FOI doesn't look at the retirement process at all. This is the product of what happened in San Juan, and now like what I just said about LIC, so the LIC, a Local Internet Community, it is effectively including another way, say a formal way of looking at significantly interested parties and adds to the confusion. So, it's not me adding this. I just made it explicit. But, I think your concerns are well-noted, Martin.

Stephen Deerhake: Any other comments or questions? All right. We are a little bit over time. We have a hard stop at the bottom of the hour. I don't think we'll need to go that long. Bart, you want to continue?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. Guten, can you go to the next document? Because that's the outline version of the mind map, and going back to the concerns. Can you move forward, Guten, change it? I think the outline version is just a recap of what's in this mind map, as well, with a reference to the different entities, parties identified. My suggestion is maybe not for the next call, but for the call after, to include references to what they are and refine this, and have a discussion around the current role and the responsibilities and when they get involved. And then leading up to the Panama meeting, have more a discussion around it. I see there is some conversation in the chat. I think what my suggestion would be, given these changes, I will check the -- if you have any suggestions, please put them in the chat and/or send them to the list so we can move them around when we update the document and add the descriptions in the outline document. Because this is a way, as I said -- this is presenting what you produced to date, and we're just trying to find a way to capture and refine the discussion.

Stephen, I think item six is done. Let's go to the next one. Guten, can you go back to the agenda document, please?

Stephen Deerhake: Okay, thank you, Bart. And I encourage everyone to look at these long and hard and (inaudible) think things should be reorganized, and there's some support for that in the chat, that you start scribbling on your copies and conveying what you think should be going on on the list between this meeting and the next.

We're on to any other business, so is there any other business? If so, feel free to raise your hand. And I have no idea if anybody has. I'm assuming that nobody has any other business. And if that's the case, then we'll move on to our next meeting. Our next meeting will be on the 3rd of May. Hopefully we'll have fleshed out both these mind maps a little further and done some reorganization on at least the stakeholder map. And I don't know what time we are next meeting. Bart, do you know, UTC, or Guten? Hello, Bart? Do you know what time -- Bart?

Bart Boswinkel: Sorry, I was on mute. I believe it's 2200 UTC, but let me check. I'm not sure.

Stephen Deerhake: All right. We'll put it--.

Bart Boswinkel: --We'll put it in there on the list.

Eberhard Lisse: I have meet--.

Bart Boswinkel: --Yes, go ahead.

Eberhard Lisse: I have midnight on my calendar as a revised time, so I think it's midnight.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, it's 2200.

Eberhard Lisse: Midnight my time is 22 UTC.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, and that's -- saying that's eight hours, so we're now at 1400 UTC. Next one will be at 2200 UTC.

Stephen Deelhake: That sounds right, so 22 UTC.

Bart Boswinkel: On Thursday.

Stephen Deelhake: All right.

Bart Boswinkel: Okay, thank you.

Stephen Deelhake: I think that's it. In lieu of anything from anybody else, I believe we can declare this meeting closed. I just want to thank everyone for participating, and we'll see you on the next call. And hopefully we'll have some activity on the list between now and the next meeting now that we have more detailed mind maps and verbal descriptions as to what we think might be part -- how this will all evolve. So, thank you again very much, and have a great day or evening. Thank you. Bye-bye.

Eberhard Lisse: Before we go, Kim will -- or they will circulate the link to the survey whether we like WebEx. I don't like it, but everybody should please put this in, whatever they like (inaudible).

Bart Boswinkel: Okay.

Stephen Deelhake: Yes, that would be good.

Bart Boswinkel: Guten, can you circulate the link to the survey, please? Okay, thank you, and bye-bye.

Stephen Deelhake: Thanks, bye-bye.

Eberhard Lisse: Bye-bye.