

---

STEPHEN DEERHAKE:

Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to our second Post-ICANN63 teleconference for the ccPDP working group on the retirement of ccTLDs. For those of you near the zero meridian, I want to thank you for staying up late. For those of you in Asia and Oceania, for getting up early for the call. And I do also want to do a shout-out for the ICANN staff for participating for their normal workday on this call, it's really appreciated.

Just as a note, I know for a fact our Vice Chair will not be with us, as he has to present a continuing medical education event in a few hours, so he is sitting out this call in preparation for that activity. As you can see from the agenda, we've got a lot to go through. I'm very happy that Allan is on the call and will be able to present us with a walkthrough of his Strawman paper. Additionally, I hope at the end of that we'll have some time to revisit Bernard's paper which he discussed with us in our last call. I'm not sure we'll be able to actually get to that, given the timeframe involved.

I'd be remiss not to mention we've had an interesting legal development regarding ccCLDs since our last teleconference, and that is, of course, that legal action has been initiated in Sweden regarding the technical contacts' role with respect to their continuing involvement in the operation of the dot [inaudible] ccTLD. I won't comment further on this other than to encourage everyone in the working group to keep an eye on this as it unfolds.

That's basically it for my introductory remarks. With regards to administrative announcements, I've got none. I don't know if ICANN

---

*Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text docent. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.*

---

staff does; if you do, wiggle your hands or just step out and say what you've got to say. And I see no hands wiggling, so I'm going to assume not. With regards to Agenda Item #3, Action Items, we've got two completed action items. The first is my revision to the proposed letter from the working group, and I apologize for not getting that posted sooner. We're going to run through that later in the call. And the second item is that the Mind Maps and corresponding outlines by Bart and Bernard have been completed, and we will also be running with those later in the call. So I think that's it for Action Items. If we can move on now to the updated letter to the Council. Kim, if you can put that up, let's go for that.

So, what I've done here is basically kept my introductory paragraph, adopted Patricio's language in totality, and kept my end of letter format. So it's scrollable, I think, yes it looks like it is, thank you Kim. So take a look. The short answer is I don't see any way around this, other than to request the Council to request the Board to make a bylaw change to clean up some unfortunate sausage making that went on when the 2016 bylaws were slapped together. Not unprecedented, GNSO has already done it, I think we need to do it here. I think we're probably going to have to do it again down the road for some other matters not related to this Working Group.

Questions, comments, discussion? Happy to entertain anybody's thoughts on this. I'd like to get this out sooner, rather than later, but I won't do anything with it, of course, until I have buy off. And I see Nick has got his hand raised, so Nick, please go ahead, thank you, sir.

---

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Stephen, can you hear me okay?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yes, you sound great, thank you, Nick.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Can you hear me okay now?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yes indeed, sir.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: So, just for those of us who weren't around at the time of any of these sort of article changes, could you verbally explain your concern to write this letter in language which I might explain this situation to my mother or somebody who doesn't know anything about the domain names? Because this seems quite a technical point and I don't think I fully got my head around it, to be honest.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yeah, basically what happened here, Nick, is that when they were making the sausage in Los Angeles in the run up to the October bylaw adoption which happened a few months before, they drop off out of what I would call the ICANN 2.0 bylaws, reference to the IANA database, and what we're trying to do is restore that. The whole way the whole ccTLD stuff is run, you've got the ISO table and then you have the IANA database that had all the contact details for that top level domain, and

---

that got dropped out, and we're just trying to restore that. Because if we don't have that, then we're not quite sure what we're doing. I don't know how to explain it much more clearly than that. Does that help you at all? Nick, are you there? Did you hear me? Did anybody hear me?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: We can hear you quite well, Stephen.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Bernard. But I don't have an answer back from Nick.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Yeah, that is helpful, but I don't really understand, I can't put my finger on why this is fatal to the Retirement Group.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Perhaps to say it's fatal is overstating the case. It's something that was in the ICANN Bylaws 2.0 and it should be there in the ICANN Bylaws 3.0 and I feel we need to get that back in place. I can rework the gravity of the situation, if that makes you more comfortable.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Stephen, can you hear me?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yes I can.

**BERNARD TURCOTTE:** Patricio raised his hand, as well. Patricio, please go ahead. Patricio, go first.

**PATRICIO POBLETE:** Thank you. Perhaps I can add something to what Stephen just said. The reason we'd like to get back that reference to IANA Database is because what we're doing in this group is deciding on the process for retiring ccTLDs and what retiring a ccTLD means is removing it from the root zones, of course, but also from the IANA Database. There are things that are on the IANA Database and not on the root zone, they have to go, too, so that's why we need to keep that reference to the IANA Database. That's what I think.

**STEPHEN DEERHAKE:** Thank you, Patricio, for that. Bart, your hand was up, so go next.

**BART BOSWINKEL:** Yeah, I think the reason for sending out the letter right now is fairly simple, because in principle this is not an issue for the Working Group at this stage. It's broader than just the PDP, it also plays a role in if you would go to the overall IDN policy, where the inclusion of IDN ccTLDs is based on the definition and the results of the procedural aspect, this change to the bylaws came in very, very late in the transition process without any consultation.

---

This was post the consultation on the bylaw changes itself. It was initiated by one person, because of the reference to sponsoring organization, and now it includes ccTLD, the manager, as a reference point. So the reason for sending the letter is it's broader than just this Working Group, because it's considered an issue out of scope. If it was in scope, then you would have to deal with it within the Working Group at this stage. Thank you.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE:

Thank you, Bart. Any other comments on that? I'm not seeing any more hands. Can I infer from that, that I can go ahead and transmit this letter to the Council as it's written? Bart's got his hand up again, or is that an old hand?

BART BOSWINKEL:

No, it is a new hand. May I suggest that you leave it up to Council which action to take, just note the issue. As I said, there is also relation with the IDN policy, et cetera, and you can explain it, you're wearing the different hat, what is the purpose, and there might be other ways of dealing with this, as well.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE:

So are you suggesting then, Bart, that I should just chop the last paragraph off, the "I therefore request..." paragraph?

---

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah, you request that the Council finds a way to deal with this, that the Working Group notes this as an issue, and it should be addressed in the view of the Working Group. How it should be addressed, that's up to the Council to decide. It gives you a bit more leeway. There room for maneuver.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Okay, so with recognition that the last paragraph of the letter is going to be excised and replaced with something along the lines of what Bart has suggested, I ask the Group, do I have concurrence from you to go ahead and make that change or do you want to see what the language is on the list before I actually submit the letter? Any thoughts, comments from the Working Group with regards to this? Not seeing any, I will go ahead then and exercise Chair's prerogative and rework that last paragraph, and put this letter before Council on behalf of the Working Group. Is there any concern on the part of the members present on the call for this proposed course of action?

BARRACK OTIENO: I support that course of action.

BART BOSWINKEL: That was Barrack.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: That's Barrack on the phone only. Barrack, what was your comment?

BART BOSWINKEL: He supports you.

BARRACK OTIENO: I support that course of action.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Okay, great, thank you. I don't see anybody waving their hand saying this is not a bad idea, so I thank you for your support on that, and we'll go ahead and do that. Moving on, then. So, I think we're done with the letter, thank you guys.

Let us then turn to the revised Mind Maps, and for this, I think I will turn the floor over to Bart. And Kim, if you can slap up his revised Mind Map, that would be great.

BART BOSWINKEL: Thank you, Stephen. I'll just run quickly through. This is duration of removal process which we'll address later on, as well, in an outlined version. What I've done is combine the output from Group 1, 2, and 3 from the Barcelona discussion. And if you combine it that way, so let me run through, it makes it easier for you to understand. So what was common and is common across all three groups was the need for a voluntary process in the sense of between BTI and the ccTLD Manager, need for a minimum and maximum period, and no distinction between name change and/or removal with respect to the duration of the process.

---

Open for discussion, so that's really not for this meeting, but maybe for the next meeting, is say what Group 1 introduced, distinguishing between cases, and at the end of the day, the duration should be the same for the different cases. I don't know whether Group 1 wants to pursue that argument or whether it needs further discussion.

What's probably the most interesting part that related to this distinction in cases, Group 1 thought three years was sufficient. Group 2 had a nine to ten year period, and Group 3 had a more flexible approach, taking into account the three year pre-removal process of the CC, that's before the ISO maintenance agency would take any action, then a five year basic period, and then with the possibility to extend to ten years. This will come up with the more detailed outline version for the Mind Map, but also in the paper that was sent to you relating the duration and questions around it for discussion.

So the real discussion is still how many years and how should it be structured, the duration of the removal process, how should it be structured. Some topics and issues that were identified, and again, this is further for discussion and more a kind of checklist. Reputation damage, ICANN PTI, that's was a concern that was raised with respect to the duration, not to limit it but also without directions. The associated risks with each of the different periods. The failing business scenario, to what extent, especially in the longer period, this could impact the duration, and one of arching concern principle that came out and needs to be confirmed in more general nature, is that the stability of the name space needs to be insured.

---

So this is the combined Mind Map. I think it's not worth going on in detailed discussion on this visit, unless you think it's completely off. As suggested on the previous call, the purpose is now more a kind of checklist whether all the aspects that have been discussed at our face-to-face meeting are dealt with in your work moving forward. Any questions regarding this Mind Map and how to use it? I don't see any. Kim, could you change the other one?

KIM CARLSON:

Bart, do you want the Mind Map?

BART BOSWINKEL:

Yes, please. Retirement process mind map, again, and I think this is the basis for the documents we are starting to discuss right now, how should the process look like? This was the first breakout session, and again, this is a combination of the output and the results of the old discussions in Group 1, 2, and 3.

Common for all, and we already agreed to that is at the start of process you change or the removal of code elements. Communication between, so, PTI currently and ccTLDs. Communication by the ccTLD parties in country, or let's say to whom it's related. Retirement plan that was clearly a common thread of your discussion. And the end key event was the removal. So the removal was considered out of scope if you recall the removal itself, so the execution on the removal. It demarcates the end of the retirement process.

So, for discussion, at least that was still open or mentioned by one, two, or differently by everybody else. So trademark issues, and we discussed previously, and that's captured in the outline notes. It was the property rights and other legal issues related to the ccTLD. Duration of process, we just visited. Staff allocations, how many domain names, et cetera, these were factors that were discussed. Local issues, local in the sense of country and what IANA does, the database, et cetera. And then issue identified, that needs to be maybe looked at, but at least needs to be captured was the reversal of the name change scenario, which was not addressed. And the example was the name change from Zaire, so ZR to CD, and potentially reversal again.

So that's the consolidated mind map from how the process should look like. Again, the suggestion was to use this as a kind of checklist, to not spend too much time with it. Keep it in the back of your minds, especially the notes included to check where we are with regard to defining the retirement process. Any questions, comments regarding this mind map. If not, would you please go to the outline document, please.

Yes, I assume this is the one. So this is an outline version of what was included in the mind maps. I don't want to spend too much time on it. It includes what came up in the document. It's the same what has been used. Kim, can you go to the second document, which is more interesting.

Thank you, so this is the outline document, as well. No, this is not the one, this is just a clean version of what we just saw. Can you go to the next one?

---

KIM CARLSON: Bart, one was the retirement, and one was the duration outline; this one is the retirement outline.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah, and there is a document from Bernie.

KIM CARLSON: Is it the policy one?

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah. Yes, and now it becomes interesting. Bernie, you want to talk to it, or you want me to continue?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: You're on a roll, Bart, so why don't you keep going.

BART BOSWINKEL: Okay, thank you. So what Bernie has effectively done, this is the next phase of the document we will discuss. In this document, and I hope it's scrollable, what you will see is a set of questions, comments combined, which in our view will bring you a long way in defining the policy. And this is also a very nice introduction to Allan's document. And one of the things we've done over the years we gained some experience, and it's helpful as a kind of framework, is define some overall principles which will help not only you, the Working Group and the broader community,

---

but also future people looking back at the policy. So if you have these overarching principles how to interpret the policy, for example, one of the basic principles is to preserve security, stability, interoperability of the DNS.

The other one is the policy applies and is applicable to all ccTLDs, and ccTLDs and IDN ccTLDs are all ccTLDs, just to make sure that there is no distinction unless there is an issue as you have already identified with respect to the link to the ISO 3166, what is the triggering event. Also the relevant principles of RFC 1591 could be very frontal and lateral views of the chest demonstrate in interpreting the policy in the future and driving the policy forward, so IANA, BTI ICANN is not in the business of determining of what is and what is not a country. If you would look at RFC 1591, the assumption was that ISO has a process for assigning and revoking assignment of code elements to countries.

I think that makes very clear that the Working Group or what the scope of the policy is, and probably another one is subsidiary, which drives some of the discussions you had before. But these were just some thoughts that we thought might help in interpreting the policy in the future and driving it forward. So you can see already, from previous discussions, conditions for applicability, and that's why we introduce it right now, is the duration of the process, that's a discussion to be had and to be completed, because it drives a lot of issues around the polices that are derived from the duration and what it means. So there are questions, some comments, not for this meeting, because we just wanted to introduce this type of paper to you.

The third main topic which we haven't started to discuss yet, I know it's in Allan's paper, is the approval process. So then we're really into the oversight law and we need refinement with respect to IDN ccTLDs, but also CC's on the exception reserve list, and then some other questions, so these are main topics for further discussions. Have a look at it at your leisure. Our suggestion as support staff is that again each of these topics is worth a further discussion and based on this once you start to fill in the different blocks, you get to a policy that is probably reasonable and also to some of the stress scenarios.

So that was just a basic introduction of this document. I see Bernie's hand is up. If you have any questions, comments, at this stage, please raise your hand or make any comments. This was just to introduce you. Bernie, do you want to add some words?

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Yeah, thank you Bart. It really is a set of questions to help the group along based on a number of years of looking at policy and considering the options that we've got here. So it's not meant to be constraining, but rather to help with thinking and help focus the discussion. Thank you.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE:

Alright, thank you, Bart. Any additional comments from the group at this point? I don't see any. I would strongly suggest you pull it down and chew on it for a bit and let's see if we can get some discussion going on the list between now and the next meeting. Thank you.

---

BART BOSWINKEL: Stephen, this is Bart again. To be on the safe side, this was part of a whole batch of documents. If it's helpful, we can re-circulate this particular document, because I think it's definitely worth reading. The mind maps, everybody's aware what's there, it was capturing what is Barcelona. This is really taking the next step.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: So your recommendation, Bart, is to push this out separately and say here it is by itself, take a look at it. I concur with that, that would be great.

BART BOSWINKEL: Right after the call we will re-circulate this particular document, and so you can a look at it and comment on it. First we need to go to the other documents.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you Bart, thank you Bernard, thank you guys for this, it's important stuff. I think it's a solid way forward. If we can now turn to Allan's paper which you circulated in Barcelona or shortly thereafter. Thank you Allan, thank you Kim for putting that up. I think Allan, I will turn the floor over to you so you can walk us through it, if that's okay with you. Have we lost Allan? This would be unfortunate. No Allan. Kim, am I crazy, or I don't see Allan on the call.

---

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Allan was on the call, as you can see.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: He was there until two minutes ago. He has stage fright.

BART BOSWINKEL: Stephen, may I suggest that we continue the discussion, if people have the chance to go through Bernie's paper, and as soon as Allan is back, that we start with Allan's paper?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yeah, let's switch. I didn't think we had time to talk to Bernard's paper again. Bernard, do you want to talk further about this guy for a little bit?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Allan came back in, so we can go back to him.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Allan is back, let's go back to Allan. Allan, don't run away. Allan, are you there? Can you hear us?

ALLAN MACGILLIVRAY: Yes. I don't know, the internet gremlins are active here in Ottawa, sorry about that gentleman and ladies.

---

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I thought you had that all under control up there, what can I say....

ALLAN MACGILLIVRAY: I don't think we run the whole internet, but really it's only about three quarters of it, you know that, Stephen.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you Allan, go ahead, we appreciate your contribution here, and we would like to have your walkthrough. Thank you very much.

ALLAN MACGILLIVRAY: Well, I'm happy to do a walkthrough, just going back briefly, I think I said, to the list seems a long time ago. I really enjoyed our session that we had in Barcelona, so I took the time to scratch a few thoughts down while it was still fresh in my mind. I dumped those to the list. I kind of tweaked it a bit more to kind of change the way I was characterizing it, because I saw it has having four, five, what I call components. In other words, what I initially put out is a straw man proposal, I meant to re-characterize as a proposal, well the number of elements, you might want to pick and choose from those, it isn't an integrated proposal from that point of view.

Actually, I intended it to stimulate thinking and certainly reading the draft transition plan, I think that Bernie and staff, I think there is at least some I think we can say parallel thinking in these. I think many of the suggestions that are in my straw man proposal have in various forms found themselves into the transition plan, maybe not exactly, but at

---

least they're there. And with the one that's not there, because we're not at that point yet, anyway, is oversight.

So, I don't intend to walk through this, other than to say there are five components, the first one I saw is really, I think we're more or less agreed on the trigger, I'm not trying to read anything here, that sort of an initial step would be PTI informing the incumbent manager in writing or formally of what the removal date is, that's element one. I think that's common.

Element two is this notion of having PTI request what I call transition steps. I know in the staff paper that this is concept of a direct transition plan, so I see a lot of parallels in that. That's why I think we can talk about that later. And obviously this would be voluntary, in other words PTI would have no means to enforce any of these transition steps.

The third element would be the possibility of an extension of the retirement period, and I guess the key concept there is really, we had quite a debate on the length of time, and a lot of that debate turned around the fact that there may be complex cases. So really the point that I was trying to make is, okay, if it is a complex case, let's not try and really work that in advance, but rather give PDI the authority to extend the period of the retirement, that is to say the period until the TLD would be removed from the root. And obviously we would define the overall maximum time in the policy, but rather it would be up to PTI. So that is my third element.

Fourth would be the possibility of taking these voluntary transition steps and making them -- I hesitate for a word -- more compulsory, I'm

---

not sure mandatory works. But to really seek the agreement of the TLD manager to agree to these in the context of securing an extension of time for the agreement for the removal. So this could stand alone.

So my last piece was just on oversight, which I know we haven't got to when I threw it in there, just to note that where there is going to be discretion on the part of PTI on firstly whether to grant an extension, secondly where it wants to revoke that extension because of a breach of an agreement. There may be a need for some form of appeal.

So, in brief, that's what I put out, and I'm happy to continue the discussion of these in the context of the staff materials. It was never my intention that this would be The Proposal. But let me just stop there and see if there are any questions at least on what I was proposing or some of my thinking. Thank you.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE:

Thank you, Allan, for that. I have a question with regards to oversight. I think what you're proposing in component five dovetails with the appeals process mentioned that's actually discussed in RFC 1591. Am I on board with that? Is that what your thinking is with regards to section component five?

ALLAN MACGILLIVRAY:

Well, I saw component five only in the context of retirement, okay? This appeal of a PTI decision is only in the context of the issues within the frame of this specific policy. So, I'm mindful of, when we finish our work of this PDP, there will be another one on an overall appeal mechanism

---

in the context of the CC community, so I'm not trying to get ahead of ourselves.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE:

Okay, thank you sir, greatly appreciated. Thank you so much for this, by the way, this is a nice piece of work, and I think it's helpful for our debate discussion going forward. Any comments from other members of the Working Group on this? Everybody's particularly quiet tonight. That will allow the Chair to come back another question with regard, Allan, to component three, criteria for extension of the retirement period, can you elucidate a little further on that for me?

ALLAN MACGILLIVRAY:

Well, so just to be fair, there was nothing mentioned in the piece I circulated, but I noted as we ourselves previously discussed, where there is a complex retirement, where for example the case of Yugoslavia, where there was a transition from one ccTLD to two, so that would be an example of a transition where I feel there might be a need for more time to actually undertake the work. But in what I was proposing, it would certainly confer on PTI's substantial discretion to grant this.

In other words, they would not have to demonstrate that criteria 1, 2, 3, 4 have been met in order to do this; rather, it would be quite broad, because as I said before, I think this is our way of dealing with complex situations, some of which we may not even understand right now. So I think the way to deal with this is to give PTI the authority to extend it. Again, within the overall time limit.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Okay, thank you for that. Let's see, Kim is no longer on the call, apparently, so I will ask the remaining INS/PTI representative, Naela, to weigh in on IANA's thoughts with regards to this extension requirement period, if you could?

NAELA SARRAS: Yeah, hi Stephen, this is Naela, I'm still on the call. So, we looked at this document, Kim and I, and first of all, Allan, I think this is a really great document because it's concise, and it really helps us wrap our minds around this is going to shape up, hopefully. So with regards to extension, we didn't really discuss it, this text itself, maybe for the lack of better wording, does not raise any flags for us.

I think as long as everyone agrees and understands that there is an agreement that the ccTLD will be retired, and we all agree on a plan for when, I don't see that that will be an issue. Maybe Stephen, I should ask, do you have any specific concerns about maybe building in an ability to do an extension?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I think there is a question of extension, obviously, but I'm also cognizant, I'm trying to solicit IANA/PTI's viewpoint on these things as we march along, to make sure we're not going down a path that you guys really have an issue with. And it sounds like you do not have an issue with this.

---

NAELA SARRAS: Yeah, if I may go again, I think as long as we have a policy, we're working on solid ground, and we have policy that the ccTLD should be retired, and then if anything, just from quick recent history, I can remember, I think AN required an extension, or at least asked for an extension, YU I think there was one extension, but it sounds like maybe it wasn't quite long enough, they sent feedback now during this Working Group. So we have some practice with this, and we know that extensions are maybe part of this process, so why not provision for it? I don't think IANA will push back on this, as long as we're working based on a policy and agreement that at some point it needs to go out.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Okay, thank you for that. I see Brent has got his hand up, so go ahead Brent.

BRENT CAREY: Thanks, Stephen. I just wanted to add, thanks Allan for the work, as well. And with the extension, I think also as a concept it's good to also bear in mind the timeliness, and I know Allan, in Line 9, Component 1, you're proposing sort of a shorter period. So I think the shorter the period is, I think it's on us to also possibly allow an extension where we're working to shorter timeframes up front, then there's that possibility because of circumstance, that someone might want an extension. So I think shorter timeframes and extension sort of dovetail together. So I quite like that there is that opportunity to have an extension for what it's worth.

---

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you for that. Bernard, I see you've got your hand up.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thanks, Stephen. Just following up on Naela's comments just to put it in context a bit. She was talking about extensions, but under the old system there was no clear maximum period. There were agreement ccTLDs and then they would fall behind, and then there was an agreement to extend, and that was great that everyone was working to get these things done.

In our context, I think what we're looking at right now, and we'll see where we end up with this, is that we're trying to set some bookends on this and there's probably, just to avoid confusion, or maybe to inject it in this conversation, there's probably two different versions of extension here. One in the paper that I put forward, that far bookend which is supposed to be the furthest you can go out, regardless of what happened, we're saying, well, there may be exceptional circumstances, and we trust the people running IANA, and if they feel it's justified under a certain set of circumstances, maybe they can actually push that out.

The second case, which I think the point is very well made, is even if there is an agreement made with the ccTLD, stuff happens, and you know, sometimes you have to give extensions. So the policy has to be flexible enough for that. I hope that helps. Thank you.

---

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I appreciate that, thank you, Bernard. Brent is that a new hand or old hand?

BRENT CAREY: Old hand, sorry, I'll put it down.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Cheers. Any other further comments, questions for Allan on his paper, which I again thank you for. Not seeing any at this point in time. Let us move on then, I guess, to any other business, unless Bernard or Kimberly have any other questions or concerns. Not hearing from them.

Is there any other business? I have none, does anybody else? Not seeing a huge waggle of hands, I'm assuming not. So, I want to thank staff for their participation this evening. I want to thank Bart for his mind map presentation and Allan for his presentation, as well. And I think our next meeting, if I'm not mistaken, is scheduled for the 13th of December at 0500 UTC. Staff, are you, you're not waving, going no, that's not the best, so, okay. I think that's it.

I think we have next meeting scheduled. I look forward to seeing you in that in the run up to the end of the year, our last meeting for the year. We'll try to have some excitement before then. I thank you all for participating this evening. I thank staff again for participating out of band. And I think that's it, unless anybody has got anything they want to say, I think I will call this a halt.

Kimberly says 13 correction.

KIM CARLSON: Meeting is December 5th.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: The 5th of December?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: It's the 13th. The 5th is next week, unless you want to do a lot of calls before the end of the year.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: No, I don't, we are going for the 13th then. Okay, the 13th of December at 0500 UTC is the official ruling from the Chair. Thank you guys, thanks everyone, I appreciate you being on the call, bye all. Kill the recording, I think we're done. Thank you so much.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**