PDP, May 3rd

Stephen Deerhake: That would be great.

Kim Carlson: The recording has started.

Stephen Deerhake: Thank you, Kim. Good morning, afternoon, and evening, and of course late-night greetings to everyone, and thanks for showing up for this. The agenda is up in front of us. It's pretty straightforward. And I have to say I'm pleased that the ICANN Genius Bar people decided that we get to use Zoom again rather than WebEx.

So, the intent of this call is to do more detailed drill-down into the retirement process, and this -- and due to some good work by Bart, we've got a more detailed mind map to look at. And we also have the beginnings of draft text documenting the retirement process that's in the mind map. Bart and Eberhard are doing some really serious dark magic that seems to capture the mind map in outline format along with the text entered in each of the numbered sections of the mind map.

So, in theory, the draft text document and the mind map will always bee synchronized. And I want to thank Eberhard for continuing to (inaudible) the documents and put the line numbering so we can precisely zoom in on what we want to talk about.

I also want to acknowledge the concerns that were expressed in the last call regarding the oversight and process management bubbles on the retirement mind map, and I promise that we'll get back to both of those. I'd also like to bring everyone's attention to the fact that we now have a new glossary term this meeting, and that glossary term is "temporary caretaker," and this apparently popped up in the IANA documentation surrounding that (inaudible) retirement, so we will get that added to our glossary, as well.

Let's see, I hoped we can spend the bulk of the call today continuing our dive in the comparative analysis, continuing the progress that we seem to have made during our last call. And I, again, reiterate it like I did in the last call, I think we actually are making some pretty good progress in understanding and documenting what went on in the past with respect to retirements, at least from a process standpoint.

Also in the documents that Kim sent out, there was the stakeholder mind map, as well as the accompanying draft text document, and I don't think we're really going to get into that on this call. But, I'd like you guys to start looking at that and giving that some serious consideration as we need to return our attention to it sooner rather than later. And when you get into the stakeholder question, there's some sticky issues that arise with regards to stakeholders, given that governments have some roles to play certainly based on how the ccLT (sic) is structured.

And I want to say to the group that we will do our best, and I mean me as Chair, to get documents out to you sooner than we did this time around so that you have some more time to look at them and review them before the next call.

So, at this point, unless anyone has something of immediate importance that they wish to put on the table at this time, and I guess you do that by raising your hand somewhere in Zoom, I'll turn things over to Bart. And before I do that, does anybody have a concern that they wish to bring up, or question at this time? And if you can raise your hand by doing so, that would be great. I think you can raise hands here, yes. Do I see any? Let me go down the list. No, I don't. All right, not seeing any hands, Bart, I think I'll turn it over to you.

Jaap Akkerhuis: You raise your hands by--.

Bart Boswinkel: --Jaap has--.

Stephen Deerhake: --Oh, Jaap's hand just came up.

Bart Boswinkel: Jaap has raised.

Stephen Deerhake: Yes, I see that. Jaap, go ahead.

Jaap Akkerhuis: People raise their hands by opening up the participant (inaudible) for doing this stuff. But just to remind, I haven't looked at the glossary, but I remember that (inaudible) was caretaker as well for a while for .tk when there were some problems there, so it's term used in various occasions.

Stephen Deerhake: Okay. We will make a note of that because we really want to try to get as thorough annotated documentation as possible on this. Thank you, Jaap.

Bart, I think you're on, and if we can put the mind map up, that would be great.

Bart Boswinkel: Kim, could you go to the mind map, please?

Stephen Deerhake: It seems like -- there we go.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, there we go. And don't get frightened. It's just what I've done is, and why we've put it up, is just to show you there are some changes, and we'll drill down in the outline so you see the big picture if we start looking into the outline.

As Stephen already mentioned, the process management and our oversight are now -- are still included and separate items, because I think it best represents that they are outcomes that look at the overall of the whole process, so the retirement process itself. It starts with process management, looks at all the different phases, as does oversight. So, that's one.

The second thing I am -- and that's what you see in that changing compared to the previous version, is there was a separate sub-topic called timing in process -- in the retirement process, but it would be easier to grasp, and at least record all the (ph) time, as part of the process management. So, it's moved from -- as a separate entity, and, as a result, it was easier to distribute the other main sub-topics so it's not as -- it's more symmetric. It reads easier, probably.

So, what I've also done is I've detailed the subtopic "timing," and again, these are the different types of timeline, timing issues you'll see around the retirement process. And I've detailed and changed -- if you would look at the oversight, I've detailed and changed it slightly, as well, remedies that I haven't seen in this scenario one or two, or in the IANA reports that are referred to in it.

I did see some -- in a way you could -- and maybe that's my interpretation, but at least it's copied and paste -- the direct oversight decision somewhere in the process, so there have

been decisions. And it's more a due diligence check, et cetera. These are the Board decision later on. Earlier on, it was just on IANA decision, as you will see. And the review process, I left it there, as well.

So, that's with respect to the process changes (ph). What you see in here is, at the different sub-sub-topics, and even in the subtopics, you see these weird signs. And these -- so at the end or at the bottom -- it means text has been added, in some cases more than in others, but if we go into the outline document, that's the areas where you will see annotated text.

So, you see not all of the items have been completed, and there is room for additional comments. And maybe if we go through the text of the scenarios, but more importantly, the publicly available documentation, the Board decisions, letters, the IANA reporting, these different items will be filled. So that's just to give you a broader look here (ph) just at the retirement process itself.

Again, it's the removal of the code element from the ISO3166 list (ph) that is the starting point initiating one. The second step (ph) is notifications, maybe notification should be to be consistent going up to process management as well, because they look at the whole process, so that's -- and they're related with timing. The second one is need for a specific arrangement. Again, I know when we started, or when the working group started its discussions, and during the time of the issue report, there was a question what is meant with arrangement and whether there is a need, or should the working group look into it.

Again, because this is describing the cases up to date, you will see there is mention, at least in the IANA report, of arrangements between, for example, the incumbent manager and successor manager, or managers from other TLDs. And I don't know. That's a matter of interpretation, but there might be a role that ICANN and/or IANA is included, and maybe PTI, as well, in these different arrangements, because they go into how a transition plan should look like, who is certain commitments, et cetera.

So, there is -- I call it arrangement. Maybe you could call it agreement. At least there is documentation prior to executing to the TLD manager plan itself. And the TLD manager plan, that's included, as well. I've included that one, and it shows the action plan from the ccTLD manager, who is working on the retirement of the ccTLD. In some cases, it's the temporary caretaker. In some cases, it's the incumbent or the original ccTLD manager prior to the decision to remove it. Again, that depends very much on the circumstances.

And so, if you would read -- and we'll do that in a minute -- if you look at the details of some of these manager plans, but also in the arrangements, you'll see the difference between, for example, the scenario one and scenario two cases. And then, the execution of the manager plan, that -- probably say this is more the planning phase, and this is working on the removal of second-level domain names, et cetera, audit (ph) trends and transition arrangements with the successive ccTLD, if any.

And then, finally, the removal of the TLD, and again, there are different aspects to that one. And as you'll see, there is documentation, not all of it, but a -- because I think the execution of removal is a practical thing. But, in the other categories, you'll see different (inaudible), language in the IANA reports as well. And there is probably -- and that goes back to the discussion we'll be having around process and oversight, process management and oversight, but also the different decisions especially around the removal.

If you look at the material that we prepared, you'll see that the decisions around the removal are also included in the decisions around in oversight. So, next, at a high level, running through the mind map, we've done this, again, to at least show you the structure that is underlying the outline of the -- or the outline document. Are there any questions,

comments, with respect to this run-through of the mind map? I see Eberhard's hand is up. Eberhard, go ahead.

Eberhard Lisse: Two things. Liz mentioned IANA, and that's the wrong terminology, and we agreed we should use the correct terminology. And you mentioned IANA on the mind map twice when it is PTI. So, can we please change that?

And then, I think the oversight and the process management notes should go on separate documents for ease of reference, for -- easier work with. If they become a sub-note of the retirement process, then it's a different thing. But, if they're separate, it just makes the mind note unwieldy and difficult to read on the screen.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, that's -- but I'll do that in the next version. Going back to PTI, you are right. But again -- and Eberhard, that's a Maxwell (ph) interpretation -- or effectively, you should have the IFO, IANA Function Operator. That's the language used on the FOI (ph), and not just the FOI, but also in other language. That's one. But, in the old (inaudible) is the IANA, and it's -- if you look at the reporting data (ph), and we describe in the old cases, we are talking about the IANA. It's definitely the case for the policy itself, we can't use the term IANA. It should be the (inaudible) generator (ph) or PTI, as the case may be. Eberhard, your hand's still up, or is it a new point?

Eberhard Lisse: It's a new point. At the time when we decided on IANA function operator, PTI didn't exist. So, I think we should move to the current terminology. I'm not a stickler, but we should avoid ourselves using incorrect terminology, because it will be so difficult to explain it to other, in particular the GAC, when we even -- to explain to them that they're using wrong terminology when we use it just ourselves. I think this is important.

Bart Boswinkel: I agree with you. The (inaudible) -- the point about the -- but that's a matter of taste, probably, and that's looking forwards, is if you do (inaudible) policy, which may or may not be relevant in case, and I hope it should [technical difficulty] with a time limit in mind, then PTI would function. But, PTI is performing the IANA function operator as long as -- under the current circumstances, but there is a mechanism or separation. And then, you talk about the IANA function operator. But probably, that's something that needs to be explained in the policy as well, and for the time being, and just to get people on board, there are (inaudible) for the purposes of -- because we are looking at historical cases, and then there is always mention of the IANA.

Any other comments, questions? I don't see a hand up or in the chat.

Stephen Deerhake: Thank you, Bart.

Bart Boswinkel: I see one question in from Liz. "Is it proposed that there is a cost associated with the retirement of CC? I don't mind include (ph) [technical difficulty]--.

Stephen Deerhake: --Bart, we apparently have lost you. Kim, do you have any idea what might be going on with Bart there?

Bart Boswinkel: Can you hear me?

Stephen Deerhake: Yes, you're back now.

Bart Boswinkel: Okay. Yes, apologies. My Internet connection is very unstable. I'm in a hotel room. So, I just -- I was talking about Liz's question. Of course, stay in group one to -- that we could [technical difficulty], I just want to for the -- as [technical difficulty], to date, delegation transfers and retirement, the retirement cases today, have not -- there is no cost in this (inaudible) in the sense that somebody has to pay for it. Of course, there is a cost

associated with it, both at the ccTLD level, at the ICANN/PTI/IANA level, and probably our entities, as well (inaudible) removing the (inaudible). So, that's included.

There are expenses, but there has -- no charges for these expenses. So, that's it. I see hands are up. Stephen, go ahead. Eberhard, and I saw Liz's hand up as well, but I don't know (inaudible). Stephen, go ahead.

Stephen Deerhake: I was going to turn it over to Liz, but it looks like she may have gone away on that. So, whoever's hand is next in the queue. Thank you, Bart.

Eberhard Lisse: I think that would be me, then. I'm fundamentally opposed of putting budget items at ICANN or IANA in to our policy. I don't care what they do. It's none of my problems. It's their problem. We make a policy. We have never put a budget in any of these policies, and there is -- this is something which I am really very concerned if we even touch this. So this is something that I don't want to see.

Bart Boswinkel: Anybody else? Stephen, go ahead.

Stephen Deerhake: Thank you, Bart. I agree with Eberhard completely on this. This is way outside our remit to start trying to come up with numbers. I'm watching that in a couple CCWG groups, and it's not a pretty outcome. We are here strictly to figure out the history, and then figure out the policy. And anything beyond that is really out of scope for our charter. So, I just want to make that clear to the group. Thank you.

Bart Boswinkel: Thank you. Nigel?

Nigel Roberts: Yes, I'm with what Stephen said.

Bart Boswinkel: And do you -- yes, we don't need to include it in the mind map, but do you want to make a note of this? Nigel, your hand is still up, or is that a new one or an old one? Stephen?

Stephen Deerhake: I would argue we should make a note that this issue was raised, and we should also document the responses to it, as well. Thanks.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. Anybody else regarding this point? If none, any other questions regarding the mind map to date? If none, let's go to the outline document.

Stephen Deerhake: Kim, if you could bring up the outline document. Do you have -- Eberhard (inaudible)? Bart, as a point of order, do you want to proceed with this one, or with Eberhard's, which has line numbers?

Bart Boswinkel: Eberhard's, please.

Stephen Deerhake: Thank you.

Kim Carlson: Okay, give me a minute.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, Eberhard's, please. Probably it's -- the substance and the content of the two documents is the same, but I hope Eberhard's is easier to read. There we are. I'll scroll up, and if we can increase the size of it, Kim, that would be great. Let's start at the top. Yes, that's nice, and then we go to page one.

Let me [technical difficulty] -- I see that my Internet connection is, again, unstable. Let me explain what I've done, and then we can run through the different sections. I've used the scenario [technical difficulty] two documents to fill in as much as possible. I know

it's not complete (inaudible), but I wanted to show you the raw mind map, as well, where you could see the different areas where I filled in some stuff.

I've used as many -- as much as possible definitions, provide -- added them in the glossary, but these are taken directly from the -- for example, with the removal code element (inaudible). So, I've used the language on the (inaudible), which is included now in documents. And [technical difficulty] with the [technical difficulty] to date. See the -- that's the different -- these are the different scenarios, and (inaudible) is identified. So, one is the rename of a country, and the other one is (inaudible) a country or -- can you scroll down, Kim? [Technical difficulty] And I'll stop to the -- maybe it's -- could do is what I suggest is that we then go over each of these spaces, whether you have any comments at first space, and then we update it.

What I've also done is included references and looked again at the different IANA reports and the language included. And that's quite an interesting experience. No, I can't move it down to show you an example. And this is particularly the case where there is a reference to a direct or a decision from the ICANN Board. And what is interesting, for example, is the Zaire case, the retirement of .zr, where there is no role for the ICANN at all, but where you see that IANA itself has taken the decision. And I've included the reference and the language of that one, as well, in the overview, as that's around 19 -- no, that's in the early 2000s.

So, [technical difficulty] just to run through page per page and check if anybody has any comments, that makes it easier. And this is just a floor (ph) first preliminary reading. As Stephen said, you have your -- you'll receive the materials [technical difficulty] later due to the public holidays everywhere. But, I think it would be very helpful if you could provide feedback and comments on the list on management (ph), and so on this version from Eberhard, and then per line number so we can start including this, and I can include it again on the rough outline versioning through the mind map.

So, Stephen, is it okay that we just do it on a page-by-page basis now?

Stephen Deerhake:	Yes, that's fine. Thank you.
Bart Boswinkel:	So, are there -- if you can scroll back to page one, Kim, are there any questions, comments at this stage around page one? I think this is -- speaks for itself. Now, we go to page two.
Nigel Roberts:	My hand not visible?
Bart Boswinkel:	Sorry?
Nigel Roberts:	Sorry, I say is my hand not visible?
Bart Boswinkel:	Oh, yes, I see your hand. Nigel, yes, sorry, it is visible.
Nigel Roberts:	Yes, I just wanted to make a point of order, Bart. I'm getting only two syllables in every three from you at the moment. It's incredibly difficult to follow what you're saying. I'm just wondering whether it would be possible to get Kim to dial out to you so that you come in at least audio-wise via the phone system?
Bart Boswinkel:	Yes, should do. Stephen, if you do this, this is easy. You can run through the pages, and then ask if there are any comments, and I'll take the notes.

Stephen Deerhake:	All right. So, Kim will call you back, is my understanding of that. You actually come in pretty well for a while, then you fade out for just a wee bit, and then you come back in again.
Eberhard Lisse:	I have something technical.
Stephen Deerhake:	Go ahead, Eberhard.
Eberhard Lisse:	We are going to try and put -- use this page in landscape with a little bit bigger font so that we try to get one page and not two-thirds per page on each screen. So then, it's easier because we can then deal with one page at a time, but that's only for next time.
Stephen Deerhake:	Got you. Thank you. We'll give that a shot, see what it looks like, and see if that'll work for the next meeting.
	So, I guess picking up from Bart, who's still -- now he's muted. Now Bart is back on the call, it looks like. Bart, are you there?
Bart Boswinkel:	You should be able to hear me now a little bit clearer. I'm on the phone.
Stephen Deerhake:	Oh, that's much better, Bart, much better. You want to pick up, then? Carry on.
Bart Boswinkel:	Yes. And I've heard suggestion from Eberhard. I think that is a very good one, that we produce it in landscape.
Stephen Deerhake:	You need to mute your PC.
Bart Boswinkel:	I've done it. I've done it. I've done it. What I suggest is, and hopefully you heard this one, that we run through this document now on a page-by-page basis, and that -- and Stephen, you do this. And if people already have some comments, either in the chat or directly, that I'll take the notes, include it. And over the next week or so, that people -- that the working group members look at the document and on a line -- where they have comments on a line or -- send them on through over the working group list so we can update it for the next call. So, it's more like--.
Stephen Deerhake:	--Okay, Bart, where did you leave off here in 1.1, I believe, yes? We finish 1.1?
Bart Boswinkel:	No, we haven't. So, the first question is are there any comments with respect to 1.1, say the way that a removal is defined?
Stephen Deerhake:	And do we have any hands raised? And no, I don't see any. Kim, do you see any? I don't see any. That being the case, can we move on to -- yes?
Kim Carlson:	--Stephen? I saw Jaap's hand open for -- or hand up for a second there.
Jaap Akkerhuis:	Yes, I did try chatting in the chat, as well. I mean, I noticed that AI was actually taken out of the ISO in 77, and it's never been dedicated, so I wonder whether it's relevant here.
Stephen Deerhake:	Okay, thank you, Jaap. If we can move on to 1.1.2, it looks like, yes, I can see where this could be bigger font. I like that idea. Scenario documents are -- examples, scenario one, French (inaudible), which Jaap just alluded to, Upper Volta, Burma, Belarus and SSR (ph) and Zaire and East Timor. With regards to this, are there anything -- have we missed anything that you -- anybody on this call is aware of? I don't think we have. I think we've been pretty thorough on this. But, if so, if there's any issue with what we're looking at here, can you raise your hand so we can discuss it? And I don't see any hands. Can we assume, then, that we are in general agreement on 1.1.2? Again, any hands? I

	have to scroll to see them all. Doesn't want -- wait, I saw (inaudible) go by. Yes, Liz, please?
Liz Williams:	Stephen, just a question you raised before about the glossary of terms that you were talking at the very beginning. In line 31, when you said that, "Note that unassigned is not a defined term," were you hoping to include it as a defined term, or include it in the glossary? Or should it be a defined term? I just don't know the answer to the question.
Stephen Deerhake:	Good question, Liz. Let me read this again. I have to reduce the font size, so I have to stare at my screen when I'm also running the screen (inaudible).
Nigel Roberts:	Yes. While you're doing that--.
Stephen Deerhake:	--It's not -- unassigned is not a defined term. I think we need to look into that. Bart, can you make a note of that, or unless you have an answer to it, because I don't.
Nigel Roberts:	Yes, Stephen?
Stephen Deerhake:	Nigel?
Nigel Roberts:	Yes, I think -- and we've got Jaap on the call, so he can perhaps confirm or refute what I'm saying. I think the point here came from an earlier intervention whereby we were talking about unassigned in the context of terms in the standard, not whether we've defined them or not. I don't know if that's helpful or not.
Stephen Deerhake:	I don't know. I have no idea what the order of the queue is, Peter. So, if I insult you by going to Jaap, who might answer this question before I -- Jaap put his hand down, so--.
Jaap Akkerhuis:	--I think I put it up, but confused. Anyway, the ISO31, (inaudible) about the ISO3166 term itself. Assigned is actually a defined term. Unassigned is not really defined, but is actually -- is used in the standard. So, that's where this reminder (ph) comes from.
Stephen Deerhake:	Can that be noted, Bart? Thank you. Peter?
Jaap Akkerhuis:	And for your other, I think I've told it before, but this is -- the standard itself is due to review, which will happen this year probably. And this is one of the items that will be brought up, that's this inconsistency is hopefully fixed at the end of -- with the next version of the standard.
Stephen Deerhake:	Okay, thank you, Jaap, for that. Peter, my apologies for cutting you off, which I think I did, but go ahead.
Peter:	Yes, thank you. That's fine. Can you hear me?
Stephen Deerhake:	Yes, quite well, thank you.
Peter:	Okay, thank you. So, I just wanted to point out that I dropped three comments into the chat room making suggestions and reference to particular lines under 1.1.2, although they are on the next page, because it concerns lines 42 to 57, and some in between.
Stephen Deerhake:	Thank you, and we will get to those shortly, I assume, if we--.
Peter:	--You were closing 1.1.2, so I was just--.
Stephen Deerhake:	--Oh, thank you for that. Well, then we've got more on the next page, which I think going to landscape might help us a bit. Kim, can we go to the next page? Because I have

no idea how or if I can drive this. Yes, okay. So, for (inaudible) the code element (inaudible) that included -- okay. Peter, do you want to elaborate on this comment, or is this just something for the record at this point?

Peter: On the first one, yes. The point here is that we always have this confusion about what is in the standard and what is not. And I think in line -- I need to switch back because I can't scroll this -- in line 27 to 31, that paragraph, we have some reference to -- oh, hang on, maybe I'm -- kind of a caveat, as in this is part of the standard. This is something different. And then, in 40 to 42, we again refer to exceptional reserves, and I think that should have -- that should go under the same caveat that was applied in 27 to 31.

Stephen Deerhake: Okay. Is there any comment from the rest of the group with regards to what Peter's just suggested? And I have to scroll that. Go ahead, Jaap.

Jaap Akkerhuis: Yes. The problem is that some of these things have actually moved in time. I mean, since this is just more or less generate from the mind map, I think in the final text, you actually would prefer to -- for instance, AI is -- I mean, it's about what time you speak. Because things have changed and being reused, and that is actually clearing (ph) here that (inaudible) -- I mean, I treat all (inaudible) these text as notes, and not as final. Probably the final text you actually would add a lot of details.

Stephen Deerhake: Okay. Thank you, Jaap, for that. Okay, Jaap, is that a new -- that's your old hand, I assume, still up.

Jaap Akkerhuis: I guess so.

Stephen Deerhake: Yes, here's -- okay. Now, there's--.

Jaap Akkerhuis: --I tried to like (ph) -- it's down.

Stephen Deerhake: Let's see, what else is -- okay, continuing on with 1.1.2, because I didn't realize -- I should have looked at my copy, that it continues, and actually continues for quite a ways. Whoops, don't know where we are now.

Eberhard Lisse: Well, this is the landscape version that I just generated and e-mailed, so you get one full page on the screen.

Stephen Deerhake: I have to say, our productivity has declined with the abandonment of Adobe. I have nothing displayed now. Can I find -- oh, here we go. Can I scroll this? No. maybe. No. Oh, Kim's scrolling it. I think, Kim, we want -- bingo. 40, yes, 40 to 56. Okay. Quick question for the group. Is this easier to read, and should we continue with this? Because I think the answer is yes.

Eberhard Lisse: But, the line numbers have changed.

Stephen Deerhake: No, not on -- not from my document. My numbers should not have changed. Line 40 on this is the same as line 40 on my hard copy from this afternoon, so I'm assuming the line numbers have not changed. Page numbers have changed.

Continuing on with this, any issue with lines 40, 42? Well, we have Peter's issues, of course, so let me continue on with line 51, other -- example (inaudible), yes. Are we missing anything here? And can we go to the next page, Kim? Brexit, we dealt with last meeting. We decided that's not -- that's beyond our remit. I assume that's still the case. Impact, going forward. With regards to 61 through 72, do we have -- are there any comments or questions or concerns? And can I see -- oh, yes, we have two hands up. I have no idea who put up which hand when, so Peter, I will go with you this time first.

Peter:	Seems to be fair, thank you. Line 57, there's some comments in the chat that can be dealt with after the call, I guess. There's a bit of wording issues there, I think, SS exit, whatever that is. I understand Southern Sudan is meant, but nobody will remember that in a few weeks' time, maybe.
Stephen Deerhake:	No. Thank you, because I had no idea what it was referring to myself. So, we will incorporate that into the notes, I assume. Peter, any more comments, or are you good? You're good?
Peter:	No, thanks. I dropped the hand.
Stephen Deerhake:	I see that. Thank you. Jaap, go ahead. Earth to Jaap. Jaap, are you there?
Jaap Akkerhuis:	Oops, I've started to mute the telephone. Just small reminder that line 71, I mean, I agree with that, but I do notice that in the working text five discussions about (inaudible) staff, actually people have make remarks that they actually want to look at the ccTLD policies, as well. So, it's just remark that's been -- I mean, we can say it's out of scope, but other people are actually using ccTLD policies for SI (ph) arguments.
Stephen Deerhake:	Okay. Thank you, Jaap. Nigel, it looks like your hand is up, as well. Go ahead.
Nigel Roberts:	Yes, thank you. Yes, I just want to reiterate something I'm referring to about line 39 in the chat. If we're going to refer to this kind of thing, it's important that we are extremely precise. There's no such country as Great Britain.
Stephen Deerhake:	Okay. Thank you, Nigel. Anybody else? Nigel, you can kill your hand. That would be useful. Okay, anybody else? So, with respect to what's up on the screen now, as we get into one and two, that's it I think for -- according to my documentation, that's it for 1.1.2, so can we bring discussion of that to a close? Does anyone have an issue with that?
Bart Boswinkel:	Stephen, this is Bart. I think we will revisit it after next week, or in the next call so we can (inaudible)--.
Stephen Deerhake:	--We'll have to--.
Bart Boswinkel:	--The remarks, yes.
Stephen Deerhake:	Yes. Given the questions that have arisen, we will definitely come back to this, by all means, and reopen.
Bart Boswinkel:	And (inaudible) -- so I think, as we said in the start of the call, this is just the initial read-through to check whether it makes sense. And then, say, next time, we refine it and take it to the next level.
Stephen Deerhake:	Yes. Wait -- yes, my view on this is this is basically a sanity check on this at this call, and then flesh out initial issues that working group members may have with it.
	So, Kim, if we can go on to--.
Bart Boswinkel:	--I see Nick has his hand up.
Stephen Deerhake:	Oh, I'm sorry. Nick, go ahead, my apologies.
Nick Wenban-Smith:	No, it's okay. Can you hear me okay?

Stephen Deerhake: Yes, you're fine.

Nick Wenban-Smith: Okay, perfect. You were talking -- sorry, let me try and find the right lines again -- about a rearrangement where there's no impact on the top level, but you're talking about in line 63 and 64 a significant number of registrations may need to be terminated. As you know, or you might know, at the moment, there's some 300,000 .eu registrations which have been given notice of termination as a result of the Brexit thing. It seems to be a bit of a political football. And I'm not really--.

Stephen Deerhake: --Got you. (Inaudible) is not having fun with that, but go ahead.

Nick Wenban-Smith: And interesting times and all the rest of it. But, I mean, in terms of the top level policy, I'm not really sure that we need to get ourselves into that sort of political football debate. So, in terms of 63 and 64, at the second level within a ccTLD impact and all the rest of it, I don't think that's within the scope of this group.

Stephen Deerhake: Nick, I agree with you completely, and I believe we kind of had that discussion last time around, that we decided that this Brexit scenario with .eu should be looked at by us. But, if I recall correctly on our last call, we also agreed that this was way outside our remit, because, at the end of the day, this is not a registry issue.

Nick Wenban-Smith: I think that's exactly my point.

Stephen Deerhake: It's about a retirement issue.

Nick Wenban-Smith: I think we should document, in fact, that we've discussed it, and that it came up in particular at the moment. But, I think in terms of the sort of policy outcome, when people look at this five years down the line, they won't even get the context at all, I don't think.

Stephen Deerhake: No, we should -- I agree with you we should document that we looked into this, discussed it, and I believe we have come, or are coming to the conclusion as a group that this is beyond our remit, because it's not involving an entire ccTLD. It's involving a subset of registrations, and that is a different issue. And I believe it's -- I am thoroughly convinced, actually, it's outside the scope of our charter.

Nick Wenban-Smith: And also, I'm not sure whether what we know today is going to be relevant at the point when this report is delivered.

Stephen Deerhake: Yes, absolutely.

Bart Boswinkel: If you look at line 65, it could be stressed, but it clearly states this is not covered by the ccNSO policy on retirement of ccTLDs. And there are two main reasons. It's out of scope. ccNSO has nothing to do with a scenario like this.

Stephen Deerhake: Exactly.

Nick Wenban-Smith: I totally agree. I just don't want us to go on record as saying that a significant number of registrations may need to be terminated.

Stephen Deerhake: Are we saying that?

Nick Wenban-Smith: Well, that's in 63.

Bart Boswinkel:	Yes, depending on policy, a significant number impacting (inaudible) ccTLD (inaudible) or may be terminated. But, we can leave it out, but it's under discussion. That's the reason why it was brought up anyway. But, we can delete it (inaudible).
Nick Wenban-Smith:	Well, I mean, I think I've made the same point again, really, what happens below the top level (ph) of (inaudible) is (inaudible) anyway. Wow, you can type really fast.
Eberhard Lisse:	And we can hear who is doing it. But, maybe we should change this to "A significant number of registration may be affected." Because in any case, the scenario should not be covered by the ccNSO policy, it clearly states. We can make this a little bit more obvious with some bolding or underlining or emphasis or something, but basically, it's just for thoroughness that we have this base covered. It's an interesting issue, but it doesn't affect the work for the working group.
Nick Wenban-Smith:	Well, in part, the reason why I say this is that it is a very difficult point of negotiation as between the -- to be clear, I come from a university city and I'm less than 50, so clearly, I wanted to remain in the EU. But, it's a very political point. And actually, the decision that has been made by the EU (inaudible) or (inaudible) basis, the (inaudible) holders of EU domains is absolutely unprecedented, actually, that people who had a legitimate right to a domain name are not going to get any sort of grandfathering as a sort of negotiation tactic.
	I mean -- well, it's up to you guys, but I really think -- I'm not really sure whether we should go there at all, because the whole thing leaves a very nasty taste in my mouth. The fact is, if you registered a domain name because you were part of a member-state in the EU, then your member-state leaves and you're told, even if you got a 10-year registration, that two years into it you're going to be terminated with no compensation right there, that goes against every market practice around grandfathering, or you can keep it until you don't want to renew it anymore.
Stephen Deerhake:	Nick, I agree with you completely. Again, I don't think it's something we should be stepping our toes into, let alone our feet up to our knees. Nigel, I see your hand is raised, as well.
Nigel Roberts:	Yes, thank you. Two things, very quickly. I completely agree with Nick's view. I'm possibly as close to this, or almost as close, as he is. And I think there is a danger that this will in -- never mind five years, maybe in six months or one year, not read particularly well and add confusion rather than clarity. So, I would propose, at a minimum, to remove line 63 and line 64. We don't need to look at the impact of depending on ccTLD policy. We need to look at the impact on the ccTLD from a level of being in the root and how that relationship is affected. So, I'm basically supporting what Nick said.
Bart Boswinkel:	May I propose the following? Because excepting (ph) that we remove this part, you said (ph), but we may turn it into impact of terms of -- in terms of the ccTLD registration policy is out of the scope of the ccNSO policy remit point, and then strike 63 and 64, so -- and therefore, effectively, you see the impact in terms of the two arguments, one and two, the rationale leads to the conclusion the scenario is not to be covered by the ccNSO policy retirement working group. It shows we've covered -- we looked at it, say it's out of scope, that's it, and then remove the whole sentence, 63 and 64. But, even if people would go back, say others coming back say why doesn't the ccNSO look at it, made very clear this is out of -- if it's affecting the ccTLD or is it part of the registration policy. It's out of the ccNSO as such.
Nick Wenban-Smith:	I mean, I think that's right, Bart. I mean, the point I think also is that, as you know, with in the CCs, individual policies that are by CC level are treated as ort of matters of

subsidiarity, where each CC can make its own decisions. And if the European Union wants to make its own decisions about the .eu domain, then that's fine. In the same way, the, say, nexus requirements within the CCs change over time, usually to become more relaxed, then that's totally fine. But whatever it is, it's nothing to do with retirement at the top level.

Bart Boswinkel: Shall we continue? I think I've taken the notes, so in the next version, we'll change it.

Stephen Deerhake: Question for the group. We're at the top of the hour. We can continue to our hard stop at the bottom of the hour. Would you like to continue, or should we wrap this up and go to AOB? I know it's getting late for some of you. It's mid-morning for some of you. So, any thoughts on this would be--.

Eberhard Lisse: --Wrap it up.

Stephen Deerhake: I hear one "wrap it up." Do I hear anybody wishing to continue? We've actually gotten to the end of -- I believe we've gotten to the end of 1. -- yes, we have. So, this actually is a good point to wrap it up. Not hearing any serious enthusiasm for continuing on, I'm going to assume that "wrap it up" wins the day. So, let us stop here. Let it be noted that we've gotten down through line 72, which is the end of the section. And Kim, can you put up the agenda? And I believe next thing up is AOB. And is there any other business for the group?

Liz Williams: Hello, Stephen, just a quick one. I said in the chat that it would be helpful to have an idea of the timeframes of what we're doing. I'm not sure -- when it said on section three here, work schedule for Panama, I didn't know whether that referred to what we were doing in Panama, or what we had to produce by Panama. To me, it's just not clear. So, I'd like to understand what the group thinks it's doing between today and Panama, and then from then on.

And I just wanted to also add in for Bart, perhaps, in his mind map, is it sensible also to -- so first question from me is what are we doing between now and Panama, so I'd like to have an understanding of the next meetings and our timeline and what we're doing. And then, the second part of that is, within the documentation on the mind map that Bart is producing, which is terribly helpful, is there a place on that mind map to indicate, as we're cracking along and understanding this, whether we would give an indication in our policy of how long things would take? But, I don't know how to do that. Thanks, Stephen.

Stephen Deerhake: Yes, Liz, thanks for the question. In regards to the first part of your question, which I will address -- I'll turn the second part over to Bart -- we're basically doing the work -- what in the past was done by two PDPs working groups. One was the delegation -- redelegation group that sorted out the history of delegations and redelegations, and that was the precursor to the framework of interpretation working group, which actually sat down and developed the policy that we now know as CFOI.

We did not have strict timelines or deliverable dates on either of those groups because, as you can see so far, this is kind of nebulous work. We're beginning to really, I believe, drill down and flesh out and develop some sort of architectural plan as to how we're going to proceed. But at this point, it's way too premature to say, okay, on such-and-such a date, we're going to have this done. We lack the participation of the GAC in this group at this point in time, which I have some concerns about, because we had that in the prior groups, and it proved very useful. We don't want to get into a situation where we surprise the GAC at the 11th hour, for one thing.

	With regards to the work schedule up to the face-to-face in Panama, we have, I believe, three meetings left, and I believe in the prior call that was discussed. I don't have my notes on that right in front of me, but it's my intention as chair to prod this group along to get us as far along as we can so that perhaps, at the face-to-face, we can actually say, yes, we understand what went on in the past with respect to retirement, and yes, we think this is an outline and start discussing the outline of what retirement policy should look like.

We've got two 90-minute sessions scheduled in Panama with lunch in between. I believe that's on Thursday. So, we are going to have a long session face-to-face in Panama, and I'm prodding this group along as best I can, with staff help, to get us to a point where we can spend that three hours focusing on what policy document might begin to look like.

So, that's my answer to that question. I hope it's sufficient. And Bart, I'll turn it over to you to answer the second question that Liz had. Thank you.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. Liz, what you mean, how long the policy takes, or the duration of a retirement process? Is that what you had in mind?

Liz Williams: Yes, please, Bart, just so that people understand, for example, it could take Q number of years. Now, we'll come to that as we go along, but I just think it's a helpful thing for stakeholders to understand what they're taking on. It's also helpful when the PTI people have to develop a budget for supporting a retirement process as to what kind of support and help and whatever they need to do. And it might just be something that's a useful set of markers for people to use.

Bart Boswinkel: We haven't touched up in it yet, but it is already included. And if you look at the -- and this will become more visible at the next meeting when we make separate mind maps for process management and oversight. But, it's been approved (ph) in the process management as a timing subtopic, and there is a lot to it. You've got the expected duration of the process. What I'm trying to work out now is how long the different retirements have taken up till now, and you've got (inaudible), so it is intuitive. So, does that answer your question?

Liz Williams: Thank you, Bart, yes. Thank you.

Stephen Deerhake: Eberhard, you have your -- thank you, Liz. Eberhard, you have your hand up, and Nigel, you have your hand up. I have no idea who put their hand up first, so I'll just go with Eberhard.

Eberhard Lisse: Okay, thanks. Some of this stuff has been discussed in the past. There is previous notes. Liz can easily dig it up in the Wiki, and that will help her a lot.

I also must say we are under no time pressure. We need to get this done properly and put in arbitrary timelines, and it's just not going to work. If somebody has to justify to one's employer the work they do, so be it, that we knew in advance. I prefer to do this one step at a time, finish one step and move on. If it takes two years instead of 18 months, I don't care as long as the outcome is good.

Stephen Deerhake: Thank you, Eberhard. Nigel?

Nigel Roberts: Yes. I just want to revisit the minor point -- well, it's not minor point, but the quick point that you made earlier about GAC involvement. Now, I'm speaking obviously just as an ordinary member of this group now, but with the insight of being the Chair for a very short while. First, I went kicked off (ph) (inaudible) active participant in the two previous groups that you referred to. I think that we're going to have more of a problem the longer we go on without GAC attendance at these calls, because if we do succeed in

getting the GAC to send us someone over, which I certainly hope we will do by Panama, then they will come in and they will take a few weeks or months to get into the swing of how we do things.

On the previous calls, we had in the beginning a very active GAC member from New Zealand, I think he was, and that even carried through when he retired and we still carried on. And the kind of feedback that they have the confidence and the comfort that we -- they kind of knew what we were doing and where we were going so that, when we produced a final report, although it -- there are a couple of GAC members who raised a few eyebrows.

As an institution, they were reasonably well-informed. At this point, they've had zero engagement with us, and that's something that worries me significantly. So, if we go charging ahead and make a timeline and produce an output, we might find it rebounds in our face. So, I would urge caution.

Stephen Deerhake: Nigel, thank you for that. I agree with you completely. I am in communication with the GAC Chair on this very topic of getting GAC representation. There are others within the community that are also reaching out to the GAC to impress upon them the importance of getting someone engaged with this group, and hopefully that will happen. Hopefully it will happen no later than Panama.

But, if we still don't have anyone on board by Panama, I am certainly going to start twisting arms and pounding shoes on tables to get somebody onboard, because I agree with you. It's critically important. And Frank Marsh did a great job as the New Zealand GAC rep on the FOI working group, and it kept the GAC from going, "Oh, my God, what have you guys done," at the end of the day. And it's going to be important for this group, as well, to have GAC engagement.

So, thank you for that. Are there any other comments related to any other business? Otherwise, I want to briefly touch on our next meeting. And I think seeing none, if I can scroll, our next meeting I believe is scheduled for the 17th of May at 0600 UTC, so I'll be the one suffering at 2:00 in the morning, and the Europeans will be getting up early. And Kim, if that's not correct on terms of time or date, please let me know, but I think that's right. Yes, thank you, Kim.

I think that's it for me. Anybody have anything else, or I will suggest we adjourn, and we meet in two weeks' time. And seeing nothing, no hands raised, I will bid you all a good morning, good afternoon, good evening, good late evening. Thank you again for your participation, really appreciate it. We had a good turnout tonight, my time, and thank you. And we'll be on the call in two weeks. And please read the stakeholder stuff and give some thought to it. And by all means, start yakking on the list, because the list has been very, very quiet, and I would love to see some discussion there.

Thank you, guys. Good-bye all.

Bart Boswinkel: Bye-bye.