PDP_Call_31_May

Kim Carlson: Recording has started.

Stephen Deerhake: Thank you, Kim. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, or good middle of the night depending on where you guys are. Welcome to our next-to-last teleconference call before we meet face to face at ICANN 62 in Panama. And I do want to thank you all for attending this call. It looks like we have a pretty decent turnout despite the CENTR's meeting in Moscow.

As some of you may have heard, I'd like to point out at the outset that I have a rather tenuous internet connection via a hotspot. I think it's going to work. It seems to work. It seems to work with Zoom. Eberhard it ready to step in should I lose my connection and take over the duties of the chair, so we'll see how that goes.

So our primary objective today is to complete our reading of the comparative analysis document that we were working on during our last call so that we can set it up for a second read. And hopefully that will come after some vigorous back and forth on the list if there are any questions about it during on our next meeting. Up to our next meeting, I should say. And when we get through the reading of the comparative analysis document today, then we will spend the last part of the meeting diving into the stakeholder document.

I'd also like to bring to everyone's attention the wiki. As noted in the agenda before you, there's been some updates and it does include the scenario 1 and 2 documents that we discussed and closed.

The glossary continues to be a living document that we will add to as we go along.

And there's also a document describing our working methods, which I believe should be reviewed by working group members from time to time. And I confess I've been guilty of not looking at this recently and I will endeavor to do so.

Also as you can see from the displayed agenda, we originally had Jaap scheduled to provide us an update on the ISO 3166 MA meeting recently held in Lisbon. Jaap is not available. He's off at the CENTR meeting. He has briefed Bart on what's the latest and greatest that we need to be concerned about, and so Bart will be giving us a little update on that.

And I think that's it from me at this point. We have an AOB at the end of the meeting. So should any member have an issue or an item they wish to share with the group, they can do so then.

I note our next meeting, our last teleconference prior to our face to face in Panama will be on 14 June, as you can see, at 22.00 UTC.

So unless there's some serious issues that need to be raised at the moment, I think we'll start where we left off with the comparative analysis document, which was I believe around line 125. So Kim, if you can bring that up, that would be lovely.

Bart Boswinkel:	Nigel has his hand up, Stephen.
Stephen Deerhake:	So he does. Nigel, can you go ahead, please.
Nigel Roberts:	Yeah. I've got myself-- can you hear me, first of all?
Stephen Deerhake:	Yes.
Nigel Roberts:	Okay. It looked like I'm muted on my screen, so that's fine.
	I just want to make a quick operational comment based on what you've just said about readings. I notice we've been talking about first and second readings of documents before. I just want to make sure that we are only doing that when we have got a pretty-close-to-final text, if you see what I mean. So the idea is that we don't finalize a document without giving every member of the group an opportunity to agree to the finalization. I mean some documents I think could definitely take more than two meetings to get to that stage and I don't want to sort of just sort of close them off because they've been in the agenda twice. So thanks.
Stephen Deerhake:	I agree with you, Nigel. That wasn't what I was saying there. I mean FOI working group rules apply here, if that gives you a better comfort level. At least that's my intention.
Nigel Roberts:	Yeah. Sure, that's fine. So we're at the final stage of this one.
Stephen Deerhake:	Well, no. We're chewing through the comparative analysis. We haven't gotten to the end of it yet, and then we'll do another pass-through hopefully on the next call and hopefully get it pretty much put to bed before the face to face. That's my work--
Nigel Roberts:	Okay. Thanks, Stephen.
Stephen Deerhake:	That's my objective work plan, yes. Thank you. Thank you, Nigel. Lower your hand, please. Thank you.
	Anyone else--
Nigel Roberts:	I was just (inaudible)--.
Eberhard Lisse:	My hand is up. Anyway, my view as the Vice Chair had on this is that two readings means at least two readings until exhaustion; not of the participants, but of the topic. So until everybody is more or less happy. I think we wrote this in the work method. If not, we can write it. It means at least two. So we're not trying to restrict in any way.
Stephen Deerhake:	Yes. Thank you for that clarification. It is the same approach. I'm exercising the same approach that Keith Davidson used with the Framework of Interpretation working group, and that we all need to be happy with the document before we finally put it to bed. So that's the spirit of what I was trying to say. Thank you. Thank you, Eberhard. And you can also lower your hand.

Anybody else? I don't see anybody else. I think we're good to go.

So with regards to the comparative analysis beginning on what you're seeing in front of you. First of all, do you want to back up a page? Does anybody want to back up a page to refamiliarize themselves or are we good to go from here? Eberhard, I see your hand is up.

Eberhard Lisse: I see there is a few people unmated and I hear background noise. So I would appreciate if everybody who is having background noise and not speaking anything, click the mute button on the bottom left of your screen.

Stephen Deerhake: And I see people are muting and I thank you for that because I was wondering about that as well. So no dog choir (inaudible).

Bart Boswinkel: Stephen? Stephen, this is Bart speaking. Let me first before we delve into the substance of the meeting provide a very, very brief update on the-- what happened in Lisbon around--

Stephen Deerhake: Oh, I totally spaced on that. Thank you, Bart. Yes, let's go through that first.

Bart Boswinkel: It is-- it's fairly short, but I think it's important, is the work-- say technical study group to (inaudible) the working group. I don't recall the name of that group. So Jaap is a liaison to that group and he's a member of the maintenance agency. That's why it's a bit confusing.

They discussed the update or a review of the ISO 3166 standard. In particular, what is of concern for this group is the definitions. They did not make progress. It was only scheduled for half the day and they had a lot on their plate around ISO 3166. Among others, the potential merge of ISO 3166-1 and -2, which would be a fundamental change. That has been deferred until a next review round. So that's reasonably good news. But at the same time, they did not have the time to discuss the issues that were tabled by Jaap around the definitions and the differences and the divergence in definitions between what's in the online browsing platform and the glossary to that one, and in the standard itself. So it's probably safest, as the working group already decided, to stick to the language in the standard for the time being. And it's sad, but the online browsing platform will keep on providing some terms, but these are not the-- part of the official standard. So that's just a brief update.

Stephen Deerhake: Thank you, Bart. If I understand you correctly, in summary we have the status quo with all these ambiguities and issues prevailing into the intermediate future. Is that a good assessment?

Bart Boswinkel: That's a good assessment, at least for the next one or two years. So that's probably the working balance for the working group.

Stephen Deerhake: Okay. So that's what we're working with. So that issue is now I believe put to rest with regards to the work of this working group. And if anybody has a different opinion I'd love to hear it, but I think that's probably where we're at with this and what we're stuck with, I guess, more to the point.

Thank you for that, Bart. Peter, I see your hand is up.

Peter Koch: Yeah. Thank you, Steve, and lower it immediately. I was just wondering. Will we receive a formal copy of the minutes of that session? I mean we can get to that otherwise, but maybe next time Jaap is--

Bart Boswinkel:	The next time Jaap is around. But the thing is, the minutes have not been circulated yet among the MA members, let alone broader. So Jaap will definitely-- next time we'll ask him to provide either a written update or more details, but this is where we are at right now.
Peter Koch:	Yeah, okay. No, that's fair enough. I was just wondering because Stephen was calling it to a close for the time being and I would like to reconfirm the outputs, and maybe even talk to my local representative of the working group, what their stance on the-- like mergers and definitions is. So for now we can only accept what the report is and that's all fine, but it would be interesting to see-- or I would not want to close this completely for the rest of this working group's lifetime.
Bart Boswinkel:	It depends on how quickly it goes, of course.
Peter Koch:	Yeah, exactly. (Laughs) Thanks.
Bart Boswinkel:	But the safest assumption is to work under the premise that you've been pushing, is that we keep and stick to the definitions in the standard itself and not use any of the online browsing platform language.
Peter Koch:	Oh, absolutely. Yes, thank you. And that was Peter again.
Stephen Deerhake:	Thank you, Peter. I appreciate your attention to detail on that and I agree with you. If we can get formal minutes, or if they issue a communiqué as to what they have decided to I guess not do, that would be great.

Eberhard, I see you've got your hand raised so go ahead, please. |
| Eberhard Lisse: | Yes. With regards to whether we can exhaust this or not, it can be that the work of the working group will be completed before this government operation that you call ISO Agency, has gotten their act together. If we get finished before then, we must take the status quo, I think. And if they make changes that are helpful or in any way that affect us, we'll take them. But we are not closing this administratively in that sense. |
| Stephen Deerhake: | No, I agree. I think we just have to assume that we're going to have to work with what is in front of us now with regards to the written document and proceed on that basis. We certainly can't wait around for them to have yet another meeting where they perhaps have more time to discuss this. So I think that's how we're going to go forward on that, unless there's any objection.

Not seeing any other hands raised at this point, if Zoom is doing what I think it does and puts the hands at the top, which it appears to do, shall we-- Bart, do you have any more comments on the ISO stuff or are we ready to go? |
| Bart Boswinkel: | No, that was it. That was it. |
| Stephen Deerhake: | Okay. Thank you for the update. I'm sorry I forgot you. That was not my intention.

So with regards to the document in front of us, does anybody want to back up a page to refamiliarize themselves or can we move forward from line 125 onward?

Okay. Picking up then our discussion from our last meeting, does anybody have an issue with what is on this page with regards to the triggers, the roles, and the specific circumstances, with .AN being the first example? |

If not, can we have the next page, Kim? Thank you.

Okay. Presuming people have kind of chewed through this thing offline, 142-147 is the end of the .AN-specific discussion.

Subsequently, we get into Section 1.4 on line 148 with the always interesting Yugoslavia case. Any issues with the text that we're looking at here?

Seeing none, can we advance the page again, Kimberly? Thank you.

And again, 160 through 180 basically is the discussion of the details regarding the splitting of .YU into .RS, etc. Do we have any questions, comments, or concerns about this text?

Seeing none, Kimberly, can you advance the page? Thank you.

And again, lines 181 through 201 we are again in the meat of the issue. And do we have any concerns about this text from those present on this call?

Seeing none, Kim, can you advance the page? Thank you.

202-204 wrap it up pretty much. Then we have .TP issues.

And then with Section 1.4.1 we get into this owner question. We do have an issue on line 214 that perhaps should have some discussion with regards to, as noted there, a new concept that needs to be defined, temporary caretaker.

Temporary caretakers come up a couple times previously in our discussions and I would like to ask the group if anyone's got some comments as to how we approach this, how we might incorporate that into whatever it is we finally produce with regards to this. The idea of the "caretaker" to my knowledge was first put forth by IANA with respect to .VI, the US Virgin Island registry, after the death of Peter de Blanc, and then knowing that the other principal owner of the registry at that time as "caretaker". And that formally existed within the IANA database for years and years and years and just got cleaned out a couple years ago.

But the idea of a "registry caretaker" is something we might want to consider and I would ask the group for any comments on this. And I see Eberhard's got his hand up so I will go to Eberhard. Thank you.

Eberhard Lisse:	My view on this is that whatever we do must be entirely voluntary from the site of the ccTLD manager. We cannot mandate anything. After a certain time, when the caretaker-- when the domain manager has relinquished, a caretaker could come in, but the point is, why do we need a caretaker to run a business or a domain that can be perfectly run by the ccTLD manager? The idea is obviously because the ccTLD manager may be slow at doing things, but we can't just go and take it away. So we must find a way of doing this in a totally voluntary and manner that is acceptable to everybody concerned, but in particular the ccTLD now, that is acceptable to ccTLD manager.
Stephen Deerhake:	Thank you, Eberhard. If I can come back to you with a question now, not in personal capacity but as chair, do you believe that we should have some language within our final work product that addresses this issue, and along the lines that you've described as something voluntary? Because it may well be that there will be circumstances where this makes sense, I think. Can you (inaudible) on that for me, please?

Eberhard Lisse: I would be perfectly happy with having this in the document, that should the ccTLD manager desire to at a certain time relinquish the management of the domain-- of the TLD when there is still a few names in there, that then a caretaker can be appointed. On the other hand, technically, depending on what software is being used, it's going to be very difficult.

If a smaller-- in the case of .AN, I happen to know that .CW, where I visited, they do these manually. So if they-- that implies they did .AN manually. And that implies to take care of this, one either would have to do it manually, which is not wanted, or one would have to reengineer the zone to pull it into software. We've done this for Google Tools. I mean the tools are there. But that is a consideration that then must be looked at.

In general-- generally, if it's an offer, a voluntary offer, I'm quite in favor.

Stephen Deerhake: Okay. Thank you, Eberhard. Anybody else with a comment on this particular item?

All right. Seeing none, Kim, I guess can you advance us a page, please? Thank you.

So here we have some stuff that really needs to be fleshed out, particularly with regards to approval, by whom, documentation, and stakeholders. And I would love to see either discussion now, or certainly discussion on the list between now and our next meeting on the 14th, with regards to trying to flesh this out. If anybody's got any ideas at the moment -- Peter, maybe you do -- be happy to start this conversation, shall I say.

Silence is deafening, so I guess we'll go on to the next page, Kim. Thank you.

So with regards to the policy, at the end of the day, we are limited in scope by what ccNSO has defined as policies. Additionally have the role of the ccTLD manager. And I think chapter -- well, line 231, rather -- is a real can of worms with regards to what might be required of ICANN/IANA/PTI with regards to the establishment of the successor ccTLD. So I think some thought needs to go into that as well. And I would love to see some discussion about that because I think that's a really important issue.

With regards to the execution management plan, again, needs to be fleshed out further.

Do we have any comments on this, particularly with the notification process on 1.5.3 with regards to, again, our favorite case, Yugoslavia?

And it appears we do not. Okay. Hang on just a sec. Zoom has defeated me here for the moment. It's telling me there are messages I should look at and then I can't find them. Ah, here we go. What are they saying here? Okay. We have an issue with Google Docs, apparently.

Kim, can you provide some input on the information-- the comments in the chat regarding getting access to the Google Doc notes? I hate to put you on the spot, but I have no idea what's going on here.

Kim Carlson: Hey, Stephen, no problem. I think Bart needs to change the permissions on his Google Doc.

Stephen Deerhake: Yeah. I have that same issue, but I wasn't paying attention to it on that score. Okay. So presumably that will be resolved.

Any issues with regards to what's on the screen in front of you with regards to policy and

the beginnings of the execution management plan? We need to flesh this stuff out and we need help from you guys in doing so. If you can do that, it would be great, any input on that.

And Bart, we now have a new link or is this an everyone link? I'm not sure what this-- no, I still need permission according to your link, Bart. Do I request access? Okay. I requested. I don't know what the rest of you guys are doing. I just requested access and we'll see. Bart's going to be inundated.

With regards to the comparative analysis document in front of us, any comments, questions? Eberhard's got his hand up, I see. Thank you, Eberhard. Go ahead, please.

Eberhard Lisse: No so much about this thing, but I would like to see the next page on the .YU case. We always-- we know that IANA function manager, PTI, always finds it difficult to communicate with ccTLD managers because the ccTLD managers just don't answer their emails, especially smaller ones.

Stephen Deerhake: Especially non-English speakers as well.

Eberhard Lisse: In addition, if you are non-English speakers it becomes even more complicated, yeah. But the point is, it's going to be difficult to write a policy you must keep us informed when there is no way of really enforcing it. And that's that. And with regards to the notes, we're done with the notes in any case and I'll kern them and email them out tonight, or tomorrow morning anyway. So if you can't access them live, you will have them in a few moments.

Stephen Deerhake: Thank you, Eberhard. I appreciate your secretariat work-- secretarial work in regards to getting all that stuff prepared for us.

So again, with regard to page 15 here, feel free to start thinking about this stuff and exercise your fingers on your keyboard on the list between now and the next meeting.

I guess, Kim, can we go to the next page? Okay. Thank you, Kim.

Recommend looking at the .ZR case as well. Rather interesting.

But now we get into 1.6, which is the actual removal of .YU, and .ZR as well. Take a look at this. If you've got-- I'll give you some-- this is rather meaty so I'll give you some time to read through it, as I will as well again.

I guess my first question to people on the call is, is there an issue with the approach that the IANA has taken described in line 250-254? Can we consider this acceptable practice then?

Naela. And let's go to you because you got your hand up just before Martin did, so go ahead. Thank you and good morning.

Naela Sarras: Hi, everyone. Yeah, thank you. So you asked specifically about lines 250 to 254, and it says when an alpha-2 code for a country is changed, blah, blah, IANA's historical practice has been to set up a-- the top-level domain and delegate it to the same manager. And I think I heard your question was, is that an acceptable practice going forward and I'm not sure that you can build that here.

If I understood the question correctly, Stephen, was in this case we determine who the manager-- we build it into the process somehow that the manager would be the same as

the existing top-level domain. And I'm not sure that we can build that in, right? Because we can't determine who the manager-- or the IANA function can't determine who the manager is. It has to be done at the local level and then they send their documentation and whatever supporting documents for us to evaluate and then, if it passes, then it goes into the root zone. But I'm not sure that IANA can make that-- the IANA functions operator can make that decision, if I'm understanding this correctly.

Stephen Deerhake: I agree with what you said with regards to you can't unilaterally make that decision. Obviously, it is a local community decision.

Naela Sarras: I mean-- so if I may continue my point, at the-- I've been part of a number of the IDN ccTLDs that got approved as a string and further have been delegated by the IANA functions operator. And it's not automatic that the entity that operates the ASCII ccTLD also operates the IDN. They could be different organizations or they could be the same. And if you look through the IANA database, there's different variations. So I just want to be careful here that we're not asking the IANA functions operator to make any assumptions.

Stephen Deerhake: Acknowledged. Thank you so much.

Naela Sarras: Thank you.

Stephen Deerhake: Any further comments from you or you're good?

Naela Sarras: I'm good for now, thank you. Yeah, I'm good for now. Thank you.

Stephen Deerhake: Okay. Thanks, Naela. Thank you for representing IANA on that point. And I'm going-- next up on the list is Eberhard.

Eberhard Lisse: No, actually it was Martin.

Stephen Deerhake: Oh, wait. What happened to Martin? Martin was up here at one point. He has disappeared.

Eberhard Lisse: Okay. Anyway, in the meantime, I agree and disagree with Naela somewhat. If it is a pure name change, one-to-one name change, like from .CR to .CD, for example, there is no-- I don't think there should be any consideration of a new manager. If their name just changes one to one, the domain manager just runs a new name. Everything else is a separate issue.

Stephen Deerhake: All right, thank you. Garth, you're up next.

Garth Miller: Yeah. I was just going to comment on the IDN fast track, but I think Naela already answered that, that if you're looking at existing practice and you look to that as far as a new cc delegation, it's not actually the common practice in my experience to be automatically assigned to the existing person. So I just think that the wording of 50 and 51 might be a little bit confusing, that it actually doesn't reflect existing practice. So, that's pretty much it.

Stephen Deerhake: Garth, can you provide-- perhaps put on the list some language that's more to your interpretation as to what's going on there?

Garth Miller: Yeah, I can do that going forward. I'll do that later. Absolutely.

Stephen Deerhake: That would be appreciated. Thank you very much. You can lower your hand if you're

done. And next up is Patricio.

Patricio Poblete: Hi. About what Naela was just saying, I believe it could be argued that it would be beyond the scope for our group to go into who should be appointed as manager since we're only supposed to deal with retirement. Perhaps we could go as far as recommending that the same manager from the old ccTLD should be appointed as manager of the new name for reasons of stability or something, but I don't think we could go beyond recommendation.

Stephen Deerhake: Okay, thank you. Martin, you're back. Thank you. Good morning, or good afternoon for you.

Martin Boyle: Good afternoon, indeed. Yeah, I had originally taken my hand back because Naela had said everything I wanted to say. I put my hand back up and Patricio has I think quite eloquently again beaten me to it with what I wanted to say.

Although, I must admit I don't think it is appropriate when we are looking at retirements for us to be putting in and saying what the new delegations, what conditions should be being applied to them. That might come in later on if we then decide that we do need to look at specific cases, but just for the moment I am far from happy with the idea that essentially we try and write very generic rules or recommendations for something that is or could be a very complicated situation in political circumstances that we don't understand. I think we're putting high honor in an invidious position in such a case. That's all I wanted to add. Thanks.

Stephen Deerhake: Thank you, Martin. Appreciate that. Note to Bart, we do have some controversy about this text between 250-254 so let's document that and--

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. I do. Just for the record, being that this is not about future policy. This is about the experience say with the .YU case, the .ZR case, and the .AN, .CW case as recorded in the different documents publicly available.

Stephen Deerhake: Agreed. But when we get to our final document, we need to I think (inaudible) this discussion, which has been quite healthy and interesting.

Thank you, Martin, again. Eberhard, I see your hand is up as well.

Eberhard Lisse: Thank you. Again, I just want to reiterate my position. If it's a pure name change, I will be adamant that there is no new appointment process. It will just be moving from A to B. Anything else is a separate issue. And I don't have a problem-- if a country ceases to exist or splits up or reunites and they get a-- whether they get a new ccTLD, a new ISO code or not, that's a separate issue. That should be done according to RFC 1591, as interpreted. But if it's a pure name change, one to one, nothing else happens, we are not going to be able to get consensus I think on that. There will be a new delegation process.

Stephen Deerhake: Thank you, Eberhard.

So historically we have nicely documented in here what happened in 250-254, and perhaps that's not the way we want to go forward so we will see how that progresses.

Any other comments, issues with regards to the text in front of you? If not, Kimberly, can we go to the next page, I guess? Thank you.

Alrighty, this is the wrap up of the previous page; again, documenting what's gone on here. Not much happening on this page. Any issues? Concerns? Then we accept this

draft as is and carry on to the next page. I don't see anybody (inaudible).

Okay. Kimberly, can we go on to the next page, please?

Eberhard Lisse: Can you speak up a little? You're far from the microphone.

Stephen Deerhake: I shouldn't be. I'm sitting in front of my laptop. Can other people not hear me as well, or--?

Bart Boswinkel: I can hear you very well, Stephen.

Stephen Deerhake: Okay. Dr. Lisse, I believe the majority says I can be heard. Can you hear me decently now?

Eberhard Lisse: Yes, it's much better.

Stephen Deerhake: Okay. I moved the mic two centimeters closer.

With regards to this page, are there any issues, comments, etc., with regards to this whole process of notification? This is what happened. Do we want to think about how it should happen differently and my answer is, yes, I think we should. So give that some thought on that, how notifications should be handled. And I think, personally, notifications is a rather sensitive topic, particularly with the whole retirement stuff.

So if no comments from anyone, let's go to the next page, Kimberly. Thank you.

So execution or removal I think is administrative trivia involving ICANN, IANA, and PTI. I don't think we need to spend a lot of time trying to sort that one out. That's administrative trivia as far as I'm concerned.

So now we get into Section 2, which is process management, which is somewhat more significant. Here's what's happened in the past, going-- diving into it with the overall-- the assessment and the monitoring of the process. Do we have any comments from any group members on the call at this point in time on this?

If you guys remain completely silent I'll start calling you out.

Kimberly, can we go to the next slide, please?

And again we're documenting what's gone on, etc., etc. So we're into timing, duration of the process with sample cases. Our favorite, of course, coming to the ascendency once again. Any issues with how this has been described? Any thoughts as to what we might want to be putting into our work product on this?

And seeing no hands, I guess, Kim, can we go to the next one?

And again, it's a discussion of how the stuff was handled. It's basically historical in its detail. I don't see anything personally controversial there. No comment on this. Is there any thought from anyone with regards to how we might want to take what's here into our final work product? Start thinking about that.

And Kimberly, if we can go to the next one, please. Thank you.

Peter Koch: Sorry, Stephen, I just--

Stephen Deerhake: Oh, I have a hand up from Peter. I'm so sorry, Peter, I didn't see you. Yes, go ahead.

Peter Koch: No, I'm sorry. That was last second. I was just wondering, the lines 312 and 313, it says, "-- and the Board ultimately believed it was more appropriate to have a relatively short timeline." There is no reasoning given for this in the summary and I was wondering whether this would inform our final output in any way. If it would, then maybe we need a bit more detail for the rationale of this belief. If it doesn't inform this, just historical facts, then that might be okay.

Stephen Deerhake: Peter, you raise a very good point. I thank you for it and, again, for your attention to detail. I don't know the level of detail of board decision rationale that they now print, which is quite extensive; how extensive it was back then. But that is a really interesting question as to why they thought it was more appropriate to have a relatively short timeframe to kill the old TLD off. I think you raise a good point in that we should incorporate that -- and Bart, make a note of this -- I think, the question of the ultimate removal and the timeframe for that. I'd be very curious, actually, to go back into the record and see what is available as to why they thought what they thought when they thought it, I guess is the way to say that.

Thank you, Peter. And Eberhard, I see your hand is up as well. So go ahead, please.

Eberhard Lisse: Yeah. I see this as a historical issue, because in the .AN case extensions were asked and given once, but not often enough. So my view on this is longer than shorter and as a CCD manager, shorter than-- longer than shorter, and as ICANN or PTI, shorter than longer. We just need to find a compromise. It has something to do with the size and so on.

In the end, I agree with PTI that you have to put a line in the sand and say now you have to jump or else. Because otherwise, nothing is going to happen and they will procrastinate and procrastinate and procrastinate. Whether we put a fixed timeline, this is just historic detail that we put on the map and hash through now, that we understand what happened in the past, but that's not yet policy. So I agree with Peter, what he said in that sentence.

Stephen Deerhake: Oh, thank you. Thank you, Eberhard. Anybody else? In lieu of any further comments, Kimberly, can we move on? Thank you.

Again, here we have historic discussion of what they've done. What-- excuse me, what IANA has done, not they -- IANA has done -- with .ZR, .TP, and the board as well. And I'm actually thinking, based on Peter's prior comment, that we probably should go back and research this a little bit further. I will endeavor to do that before the next meeting and present anything I think is of issue.

Anybody have any issue with this discussion of what's gone on in the past here?

Seeing none, Kimberly, can we move to the next page? Thank you.

And again--

Eberhard Lisse: There's a hand. There is a hand.

Stephen Deerhake: I see a hand up. Yes, please, Naela. Go ahead.

Naela Sarras: Sorry, I didn't raise it fast enough. Just a clarification on the page--

Stephen Deerhake: Go back to the previous page?

Naela Sarras: On the one where we're talking about .TP. Yeah, line 337-- 338. I'm not sure why this is written in the present tense, but it's talking about history. Why does it say the removal date is currently scheduled for 28 February, 2015?

Stephen Deerhake: It all depends on what timeframe you're in but, yeah, that looks like an error. Thank you.

Bart Boswinkel: It was a direct copy from one of the reports.

Naela Sarras: Oh, this is a quote? Okay.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah. This is just cut and paste from the reports.

Naela Sarras: Okay.

Stephen Deerhake: So I guess, Naela, you have to fix that yourself. I don't know. I'm joking. Anyway, let's carry on. Thank you for that. People are paying attention. I like that.

Page-- thank you, Kim.

Any issues with this one? I myself find it curious on 359-360 about measures necessary. And 361. Not sure what really went on there, but it's history so--.

Any further-- no hands that I can see in Zoom, if I'm using Zoom properly. Kimberly, I think we can go on to the next page. Thank you.

So this is stuff we need to really flesh out and I would love to see the beginnings of some conversations on the list about Section 3, at least. Other things as well, but certainly this. Thoughts? Comments how we might-- we need to think about particularly-- well, all of it, but the oversight issue is of concern to me personally, not as chair, as specified in 3.3. And also the board decisions. It's not clear, particularly as an empowered community, and particularly as how ccTLDs in many respects stand outside of the empowered community, how we interact and how this is organized set forward.

Do we have any comments on this? Please think about it and please start yapping on the list between now and the next meeting. That would be really, really helpful.

Going forward I think, Kim, to the next slide. Thank you.

So historically we've got these things to look at and decide was this appropriate-- is this-- what's been done in the past, I guess basically, is this something we might be happy with having going forward? And I'm not sure it is. I'm not sure it's not. I'm asking you guys for some opinions on this.

And I'm hearing silence so I don't know what to do. I will forewarn you that at the face-to-face meeting I will be calling people out. Everybody's got their microphone muted. I love that. No I don't, actually, but you know where I'm going with it.

All right, Kim, I guess let's go to the next page and then we can move on.

Again, the remaining resolutions. Nobody has any issues, apparently, with the historical record so let's go on to the last page, Kim. Thank you.

(Inaudible) This needs to be fleshed out, 410, 412, etc., etc. I mean it all needs to be

fleshed out. 409 is administrative as far as I'm concerned. I don't know what-- if you guys have opinions on this or not.

So I believe we've come to the end of the first read through on this document. So we have officially completed the first read through of the comparative analysis document that has been dutifully prepared, and I thank Bart for doing the grunt work on that. And given that we have six more minutes -- actually we have 36 more minutes in theory -- should we proceed onto the next bit of work on our agenda?

Bart Boswinkel: Stephen, this is Bart for a minute with respect to this one. So what I'll do is, as soon as these notes, what I've been taking have been circulated, I'll use the notes from the previous meeting, from this meeting and the meeting before to update this document and circulate it again. So at least then you have a bit of a updated version. So that's for in two weeks and we'll do the research in some of the parts that have been indicated today as well and include a little bit more language there. But that's part of this part of the comparative analysis, just so people can know what to expect for the next meeting.

Stephen Deerhake: Okay. That sounds good, Bart. I personally think we probably should not start diving into our next task, but go to AOB and wrap this up. And if there's any-- if anybody really wants to carry on for another half hour, raise your hand now. Otherwise, forever be silent. And I see-- I see no hands!

Bart Boswinkel: (Inaudible)

Stephen Deerhake: So let us go to AOB, I guess.

Bart Boswinkel: Stephen, just again one remark with respect to the next item, the role of stakeholders. That's another way of looking on a lot of material that's already in this first overview of process steps. It's just another look at the-- what is happening. And again, that was based on the discussions in San Juan. So I don't know when-- so we keep it-- it probably needs to be updated based on today's conversation and the previous conversations as well.

Stephen Deerhake: Can we get that updated, Bart, and have that out for-- a link to it for working group members to review between now and the 14th of June, and maybe we can do a quick dive into that?

Bart Boswinkel: Let me try to do it. So if you don't have it by Friday in the wiki-- so that's-- see here, what's the date? That's the 9th, that it didn't happen -- or that's the 8th -- I was not able to do it. Otherwise, we should have it say no later than the 8th.

Stephen Deerhake: Okay. I don't want to overburden you because I know you're dealing with other stuff as well in the run up to Panama. But yeah, if we could have that out on the list. If we can get some active list participation. And I'm frankly begging working group members to start communication on the list about stuff so that we can hash some of this out between teleconferences, etc.

So yeah, thank you, Bart, on that one because we do need to start fleshing that out as well.

Bart, if you have anything else or not? Apparently not. You're muted.

Bart Boswinkel: No.

Stephen Deerhake: Okay. Any other business from anyone?

There is a deafening silence on any other business so I'm going to presume there's not. We have 19 participants. I want to thank you all. And I believe I'm going to adjourn this meeting at this point in time.

So again, I really appreciate you showing up in whatever time zone you showed up from, and we will convene on the 14th at a less convenient time zone for myself personally, but hopefully a better time zone for the rest of you guys and we'll chat then. And please, please, please look at this stuff, think about it and start posting on the list about our way forward. I appreciate it. And with that, I say goodbye and good morning, good night, good late night, good evening. Thank you very much. Cheers. Bye-bye.

Bart Boswinkel: Bye all.

Eberhard Lisse: Thank you.

Martin Boyle: Thank you. Bye-bye.