BART BOSWINKEL: Thank you. Stephen, over to you.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Bart. I assume I can be heard? Good morning, good afternoon and good evening, and welcome to the first post ICANN 62 teleconference of the PDP working group on the requirement of ccTLDs. I specifically want to thank Kimberly for getting up really early to support us with her behind the scenes magic as always.

Welcome back to the land of Adobe Connect, and that's all I intend to say about the platform that ICANN has chosen for our teleconferences. I want to thank those of you who were able to attend our recent face-to-face in Panama, and those who participated remotely. Apparently, there were a couple of you, I don't know who you were however. I think we made some good progress in Panama, getting up from our seats and congregating, book charts and take us out of our comfort zones but I think it's been very useful in the process [AUDIO BREAK] forward in both San Juan and the Panama meeting.

I'm not aware of any specific action items as called for in agenda, item number two, so let me turn to a couple of housekeeping items under agenda item number three. Kim, if you can put up the slide if you have it with URLs that would be great. What I want to do here is just remind everyone, both our charter and our agree-to rules of engagement. I think it's useful for all of us, whether charter members of this group or more recent members of this working group to periodically revisit these documents and just have what in them in our heads going forward.

I also would encourage everyone to read or re-read the final report of the framework of interpretation working group, it's short, crisp, but it's also current ICANN policy and indeed it's what's brought us here together today.

In some further housekeeping news, I suspect that a lot of you like me have been going somewhat nuts trying to keep track of what are the current documents, the mind maps, the textual variance of the min maps, etcetera, etcetera. So, I and the Vice Chair of ICAAN staff are well aware of this issue, and we've been endeavoring to get things sorted out before the next teleconference meeting at the end of August that we will have a coherent version naming convention and proper posting of documents in the Wiki Space in place before that next meeting.

I would have Al address this, but he is not yet on the call it appears. At least, I don't see him.

ALAN MCGILLVRAY: I am.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Eberhard, do you want to talk a little bit about the naming stuff you want to have proposed, or should I just continue?

EBERHARD W. LISSE: I can do this. Hi everybody. We noticed that we have about 125 files lying around in the directory, and for me it was very difficult to find the latest document to work with. So, we decided ICANN has a similar,

some of the documents have long names and a little bit of systematic in it. Independently of ICANN we thought we'd put some systematic in there. We have belatedly sent out documents about an hour ago, and our apologies. When I came back I was swamped at work, and so it took a little bit longer and we had time difference so we couldn't get it up on time. Sorry about that, we'll try not to let it happen again.

If you look in that e-mail you would find that these files are now systematically made. And what scheme we used doesn't matter, we will try to, if we make documents on teleconference, if we make it as a teleconference and put a topic and then the date. Face-to-face meeting, we make the similar thing, and if we upload to Mind Map, we keep the name, change the date, so we have a chronology of sorts. It serves nicely in the directory, and we can then also phonetically have differentials in redline between two documents and see what has changed from one document to the other.

I do not like to have more than one, to compare more than two documents because then it becomes very difficult to handle, and you can always go with such a scheme from version to version. The idea is basically that when you look in the safety things in the same directory, and you look, but it's easy to say, "Okay look, I depend on my documents, these are the Barcelona, these are the telephone conference, this is the policy, this is the comparative analysis, this is the root of engagements and so forth." Unless there is any strenuous objections, I propose that we carry on. If somebody has better naming and proposals, just let them know we are not very high on what name a particular document has, as long as we remain systematic and it's easy to use.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, El. I also want to mention that at ICANN 62, Bart impersonated Yapp and presented Yapp ISO 3166 over to the GAC, and I thank Bart for doing that. I'm also still trying to recruit active GAC participation in this working group. If I have a breakthrough on this, I will let you know via the mailing list. I think that's about it for housekeeping, unless Bart, I've overlooked anything; have I that you're aware of?

BART BOSWINKEL: Nope.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: If that's the case, let me move on to item 4, which is --

EBERHARD W. LISSE: You overlooked my hand.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yes, I have a hand up, Eberhard, I'm not used to Adobe, and it's early in the day, but go ahead.

EBERHARD W. LISSE: It's unfortunately that I forgot what I was going to say.

EN

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Ah, age is a beautiful thing.

EBERHARD W. LISSE: I'll come back to it.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: If you figure it out, we'll come back to it on AOB, how about that? If I can move onto item 4, I think we're essentially done with the comparative analysis for this exercise. Admittedly we have some loose ends in some of our documents produced today, but I think whether or not we get around to filling out the last little bits and pieces is less important than moving forward and building up on our face-to-face work from Panama. Because none of the documents we've produced to date are "final work product documents," they're really scratch documents at this sort and that sort and that's why I'm not that fussed if they're not completely neat and tidy.

So, before I formally close out the item, are there any comments from the working group and I'm looking at hands being raised. And, I see none. That being the case, I think we can move onto item 5 of the agenda, which is the heart of our meeting today. Kim, I guess at this point if you can put up the consolidated overview core elements mind map, we can start diving into that. This mind map, Bart, is attempting to capture beginning in the upper right-hand corner, the important points that each of the three breakout groups in Panama identified. I think at this point, I will turn things over to Bart who can walk us through this. Are you good with that, Bart?

EN

BART BOSWINKEL: Yes, I'm fine. So, let me explain, those of you who were not in Panama, we had a breakout session again as Stephen alluded to, and the real question at the time was; if you saw the previous mind maps and based on the comparative analysis of scenario one and two, it had a lot of elements over there. And, the question for the breakout groups and for the primary meeting was; they're looking at the mind map, but also based on the discussions we had to date, we'll definitely must be included in the upcoming or the new policy, so that's item number one, which should not and shall not be included. Maybe included. And then, a fourth category that was more the daily discussions and questions raised as a result of this exercise.

Again, we used the three groups that were pre-defined in San Juan, those who were attending were the core of these groups and new members and interested people who were interested in [inaudible], so that's why you see group one, two, and three listed everywhere.

I assume you've seen the notes from [inaudible], following the face to face working group, and this is the results of the reporting back of these HLD's individual groups. So, the way to read this, and there will be an outline version, which is in the package that Eberhard just sent out, so there is more text to it as well, but the starting point is, so what definitely groups things must be included, so group one, and you can read it yourself, hopefully I can increase the size a little bit, yes, so I'll move over, I hope you can see this properly. So, group one thinks that a trigger event as to say from the comparative analysis should be included, notification, and end of life plan response, and what should be

in the end of life band and around it is the board approval of the plan, oversight of the execution were to provide assess, or you can read it yourself.

So, this was what group one felt needed to be included, and explained this to the group, and some of the explanation is included in the notes of the mind map, which is included in the outline document. The second group, group two, again as you can see, included a trigger event, notification and specifically reference a time-frame to total duration of the process, default actions, etcetera, and again, you can read at your leisure.

Group three, so again, included again other elements, but say, there are some similarities like the triggering event which is considered here. The scope of the policy, the procedures and what should be included there is something else. The review mechanism, so that's a reference to the second policy of a second working group, which will be the launch as soon as this one over the governor's role. Another thing was the review of the policy itself, once developed, the plan and checklist. That's with respect that the different groups felt, I'll reduce the size again, otherwise you lose track. That's what the different groups felt needed to be included in the policy.

I'll get back to how to deal with it in the next phase. Interestingly enough, some of the groups also, all of them because that was an explicit question, referenced some topics that should not be included in the policy, which almost is a nice part of it, it defines the policy more or less or the scope. So, group one as you can read is a reference to Bart's cases. I don't know whether they meant cases should not be addressed

EN

proactively, so cases should not be addressed- so, going back in time, deal with cases from the past. Reasons for coaching should not be included, so that was group one.

Group two; making policy on the fly and interference with their policy. That's an interesting observation because it relates to the limit of the policy development scope of the ccNSO as well, and that will be, as you will see, one of the major question coming up, and also identified a risk, the process may be sold so maybe that's not to be treated and not to be included, but they list it as not to be included, so we didn't want to change that and the group three, no pressure on ISO MA, and their internal processes, and this is probably the way I interpreted what they are saying, but I could be wrong that people from group three are on the call, is say given the discussions currently, conducted in ISO 66MA and working group two around the definitions, they should run their own course. And, that has, because this is external to our environment and external to ICANN, pressurizing it again from by the working group would interfere in the processes of ISO, and we had gross effects of that.

What may be included; group one and three didn't mention anything there, they didn't discuss it probably because they were focusing on the other question points. But, group two say a project and process between new and old operator. So again, that is something that could or could not be included.

Moving over to the open questions as recorded, so the group one presented and discussed with the other groups a point about the involvement of the board and you can see in other groups as well. In

the outline you will see there is a response, a tentative response, which will probably need to be documented properly, but I just want to mention it right now. A similar kind of question with respect to the PTI board, so that's group one. And, what is a decision, and an interesting observation was; what about if a manager is non-cooperative, the ccTLD manager who does not want to cooperate, there is a policy in place, who doesn't want to cooperate with to effect with the policies. So, that's one, and again, that's' related to another set of questions with how [inaudible].

Group two was how to ensure adherence to the plan. Again, as a question and that's related to non-cooperativeness and also probably in some of the items in there that must be included. Identify sunset process; it was raised as a question, you could also maybe could link it to; must be included as the other one. The scope of the policy was raised as a question by group two, and as you may have seen, it was also a part of one of the groups of their, say, must be included.

The policy change in 2012, this relates to the role of the ICANN board of directors. Contractual arrangements, is there any effect, especially around the new, I think that was the reference the IANA naming functions contract. But again, this is included in the overview, which is the outline version.

Then, group three, resistant or non-cooperative manager, how to deal with it, does the policy apply retroactively? Again, that was addressed in some of the other groups, or planning group; how do you ensure, and what is the scope of the policy. And then the question mark; should there be long stop date, and again, that's ultimately the interesting

EN

question. Because, say if it includes a long stop date, you could end up with a very simple policy by that end, long stop date. The ccTLD needed to be removed, for example, but that probably is too simple. Storing how to deal with it, what is now continued business, incumbent.

Again, all questions around this had to do with, say with specific cases I would say. IFO's so that IANA function operator, and now the interesting bit again with respect to the scope of this policy; does the policy apply to ccNSO members? Therefore, your information was not often familiar with the article ten of the ICANN bylaws, say, one of the sections in it refers to that policy development, or to the ccNSO policy development policy only applies to members. There are some exemptions there as well, and then the board position; how it- what is meant by it.

But, that's the basic high-level overview of the result of the face-to-face, and a starting point for the next steps. Now, Stephen, I don't know if you want me to continue, or if you want to raise the next steps?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I'll let you continue on. Okay, thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL: So, I think that the first question, and I see that there are people who are on the different working groups at the face-to-face meeting, maybe we should ask the question by e-mail as well over the next week, because this is a starting point for the next stage; does this capture the results from your perspective of the face-to-face session?

We'll circulate the notes again, and the pictures from the sessions, but as a starting point, if you feel something is not captures or should be captured in a different way, please include it. Those people who were not able to be there in person, if you have any questions around this, please send them to the list over next week so we can clarify, say the outcome of this mind map and the basic outline version.

I think in the next step, I'll allude to it in a minute, say what we're going to discuss in the next phase is interesting. This is just a stock taking of the results of the face-to-face-so I hear some background noise- Stephen, go ahead?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I can jump back in here. Just want to make sure that for those who were to re-emphasize for those who were at the face-to-face in Panama, something that your group came up with on this mind map, because we're really trying to capture everything of import that the various groups put together, so if you see something missing and you were in Panama, by all means, raise your hand and speak and let us know, thank you. Back to you, Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL: Pardon me, if you do not -- you can hear me now? So, if you have some questions regarding this overview, please send them to do this or comment if I haven't captured, because that may explain the next phase. If, let's say after a discussion with the leadership of the working group, the next phase is to try to capture the common elements and maybe even add some language to it and the trigger event, and based

on the discussions to date, we already had some language around what could consist of that trigger event, and define that of, "That must be included." To find the commonalities, but also the differences between group one, two and three to start the discussion and hopefully first focus on what the group, and what you think should be included and what everybody had in common, so that will be easier.

Then, focus the next call on what the difference is between the different groups. For example, group three has; scope of policy and however you slice or dice this, you do not see this in group one or two, but you see it back in the questions, so whether this should be included in the description or in the policy itself or not, that's open for debate and it is not clear based on the results of the face to face whether there is a common understanding, it needs to be included.

I hope this is similar to the review mechanism and governance role, maybe people didn't have the time or thought about it, but at least you see that two of the three groups did include the review mechanism and governance roles. One group was not explicit about it, or did not include it, so that's something to discuss; whether it should be and must be included in the policy, and if so, how it should look like in the next version.

So, that will be the next phase of this mind map, so this is just an intermediate one, the overview, for the next call we'll prepare a mind map where there is no reference to the groups anymore, but only two must be included elements that were shared, and there was say, not a common understanding that it needs to be included.

Similarly, with respect to "not to be included," again, there is a difference and maybe it's going to be interesting to see where there are some debate, everything that is listed here of not to be included, it should still be there, and "maybe included," again, with respect to the questions, I think what we'll do is try to attempt to refer these questions based on the results of the meeting, and also to the points, "must be included," and "should not be included," and these open dose questions which do not have a link, so we do not forget about them. Sorry, making you seasick moving all over.

That would be the next phase, is using the output as agreed by you, from the face-to-face meeting, and then start filling in the high-level topics for, so capture the high-level topics for the policy, and then start filling in the different topics, and hopefully by say, the Barcelona meeting, we do have a robust version of, say, based on the output of Panama should be included and even some rough language around it. That's the next phase, back to you, Stephen, unless, of course, if there are questions, remarks, please let me know.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Bart. Are here any questions from the group on the mind map, and I think specifically the categories; "must be included," "must not be included," and particularly I think the latter one is a very interesting category that perhaps we should spend some additional time trying to flush out, but I'm opening up the floor to anyone who may have some specific comments on the mind map, or might want to add some additional items post-Panama.

BART BOSWINKEL: Also, on the way forward.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: On the way forward, correct. And, I see no hands. Am I reading correct? Yeah, okay, does anybody have a comment on anything with regards to where we are on this? I see our silence is deafening. I see Liz has got her hand up, so Liz, go ahead?

LIZ WILLIAMS: Hello everybody. It's very nice [inaudible]. And Bart, I was following along.

BART BOSWINKEL: I can't hear.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Liz, can you fix your audio for us please? Your audio is very weak.

LIZ WILLIAMS: Sorry, is that better?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Somewhat, yes.

BART BOSWINKEL: No.

LIZ WILLIAMS: Bart, I'll put it into the chat bar, I'm sorry, okay I've got limited bandwidth.

BART BOSWINKEL: Okay. You sound like you are far away from the microphone.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: She's going to put whatever her comment is in the chat, apparently. No questions to each player, color code where the groups have a theme. Brent, can you qualify that remark in the chat about color coding?

BART BOSWINKEL: While he is doing that, I think we can, under mind map, link topics with arrows together so that's one way of doing it.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I think this will be somewhat simplified for the next meeting because we are going to collapse the commonality of what the groups came up with, so certainly the upper right had corner will be much simpler.

I was thinking about this just now; we don't need to do that, we basically need to synthesize this, and say, "Commonalities going on we basically move into the group chat and say, "This is the topics that were in our groups, and then we have got, that's it." We basically remove

group one, group two and group three and then combine the things that can be combined, yeah, so that's the plan to have that done before the next meeting. Bart, can you address Liz' question that's in the chat?

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah, it's rather easy. Well, probably not be easy, but one of the things that I think we can do with the mind maps, and that's why if you look at it, you see these weird scribbles, like for example on group, say, "Item one must be included," group three at 137 you see these scribbles, plan, there you are, and the other one as well. These scribbles effectively the way to read this as well, and the way you can read this is; these are headings on an outline, and these scribbles are effectively the language you put into a report.

If you would look at the documents we've shared with you, which we read, the documents effectively are the outline version of these mind maps. It's a combination of say the headings, and it must be included or a section or paragraph. Or, chapter 1, group 3 is section 1.3, and then you go up at the level of paragraphs, 1.3.A checklist is a heading of a paragraph, and then you put in the language, and that's the way you could capture a lot of discussions fairly easy.

I think once this is done, then you revisit what you've got and then you turn it into a quality-like document and again, that's something for further discussion closer to either in Barcelona or closer to, or just beyond, depends on where we are in the process, how the ultimate policy recommendations should look like, whether it should be something like the FOY document which is pretty concise, but that's an

EN

interpretation and it's a policy-related document, not a policy in itself, or more like the overall policy, which is another way of presenting the information.

I hope this answers your question, and I see Peter had some remarks around this as well. What we could do the next time as well, say, just to introduce the next version is use this document that is mind map and the related outline, and one of the documents that is included, sorry, one of the conventions around the naming of documents we want to include is, for example, this is called the consolidated overview, and whether it's a mind map version or the outline version, so you know which relates to which, and there will be the same date and the same version number in it. So, you can easily switch from one to the other.

Definitely not adding text to the mind map, because then you lose the whole function of the mind map, it's just a utility, it's just a tool to capture high-level concepts, but not the real language. That's what you do in an outline version and build on that. Okay, thank you.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Bart. Do we have any other comments or thoughts from the group regarding this specific mind map? It's critical that we come to agreement that we have captured what, accurately captured what was discussed by the various groups in Panama, so that we don't lose anything, particularly when we combine the thoughts of the group. So, those who are in either group one, two, or three who think there might be something missing, please speak up now if you believe we are remiss in what we presented here.

BART BOSWINKEL: Or, we can do so over the e-mail list over the next couple of days.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: But, I'm sure that into next week I think would make sense, but try to, if you see anything remiss, try to get back to us within the week from today so that we know what's going on, so that we can capture anything that we've missed out on. Bart, I thank you for doing this presentation on this. I think it does capture the essence of both the [inaudible] notes and what actually transpired in Panama, and I think it's a pretty solid starting point.

BART BOSWINKEL: And we will also circulate the pictures of the [inaudible], took some pictures, so they will be circulated as well.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yeah, I assume we'll have those up as part of our collection of documents as well, because actually those are kind of interesting because of the approaches taken by the three groups were rather different on that, so that would be good to have if it's available as well on that.

Do we have any further comments regarding the mind map and the way forward on this? I would especially like to encourage you to think about that the stuff that the groups said should be excluded. In some respects, I find that more interesting than the stuff that we think must

be included. We're specifically looking at tiptoeing around some things, and I think that's going to require some serious thinking. In lieu of any additional comments, Bart, do you think we should try to wrap this up, or do you have anything else you were going to-?

BART BOSWINKEL:	No, just to say, Kim just notified me that she could put up the outline version, maybe it's an idea just to…

STEPHEN DEERHAKE:	Should we take a peek at that? Just to show you what we were talking about. Again, and these are the documents, they should look familiar, but as you can see, this is the way to see what all was captured in [inaudible] notes, and where we can start discussing what needs to be included, and questions and responses to these questions. And, based on your discussions, capturing it that we can start filling this in. Bart, you've got your hand up?

BART BOSWINKEL:	Automatic consolation from the mind map, on the mind map you saw this little icon, and the text was selected below the bullet-point, so at line 35, it would be the bullet-point that you can see on the mind map, and 36 to 37 would be, let's say, in the smaller icon. The other method of consolation is in intervention, it comes, but if changes need to be made, it's strictly made to the mind map, now you are on the same process again.

This is what's in your pack this morning, please check it this way and the mind map, and we'll send a note and the pictures around as well to the list today. That's about it from my end on this item, item 5 on the agenda. Okay, back to you, Stephen.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Bart. That being the case with no further comments from the group, Alan's got his hand up, so Alan, go ahead?

ALAN MCGILLVRAY: Thank you Stephen. Firstly, I'm a little late this morning, I apologize to the group. I have something I'd like to raise under AOB, are we at that point yet, or should I stand down for a moment?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Actually, if you could stand down for a moment, we will be getting to AOB very shortly, so if you can hold that thought, that would be great. Moving onto item 6 then, and our next meeting is tentatively scheduled for the 30th of August, at 1800UTC, we will also be having meetings on the 13th of September, the 27th of September, and the 11th of October in our run up to Barcelona, so we have four opportunities to get further along and actually develop some policy between now and Barcelona's face-to-face meeting. I just want to bring that to your attention.

We do have a bit of a break between now and the end of August, so the people in the Northern Hemisphere can enjoy a little holiday. Action; does that involve getting on the phone to have a call with a working group. So, with that, Alan, if I can turn things over back to you on AOB?

ALAN MCGILLVRAY:
Well, thank you Stephen, this is Alan MacGilvray, firstly, I found the discussion that we had in Panama very, very stimulating, and one thought that struck me there and I thought I would raise it perhaps again here is; whether as a result of our policy it would allude to what one could call an involuntary retirement, that is to say, the retirement of a ccTLD without the agreement of the manager or the former country, or whatever you want to call it.

And, for me, I think we should have an early discussion of that question, because it will, at least in my mind, would drive the policy, because if we had a policy that could end in this result, it could be very different than if we had a policy in which there would be no involuntary. So, I think we should have an early, at least an opening discussion of that questions, and I would, and if others agree, we should decide when to have that discussion, thank you.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE:
Thank you, Alan. I agree that discussion should be had, but I also believe that at the end of the day, given that this policy would only apply to a CC member, that the way out of having said policy apply to a registry would be for that registry, if they were a CC member to withdraw from the ccNSO, but I agree, we should have that discussion. I am happy to entertain that as an agenda item for the August call, if people want to think about that question between now and then, and perhaps get a little discussion going on the list, that would be great.

EN

And, it would be nice also of course to hear from PTI on this, hint, hint, Kim. I'm happy to entertain that as an agenda item for the next call and carve out a little time. So, if people want to start thinking about that between now and the end of August, that would be great. Does that work for you, Alan?

ALAN MCGILLVRAY: Steve, that's perfect, thank you very much.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Great, and see Eberhard's got his hand up as well, so I will turn the floor over the Eberhard. Go ahead, El.

EBERHARD W. LISSE: Involuntary retirement is not possible.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: You need to speak up, we cannot hear you very well.

EBERHARD W. LISSE: Involuntary retirement is not possible, because we only deal with issues caused by changes on the ISO code. We will discuss this more on the mailing list, but I'm convinced that this is an issue that will concern us much.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Okay, thank you for that. Let's see, any other business that we need to attend to- I might be missing something.

BART BOSWINKEL: Stephen, this is Bart, around this same topic, if I understand Alan's question correctly, it's a non-voluntary retirement, and you did say involuntary?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Non-voluntary, I understood it, Alan, you have your hand up, so the floor is yours.

ALAN MCGILLVRAY: I just, certainly the way I see it is, if, let's look at the case of SU, okay, there was a country dissolved, now certainly SU was moved to the reserved list, but let's say there was a situation in the future where a country came off of the list, we went through a transition process, and the manager simply refused to transition out and wished to continue to operate the ccTLD, even though it was no longer on the 3166 list. What would we do in that situation? Would we go against the wishes of the manager and remove it from the root, or would we not? But, maybe we need even some work around the question, thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL: Sorry, that was not the reason…yes, I'm asking, what I suggest just to be on the safe side, but I do like the explanation, let me put it on the list of questions, because I think this is a debate about the scope of the policy

EN

as well, and there are some questions around the scope of policy, so we don't need to say it will be addressed in the context of the other questions as well relating to the scope and also, for example, of the questions that was document was, "What if a ccTLD manager is non-cooperative?"

Whether that's non-voluntary, that's the other side. In my view it looks at the same set of issues, so I'll capture this, if you agree, I'll capture this as one of the questions that needs to be addressed under the list of questions and discussion.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Bart, I just want to note that the chat is getting interesting with regards to this concept as well, so we need to capture what's going on in there as part of the notes going forward.

I gave you guys the list of the next meetings. September will be pretty busy, and we will be vising October as well on the run up to Panama. I'm not quite sure of the times of the October meetings, but we'll get that out on the list shortly. I believe then, in view of…is that an old hand or a new hand, Eberhard?

EBERHARD W. LISSE: New hand.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Okay, the floor is yours, go ahead.

EN

EBERHARD W. LISSE: I think what everyone mentioned, is not a fundamental issue of our working group, it is only whether it's a voluntary or involuntary element is not so much an issue for our group, we just need to have a policy be acknowledge with things ccTLD, sorry, and if an offer to identify is removed from the active list in ccTLD, ICANN can no policy what to do, so we will make such a policy.

Now, if you are non ccTLD, we don't have to abide by it, but you would soon get to move from the root eventually, you have to come up with remedies maybe. Generally, we need to develop a policy that is reasonable so that a member of ccTLD is involvement is minute. Maybe one every five to ten years at the most. So, it's not something we need to be overly concerned about how much drama this is going to be.

And, countless involved are aware of what's happening in plans, so ccTLD managers will be aware of what's going to happen. If they don't like it, well, in the end, it's tough luck. If the [inaudible] ceases to exist, the ccTLD eventually will go away. We basically don't need to debate any of this other than how long it's eventually going to be, and how it's eventually going to work. But, if it happens, whether you are CCNS member or not, in the end, the ccTLD will go on after it

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: All right, thank you for that. I certainly can see that we should be able to continue this discussion on the list with some degree of vigor with regards to viewpoints. I do not, myself, have given it sufficient thought that the ISO table prevailed over everything. If we can discussion on

with that would be great, and I think Alan is quite correct in that we really need to nail this question down sooner rather than later, because it will shake the policy in a very fundamental way going forward. Bart, I see you have your hand up?

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah, there is nothing to do with this topic, I just want to -- if you've closed this one, I just want to go back to the meetings.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Okay, let me poll the group; are there any further comments on this particular issue that Alan's brought up at this point in time from anybody on the group, if so, raise your hand. Not seeing any hands, I'll turn it back to Bart, and go back to whatever you want to go back to Bart. The floor is yours.

BART BOSWINKEL: The point is -- thank you Stephen -- the point is, about the face-to-face meeting in Barcelona. We mentioned it a couple of times, unfortunately, or fortunately depends on you look at it, this meeting is now scheduled very early in the week, so if you could take, if you want to participate in that group, say in person, you need to be in Barcelona on Saturday afternoon, I believe it's the 20th of October, block 4 and 5, or block 3 and 4, I don't know.

Kim, could you…is it 2 and 3, or 3 and 4, or…4 and 5? 4 and 5, so that's the end of the afternoon on Saturday, the first day of the meeting, so that's different than when we had our meetings in San Juan, Panama

EN

and before. That was always at the end of the ICANN meeting; it's now at the start of the ICANN meeting. So, on the first day, so please take this into account when you book your flight to Barcelona. That was all, Stephen.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Bart. I had that in my notes to bring up, and I totally spaced on mentioning that, so thank you for bringing that up. So, basically if you want to produce data in the face-to-face, you need to show up a day earlier than you were thinking you might probably need if you show up. So, plan accordingly.

Fortunately, it's still early in the booking phase, so you should be able to do that without too much effort. I'm sorry for the change in time from the end of the meeting to the beginning of the meeting, but this is ICANN planning. They do what they can, and this is a very hard meeting to plan for because it's the AGM and the long meeting.

I think that's it then from my perspective. Kim, do you have anything, or does anybody in the group have any last thing they want to bring up before we bring this to a halt with two minutes to go?

Seeing no hands from anyone, let's plan on spending some time on the list between now and the end of August, and we will reconvene at 1800 UTC on the 30th of August. So, I wish everyone in the Northern Hemisphere a good summer vacation, in the Southern Hemisphere I guess a winter vacation, and we will see you at the end of August, thank you very much. Good-bye everyone.

EN

BART BOSWINKEL: Bye-bye.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: We're done, thanks Kim. Thank you, Kim.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]