

Framework of Interpretation Working Group Call

9 August 2012

Attendees:

ccNSO:

Ugo Akiri, .ng (joined late)
Keith Davidson, .nz (Chair)
Chris Disspain, .au
Stephen Deerhake, .as (for the first hour)
Eberhard Lisse, .na (joined late)
Paulos Nyirenda, .mw
Patricio Poblete, .cl (joined late)
Nigel Roberts, .gg
Bill Semich, .nu (joined late)

Other Liaisons:

Cheryl Langdon-Orr, ALAC

Staff Support and Special Advisors:

Jaap Akkerhuis, ICANN / ISO
Bart Boswinkel, ICANN
Kim Davies IANA
Kristina Nordström, ICANN
Bernard Turcotte, ICANN

Apologies:

Martin Boyle, .uk
Dotty Sparks de Blanc, .vi
Carlos Aguirre, GNSO
Becky Burr, NomCom

Kristina Nordstrom: So on the call we have Keith Davidson, Chris Disspain, Stephen Deerhake, Paulos Nyirenda, Nigel Roberts, Jaap Akkerhuis, Bart Boswinkel, Kim Davies, Kristina Nordstrom, and Bernie Turcotte. And apologies from Martin Boyle, Dotty Sparks de Blanc, Patricio Poblete, Carlos Aguirre, and from Bill Semich, who will be 20 to 30 minutes late. That's it.

Keith Davidson: Okay. So--.

Chis Disspain: --See if we can finish before Bill gets on the call, shall we?

Keith Davidson: That's interesting to note that Bill might also be on the call later, and if we could also record an apology from Becky to say that she'll be late. Okay, any further apologies, anyone else on the call whose name wasn't called? If not, can we move on and have a look at the agenda. If there anything -- or just looking through the agenda, the main topic tonight is revocation. I think I've listed two items, and agenda item five, other outstanding items, and both of those are really awaiting Martin to be on a call since they're both Martin issues.

And I think the intention he gave was that he'd be on the next call of the group, so there's nothing that's desperately urgent. It's GAC (ph) related, so I think we can just leave those items aside. So any other comments regarding the agenda? If not, it'll proceed as it stands. We have the meeting report from 26 July in front of us. Bernie, is there anything we need to specifically be concerned about, or that isn't otherwise covered on -- from that 26 July meeting?

Bernie Turcotte: I don't believe so. I think it's fairly straightforward look at what we went through, section by section, and what was approved and what was not. So I have no further comments.

Keith Davidson: Okay. Didn't hear (ph) any comments from anyone else regarding that meeting report? If not, can we move on to the substantive item on the agenda, the revocation document on item four, and there's been quite a bit of work between meetings, I think particularly Becky and Bernie working away on the text of the result of the discussions at the last meeting. So Bernie, do you want to talk us through those changes, or the changes that have gone into comprising version three of the revocation document? Thanks, Bernie.

Bernie Turcotte: Thank you, sir. As usual, the file's named 3.1, and we've got version three in the header of the document itself. Sorry. For those that are used to the group, they know that I make that mistake quite often. Basically have not -- version three is a clean start with everything that was accepted in 2.1, and the things that were not were kept as such. And so, really, there is nothing new until section five, where Becky has done a fair amount of homework and proposed a lot of things in the areas where we were still having issues.

So unless there are other comments, I think we should start with section five. I'm not sure if that's a comment, I'll say. So not hearing anything, I think -- oops, got a new one. I'm going to pull up my copy of the--.

Nigel Roberts: --No, it's an old one.

Bernie Turcotte: Pardon me?

Nigel Roberts: It's just Nigel again, returning.

Bernie Turcotte: Hey, Nigel. I'm just going to pull up my copy of the file so I can actually read the comments. All right. So, Section 5.1, the minor edit, there is -- "no" has been removed, and basically so it reads now where RFC-1591 does not provide a policy basis, so I don't think that's significant. 5.1.1, we've removed "unconsented" and replaced it with "undertaken without the consent of the incumbent manager," which is a great suggestion from Becky. So two minor editorial changes, one in 5.1 and one in 5.1.1. Are there any issues with that? Okay, I wasn't expecting any, so great. We'll move on to 5.2.

5.2.1.1, under applicability to ccTLDs, there's been a fair amount of work here, as you can see, lot of text has been struck, and we -- what we did here is basically work, or this was my understanding Becky Burr and BT were to finish this, but when we closed off the meeting in Prague, I thought I got an -- or there

seemed to be an understanding in the room to just keep it simple, although we had all this explanation and discussion, but that -- the group felt that really what we should be saying is the working group members believe that section 3.4 of RFC-1591 is to be read in such a way as to imply that RFC-1591(a) imports ongoing obligation to the designated managers to operate the ccTLD without substantial misbehavior, and (b), and creates a reserve power for the IANA contractor to (inaudible) if such substantial misbehavior were to occur. So basically, we've removed all the long discussion and explanations as to why we lead to this. I believe it was my understanding that it was the will of the group to just basically take it down to this, and I'd like a confirmation as to if this is correct.

Keith Davidson: Well, I think that was my understanding as well, Bernie, but does anyone have any comments? Is everyone happy with the 1.1.1.1 as it stands? Okay, let's assume it's doing its job then, Bernie.

Bernie Turcotte: All right, excellent.

Keith Davidson: Oh, I just -- there's one question that might arise from that, and that's I guess the aim (ph) that Kim and -- implementation, you know, how much detail would you require, Kim, under your new contractual obligations with NTIA about stepping in (ph) and what that might mean, how -- do we need another document that's much more explanatory about such interpretations of policy?

Kim Davies: That's a good question. I think the contract doesn't specify a very specific way in which we meet the derivatives, but if there was sufficient vagueness in the guidance that we have that we didn't feel (inaudible), we could make a determination the guidances that we refer for policymaking back to the city (inaudible), or whoever is appropriate. So it's hard to say. I'd have to think about it.

Keith Davidson: Okay. Well, as it turns out, we -- I've been talking to USG a little bit, and Vernita (ph) has offered to come to ICANN Toronto to give the ccNSO an update on the IANA contract renewal. And so it might be a good opportunity. I've suggested to the program committee that we take Vernita up on that offer and that perhaps we try and put that discussion point on the agenda around the same time as the IANA report. So it may well be a topic that we can jointly raise that point, Kim.

Kim Davies: Sure. I mean, I -- we've obviously had discussions at NTIA as well, and I think informally the sense is that more work will be referred to the ccNSO and of new contracts and under the existing contract. So on a very high level, seeking clarification on how to implement certain things that are not clear is probably likely to increase, moving forward.

Keith Davidson: Yes, I would hope so. So yes, I'll continue. And sorry to others on the call. It's slightly off-topic, but I think it's not entirely unrelated, but I'm seeking to encourage the ccNSO that we should have the IANA report, the report from Vernita on the IANA contract and the FOI working group more or less contiguously on the agenda for Toronto, as I think that's a spillover between or through (ph) subjects at this stage. So I'll continue working on that on my own accord.

Okay, thanks for that slight diversion too, Kim. And Bernie, back to the topic at hand. Thanks.

Bernie Turcotte: Thank you. All right. 5.2.2 we've been struggling with, and I'm trying a new approach. After re-reading the entire document for where we're going and what we're doing in the other sections, I felt that this new approach is about just trying to define if IANA stepping in under 3.4 includes the possibility of revocation. So basically, I've changed the question, does IANA stepping in include the possibility

of revocation, and the argumentation that is made is that the only formal mechanism for IANA dealing with delegated ccTLDs is transfer, which needs to be consensual, as we have defined earlier, and if there is significant misbehavior, because this is what we're trying to address, it's probably not reasonable to assume that there will be consensual agreement to a transfer.

And if that's the case, then really the only formal mechanism left to IANA is revocation. So the argumentation goes along the lines that, if we don't include the possibility of revocation as stepping in, not that we're saying it's the only thing IANA does and we go through all the detailed description of the other things IANA does before it gets there, and what we think it needs to do if it actually contemplates revocation, but the point is I'm trying to focus this as saying, okay, significant misbehavior, is revocation on the table, I'm proposing that.

So I'll take comments at this time.

Keith Davidson: Nigel has his hand raised, so Nigel?

Nigel Roberts: Am I on mute?

Keith Davidson: No.

Bernie Turcotte: You are not.

Nigel Roberts: Good. Thank you. Two things. First of all, I'm not sure what bit of the document you're referring to, because my screen still shows 1.1.1 in front of me. Secondly -- thanks. Now I can see what's going on. Secondly, you kept referring to significant misbehavior. I thought RFC-1591 referred to substantial misbehavior.

Bernie Turcotte: Sorry, sometimes I get confused when I'm trying to write these things too quickly. But yes, you're correct.

Nigel Roberts: Okay. I mean, there's no problem, but, I mean, there's a substantial difference, and we should use the term that's used in the policy document.

Bernie Turcotte: Yes, as opposed to significant one, I agree.

Keith Davidson: And the document--.

Nigel Roberts: --Thank you, that's highly significant (inaudible).

Keith Davidson: Yes, and you hit another point, Nigel. You've got on to mute. Nigel, we're not hearing you. I don't know what's happened to Nigel.

Nigel Roberts: Those are the (inaudible).

Bernie Turcotte: Okay. I'm looking at the document we're actually sharing. I had been working off my local copy here, and obviously the number got screwed up, 4.5.2.1, which actually shows up as 1.1.1 again, and 1.1.1.1, but seems to fix itself a little later. So -- but the content is essentially what we have been talking about.

So any other comments, and with -- thank you for that, Nigel.

Keith Davidson: No other comments, (inaudible). Let's see, continue, Bernie.

Bernie Turcotte: Okay. Going back to my copy, so the numbering is just a little bit off. And so, closing off the official 5.2.2, which is a little messed up in the document, FOI working group also believes that it's consistent with the purpose of --.

Unidentified Participant: (--Inaudible.)

Bernie Turcotte: Hey, that sounds like fun -- believe that it's consistent with the purpose of RFC-1591 to interpret revocation as a last-resort option. Just given we've changed the text in 5.2.2 to say revocation is on the table, I wanted to make clear that we had generally agreed elsewhere in the text that revocation should be a last-resort option, so I'm just stating that again. And then, 5.2.2.3, which I will give you the official version, which is 5.2.1.3 on the one that's being shared, the change there is not significant, but the FOI working group believes it is also consistent with the purpose of RFC-1591 to interpret IANA stepping in as the IANA contractor continuing with the traditions of, one, ensuring security and stability to the Internet and the ccTLD, and two, deploying all means at his disposal to assist in resolving issues with the incumbent manager.

So that closes off that section, which has been a little difficult for a little while for us. And I've noted Nigel's change. And I see Nigel still has his hand up, so maybe we can hear if there's something else from Nigel.

Nigel Roberts: There is. It's very pedantic, but I would prefer to see the definite article in 5.2.1.2 and not the indefinite one, or is it the other way around? There's only one last resort, so it must be the last resort option.

Bernie Turcotte: Fine. I'll note it. As usual, Nigel, you know, I'm not difficult on those things, and I defer to people who have better language skills. So, fine.

Nigel Roberts: I'm also -- this is the first time I've managed to see the latest version of 5.2.1.3. I think it's a little clumsy, but I'm not going to try and rewrite it on the fly tonight. Again, the formatting of where the one and the two is makes it look a bit weird. With your permission, I'll play with it, so -- about 10 seconds and e-mail you something.

Bernie Turcotte: Absolutely. As usual, suggestions are welcome, guys. You know that.

Nigel Roberts: That's it.

Bernie Turcotte: All right. Anybody else?

Keith Davidson: Doesn't appear to be. Thanks, Bernie.

Bernie Turcotte: Okay, moving on. The next major change I have is -- in the official document it's 5.2.3.3, and let's find it -- what you've got on your screen under analysis of requirements. Okay, so on the shared document, it's 5.2.2.3, so we're off by one. In my document, it's 5.2.3.3. So that -- there has been significant surgery proposed by Becky on this, and I'll line this up on the screen, and we'll go through it. And the changes are not showing up nicely on this version, so I'll go through them here. Minor wording, "The manager must be able to carry out the necessary responsibilities and have the ability to do an equitable, just, honest, and competent job." I don't see that as being significant for anyone.

Now, on the official version -- Nigel? If you're speaking, we're not hearing you.

Keith Davidson: Nigel, you're still muted. Oh, there you go.

Nigel Roberts: Hello.

Bernie Turcotte: Yes, we're hearing you now.

Nigel Roberts: Yes. I was expecting you to come to me after you'd finished saying what you were saying. You're very quick.

Bernie Turcotte: Okay. So on the one under that, we've got significant surgery, and it now reads, "On balance, the working group believes that RFC-1591 should be read to impose on those managers designated after its issuance an ongoing responsibility to carry out the necessary responsibilities and do an equitable, just, honest, and competent job." So I've got this as 5.2.3.3.1.1 in the official documents, but I believe that's 5.2.2.3.1.1 on the screen. Any comments? That's new wording (inaudible). I heard a noise.

Nigel Roberts: (Inaudible.)

Bernie Turcotte: Pardon me?

Nigel Roberts: You said Becky. Is Becky here?

Bernie Turcotte: No. I said it's new wording from Becky to address--.

Nigel Roberts: --Oh, I see. I'm so sorry. My apologies.

Bernie Turcotte: Becky has not joined, I don't think. So any comments on that?

Nigel Roberts: Yes.

Bernie Turcotte: Okay.

Nigel Roberts: I think there's a certain element of clumsiness in it, and I know where we're going here, and probably whence it originated. A bit -- I'm a bit uncomfortable that this scratches the surface, or rather perhaps skates over the thin ice, of interpreting, shall we say, the legal situation or something with regards to differences between those who were designated after RFC-1591 was issued and those before. I would suggest that, although we keep much the same words, it would read -- and this is only an example, not a proposal -- something along the lines that RFC-1591 requires an ongoing responsibility, and in a footnote refer to the situation of whether -- and say which may or may not be applicable to managers, et cetera, et cetera, or just refer to the pre-RFC-1591 situation in a footnote, because if you write it in the form RFC-1591 requires, whatever, then it only requires it to those people to which it's applicable. So you still achieve the same effect without getting into a great big debate over whether, well, that TLD's an RFC-1591 compatible TLD, and that one isn't.

Bernie Turcotte: I think I understand your point, Nigel. And what I'm going to say is sometimes Becky has some really good reasons for writing these things. So let's take that offline with Becky and hammer out the exact form, because I don't think it changes the intent of what we're trying to do.

Keith Davidson: I think the original wording was--.

Nigel Roberts: --It's not intended to change the intent.

Bernie Turcotte: Yes, I understand that.

Keith Davidson: Yes, I think the original wording was rather sort of firmly positioning RFC-1591 as you suggest, and I think it was other issues that arose because of that that led to the softening of language, too. So -- but anyway, let's take the action point that Nigel, Bernie and Becky will have a look at that particular cause in a bit more detail.

Bernie Turcotte: Well, everyone okay with that?

Keith Davidson: Looks like it, so please proceed.

Bernie Turcotte: Okay. The next point, 5.2.2.3.1.2 on the screen document, meeting the competency requirement, which has had major surgery, now reads -- again, from Becky -- meeting the competency requirement. The working group interprets RFC-1591 to require the IANA contractor to ensure, when designating a registry manager, new or replacement, that two criteria are met: (A) prospective registry manager designated under RFC-1591 must have the following qualities. The proposed manager must demonstrate that he or she, or if a legal person, it possesses the requisite skills to carry out the duties of a manager, and those two last sections were not touched. And this next one has had a bit of surgery. If the designated will be -- if designated, will be in a position, i.e. will have the means necessary, close quote -- brackets, sorry -- to carry out those duties, including the ongoing responsibilities discussed above upon receiving the appointment.

So basically, the header text has been changed because there's been a bunch of stuff. (Inaudible) appears to be (inaudible) stuff has all been removed, and we've got the working group interprets RFC-1591 to require the IANA contractor to ensure, when designating a registry manager, new or replacement, that have two criteria. And we've just been talking about the first one. Any comments here? Nigel, I see your hand up.

Nigel Roberts: Yes, this is kind of almost a point of order, in a way. You were reading, and it didn't correspond to what was in front of me.

Bernie Turcotte: Oh, I'm sorry.

Nigel Roberts: And going back to the previous one, I noticed there was kind of text, like a sentence starting without a full staff (ph) and that didn't seem to run on together. So I'm wondering if there's an issue with what's posted on the screen.

Bernie Turcotte: Oh, my, okay. Let me see if I can pull in my version, and we will make this go away. So please give this intermission for a second while I go hunting through my files, 3.1 -- no, I didn't produce a PDF of that, and that may be the problem in the translation somewhere. So let's produce a PDF, 3.1, PDF, okay, let's see if I can link to that. Share a document, browse my computer, converting as we speak. Let's see what happens. Okay, so hopefully you've got revocation 3.0, which would be 3.1 in front of you, and let's take it down to -- yes, our numbering is fixed, and we've got the same file here. So let's get back down to where Nigel pointed out our problem, analysis of requirements, and here we are. So hopefully everyone's seeing the same thing now with the text, and we're all literally on the same page.

So basically, we went through 5.2.3.3.1.1, the ongoing responsibility to carry out the necessary responsibilities and do an equitable, just, honest job. And we have just been talking about 5.2.3.3.1.2 with the changes that we were proposed. So basically, I don't think there's anything significant in the way we've adjusted 5.2.3.3.1.2, just makes it clearer. 5.2.3.3.1.2.1 has not been changed, 5.2.3.3.1.2.1.1 has not been changed. The one following that, 5.2.3.3.1.2.1.2, duties including the ongoing responsibilities discussed above has been added. So hopefully everyone's seeing the same thing now, apologies for that, and are we okay with this, or do we have comments?

Keith Davidson: Nigel was still making comment, I think, so Nigel, if--?

Bernie Turcotte: --Now that you're actually--.

Nigel Roberts: --Well, now it's (inaudible) document. The blue text, which it says, "including the ongoing responsibilities discussed above," should be in parentheses and not have a capital letter at the beginning, perhaps.

Bernie Turcotte: Okay, will do. Anything else? That sounds pretty good. Let's move on. I see no hands raised. Okay, our next change is 5.2.3.3.1.3, necessary responsibilities. As described more fully below, the necessary responsibilities enumerated in RFC-1591 include -- so all this is new text from Becky. 5.2.3.3.1.3.1, serving as the designated manager; two, operating or supervising the operation of the ccTLD; three, ensuring that the name servers are on the Internet; four, providing e-mail connectivity to the designated manager and its staff; five, maintaining an administrative and technical contact.

So we've got a new version of 5.2.3.3.1.3 up on the screen proposed by Becky, and I'll take comments and questions at this point.

Keith Davidson: Nigel was indicating a check of happiness with it, and I notice Eberhard has joined, if we could note that for the record, and has his hand raised. Eberhard?

Bernie Turcotte: Hi, Eberhard.

Eberhard Lisse: Hi, I just wanted to apologize for logging in late.

Keith Davidson: Thanks, Eberhard, and noting Bill Semich has also joined the call, and he did indicate that he would be late. So welcome, Bill, too.

Bernie Turcotte: Hi, Bill.

Bill Semich: Hello.

Keith Davidson: So we're dealing with 5.2.3.3.1.3 in its entirety, and Nigel has indicated a check of happiness with that proposed text. Any further discussion required? If not, please continue, Bernie.

Bernie Turcotte: Thank you, sir. Scrolling down, okay. our next area is 5.2.3.3.1.4. We hadn't figured out what to do with "to do an equitable, just, honest, and competent job." Becky has proposed adding "the necessary responsibilities must be undertaken in an equitable, fair, honest, and competent." Okay.

Bill Semich: Manner.

Bernie Turcotte: Yes, manner. Sorry, so minor edit there. So thank you, Bill. So the added text is, "the necessary responsibilities must be undertaken in an equitable, fair, honest, and competent manner," the type thanks to Bill. Any thoughts, comments, 5.2.3.3.1.4? Okay, I'm going to take it that this sounds good with the typo correction. Moving on to 5.2.3.3.2. "operates the domain name system in that country." Again, there's been some major surgery here. and what we -- it now reads is "should be interpreted as operates the ccTLD associated with the country or territory," full stop. So that was 5.2.3.3.2.1. Thoughts, questions?

Bill Semich: Works for me.

Bernie Turcotte: I thought that would work for everyone, and I guess so did Becky, which is why she writ (ph) it. Okay, moving on. Our next--.

Keith Davidson: --Just a moment, Bernie. Eberhard has his hand raised, so Eberhard?

Bernie Turcotte: Returning to that text. Yes, Eberhard?

Eberhard Lisse: Can we make the document scrollable, please?

Bernie Turcotte: Kristina? Kristina, if you're talking, we're not hearing you.

Kristina Nordstrom: Sorry, I wasn't talking. I just did it, and then I wrote done in the chat. Sorry, it's done.

Bernie Turcotte: I saw the chat. We're done, Eberhard. Do you have a comment on 5.2.3.3.2? If you're talking, Eberhard, we're not hearing you.

Keith Davidson: Let's assume not, then, Bernie, please--.

Eberhard Lisse: --Can you hear me now?

Keith Davidson: Oh, yes, we can hear you now, Eberhard.

Eberhard Lisse: I can read it, I can scroll it. Thank you.

Bernie Turcotte: Okay. Moving on, the next change is 5.2.3.3.4, "there must be an administrative contact and a technical contact for each domain." For top level domains that are country codes, the new text is, "that are subject to RFC-1591, at least the administrative contact must reside in the country involved." Questions, comments, thoughts, 5.2.3.3.4? Going once--.

Keith Davidson: --It looks to me like everybody -- oh, now I've got (inaudible) raised. Eberhard?

Eberhard Lisse: "For top level domains that are country codes that are subject," these two "thats" are a little bit mis-understandable.

Bernie Turcotte: That could be replaced by "and subject."

Eberhard Lisse: (Inaudible.)

Bernie Turcotte: We'll fix that, Eberhard. Good catch.

Eberhard Lisse: Okay. Okay, works for me.

Bernie Turcotte: Okay.

Keith Davidson: Yes, and I think Bernie, yes, the second "that" being an "and" is perfect.

Bernie Turcotte: Yes. I was trying to -- Becky worked hard and fast, and I was trying to stick to her words as best as possible, so there were some edits that obviously need to be done. That's one of them. All right, so I'll assume 5.2.3.3.4, with that grammatical correction, is okay. Moving on, which takes us to 5.2.3.3.6.1, and that is under the section 5.2.3.3.6, which is the designated manager must be equitable to all groups in the domain that requests domain names. The subsection to this, 5.2.3.3.6.1 now reads, with some minor adjustments, "it would seem reasonable to interpret this requirement in the current context, comma, as obligating the manager" -- should be "to publish its registration policies on the Internet for anyone to consult, bracket, minimally in all the official languages of the country or territory," close bracket, "and apply these policies in an impartial manner," and this is the big new text, "treating similarly situated would-be registrants in the same manner." Well, this is what Becky is suggesting for 5.2.3.3.6.1, and I see Eberhard has his hand up. Eberhard, you're up.

Eberhard Lisse: You must remove the "all" from the "all the official languages." Otherwise, South Africa would have to publish it in 11 languages.

Bill Semich: Yes, and Sweden would have to publish it in Yiddish and Sami.

Bernie Turcotte: Okay, so the suggestion is minimally in the official languages?

Bill Semich: How about language or languages?

Bernie Turcotte: Language or languages, okay. This is the original text. It's been there for a while, so we've never had that. I am not seeing a problem with accepting that suggestion. Anybody else?

Keith Davidson: Nigel's indicating some dissatisfaction. I don't know.

Bernie Turcotte: Who is not happy, Keith?

Keith Davidson: Nigel appears to be indicating--.

Nigel Roberts: --No, I'm just trying to come off mute. Am I here?

Keith Davidson: Yes, you're here.

Nigel Roberts: Yes, I agree with -- again, I agree with the intent of this. I'm unhappy with what we're doing here, which is to effectively provide operational procedures when we -- this isn't interpretation of the existing policy -- it is to some extent, but it's going a little bit further than the mere interpretation here. I would want to be looking at giving guidance as how -- in other words, you say what, not how, so you don't say that you would interpret it to include official languages. That's prescriptive. You would say, "so that everybody in the country or territory concerned would be able to access the policies."

Bill Semich: Or understand.

Nigel Roberts: Do you see the point I'm going on about here? Just talk about the purpose rather than how it's to be achieved. It's not our job to say how it's to be achieved.

Bernie Turcotte: Yes, and I'll step in for Martin, and he'd probably be supporting you at this point, I think. So okay, interesting. We'll see what we can do with that. Thank you, Nigel. Anybody else?

Keith Davidson: I thought I heard Bill make a comment on the background but didn't quite catch the comment or who it was.

Bill Semich: Well, I think the condition here is that it be understandable in the local community, that's all.

Bernie Turcotte: Yes. I had caught that. Thank you, Bill. I'll see what I can generate from those comments. And as usual, we'll have it for the next meeting.

Bill Semich: Thanks.

Bernie Turcotte: Okay. I'm not seeing anything else for 5.2.3.3.1.6.1. Thanks, that was great input. Let's move on. Right below that, we are now in 5.2.4, Defining Substantial Misbehavior. There have been some edits to 5.2.4.1, which is not significant, I think. "Substantial misbehavior, the working group interprets this phrase to refer to significant incompetence or unwillingness by the incumbent manager to correct important issues with respect to the requirements of RFC-1591 for managers of ccTLD." I see a big red X from Nigel, so I'm not sure whether that's just him saying no, I don't like it, or if he's disappeared. Nigel?

Nigel Roberts: No, it's me saying no, I don't like it.

Bernie Turcotte: Ah, okay. Again--.

Nigel Roberts: --I think it's wrong.

Bernie Turcotte: Okay. Well, I mean, as I said, most of these changes in this part of the documents are what's been suggested by Becky and, unfortunately, she's not here. So maybe you can tell us why you don't like it, and that way we can move forward with this after I get ahold of Becky.

Nigel Roberts: Sure. I mean, we don't have to fix it right now, but substantial misbehavior does not mean that. It might include that, but it doesn't mean it. So substantial misbehavior -- I thought we had good text on this some time back -- refers to misbehavior that is more than merely misbehavior.

Bernie Turcotte: No. Actually what you're seeing there is the text we agreed to, and the blue stuff was just a few words added by Becky. But basically, the last two passes, we were sort of okay with this text. It hasn't changed for three meetings, I think.

Nigel Roberts: Yes. There's been a couple of meetings I've missed or not been able to go through. But I'm looking at what's in front of me in 5.2.4.1 only, and the--.

Bernie Turcotte: --Yes, that's what we're talking about--.

Nigel Roberts: --(Inaudible) 5.2.4.1?

Bernie Turcotte: Yes.

Nigel Roberts: And the definition that's given in 5.4.2.1, in my book, cannot be a definition of substantial misbehavior whether in the context of RFC-1591 or otherwise. Substantial misbehavior in the context of RFC-1591 may include that, but significant incompetence isn't substantial misbehavior. It's incompetence.

Bernie Turcotte: Okay. So I think what I'm going to suggest at this point is that we note Nigel doesn't like it, and move on to Eberhard and see what his comments are. Is that okay, Nigel?

Nigel Roberts: yes.

Bernie Turcotte: Okay, great. Eberhard, you're up. If you're talking, we're not hearing -- oh, okay--.

Eberhard Lisse: --I'm not really sure Nigel doesn't like it, but I tend to think that substantial misbehavior includes significant incompetence, unwillingness (ph), but there may be more, so maybe write some -- we must find something that we don't make these too exclusive of anything else. That's probably what he means. I think that's a good idea.

Bernie Turcotte: Yes, that's the way I'm taking it.

Nigel Roberts: It also means the substantial incompetence that is not fixed or isn't willing to be corrected. So in other words, or a willful refusal to fix substantial issues caused by substantial incompetence. That's all part of substantial misbehavior, but it's not a definition of it.

Bernie Turcotte: Okay. Well, I'm sure we can have a great discussion around that kind of argumentation with Becky, so I'm still proposing notice, fine. I don't think we're going to rewrite this on the fly at this point, and let's carry on if it's okay with everyone.

Nigel Roberts: Good way forward.

Bernie Turcotte: Okay. Anybody else on 5.2.4.1? Okay. 5.2.4.2 has undergone -- well, basically been rewritten, so let's give it a shot. "The working group suggests that the ccNSO could help to inform the definition of substantial misbehavior by documenting, in consultation with the GAC (ph) and other stakeholders, current standards and generally accepted practices, or ccTLD operations." So just as a point of background, we will remember that we were talking about accepted standards and things, and several people had issues with that and how that would be interpreted, or it would be left open if there was nothing else. So I think Becki was trying to address that, and her approach is saying, well, if there's nothing out there, then let's task the ccNSO with doing it. So I think the general thrust here is ccNSO work on this. We've got a big red X from Nigel, and I'll put it over to Nigel at this point.

Nigel Roberts: Thank you. This is a less -- it's not such a big red X, but it is -- having re-read it three times, first of all, with an ordinary person's head-on, and then after several passes with a slightly more strict construction hat on, I don't like the use of the word "definition" from here. Having re-read it three times, I see what Becky means, and I agree with what she means. But I think we could rephrase this, because this is not really anything to do with the definition. It's to do with, once you've got the definition, what you do with the definition. Are you with me?

Bernie Turcotte: Yes.

Nigel Roberts: So it would -- I would like to see the phrase "inform the definition" put in slightly more plain English without using the word "definition."

Bernie Turcotte: Okay, noted. Eberhard?

Eberhard Lisse: Firstly, there is a typing error. Accepted (ph) is spelled wrongly. And secondly, the GAC has no input to make on the operation of a ccTLD. Whether they can give advice or not, I don't care. They are not stakeholders. So to put them in the sentence, state with consultation with the GAC and other stakeholders, it's not acceptable to me. I'm not saying we shouldn't consult them, but you must phrase it in a way that is much less strict, and there is no such thing as current standards or generally accepted practice. The words I wouldn't be able to accept. We must find different wording here.

Bernie Turcotte: Okay.

Eberhard Lisse: So I agree with the idea that -- what's behind the paragraph.

Bernie Turcotte: Well, then we've moved forward, I think. I like the idea that people like the concept of what we're trying to do here, and so we'll build on that and see if we can address the issues. Nigel, you still have your X, so I'm taking it that you still want to talk.

Keith Davidson: No, (inaudible)--.

Nigel Roberts: --No, that's wrong. I don't want to talk.

Bernie Turcotte: Now you've just got your hand up. Okay. So I'll take it that 5.2.4 and its subsections need major work. We've noted all the things with the scribes, and we will be working on them.

Keith Davidson: Yes. I think, Bernie, it would probably be fair to not do too much work in the next two-week period, but wait for Becky to be on the call and have a reasonably

useful debate with Becky and Nigel and Eberhard at the time, and see if we can work back to Becky's reasoning behind this wording. So I think if everyone's happy, let's please do that.

Bernie Turcotte: Okay.

Keith Davidson: Not seeing any objections, so yes. I don't -- it could be quite difficult to reinvent a reinvented wheel, if you know what I mean, so let's try and understand where Becky was basing this from before--.

Bernie Turcotte: --Well, I think what I'll try to do is properly document the concerns that were raised on this call and go see if I can do a go-through with Becky before the next call so that we can maximize our input. And if there are some points which she has wording for, then maybe we'll have some stuff. But yes, okay, thank you. Eberhard?

Eberhard Lisse: Yes, I just raised my (inaudible) isn't official objection.

Bernie Turcotte: Pardon me?

Eberhard Lisse: I just raised my hand, so please have -- can notice an official objection.

Bernie Turcotte: Official objection to?

Eberhard Lisse: No, Keith said he doesn't see any objection, but the point is he's right, in a way, that we should wait for Becky to do this and to -- and think about it. But the wording as is is not acceptable.

Bernie Turcotte: Okay, understood. Thank you, Eberhard.

Keith Davidson: Absolutely taken as read that it's not acceptable, and I can see exactly why, so it needs modification. But let's understand the reasons for modification while we do that. Nigel has his hand raised now, so Nigel?

Nigel Roberts: Just as a practical matter, if you'd like to copy me on what you've captured as being the takeaways from this meeting, that will prompt me to make a suggestion of how to fix them.

Keith Davidson: Thanks.

Bernie Turcotte: Well, probably what I'll do then is I'll send you an early draft of the meeting notes, because that -- I just captured them once so that it makes sense for everyone.

Nigel Roberts: Yes. No, that's fine. It's just these two or three specific points that we've dealt with that have put up these red flags for, and it'll just prompt me. It'll take me a few minutes to respond, but it's late at night, and I can't read it on the fly tonight.

Bernie Turcotte: Okay.

Keith Davidson: And just for the recording, noting Ugo joined the call about 10 or 15 minutes ago. Sorry, please continue, Bernie.

Bernie Turcotte: Thank you. all right, moving on off of 5.2.4 on to 5.2.5. And here's the cursor. Process for revocation - there's been some updates by Becky on 5.2.5.1, so we'll just read through it, as we usually do. "The FOI working group also believes it is consistent with the intent of RFC-1591" -- excuse me -- "to state that revocation should be a last resort option for the" -- and taking to heart the comment from Nigel earlier, "the last resort option for the IANA contractor. The IANA contractor should use all means at his disposal to assist the manager to resolve any

important issues with respect to the designated managers meeting the applicable requirements of RFC-1591," full stop. "Revocation should only be considered if the IANA contractor reasonably demonstrates that the manager is significantly incompetent or unwilling to resolve material, clearly identified and documented failures to fulfill the necessary responsibilities in an equitable, just, honest, and/or competent manner in an appropriate timeframe." That's a mouthful. "If the delegation is revoked, the IANA contractor should use all means at his disposal to ensure the ccTLD will continue to resolve name (ph) and that a suitable replacement is identified by significantly interested parties consistent with the applicable laws and local procedures as described elsewhere on an expedited basis," full stop.

So here we go. Basically, Becky sort of framing this a little bit tighter than what was there. I don't think there's any intent to change what we were trying to state, which was generally okay and acceptable, but just trying to tighten it up. And I see we've got Kim, so let's take our next caller. Kim, you're online.

Kim Davies: Thanks. I just wonder if this -- second half of this sentence calls on IANA to get involved in the country in the process by which the suitable replacement is found. And I'm just a little concerned that that's a historical role that there's been a pretty bright line between IANA's not involved in the local process. but if it needs to use -- it needs to be involved in getting the significantly interested parties to identify a suitable replacement, that might be considered sort of crossing that line. Obviously there's a problem here to be solved, in that there's -- at that moment not a (inaudible) operator because the previous operator's been revoked. But it's something where I would feel a lot more comfortable if there was some precision in terms of what exactly is expected of IANA and what's not expected of IANA in that position, because it could easily be interpreted that IANA's overstepping its bounds by getting involved in a local issue.

Bernie Turcotte: Thanks, Kim. I think that's very useful comments, and I certainly understand the basis for it, so all right, we'll note that.

Bill Semich: I have a comment, and I'm not able to raise my hand.

Bernie Turcotte: Ah, okay. Well, my next one is Nigel, and then I'll take you, Bill, if that's okay.

Bill Semich: That's fine, thank you.

Bernie Turcotte: Okay. Nigel?

Nigel Roberts: Okay. I'm concerned at the conflation of the words "substantial" and "significant" again. In 5.2.5.1, we have the phrase "significantly incompetent." Supposing I was to suggest to you that, instead of using the term "significantly interested parties" throughout our document and throughout the document itself on significantly interested parties, we replace the words "significant" with "substantial" so that then referred to substantially interested parties. It would completely change the meaning of what we were doing. So significantly incompetent is incumbent that you simply notice. Substantially incompetent is something that you -- it's more than just that you notice it. It's having a real bad effect. So I think we need to be very, very careful throughout our work that we don't accidentally drop in the word "significant" with "significantly," pardon the phrase, lowers the bar from substantial.

Bernie Turcotte: Okay. Nigel, my comment on that is we've got significantly interested parties in RFC-1591. I'm not sure we've got--.

Nigel Roberts: --Bernie, stop. I was not suggesting that. I was using it by way of an illustration. As for the facts, there is a -- not only significant but substantial difference between the words significant and substantial in their effect.

Bernie Turcotte: Okay. all right. Anything else, Nigel?

Nigel Roberts: So can we substitute substantial for significant here?

Bernie Turcotte: Well, I think as Keith has suggested, given these are Becky's words, we'll run through it and we can have the discussion with her.

Nigel Roberts: Fine.

Bernie Turcotte: Sure. Noted, and it'll be documented, and it'll be part of that process when I produce the notes for this meeting.

Nigel Roberts: As long as (inaudible), that's great.

Bernie Turcotte: Okay. I see Eberhard has his hand up, but I promised I would let Bill in. And so, Bill, over to you.

Bill Semich: Yes. Again, I like that word, "conflation," Nigel. I might use it here in the sentence that says, "Revocation should only be considered if the IANA contractor reasonably demonstrates that the manager is significantly incompetent or unwilling to resolve material clearly identified and documented failures to fulfill the necessary responsibilities in an equitable, just, honest or competent manner in an appropriate timeframe." There's an awful lot of ideas being sandwiched together here which are confusing, to say the least, and perhaps incorrect. Does this mean that no revocation would happen if a document fails to fulfill the necessary responsibilities in an inequitable, unjust and dishonest and incompetent manner, or what? You see what I'm saying? There's too many things being joined together with commas and "ors."

Bernie Turcotte: Yes, I understand your point. I'm not arguing it, and I cannot defend it for Becky at this point. So I'll give you the same answer I gave to Nigel. We'll note it. we'll document the concerns, and we'll take it up with Becky. Is that okay, Bill?

Bill Semich: Oh, sure. I'm sure Becky will make it work. I'm just concerned that--.

Bernie Turcotte: --Yes, I'm sure she will, too. All right. Thank you, Bill.

Bill Semich: (Inaudible) and incompetent phrase is just sort of stuck in with a bunch of other things, and I think it should stand alone.

Bernie Turcotte: Okay. great. Eberhard, you're up.

Eberhard Lisse: "Identifies by" is supposed to mean "identified by." It's a typing error.

Bernie Turcotte: Okay. Thank you. anything else, Eberhard?

Eberhard Lisse: No.

Bernie Turcotte: Thank you.

Keith Davidson: And Ugo also has his hand raised, so Ugo?

Bernie Turcotte: Ugo, if you're speaking, we can't hear you. And we still can't hear you. Shall we take Nigel, Mr. Chair?

Keith Davidson: Yes, please.

Bernie Turcotte: Nigel?

Nigel Roberts: I can actually defend Becky's language. And just to say to Bill that it seems to raise a lot of hurdles that you have to jump through before revocation can be used. I'll take it offline with Bill quite happily. It could perhaps be made slightly clearer in plain language, but I think that language works.

Bernie Turcotte: Okay. and I'm sure we'll all have a great discussion about it with Becky. I also think the general concept is probably okay, but even I think we could take another edit at it to make this maybe clearer in some points, and we've gotten some great points made.

All right, so that was 5.2.5.1. We've beaten this one to death, I think. Anybody else? I don't see anyone, so I'm going to take it as the points have been made, and we're moving on. 5.2.5.2 is as-is. 5.2.5.3 has undergone surgery. We've replaced "The IANA contractor should develop and post 'the'", that has been removed and been replaced with "The working group suggests that the ccNSO undertake, in consultation with the GAC and other" -- insert -- "interested stakeholders to identify for further discussion possible procedures to be followed in connection with any proposed revocation of the delegation of the ccTLD based on the work of the FOI working group. These procedures should be reviewed and approved by the ccNSO, and it will be responsibility for monitoring these." So, essentially, what we've got here is Becky using that device that was introduced a little earlier of saying, if we're going to have revocation, we're going to need procedures, and if we're going to have procedures, then the ccNSO should be leading the charge on that. Questions and comments? Nigel, you're up. If you're speaking, we're not hearing you, Nigel.

Keith Davidson: He's removed his hand up and reverted to a tic, indicating he's accepting what's in front of us.

Bernie Turcotte: Okay, I didn't see that. Okay, anybody else on 5.2.5.3? Going once, going twice, okay, let's move on. We're getting there, folks. Moving on to section 5.3, which is about section 3.5 of RFC-1591, revocation for persistent problems with the proper operation of the domain, ccTLD. Our first change comes in section 5.3.2.2, where we've had some text added by Becky. The original text reads, "The IANA contractor has not published its expectations as far as what constitutes a manager doing a satisfactory job of operating the DNS service for the domain or what should be considered to be persistent problems with the proper operation of the domain." Becky suggests that we add, "The working group suggests that the ccNSO could inform this discussion by documenting, in consultation with the GAC and other stakeholders, current standards and generally accepted practices" -- whoa, sorry about that, folks -- "for ccTLD operations, the failure to comply with which would constitute problems with the proper operation of a ccTLD."

Okay, 5.3.2.2, and this time we've got Eberhard up first. Eberhard?

Eberhard Lisse: I don't really understand the English, "could inform this discussion." I don't know this word. And then, again, we don't have (inaudible). We don't have best practices and so on, so we must find a different vocabulary that is uncontroversial.

Bernie Turcotte: Noted. Anybody else?

Bill Semich: Yes, it's Bill.

Bernie Turcotte: Yes, Bill?

Bill Semich: Well, I raise the same issue that I think Eberhard did recently. I'm really not sure what the GAC can bring to the table in terms of current operating standards for ccTLD.

Bernie Turcotte: Yes. I think we'll take that as a general comment whenever we're referring to this device of getting the ccNSO to do some homework on this. But yes, noted, Bill. Is there anything else, Bill?

Bill Semich: Well, I don't object to having the GAC give us advice and bring good information to the table. It's just that, if we institutionalize this concept, it's cause for worry.

Bernie Turcotte: Okay, noted. Next one up is Nigel.

Nigel Roberts: Yes, thank you. One suggestion, yes, I think we need to give a little bit of -- do what I sometimes do and reach back into the bag of historical perspective here. This phrase -- excuse me -- this phrase that you -- we have in 5.3 -- where were we?

Bill Semich: 5.3.5.2.

Nigel Roberts: Remind me the name of the paragraphs that we're doing just to make sure I'm going through the right one.

Bernie Turcotte: 5.3.5.2.

Nigel Roberts: Okay. The proper operation of a domain has a specific meaning in the mind of the authors, and we are giving it a different meaning. Persistent problems with the proper operation of a domain, in the mind of the authors -- and you can actually consult with at least one of them if there's some doubt on this -- meant the DNS not working. And don't forget, RFC-1591 was intended to apply to all domain names, not just top level domains and not just country code top level domains. It was intended to apply to all domains, including, for example, second-level, or even third-level domains under dotcom.

We are taking a much more liberal interpretation of what was written, and I'm not sure whether or not we are straying into policymaking.

Bernie Turcotte: Fair enough. Thank you, Nigel. And I'm sure that'll be a great discussion with Becky. All right. Did that conclude your remarks, Nigel?

Nigel Roberts: I can just add one thing. This is one of those things whereby you find a comment to say in -- for example, in a court case, this is a matter for the legislature to fix. That would be an early matter for a PDP to address. I don't think you can merely address it by saying the original words now mean something different, unless you take a very, very broad view of the word interpretation. So it's a very interesting point that I think Becky and I, and maybe anybody else who has an interest, ought to focus on.

Bernie Turcotte: Okay. Anybody else? I don't see any other hands up, and we'll move on to 5.3.2.3. Again, some major surgery. "Persistent problems with the proper operation of a domain and published this -- sorry, I tried to follow through on this, but I guess all we're saying is we need to publish whatever the ccNSO will come up with, and we don't need to remake all the same arguments that we just had in a previous point. Nigel?

Nigel Roberts: So I'm just still up.

Bernie Turcotte: Oh, okay. Sorry. 5.3.2.4, following appropriate consultation, this documentation could then be used as a reference point. And okay, I think this is all in the same vein and all the same comments apply, so unless there's something different than what we've talked about in 5.3.2.2, then I'll take it as general applicability of the comment. Are we okay? Okay. Now, let's move on. Definition of revocation, 5.3.3, minor change in 5.3.3.2, Delegation of responsibility for the management of the ccTLD to the designated manager. I don't think that's going to ruffle too many feathers. Questions, thoughts, comments, suggestions, 5.3.3.2? Okay. 5.3.3.3, "As such, one should define 'delegation' as the IANA contract manager" -- this is the new wording -- "identifying or acknowledging the identification of a proposed manager as the designated manager for the ccTLD. The responsibility for management of the ccTLD to a manager -- designated manager," 5.3.3.3. Okay. So I'm not taking it as accepted. I'm taking it as we have to talk to Becky as this -- about this.

Okay, moving on, 5.3.4, Process to revoke a delegation. I think Becky's, again, tried to clear up some stuff, similar to what we had with significant misbehavior. "The FOI working group also believes the intent of RFC-1591 is that revocation should be the last resort option for the IANA contractor" -- yes, I've noted this. "The IANA contractor should use all means at his disposal to assist the manager to resolve any persistent issues with respect to the designated managers, operation of the ccTLD," full stop. "Revocation should only be considered if the IANA contractor reasonably demonstrates that the manager is unwilling to or incapable of resolving the clearly identified and documented failures to fulfill the necessary responsibilities in an equitable, just, honest, and /or competent manner issues in an appropriate timeframe."

All the same comments we have around this language I think apply here. I understand that. "If the delegation is revoked, the IANA contractor should use all the means at his disposal to ensure the ccTLD will continue to resolve (inaudible) in that a suitable replacement is" -- it's the same language. We've got the same issues. I'll just cup the same concerns, given it's the same language. Are we okay, or are there new comments relative to what is essentially the same language from earlier on? Nigel?

Keith Davidson: Oh, Nigel has changed to a tic, agreeing with the process outlined.

Bernie Turcotte: Okay. Thank you, sir. We're almost there, guys.

Keith Davidson: Stephen's also indicated a check of agreement in terms of that process, so I think (inaudible).

Bernie Turcotte: Okay. At 5.3.4.3, major surgery here. "The working group suggests that the ccNSO undertake, in consultation with the GAC and other interested stakeholders, to identify for further discussion possible procedures to be followed in connection with any proposed revocation of the delegation of the ccTLD based on the work of the FOI."

Again, I think we'll just reiterate some of the same comments. I see Nigel's got his hand up. Nigel? Oh, it went away.

And that's it, ladies and gentlemen. We're done the next path (ph). We've got some wins. We've got areas of concern, and we've -- I think our focus, just to remind everyone, will be documenting the concern in the meeting notes as per my habitual standard. I'll be forwarding those early drafts to Nigel, because he said he wanted to have a look at them, and will be trying to run through those with Becky before the next meeting. And we will be ensuring that Becky can participate in the next meeting so we can have a fulsome discussion on some of the points that were raised regarding revocation document 3.1 today.

That's it for me. Mr. Chair, over to you.

Keith Davidson: Thank you, Bernie, and thank you, all. I think we made bits of progress, and we have a number of checks and balances to go through when we have a fuller meeting of the group, but thank you.

I think, moving on, unless anyone has anything to add in terms of a revocation topic, if we can move on, as I said at the start of the call, we have two held-over items, and item five on their agenda and responding to the GAC. And I think we need Martin on a call to progress those items, so I'm holding them over and leaving them. Eberhard, you have a comment?

Eberhard Lisse: Did you get the e-mail that I sent about a week ago about this concerned issue, this court case that happened here, which has some interesting language in it? Good reading.

Keith Davidson: Yes. I've read it, and it's sort of partly -- well, it's not irrelevant, but yes, there was informed consent specifically. But thank you for sharing it, and it might be one of those things that could prove useful as time goes on. Eberhard?

Eberhard Lisse: Yes. I mean, I don't want to revisited consent based on this, but whenever I dig up some stuff that is interesting on this, I forward it to the list, and as you know, I'm involved with informed consent, but not in -- I was not involved with this case. I just found it quite interesting what the judge has to say about what informed consent means.

Keith Davidson: Okay, thanks for that. Okay, and then, looking at our -- any other business, we have our next scheduled meeting on the 22nd of August, which I think is at the unkind time for the northern hemisphere. So while the northern hemisphere may be returning from its summer break by then, it may not inspire a large participation due to the time of day, but let's run with it, and we'll talk to you all then. Are there any other issues of business that anyone wishes to raise before we close the call?

Stephen Deerhake: Steve, yes. What do you mean by unkind time?

Keith Davidson: I think that the next time is 500 UTC. Is that--?

Stephen Deerhake: --Well, that's six o'clock in the morning. People just must get up and have their breakfast early.

Keith Davidson: Okay, that's not too unkind.

Stephen Deerhake: This is more antisocial for me than six o'clock in the morning.

Bernie Turcotte: Yes, it's the North Americans and the Latin Americans that have a problem with this particular--.

Keith Davidson: --Oh, okay. That's like 1300 UTC that is the most unkind to the northern hemisphere, or to the Africas, Americas, Europe, I guess.

Stephen Deerhake: 1300 is lunchtime. That's perfectly fine, as well.

Keith Davidson: Okay.

Bernie Turcotte: No, it's this next one, Steve. This next one is one a.m. for Washington-New York-Montreal.

Keith Davidson: Okay. Eberhard has his hand raised.

Eberhard Lisse: The 22nd on my calendar is a Wednesday.

Keith Davidson: Oh, yes, yes, that is not a Wednesday. It should read the 23rd. My apologies. Always a Thursday.

Eberhard Lisse: Because 23rd is a very long weekend for us, because the Monday is a public holiday. So I'm very particular about it.

Keith Davidson: Yes, okay. But yes -- no, definitely always a Thursday, so the 23rd. Was that noted in the diary (inaudible)?

Bernie Turcotte: I'll fix that, Keith.

Eberhard Lisse: And it's even changed. Kristina already changed it, I think.

Keith Davidson: Okay. So anything else from anyone? If not, let's declare the meeting closed, and thank you all for your participation, and we'll talk to you on the 23rd of (inaudible) at 500 UTC.

Bernie Turcotte: Bye everyone.

Bill Semich: Thank you, guys.

Unidentified Participant: Thanks.

Bill Semich: (Inaudible), everybody. Bye from Bill.

Unidentified Participant: Bye-bye.

Unidentified Participant: Bye.

Keith Davidson: Bye everybody.

Unidentified Participant: Bye.