

3559

Stephen Deelhake: I assume we still do not have Eberhard on the call, but go ahead and start the recording, and let's carry on.

Kim Carlson: The recordings have started.

Stephen Deelhake: Okay. I'm looking at a rather robust attendance list, and I thank you guys for that. So, good morning, early afternoon to our Asia and Oceania colleagues, and a good evening to our European and African colleagues, and a good late afternoon and early evening to our colleagues in the Western hemisphere. I think I've covered us all, but if I omitted anybody for -- call me out on it otherwise.

So, welcome to our last teleconference of the PDP Retirement Working Group prior to our upcoming face-to-face meeting at ICANN 62. And again, as I have said in the past, I thank you all for attending this teleconference, especially for those of you who are late or up really early. It's appreciated. It's important work.

So, as you know, and as we're finding out as things are going on, as people are joining, the Genius Bar at ICANN has decided that we needed to use the new and improved Adobe Connect for this call rather than the Zoom, which we have been using for the past few calls, and which I think I can say for all of us, we finally developed a familiarity with that allow us to operate with at least a decent efficiency. So, of course, it was a perfect time to change technologies, so, after all, they are the Genius Bar, and they do know what works for us so much more than we do.

So, I have to say, going into this call, I've not had any experience trying to run a teleconference using Adobe Connect. I felt I finally had some (inaudible) with teleconference management sorted out on our last teleconference with Zoom, and, frankly, was looking forward to using it again when the Genius Bar intervened. So, I ask you to please bear with me as I try to sort out what's going on, where, what's what on the screen, whose hand is up in what order, et cetera, and I'm counting on Kim, et cetera, and Bart to help me out on that regards.

Lastly, with regards to this topic, I do wish to make it very clear that my sarcasm regarding ICANN's Genius Bar is in no way a reflection on our secretariat staff, for whom I have the utmost respect, as I am sure you do, as well. And despite its self (ph) goals in so many areas, ICANN has, it seems, always blessed the ccNSO with a very talented and committed secretariat staff, and I'm grateful for that. My rant is with ICANN IT, not with our secretariat staff, obviously.

So, with regards to the agenda, we got an action item that Bart will be filling us on, but we also have Jaap on board, so perhaps he will be able to contribute that, as well. The overall plan for this teleconference, just to switch from the comparative phase we've been engaged in to the stakeholder analysis phase, and to that end we will engage in an introduction to the stakeholder analysis mind map that was distributed on the list, and,

following that review, we'll begin to flesh out the resulting outline document, repeating (inaudible) what we've done previously. And hopefully, we'll have sufficient time left after this introduction to the stakeholder analysis to proceed into a second reading of the comparative analysis document that we discussed on our last meeting and the meeting before that, with the intent of putting that to bed before our face-to-face meeting in Panama.

We also want to dive a bit into the preparation for the Panama meeting, the face-to-face meeting. This will be a three-hour meeting scheduled for Thursday morning, if I'm correct. And like the Puerto Rico meeting, I expect it to be rather interactive, so be prepared for that, and please don't shy away from it if you're going to be in Panama. We really need your participation. As we solidify what we think is going to go on in the Panama face-to-face meeting, I'll post some additional details to the list.

And with that, I believe we're ready to rock and roll. Bart, you want to take up the action items?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, hello (ph). One of the effectively three action items. One was to check with Jaap, at the request of Peter, on additional information coming in from the MA, from the meeting in Lisbon around ISO 3166 by the -- I think it was the working group (inaudible). And Jaap is on the call, and as you see, it's the next item on the agenda, so it has been completed. In that sense, Jaap will give a brief update, Peter.

The second one was around the question around the rationale for the limited time frame that was reported in the action item in the updated version of the comparison document, so the outline version you will see a reference to that Board decision. And so, that one is completed, as well. And the third one was, time permitting, on my end update the mind map for the comparison -- for the comparative analysis. I just made it this morning, so it was included, and it is very clear this is distributed rather early to the call, but at least that's done. And I went through all the discussions and notes from the previous three calls and updated the document accordingly. If we have time, I will just highlight the changes, and then there should be no surprises there.

So, these were the three action items I had recorded from the last call. Back to you, Stephen.

Stephen Deerhake: Thank you, Bart. I am unable to ascertain how one sees whether hands are raised.

Bart Boswinkel: There are none raised. You can see it as soon as I raise one, for example.

Nigel Roberts: Yes, I can't raise a hand.

Stephen Deerhake: Oh, okay, that's why. Go ahead, Nigel, then.

Nigel Roberts: Okay. Thanks, Stephen. I've got a couple of points, actually. I want to make a couple of administrative points about this. I tried to use Adobe, which whatever new version or whatever is being run here is demanding a particular version of Flash and, unfortunately, I'm not able to participate in the Adobe room, which is a bit surprising, really, because Adobe was working kind of really well up until this point when I was Chairing it and in all the previous meetings I was in, and so on. I'm kind of a bit surprised at this. I'll probably try and work it out, but, at this point in time, I can't put hands up. I can't see the documents, and so on. Zoom was kind of working, and we were kind of beginning to get used to it, but I'm just beginning to repeat what Stephen said.

I just want to make another point about the agenda before we get deep into it. I notice that we are formally putting things on the agenda as first and second reading. Now, for

my mind, when you put something on as second reading, that is a final version that is not going to change after that. I'd just like to make a little plea that, if that's what is intended on today's call, that's fine. If it's not, can we just put it on without saying first and second reading, and so on, until we have a version that we're going to approve, and then put that down as second reading? Does that kind of make sense?

Stephen Deerhake: Nigel, your comment--.

Eberhard Lisse: --Can I have mine (ph)?

Stephen Deerhake: Eberhard, I see your hand is raised. Do you want to proceed?

Eberhard Lisse: Yes. Can you hear me?

Stephen Deerhake: Yes.

Eberhard Lisse: Okay. Nigel, it appears that you either have not been participating last time, or you haven't read the notes, because we have had exactly this same question last time. We are not going to make it -- this is not final documents, but we are reading every document twice, at least twice. And once we have got an idea about what we are reading, then we are going to go further. That's what we discussed last time. And this is not in any way a final document. This is just a comparative analysis of what happens, okay? Maybe you'll want to read the notes from last time.

Nigel Roberts: If I can respond to that?

Stephen Deerhake: You can. Go ahead, Nigel.

Nigel Roberts: Yes. Eberhard, that's exactly my point, which I'm asking that we don't formally put them down as first and second reading, and we do exactly what was agreed on the last call, which I was listening to, and that we do exactly this way, which has worked in the past. But, the title "first" and "second reading" has a kind of a parliamentary meaning, and that means final version to be approved, or something. So, the first reading, the second reading, they're formal stages.

We had a policy that we would never approve anything until it's been discussed on at least two calls. We've maintained that policy in the FOI in the previous version. But, I'm just asking that we don't use these terms "first" and "second reading". It's nothing to do with the procedure. It's just to do with the agenda.

Stephen Deerhake: Thank you, Nigel. What did -- how did we describe it in the agenda on the FOI? Because I don't recall. I'd have to go back and look at them. Can you recall off the top of your head? Otherwise, we'll defer this discussion.

Nigel Roberts: Well, the top of my head, yes, I can. We did -- we didn't do it like this formerly as first and second readings. We simply had it on the agenda for as many meetings until we were getting some kind of closure. And then, when we were getting closure, we were just making sure that the document had been on at least two consecutive calls, and it was approved. We just said, "For approval."

Stephen Deerhake: Acknowledged. I will strive to engage similar nomenclature, going forward, with regards to this working group in the spirit of the FOI and how we handled that then. Thank you, Nigel.

Nigel Roberts: It's not a big deal, but thanks, Stephen. It makes it clearer.

- Stephen Deerhake: Yes, yes, I saw your hand wiggle a little while ago. Do you have anything to say, or are you going to keep your hand down and not say anything?
- Eberhard Lisse: No, I have something to say. I propose that we discuss this with the Chairs and the Vice-Chair and come up with a formulation that doesn't irritate me in the middle of the night having to deal with this for the fourth time in a row. And secondly, with regards to Adobe Connect, the reason why it's not working for Nigel I think is because of -- they use now a safer version which doesn't have to secure the (inaudible), but which makes the usage bad. We don't have to discuss this year. We have tried to take it up with management, with the IT Department. The CIO, Mr. Rangan, or Ranguin, or something, gave us back a page of platitudes, and I can post that to the list if you want to. But, we are going to -- the Chairs are going to take this up with them in Panama, so I don't really think we need to discuss this here.
- Stephen Deerhake: Eberhard, as I stated in my introductory remarks, I'm not impressed with the Genius Bar either. And yes, we will be taking this up with ICANN IT management with no due respect to our secretariat staff and our support staff on this call, but they should have consulted us. So, I would like to move on to the substance of the meeting, if that's possible. And again, I would like to call Naela. I saw your hand went up and went down. Do you have anything to say, or do you wish to remain silent? And if that's the case, can we proceed? Go ahead. I see a live mic, but we cannot hear you, Naela, if you have something to say. Assuming not, then? So--.
- Bart Boswinkel: --Naela is typing.
- Stephen Deerhake: Oh, she's typing. Here we do. We have things in the chat room. Oh, she lost the audio, okay. Yes, Liz, we're trying to do so. All right. Let us move on, then. Bart, Jaap, do you guys want to sort out how you want to (inaudible)?
- Bart Boswinkel: Yes. If you could be so kind to give a bit more background to what happened in -- during your meeting in Lisbon? I've explained that you discussed -- that the working group has discussed the potential changes to the standard, but that nothing came about because it was too short and too many suggestions, so that, in principle, we have to live with the definitions as they are right now for the time being, and that you didn't expect any major changes soon; and secondly, that the formal minutes of that meeting were not available yet, so Peter had some -- wanted some additional clarification, so maybe you can add some additional clarification, or some recall of what happened. Over to you, Jaap.
- Jaap Akkerhuis: Yes, this is Jaap Akkerhuis speaking. And yes, I'm pleased that currently, in the (inaudible) minutes, I'm not (inaudible) either, so, I mean, it's going to point (ph) to getting too much details, but I'll check it. We'll go to my personal notes.
- And most of things that is needed for ISO to do is to have the formal review every couple of years, I think every three years. They should check whether or not the (inaudible) would need to review, and this time it's (ph) not necessarily will actually result in the re-issue, but at least it will be looked at. And due to changing (inaudible), it's very late so to do that. So, the meeting in Lisbon of working group 2 was to see which points needs to be addressed, if anything else needs to be addressed.
- I must, as a liaison D, on special invitations, work (inaudible) can only be done by official members of the ISO. And I'm just -- but I was invited as being a liaison, and so to discuss (inaudible).
- So, I will skip the details, but there is -- yes, there is some work that will be done by changing the terminology to be more precise and tighten up the rules, because it's not only people from ICANN which have problems understanding it, but also other people

have questions about how -- what exactly is meant. And there is -- so, there is a tendency to make the rules stricter and for A Lac's (ph) ability as well, because people take -- on the other hand, we had some (ph) discussion what to do with other stuff, like the Eurasian economic validations, indigenous (ph) nations, things like that. And so -- but, for the time being, decided not to change too much on point one and point two. Now, the discussion is whether or not -- whether point one and point two should actually be combined again. It used to be (inaudible), just one single point, and there have been -- but this new rule inside the ISO that things should be in one place as much as possible.

But, given the time limits, they decided to actually -- we just continue with current structure of -- so it will be point one and point two and a (ph) point three, so that's actually (inaudible). Probably the first draft of the new point one will happen in somewhere in November, so that's about it. It also takes away some of the problems especially David (ph) has with some -- because the German standard (ph) body is appointed by the European Economic something, or whatever, to giving the German translation of the ISO standards and changing the structure will get (ph) a lot of problems by proper translation.

So, there are a lot of things mixed together, but the end result is hopefully there will be better (inaudible) standards, and this will be -- and then, with the next version, there might be -- actually be big changes in the standard. That's where I'm at now. So, that's, in short (ph), what happened.

And actually, what will be going on is that -- what will be going on through November is that the members of working group 2 will actually sit on this standard -- (inaudible) standard, but (inaudible) to be voted on by the technical committee for this session, the plenary. And I will try to follow the work as much as I am allowed to see.

Stephen Deerhake: Thank you, Jaap for that.

Bart Boswinkel: Stephen, Peter's got his hand up, Peter Koch.

Stephen Deerhake: Yes. Thank you, Peter, go ahead. I'm sorry I didn't see you.

Peter Koch: No, I took it down already. Thank you. Thank you, Jaap, and apologies for keeping you up in the middle of the night. I think what I asked last time was exactly the access to the minutes if they become available, so your more detailed report is very much appreciated. And my plan was to -- because 3166 has relevance here, and obviously also in other working groups in other supporting organizations, to have some more information so that I can establish contact with our national standards body in that regard, and maybe we can coordinate offline between the two of us so that maybe they get infiltrated -- oh, sorry, no, influenced. That was the word I was looking for -- by multiple channels in a consistent way. Thank you.

Jaap Akkerhuis: Yes. Notice I cannot really publish the minutes, but since the German standard body is actually (ph) official member of working group 2, I mean, they will have the official minutes. But, I won't be (inaudible) see (ph) what happens in the working group. I'm not supposed to give details. I mean, I cannot (inaudible). I can only (inaudible) kind of roughly talk about it.

Stephen Deerhake: Well, thank you, Jaap. I want to thank you for your update on that, and I'll let you and Peter sort out what level of greater detail you guys can get into offline. If there are no additional questions for Jaap, can we move on to the next agenda item? I'm holding the floor open for any additional questions. And thank you again, Jaap, for giving us what detail you could give us on this.

And I think, if I understand Adobe correctly, I'm not seeing anything further. We are going into the next agenda item, which is the mind map. And I think I will turn this over to Bart, who can walk us through it. Is that okay with you, Bart? Are we good to go there?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, that's fine. Kim, could you go to the stakeholder analysis mind map, please, the other one?

Stephen Deerhake: I can't tell which one's up, actually. Thank you, Kim.

Kim Carlson: Hey, Bart, can you re-send that to me, please?

Stephen Deerhake: If I understand, Kim, we cannot scroll, is that correct?

Kim Carlson: That is correct.

Stephen Deerhake: Okay. So, just want to put that out there for the working group, that you cannot ask her to release it and have you guys fool around with it individually, for reasons which are beyond my pay scale in ICANN. And what else am I missing here, all these screens?

Bart Boswinkel: I think that one was circulated in -- originally (inaudible). (Inaudible) circulated it yesterday. There we go. On its way, Kim.

Kim Carlson: Thank you.

Bart Boswinkel: Maybe I cannot (inaudible) it. There you are, yes. And again, I think we shared this before. This is just another look at those who are -- the parties who are involved in the process that you've identified. And again, this is based on the workshop in San Juan.

What I've done based on the -- I've listed the different entities, and you discussed it already sometimes. As you can see, the major entries are effectively the significantly interested parties. And going back to the -- we'll see more clearly in a minute once we get to the outline version, is that you've been using the term LIC as well, so Local Internet Communities, for the significantly interested parties. So, there is some -- yes, there is need for additional clarity. The other one is clearly the ccTLD manager. IANAs PTI, or IFO, this is just the ICANN Board, and then the other interested parties.

So, effectively, these are the same type of -- and groups that you could identify based on the work of -- the framework of interpretation of the entities relevant for delegation and transfers of top-level domains. And it's a bit refined, so the more interesting bit is the -- part is the outline version. So, Kim, if you could change to the outline document, the one from Eberhard on this one? Yes, there we go. And again, you see the different parties. And Stephen, may I suggest that you run through the document with asking whether there are questions -- this is a relatively short document -- if there are any comments per page, as we did, and then refer to the line item. This has been in everybody's inbox now for quite some time, with a reference to it.

Stephen Deerhake: Okay, thank you.

Bart Boswinkel: Hand back to you, Stephen.

Stephen Deerhake: Thank you, and I will take over. We are looking at document that has been available for some time. I can't scroll it. I guess Kim can scroll it. I'm not sure who can scroll it. There we go.

Bart Boswinkel: Kim can scroll, that's -- yes, Kim will.

Stephen Deelhake: I guess we can't individually scroll it, so we're going to work with Kim's master scrolling, then. I assumed you guys have all had a look at this, at least, and my question is do we have any questions about what's in front of us here in terms of definitions, mostly were derived from previous work by this community, et cetera, et cetera. And I will formally ask, are there any questions, concerns about what we're looking at in front of us? And if not, I will ask Kim to advance the page. Thank you, Kim.

I will ask the same question. It's all heavily tied into the FOI working group's work. A lot of us were on that group, as well. Some of us weren't. I acknowledge that. Do we have any questions regarding the text in front of us? And I'll give you guys a little bit to read through it. Not seeing, as best I can tell with Adobe, any hands, or people waving or carrying on, saying they have a problem with this. Can we proceed to the next page, Kim? Thank you.

And again, this is what we've been looking at, and with the FOI WG interpretation. Any issues with this text? Apparently, if I can scroll properly, not seeing any hands. Kim, can we go to the next page then, please? And again, give you an opportunity to chew through this again. This is rather meaty, actually. And again, if I understand Adobe correctly, not seeing any hands about this issue, and not hearing anything. Kim, can you advance again, please? Thank you. Includes a page with essentially nothing on it. Kim, can you advance again? Thank you.

And again, got some stuff to flesh out here, but again, Kim, can you advance? So, in 1.4.1 with regards to oversight, guys have had an opportunity to chew through this. I know this is exciting reading material, especially on the beach. I don't see any hands, any issues I don't see. Oh, wait, Peter is showing up here, but I don't see Peter. Where is Peter? Peter Koch, do you have something to say?

Peter Koch: Sorry, did I have my hand up?

Stephen Deelhake: Apparently your mic is active, because I keep seeing your name flashing back and forth alongside mine.

Peter Koch: Oh, I'm sorry. That was a mistake. Sorry.

Stephen Deelhake: Okay, no problem, sir. No problem at all. Kim, could we have the next page, please, I guess? Thank you. This is, again, the whole Netherland Antilles stuff with AN, CW, SX, et cetera, et cetera. I don't think we have any controversy about this last time. I don't see any now. Can we proceed, Kim? Thank you.

And that's the draft, and we've got some more work to flesh it out, but there we stand with that. And I believe we're done. Thank you, Kim. And back up to agenda, I believe, and where do we go from here? Are we at AOB, can it be?

Bart Boswinkel: No, we're in number six.

Stephen Deelhake: Number six, okay. I was hoping so much.

Bart Boswinkel: The second version of the comparative analysis documentation.

Stephen Deelhake: Okay, will you bring that up, and do you want to walk through it?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Stephen Deelhake: Or I should just walk through it?

Bart Boswinkel: Kim, would you -- you can do it this way. Maybe it's easier to go to the mind map first, please. I know it's a bit confusing. Because then I can show you what I've done with it. I made some small changes to the mind map based on the conversations.

Stephen Deerhake: Right, so we should see the mind map, and if you walk through that, then I can walk us through the document proper, yes?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. Yes. So, what you will see is -- where do we go -- (inaudible) notifications has been -- so I'm in number two, notification, so the retirement process itself, number two, notifications, has been simplified and with -- based on the conversation I think two meetings ago, is who is required to inform whom, and when. So, that's more a general question that needs to be -- if you think it's relevant for the policy, that will need to be included and answered. So, that's the first one.

The second change is a need for a specific arrangement documentation. I've redone it a little bit, is to -- with respect to arrangement to show this is based and to make it very clear this is based on the experience to date. So, it is not part of the policy. It is just to inform the discussions on the policy. So, the definitions of roles and responsibilities as an arrangement, but is -- I split it out to the different cases, so the docs (ph) that are YU, NA, it should be AN (inaudible). So, the Netherlands Antilles case, it's AN, not NA. Sorry, apologies, Eberhard.

And then, the need for a specific arrangement and documentation, as you will see in the outline version, I have included a general observation based on this one. That's more -- and that's more a question that you could derive from the discussions you had, is whether such an arrangement is needed, effectively. Once you have a policy, it's the other way around. Because there is no policy, probably an arrangement is needed to define the roles and responsibilities of the parties involved in the manager plan, or in the transition, or to remove the TLD. So, that's a point for discussion in Panama. So, that's a change, as well.

TLD manager plan, again, for clarification and to make very clear, this is based on the experience to date. It has nothing to do with the future policy. It's a recording of what happened, is I got the examples to date. Now, in scenario one and scenario two cases, could do that for this one, as well, the roles and responsibilities. So, that's a change, and the execution manager plan hasn't changed, removal from the root zone database. Again, the -- no changes. If you would look at the top oversight, you'll see no changes -- excuse me, so going back to removal TLD from the root zone database, this is part of the retirement process. There is the reference to the -- a specific reference to the YU removal, because -- and the full resolution is included from the minutes, because this is where you see the reference to the -- and the rationale for the need for a short-term to -- I think it was three years for the removal of a TLD, and that was at the request of Peter last time.

So, these are effectively the major changes, and then -- oh yes, and the final major change, because we spent a lot of time on the first call we discussed this, the Brexit exit is changed, so Brexit -- it's now called the Brexit-like scenario. And as you will see, the language, or the description of this scenario has changed as well. The impact for -- the potential impact has been deleted, but you will see this as soon as we go through the full document. So, that was the update at the mind map level, and then the notes have been changed, as well, following the discussion in the last couple of meetings. Could you change -- can you go to the outline document please, Kim?

The unfortunate thing is we did not have the time nor the ability yet to do a red line, or a comparison of documents, but maybe, Eberhard, is that something we could do for the



next meeting, that would be fine. And just scroll up, and I'll (inaudible) touch it anymore (ph). Eberhard?

Eberhard Lisse: No, we can't. I'm taking the mind map and exporting it via script without at all touching it. What I could do is I could run a DIF (ph) and figure out a way to automate the marking of the differences, but this is an automated process, not a manual process.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, okay. I was just asking, so if it's not feasible, then we have to do it another way, or we -- yes, one way or the other, we mark it up. But -- so, that were the highlights of the different -- and the changes based on your previous discussion, so back to you, Stephen, to run through the document itself. So, my advice would be to, again, do it page-on-page base, although it's relatively quick. I can go through the major changes if you want, but maybe a page-by-page base, and then do it again early on in the Panama meeting so not everybody's on the call who was involved, anyway. (Inaudible.)

Stephen Deelhake: Thank you, Bart. I just was struggling to regain control of Adobe Connect here, because it went full screen on me so I could look at the mind map, and I couldn't get out of it.

So, what we are looking at here is a first view of this. I can't scroll this. I guess only Kim can scroll it. I guess can we go to the second page, Kim, and we can start looking at this. Before I did that, I should have asked everybody if they'd read the first page. Are you good to go on line 10? Is there anybody needs to go back? Because I can't control this. I'm assuming the answer's no, so can you continue reading on, assuming you've also looked at this beforehand? Can we go to the next page, Kim? Thank you.

And these are examples, seemingly each obscure but in totality rather significant. And I think it's also important to note that it's been a while since this happened, but nonetheless, it could happen again. And of course, in the Netherlands Antilles, we had a lot of action of late. So, if we can go on to the next page, Kim? Thank you, Kimberly.

Are we -- anybody has any issues with the text that we're looking at here?

Bart Boswinkel: This is -- Stephen, this is Bart.

Stephen Deelhake: Yes, Bart.

Bart Boswinkel: There is a small change to lines 45 through 47, or 45, 46, based on the comments from Peter at the time. So, it's just now -- it was, after a few years, the SU code was included in this, so that's actually a reserve code.

Stephen Deelhake: Right.

Bart Boswinkel: That's it. There was some additional language there initially. So, that's changed. Maybe let's do it that way (ph). I'll explain per page if I recall what has changed, and then you can look at it.

Stephen Deelhake: If you can do that, that would be great. I guess, Kim, you're scrolling, so keep scrolling. Somebody gets to scroll.

Bart Boswinkel: Then, the second -- so, the second major change was that's where you spend a lot of time. That came back two meetings ago. That's the -- at the end of -- starting with line 61, page four, and moving up to page -- or to line number 73, the Brexit-like scenario, it's the scenario that's of something moving away. Example, and I've used -- and this time I've looked it up -- it's the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, (inaudible) the European Union to have a full description. Most importantly, as you can see, that the impact of -- and the mentioning of the 350,000 domain names has been removed, and if

there is an impact, it manifests itself at the level of local policy, and is out of scope of the ccNSO policy remit. So, I think that removes the really controversial parts of this scenario, and this part is, anyway, out of context, but if you want to move on--.

Stephen Deelhake: --Yes. Can we slice and dice that out for the next iteration, or do we want to put it into a -- perhaps we should put it into an appendix saying we've looked at it, and it's out of scope, and just document that we look at it.

Bart Boswinkel: I think what you -- and this goes back to the discussion you had initially. So, you can -- the first version was a starting point. This is a follow-up version, and we need to discuss it because people with a real interest in that text at the time are not on the call, and they sent their apology. And so, they need to look at it again so we can do that and say -- what I could do is highlight those areas that have been changed so they have the time to look at it, because you start -- this is the next iteration. Don't compare it as, say, you want to focus on the common text. That's the advantage of red line.

Stephen Deelhake: Okay.

Bart Boswinkel: Shall we move on? Shall we move on?

Stephen Deelhake: Yes, (inaudible). Thank you, Kim.

Bart Boswinkel: Again, that's what I said. 1.2.2, line 81, that has changed. It's significantly easier this way, and thanks, Liz, for suggesting it at the time. But, it remains a question that needs to be answered as part of the policy, probably. Next page.

Stephen Deelhake: Thank you, Kim, next page. One more, I think.

Bart Boswinkel: And need for specific -- this is what I just said, need for specific arrangement. This was rearranged, and the text, 92, 96, and I see some typos. 92, 96 is now included, and to capture a question that crossed my mind, so this is just stronger language that -- whether there is a need for a specific arrangement documentation at the start of the process, whether that is -- was needed, because there was no policy in place, and if that's the case, then the question becomes do you want to have -- is it needed if there is a policy in place, because as all of you know, currently there is no policy. So, again, I just want to mention it, when (ph) no arrangement is one angle, nothing change that. Next page, please, Kim. Go to page nine.

Page nine, as I said, I differentiated the different cases because they record history and nothing else. And just to show at a very high level what I -- not without going into recording all the IANA reports or the Board decision trying to summarize what's in there just as a description. And this is based on the scenario one and two document. So, this is page nine, is the YU case, and the next page is I think page -- please go to page 10, Kim - the NA case, AN case, as I said. So again, apologies, Eberhard, so it's the AN case. And then, the--.

Stephen Deelhake: --Yes, but we have line numbers we can refer to when we've got -- if anybody's got an issue with this, going forward.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. And then, that's it with respect to the arrangement, but there is a bit of -- so that was the change, but no change in language with exception of the remarks at the first point. No comment. Please go to page 11, starting with line 167. Again, TLD manager plan included the examples to date. Next page, so scenario one, and these are -- and then the scenario two cases, yes, and so there are no changes with it. There's no change in language there, so this was just more a rearrangement than anything else. Page 13, no changes. Page 14, no changes.

- Stephen Deelhake: Bart, if I can stop you here for a moment and ask the group, does anybody have any concerns, issues, with what we're going through now, or not? Not seeing any hands, if I understand Adobe. Bart, continue, please, sir.
- Bart Boswinkel: Yes. Page 15, what to include in the policy. Again, there is no change. The only thing is there is, as you know, temporary caretaker. What has been added was from the notes, that it was used and that you agree to do it, so that's more an extension approval. So, page 16, nothing needed. Kim, I can scroll, as well. Execution manager plan, again, no changes there. Removal, also no changes, ICANN Board decision notifications, no changes. Execution of removals (ph), again, cases to date. It shows this is all about the recording what has happened in the past. And there's some typos. And the recorded Board decision of YU, that's been added because probably that's the richest text on the consideration, so included it all, but it -- as it's now included, you should really (inaudible).
- Stephen Deelhake: And Bart, again, if I can interrupt you, I would encourage everybody to read that particular part of the document, because it's kind of meaty. Thank you. Continue, Bart.
- Bart Boswinkel: Yes. So, that's page 22 and 23 and 24, 25, so that's all -- this is directly quoted from the Board decision. So, I would strongly advise against changing the language, as this is cut-and-paste from the Board minutes, from that meeting of September 2007.
- Stephen Deelhake: I agree with you, Bart, on that. And if there's any issue with that from the group, please feel free to express it either now or on the list. Thank you. Continue, Bart.
- Bart Boswinkel: Process management, no change. Timing, again, no change. Again, these are just for -- because we didn't spend too much time on it last time, is that you've got different -- if you talk about timing and the duration of process, I think when you start thinking about it -- sorry, scroll down. I want to make this (inaudible) -- there are different times that you have to deal with, so that's the anticipated duration of the process. This is effective date, et cetera, that may say initially, or the anticipated date, and then the real effective date getting closer, because there will be circumstances where (inaudible) at least based on the experience to date. So, probably -- and this is something to discuss further in Panama, is the -- if you talk about timing, duration, think about the different events from a anticipatory view and from when it effectively will happen, and when it's affected (ph). These are all different views on the timing issues.
- So, oversight, no changes there either. And--.
- Stephen Deelhake: --Yes, we've got more stuff to flesh out.
- Bart Boswinkel: That's the point and decision. Again, the decision of reviews, this is more which type of decision you think need to be reviewed at the time, but that will move into the data policy itself. So, that's the outline overview based on your previous comments. I realize it's been sent today. So, if you take your time over the next one and a half weeks to look at it before we hit the Panama meeting, and those who are not on the call do at the time, as well, so we'll remind them by e-mail. We can start off by a brief run-through again. I'll show again the highlights, if there are some comments. I think then you have a sound basis for the next step, what should be in the process, or what's process that should be included in the policy.
- So, back to you, Stephen.
- Stephen Deelhake: Thank you, Bart. That sounds good. We've got some reading to do before Panama. We have some thinking to do before Panama. And we've got to flesh out this obviously some

more, but I think we're making some solid progress. Are there any comments from anybody participating who would like to say anything about this? Floor is open to everyone. And I'm looking. I think I'm looking at deathly silence, if I understand Adobe correctly.

Bart Boswinkel: You do understand Adobe correctly.

Stephen Deelhake: Well, I'm not so sure, actually, Bart. There we go, nope. I have a hand up. Liz? Greetings from Australia. How are you? Good morning.

Liz Williams: Very well, thank you. Very lovely day here. It's been terribly dry, so we desperately need the rain.

Stephen Deelhake: We can barely hear you. If you can do something about your audio, that would be appreciative.

Liz Williams: How's that? Can you hear me now?

Stephen Deelhake: Not much better, but carry on.

Liz Williams: Okay, I'll be quick. I just wondered if you--.

Stephen Deelhake: --That's much better.

Liz Williams: Could you quickly review the scope of the meeting for Panama? Just -- or you said it at the very beginning, but I just wondered if you could quickly run through the plan for Panama and what we're going to achieve there.

Stephen Deelhake: The plan for Panama is under development. It's going to be I think similar to what we did in Puerto Rico, so count on a rather highly interactive meeting as we shift into our next phase in trying to sort out what we're doing here, which means group breakouts and flip charts and collecting all the information and putting -- having staff get mind maps organized around what we brainstorm during the course of that three hours. That help you out?

Bart Boswinkel: Stephen, this is Bart.

Stephen Deelhake: Yes.

Bart Boswinkel: Maybe make it a little bit more focused in the sense of if we could conclude this bit around the mind map of the comparative analysis, because you've got -- at the start of the meeting, and that shouldn't take too much time, I hope. Then start thinking, and that's where the group really needs to start working on it. You've got all the information in front of you, and I don't mind producing these mind maps and putting them on the wall. And then, the working group could start thinking what should be included in the process itself. So, this is all being descriptive. This is all past (ph).

Now, looking forward, what does the group think needs to be included in the--.

Stephen Deelhake: --We're trying to transition into policy.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, based on then (ph), and maybe there are elements in here that you think, and that's why you need this as a basis, or that's why we thought you could use this as a basis. There are elements in this policy that need to be fleshed out, but maybe they should not even be included in the policy. Maybe there is something missing that should be included in the policy, so that's the first iteration. And once -- and then, you have a

discussion at, say, a bit of a conceptual level what should and what should not be included in the policy, and the next step is filling in these different, I would say, steps or concepts or topics, subtopics, however you want to call them, and maybe you can use language that's already included based on the past, but start filling it in. And in that way, you build the story and the policy based on what's already available. So, that is, from a substantive point of view, the plan for -- to date. And maybe that will change the plan for Panama. And that's why we have a three-hour session.

Stephen Deerhake: That was more eloquently expressed than I was doing, but yes, that is expressed, Liz, what current thinking is with regards to the Panama meeting. And I think we can achieve that and really move into some substantive policy development work now that we have pretty much ferreted out what the problem, quote, is, unquote. Liz, does that answer your question, or at least give you some ideas as to where we're going?

Liz Williams: Thank you, Stephen. I've sent in the chat a thank-you to you both. Thank you.

Stephen Deerhake: Oh, yes, I see that. Yes. So, I'm thinking we're going to have a really -- once again, another highly interactive session in Panama where we can break out and discuss this and that and capture the beginnings of policy and start getting that organized now that we've got a handle on the overall issues, shall we say. I don't want to use the word "problems," but the overall issues. So, I hope that works for you. Anything additionally, Liz?

Liz Williams: No thank you, Stephen. All good, thank you.

Stephen Deerhake: All right. Thank you so much. Anyone else, any question here with regards to the next meeting? And I'm seeing none, I think. I could start calling out people, call out the Canadian, but he probably won't talk to me. Anybody else on anything? I guess, Bart, where are we now at -- we kind of skipped AOB and went to next meeting, or should we go back to AOB, or -- who's keeping track here?

Bart Boswinkel: Excuse me, I was on mute. I think there are no -- Liz's question was around AOB, so you can adjourn.

Stephen Deerhake: Was that an AOB or a next-meeting question? Any more AOB, formally requesting of the group? And I see none. Next meeting, therefore, will be our face-to-face meeting, which will be on Thursday morning in Panama. I hope to see as many of you as possible, and I wish everybody safe travels for those who are coming down to Panama. And we will see you there, and we will take up this task then and there. And I think with that, barring any comments from anybody else if they wish to raise their hands, I think we will call this meeting adjourned, and we'll see you in Panama. And I thank you all. And Jaap, yes, it's time for you to go to bed, time for everybody in Europe to go to bed. Thank you so much, everyone.

Bart Boswinkel: Okay, bye-bye.

Stephen Deerhake: Bye, everybody.

Peter Koch: Bye-bye, good night.

Stephen Deerhake: Good night. Thank you, Peter. Thank you, Kimberly. Thank you, Bart.