

TRANSCRIPT

Framework of Interpretation Working Group

22 May 2014

Attendees:

ccNSO:

Becky Burr, .us (Vice Chair)

Keith Davidson, .nz (Chair)

Chris Disspain, .au

Stephen Deerhake, .as

Dejan Djukic, .rs

Daniel Kalchev, .bg

Eberhard Lisse, .na

Patricio Poblete, .cl

Bill Semich, .nu

Other Liaisons:

Maureen Hilyard, ALAC

Cheryl Langdon Orr, ALAC

Staff Support and Special Advisors:

Jaap Akkerhuis, ICANN / ISO

Kim Davies IANA

Kristina Nordström, ICANN

Bernard Turcotte, ICANN

Apologies:

Martin Boyle, .uk

Desiree Miloshevic, .gi

Nigel Roberts, .gg

Suzanne Radell, GAC

Keith Davidson: --call, but, Kristina, can we have a list of apologies, and let's see who is on the call.

Kristina Nordström: Yes. We have (inaudible), and from the ccNSO we have Keith Davidson, Becky Burr, Chris Disspain, Stephen Deerhake, Eberhard Lisse, Patricio Poblete, and Bill Semich.

From Liaisons we have Cheryl Langdon Orr and Maureen Hilyard.

From Staff and Special Advisors we have, Jaap Akkerhuis, Kristina Nordström and Bernard Turcotte.

And we have apologies from Martin Boyle, Desiree Miloshevic, and Nigel Roberts and Suzanne Radell.

Did I miss anybody?

Keith Davidson: That captures everybody I think, but I (inaudible) -- Any further apologies received by anyone? If not, can we approve the agenda? And in fact, I've put a (inaudible) there, I think it's subject to some change, because we really want to concentrate just on this final report. So shall we make that item three on the agenda, the final report?

And, Bernie do you want to walk us through it? And if time permits, we'll go through the rest of the agenda items after this.

Unidentified Participant: Have we got a quorum?

Keith Davidson: I think we have, and I think I've given sufficient warning on the list --

Bernard Turcotte: Yes, (inaudible) --

Keith Davidson: -- that we do need to finish our business today so, you know, given that we cancelled the last call due to a lack of quorum, I think we have to -- you know, we just have to do our business and, you know, I feel we have sufficient numbers to carry on today. So, shall we proceed?

Bernard Turcotte: Yeah.

Keith Davidson: Okay. Thank you. Bernie?

Bernard Turcotte: Thank you, sir. So, as Keith has said, we need to focus on -- Kristina we need to make this scrollable, at least for me, so I can get to the fun parts. We will concentrate on the final report. Apologies for the fact that it's still in draft state, the stuff that goes around the edges. I don't think too many people will be flustered about it, given we will be inspired by the various progress reports and final reports we have posted on the other topics.

However, the final report needed some editing to sort of make it work as a single unit, and so I try to present that as best I can with some comments in the document that was distributed.

So let us get going. So we are missing the intro that Bart is working on, Bart is still on the other call. After that we will get into the section that we do have, which is the FOI Working Group interpretation of RFC 1591.

So essentially what this is, is a gluing together all the recommendations from consensus (ph) and revocation into one document. Now, over the years, and yes, it has been years, our style changed in how we presented these things, and so if you simply stuck them together, they really looked pretty bad. So I took it on myself to sort of throw in some

edits, I do not believe they have changed the meaning of anything we've done. You know me, I try to be very careful on that, and the notion is to go through those, and then the recommendations.

So part of the changes, just as a context, were that if you remove them from the context of the document where they came from, i.e. if you took something out of SIP, or if you took something out of the Revocation documents, sometimes you have to reframe the context when you're putting them in another document as a cut and paste.

So here we go. One, Section 1, FOI Working Group interpretation of RFC 1591; then we'll take a series of items as we do always; it seems to work for this Group. I'll stop after each formal point, and then we'll see if there's a problem. This is just a note to sort of lay it out; RFC 1591 only identifies three mechanisms available to the IANA operator.

Now it sort of stopped there in the revocation documents, so I added the text in yellow: to assign or modify the management responsibility for ccTLD. Delegation Section 3 RFC 1591, transfer Sections 3.6, RFC 1591, revocation Section 3.5 RFC 1591. Other mechanisms may be available to the stakeholder community under applicable domestic law. However, those mechanisms might not be available to the IANA operator as a practical matter.

Questions, comments issues; all right, we didn't kind of number these, so I'll just plough through and if I'm too quick, as usual, stop me. Number two, the FOI Working Group interprets delegations (ph) Section 3 of RFC 1591, to mean the process by which the IANA operator initially assigns management responsibility, or transfers previously-assigned responsibility, I added, "after revocation" because otherwise it applies across the board, we figured out, and that should have been an edit in the original document, for the management of the ccTLD.

To point one, note, in the case of a delegation, Section 3.4 of RFC 1591, it requires that Significantly Interested Parties should agree that a designated manager is the appropriate party, and that other stakeholders have some voice in selecting the manager. So this was dragged in from the SIP Report, and it sort of seems to fit nicely under here. So point two, question, comments?

Okay. Number three, the FOI Working Group interprets the term transfer, Section 3.6 of RFC 1591. Now if I've gone and added a bracket Section 3.6 RFC 1591, I didn't think that was a major change.

I see Bill's hand; Bill, over to you. We are not hearing you Bill.

Keith Davidson: Bill, you are muted.

Bernard Turcotte: Bill? His mic doesn't -- Bill, are you there, because I'm not hearing you? All right, I'm watching the -- I'm watching the chat. Yes, we know you are there.

Chris Disspain: Bernie, can you hear me?

Bernard Turcotte: Yes, I can hear you fine, Chris.

Chris Disspain: Okay. I thought I was on mute, so I shall mute myself.

Bernard Turcotte: Okay. So Bill is going to dial back in, we'll take his question at that point.

Number three, we'll take a little bit, chunk by chunk this is a long one.

The FOI Working Group interprets the term transfer to refer to the process by which the IANA operator transfers responsibility from and incumbent manager to a new manager with consent of both parties, so that's exactly as it was.

3.1, the FOI Working Group interprets Section 3.6 of RFC 1591 to require that the IANA operator should only seek consent for a transfer request from the incumbent manager -- proposed manager -- and the proposed manager. The IANA operators do not seek consent from the administrative or technical contacts -- or contacts -- sorry.

So, anything on 3.1 for those minor edits?

Keith Davidson: I've just fallen off the Adobe Connect, so I'm reconnecting, so I don't know if anyone has their hand raised at the moment, or not.

Bernard Turcotte: No. I'm not seeing any, except for Bill, and I'm waiting for him to come back on. All right, the 3.2, the FOI Working Group further interprets Section 3.6 of RFC 1591, regarding agreement to transfer -- do the transfer. As requiring that the communication from the IANA operator requesting the party's consent should clearly state (a) -- I'm actually not going to read this, because we've beat this to death, and it's exactly as it was approved in the consent document. So, unless people really want me to actually re-read and talk about what we have agreed to in the past, I don't see the point. And I think in the spirit of saving time, if there are no edits, I will simply say: folks, it's cut and paste.

EI, (ph) I see you have your hand up.

Eberhard Lisse: Can you please go to 3.1 there was a typo.

Bernard Turcotte: Yes, sir. I am there.

Eberhard Lisse: (Inaudible) -- about 3.2, 1591 and regarding, there must be a space in there.

Bernard Turcotte: I think I see it on my screen. But I'll recheck in the final document, anyways. Thank you, sir. Anything else? Okay, I see the hand (ph) has gone down. Patricio has put up his hand. Yes, sir.

Patricio Poblete: Pardon me.

Bernard Turcotte: Yes, sir.

Patricio Poblete: About this, not asking consent from the administrative or technical contact. I'm wondering, operationally, who was the IANA contact for a specific ccTLD, because, at least in our case, the only name that people, in the record, are the admin and the techs (ph) contact.

Bernard Turcotte: I think as we discussed this when we were talking about it, IANA -- well (a) those are the names of people that are contacted, but there is also contact information for the manager. And I think the point that we had made when we were going through this, is that we were going to get the consent from the manager, and not the contacts anymore as per our interpretation. Now IANA should manage -- if IANA cannot get a hold of the manager we've all got a huge problem. So I'm not seeing that as a big issue.

Patricio Poblete: I was just wondering if this work (inaudible) -- extract this, for instance, in our case, the Manager is the University of Chile. That means you would try -- IANA would try to contact the University of Chile for consent?

Bernard Turcotte: That is correct.

Patricio Poblete: Whoever answers the phone there, right?

Bernard Turcotte: Well, whoever is authorized from the University; I mean, we are all used to dealing with formal structures and you know if -- and we've seen in the past, I do not need to bring up certain very specific cases, where, you know, some transfers have been done and the University has not been happy with the result at all. So I think that this is exactly -- well (a) except for the text in yellow, this is exactly what we approved, and (b) I think we did talk this to death with examples and everything else. Is that okay, Patricio?

Patricio Poblete: Yeah.

Bernard Turcotte: All right. Bill, are you able to talk?

Bill Semich: I am. I don't know if you can hear me or not.

Bernard Turcotte: Yes. I can.

Bill Semich: Okay. I did have a comment on this, but if it's been approved, it doesn't make much sense commenting this late. But I'll make a comment anyway on this issue that Patricio raised, and that is I'm not sure you want to be so proscriptive to say the IANA operators should not seek consent from, because what if the manager has assigned that responsibility to the administrator for technical contacts.

Bernard Turcotte: Well, you are correct. At this point at this point we are not going to describe that. And I think the word that is used is "should not" and I think -- you know, what we have said in the past, is these are directives to IANA. We are not trying to write the processes and procedures for them, and if they hit a snag when they are creating the implementation scheme or this, so it can actually work, then I'm sure they will get back to us, and we will deal with it.

All right next in line is EI.

Bill Semich: Wait, wait, wait; when do I go back to my first question, at the beginning?

Bernard Turcotte: Oh, I'm sorry, I was not aware that was not your first question.

Eberhard Lisse: Can I -- can I just finish this one, and then Bill can go back to the first one.

Bill Semich: Sure, sure, I just didn't want you to get too far into the document.

Eberhard Lisse: I disagree with that issue. It doesn't matter. There's a defined manager, and there is defined contacts. Sometimes they are the same, sometimes they are not. But it's the manager, the entity that we have -- that we hold responsible, and we also we are just interpreting, we are not writing policy. And I like what Bernard said, if IANA can't -- IANA operator can't get hold of the manager then we are in trouble. So I think we should leave - we have talked about it enough, and I think it's fine; and we should leave it as is.

Bernard Turcotte: All right.

Keith Davidson: And Chris has his hand raised too, so.

Eberhard Lisse: Bill is -- Bill should do his I think, unless this is on this point.

Keith Davidson: I think Chris is on this point -- oh, no, Chris' hand has come down. I think the all important thing that we are all forgetting here is that the IANA operator shouldn't assume that the administrative or technical context, have authority over the domain, and I think Chris is agreeing with it. So, okay, can we continue, and go back to Bill for his original point.

Bill Semich: Bernie, can you scroll back up?

Bernard Turcotte: Yes, sir. Which part?

Bill Semich: To the very -- I think it was the second one.

Bernard Turcotte: Ta-ta-tum -- Big fingers -- sorry -- just a second.

Bill Semich: Okay. I understand why you would have put "after revocation" in the sentence about assigned management responsibility or transfer previously assigned responsibility, but that leaves in limbo, in this section at least, delegation as it applies to a transfer, and I'm going to say that, it's possible that you're thinking that a transfer doesn't require delegation, but I just want to know what your thinking is here. The transfer (inaudible)--

Bernard Turcotte: Yeah--

Bill Semich: The voluntary transfer.

Bernard Turcotte: Yeah. Well, we don't have anything that is an (inaudible) -- voluntary transfer anymore. We have a takeaway with revocation--

Bill Semich: Right, but I said voluntary?

Bernard Turcotte: (Laughs) I'm just making sure everyone understands the same thing.

Bill Semich: Okay.

Bernard Turcotte: So when we re-read the interpretation of delegation, we just wanted to make it clear that transfer was a separate point, and that's why transfer comes right after it, where we detailed and discussed. But there was some--

Bill Semich: But (inaudible) to transfer without a revocation.

Bernard Turcotte: I'm not following you.

Bill Semich: Well, if you go up to the three dots above, delegation transfer and revocation.

Bernard Turcotte: Yes.

Bill Semich: In number two, you are saying that the delegation only happens when there's a new assignment or a transfer after revocation.

Bernard Turcotte: Yes. That is correct.

Bill Semich: So that will apply -- and I'm trying to understand this, that if there is a transfer not after a revocation, but between entity A and entity B, and they both agree to it, that is not going to require a delegation to entity B?

Bernard Turcotte: It's not the same thing as a delegation process as we define it, no. That is correct.

Bill Semich: Okay. So there is some lack of clarity there in my mind.

Bernard Turcotte: Possibly because this was added in to sort of make it clear, and I think we can get Becky to have a look at it. EI?

Eberhard Lisse: I think the word "transfer" is a little bit confusing, so Bill makes a good point. So what about: initially assigns management responsibility, or assigns previously-assigned responsibility after revocation; so that you avoid the word "transfer" in that context.

Bernard Turcotte: I see. Yes. I understand--

Eberhard Lisse: Because such -- we have transfer separately from delegation, and now we have transfer in a delegation, and that is a bit -- it's quite right, it can cause confusion.

Bernard Turcotte: True. Becky?

Becky Burr: Yeah, I -- I guess I am not sure -- I mean, either it would be after revocation, or a consented transfer, because--

Eberhard Lisse: No, that now you are going into content, and we have -- and we shouldn't do that. We should leave the meaning of this paragraph as is, we should just make (inaudible) -- maybe aware of making it more (inaudible) vocal, but without changing the meaning.

Bernard Turcotte: Yeah.

Eberhard Lisse: It's the initial assignment, or it's an assignment after revocation. It's not a voluntary consented transfer.

Bernard Turcotte: Yeah. I sort of liked Eberhard's idea of removing the word transfer, because I understand the conflict that it's causing. But let's not try to edit online, I'll go through it with Becky, and--

Becky Burr: Oh, yeah. I agree -- I agree with that.

Bernard Turcotte: Okay. She's got it. EI, I like your stuff, we'll be adjusting accordingly. Would that help you, Bill?

Keith Davidson: You're on mute, Bill.

Bill Semich: Sorry, I had it on mute. Yes. This is fine, thank you.

Bernard Turcotte: All right, great. So, any other questions, before we proceed?

Keith Davidson: It looks like everybody is happy.

Bernard Turcotte: All right. So 3.1 there were a few minor edits, just to get back in the swing of things. The IANA operator and a transfer request, any issues of that? Seeing none, we'll move on to the next edited text. Oh, come on. The fingers are not moving very well today, sorry.

All right, so further down in the transfer section, we've got the consent issue, and then in the yellow text the reason we've made an adjustment here is with regards to the current IANA transition. Meaning that it was hard quoted in there that it was the U.S. GDoc (ph), so to adjust for reality, we edited in -- we'll seek approval from the appropriate parties currently U.S. GDoc, if the request is approved by the ICANN Board.

So, Eberhard.

Eberhard Lisse: Perhaps it's the way it's written it's not proper. It cannot be written as a singular with a single with an I-E, if it's singular it's a Y, so it doesn't look right when you -- when you look at it, it looks like as if it's an error.

Bernard Turcotte: Agreed. We'll correct. Any other comments? Okay, we are looking good. Noted, thank you, El.

All right, now we end up with 3.3, I've highlighted it, but we've actually used the text in other places, I just wanted to be double sure we are comfortable, because I had to make a few minor edits in that text, so I will read 3.3. The term re-delegation and un-consented re-delegation are in common use by ICANN, the IANA operator and the stakeholder community -- that's where I made the change; I've added some detail there.

When describing the reassignment of the ccTLD Manager, given there is no reference to the term re-delegation of RFC 1591, there is no policy basis for an un-consented re-delegation, the FOI recommends that the term -- the use of the term "re-delegation" be dropped in favor of the term "transfer". El?

Eberhard Lisse: If you use quotes, use them consistently. In this paragraph I would quote un-consented re-delegation and re-delegation the same way you had it done in the first line.

Bernard Turcotte: Yes, sir. Will do. Any other comments? Okay. Section 3.4 is simply noting where it comes from; I do not think that is actually an arguable change. Thank you for that, Bill.

Keith Davidson: Bill has his hand raised again.

Bernard Turcotte: Sir?

Keith Davidson: Bill?

Bill Semich: Yeah. There appears to be some influence at just use of the English language here, but maybe I'm wrong. So in the case of transfer, Section 3.6 of RFC 1591, is that some of term of ours: transfer, Section 3.6, or is it missing a preposition?

Keith Davidson: Nothing (inaudible)--

Bernard Turcotte: I understand your point, Bill, this -- as I say, this is an early draft; it hasn't been gone through to correct this kind of stuff. Comment noted; we'll take care of it, thank you.

Keith Davidson: Eberhard has his hand raised. Eberhard?

Eberhard Lisse: Same thing here, I would uppercase, I would capitalize "transfer" but maybe we should come up with a way of consistently making all these terms of (inaudible) -- either italicized--

Bernard Turcotte: Eberhard Lisse, if you are still speaking we've lost your vocals. I understand the comment--

Eberhard Lisse: Yeah, sorry. Sorry about that. I leaned on the mute button. We should, maybe, consistently use the quoted terms throughout the whole document, or put an emphasis, or italics or something, so that we know -- if you were to capitalize "transfer" then -- or put a comma behind it, then it makes even more sense.

Bernard Turcotte: Thank you, sir. That's a really good comment. Anything else?

Keith Davidson: Everybody is happy.

Bernard Turcotte: All right, moving right along. All right, 4.5. Now, judgment call and I'll be happy either way, but I was trying to sort of relate either -- each of these interpretations to be as precise as we can to RFC 1591. In some cases it became quite difficult, and upon re-reading the whole text and thinking about this, I decided to insert the sort of generic overall, and I'll be happy to take comments or guidance on that, but it just seemed to be useful.

Chris? We are not hearing you, Chris.

Chris Disspain: Can you hear me now?

Keith Davidson: Yeah.

Bernard Turcotte: We can hear you now.

Chris Disspain: What do you think it achieves?

Bernard Turcotte: It achieves that the reader is not confused, versus all the other parts of the document where we've referred to various specific sections. So I was trying to clarify that this is a consideration by the FOI Working Group, many sections of RFC 1591, as opposed to a specific one. And the whole reason for why I'm asking for guidance is, yes, I'm a little torn myself as to whether it is useful.

Chris Disspain: While you refer to a specific paragraph, where you are -- where we are interpreting it in a specific paragraph, we refer to a specific paragraph. So I reference to RFC 1591 without reference to a specific paragraph, perhaps, might be taken to mean -- meaning the whole of this. So I'm not actually sure whether the (inaudible) --

Bernard Turcotte: As I said, I'm happy to take it out.

Chris Disspain: Sure.

Bernard Turcotte: Bill?

Bill Semich: Yeah. I'm reading this again, 4.5, and I have to say I kind of -- well, what's the word -- I have a conflict of reading of this paragraph where this -- sort of like one of those optical illusions where you see two faces in a vase, well, when I read this I somehow seem to think it's telling me that the RFC 1591 actually doesn't let IANA get into situations with the specialist behavior or posing a risk, or so on and so forth. I'm wondering if the language could be tightened up to the point where, say, a word like "restrict" IANA's operating authority, it's already -- as opposed to "limit" it. There's a -- I have a confusion in this sentence, and it sounds to me like IANA is not allowed to do these things.

Keith Davidson: It doesn't sound like that to me, Bill, I have to say.

Bill Semich: Well, I'm just -- you know, we all speak different kinds of English you know. And a plain reading for me is confusing, as opposed to direct and straightforward. But that's just a comment, I'm not going to force an edit on something, I'm just giving you my simple reading of it, which is clearly not the intent. Am I still on?

Keith Davidson: Yes. You are still on.

Bill Semich: Hello?

Keith Davidson: Yeah. Thanks, Bill

Bill Semich: Okay. All right. So I'll leave it at that, you know, fix or don't (ph).

Keith Davidson: Okay. Eberhard was next. Eberhard?

Eberhard Lisse: I would out-dent 4.7.1, so that it is on the same level as 4.8. It's indented with the bullet points and it doesn't -- that doesn't make sense to me from that respect.

Keith Davidson: Okay. Noted. Going back, I think it would be fair to say that there was some opposition to the word "overall" I don't think it's adding anything, Bernie, in actual fact, and it's possibly introducing a little of ambiguity that won't help, so I would suggest we remove that.

Bernard Turcotte: Happy to take it out.

Eberhard Lisse: Take it -- take it out.

Keith Davidson: Thanks.

Bernard Turcotte: Done.

Keith Davidson: And EI's point was 4.7.1 should be not indented.

Bernard Turcotte: I can make it 4.8 -- I'll look at that with Becky, it's just, originally it was a sub-point of the other one, given how we are restructuring the thing, it may make sense to out-dent it, I agree. We'll look at that.

Eberhard Lisse: Okay.

Bernard Turcotte: All right. Going to the next yellow text. Ah, yes, point 5. Significantly Interested Parties, in the backend of that: to be considered the Significantly Interested Party, any part other than the government or territorial authority for the country associated with the ccTLD must demonstrate that it has direct -- and I think it was indirectly understood that it was the manager or the government, and so upon rereading it very carefully, I thought it wise to make that edit, and it sort of made sense to me to carry it through like that.

Any issue -- I see two ticks from Bill and Chris, usually when I get those two going, I'm happy.

Keith Davidson: And Eberhard has got--

Bernard Turcotte: That's right, and Eberhard.

Keith Davidson: So I think you have general consent to proceed, I'd say.

Bernard Turcotte: Excellent. Thank you, ladies and gentlemen. 5.1, yeah, I had to do some surgery here to fit this in, the FOI -- as a sub-point -- the FOI interprets the requirement for approval from Significantly Interested Parties, Section 3.4 of RFC 1591 should require the IANA operator to obtain, evaluate and document input from Significantly Interested Parties for delegations and transfers. So basically if you went through the Significantly Interested Parties' stuff, and our recommendations around that, can you try to bring it back in under something that sort of makes sense, you sort of end up with that, but that was a trial. EI?

Eberhard Lisse: I don't like the Significantly Interested Parties the S in lower case -- no, go down to the next -- go down a bit--

Bernard Turcotte: Yeah, Significantly Interested Parties.

Eberhard Lisse: There we are. It should -- Significantly Interested Parties is one term, so that should be uppercase, and delegations and transfer, there should not be a comma, but there should be an end in there, or comma and an "and". It should read "for delegations and transfers." Hello?

Keith Davidson: Bernie? You are muted, Bernie.

Bernard Turcotte: Oh, so I am, and here I was rambling on, thanking EI, and saying it was it was noted and will be taken care of.

Eberhard Lisse: Excellent.

Bernard Turcotte: All right. 5.3, which is still under SIP; the IANA reports on delegation and transfer to reflect consistent application on these FOI Working Group; I added "interpretation" since it seems to make sense in the context where we are working the stuff, all the rest is approved text. Is that okay, with people?

All right, moving on; 6, oh, yeah -- okay, I think this is the last major one I think: the FOI Working Group defines stakeholder in the context of the administration of the ccTLDs to encompass Significantly Interested Parties -- Interested Parties, and other parties referenced in RFC 1591. The front part I think people can understand why I'm -- given how we've structured this, that it sort makes sense to add that intro, and I don't think it removes anyone. So we will see what happens with that. Any issues with 6?

Okay. 6.1, the FOI Working Group interprets the requirement for interested parties to have some voice, Section 3.4 of RFC 1591, to require the IANA operator to obtain, evaluate and augment input (ph) from stakeholders for validations.

So, it's all in yellow because it grabs a bunch of parts from various things, and restructures them into one, I think it makes sense. I see no issues.

All right; 6.2, the FOI Working Group interprets the requirement for concern or affected parties and transfers to communicate with the IANA operator, Section 3.6, RFC 1591, to require the IANA operator to obtain, evaluate and document input from stakeholders for transfers.

Okay. 6.3, I've added: the FOI Working Group interpretations -- I don't think that's too much of an issue. So, some significant surgery in 6, but I think it brings it back so it holds together in the context of what we are doing in the recommendations. And unless I see something, I'll take it that people are comfortable with that.

All right; not seeing anything, let's move on. That's exactly as is, 8 is exactly as is; 9 is exactly as is; 10 is exactly as is; 11 has -- overall, we've agreed to remove those.

That would conclude the section interpretation. So that is the full package gluing together all our recommendations of interpretation. And the next section is recommendations, but before we go there, any final set of issues regarding our interpretations? I'll use this to take (inaudible).

Keith Davidson: Yes. It does seem like everybody is happy.

Bernard Turcotte: All right. I'm hoping that that was the hard part for today. Moving on to the next section; recommendations: now in the first part, after some discussions with some GAC people, there was some concern about how our interpretations, and how these can be applied by the IANA contractor, would affect governance, and so Becky, after listening, very kindly drafted this text which, for the moment, we have position as the introduction to the

recommendations, and I think it's well worth, because all of it is brand new text, going through it and making sure we are all comfortable with that.

Is that okay with everyone? Okay. (Coughs) -- Sorry -- there may be a bit of that today, I'm quite bogged down by allergies.

The country code names supporting organization, ccNSO, that's the framework of the Interpretation Working Group with developing and proposing a framework of interpretation for existing IANA policy, governing the delegation and re-delegation of ccTLDs.

The FOI Working Group's goal was to give IANA and the ICANN Board, clear guidance on the meaning of RFC 1591 in order to clarify existing policy and facilitate consistent and predictable application of this policy.

I see EI, has his hand up.

Eberhard Lisse: You use, in the first paragraph, the FOIWG had; and then on the second paragraph obviously "has" it should go into the same tense, present or past, but the same.

Bernard Turcotte: Okay. We'll have a look at the EI, thank you.

Keith Davidson: Actually --

Bernard Turcotte: If nothing else. Okay.

Keith Davidson: Yeah, Bernie. Just while we are there, let's say on line three: for existing IANA policy governing; and I think it should be: for existing IANA policies and guidelines governing.

Bernard Turcotte: Ah! Actually, yes, we made a big point of that. If Becky is okay with that, since this is -- these are her words.

Becky Burr: Yes.

Bernard Turcotte: We will adjust it (inaudible). Okay. Noted. Thank you. Anything else on the opening paragraph? Excellent!

In reviewing the FOI Working Group recommendations, it is important to keep the following context in mind. Point one, the FOI Working Group had no authority to develop or recommend new or changed policy. And the recommendations reflect the limited scope of the FOI Working Group's Charter. To the extent new or changed policy may be appropriate, or desirable, it must be developed with the new formal Policy Development Process, PDP.

Are we good here? I think that is quite consistent, there's nothing that is -- should cause heartburn here.

Second bullet: the FOI Working Group obviously has no authority or ability to limit or constrain principles of sovereignty or the rule of law. Excuse me -- in line with the ccNSO statements in the past, in principle, local issues should be resolved locally. In fact, the report shows the FOI Working Group interprets existing policies and guidelines to limit IANA's ability to act on its own authority to instances only where substantial misbehavior by the ccTLD Manager, (a) poses a risk to the security and stability of the DNS, or (b) involves the Manager's failure, after notice and reasonable opportunity to cure -- to perform the executive (ph) requirements, i.e. to be on the Internet, maintain IP, email connectivity, identify technical contact, and identify the in-country administrative contact.

I will get to you, El.

And this principle does not, however, affect IANA's obligation to implement local decisions consistent with applicable international law.

Eberhard?

Eberhard Lisse: Can you fix the brackets -- footnotes on the third line should be at -- before the full stop.

Bernard Turcotte: Agreed.

Eberhard Lisse: I don't -- and I don't understand what we are saying here, about applicable international law, I don't know -- I don't remember whether we've talked about this much better, I don't -- Nigel, at least, is always harping about it, but I don't understand the context here very well. Though I'm not dying in any ditch here, I'm just mentioning it.

Bernard Turcotte: Well, actually, it may come up as a question, and since we are lucky enough to have Becky, maybe she can talk to us for a few minutes, since we are doing well, on time. Becky?

Becky Burr: So just the general, why are we doing this?

Unidentified Participant: No. The reference to international law, Becky.

Becky Burr: Oh, the reference to international law. So, what I was trying to suggest in a polite way was that; it's not enough just to, you know, pass a law or have somebody from a government -- a minister, write a letter to ICANN saying: you know, we've done our -- you know, we've passed a law, or we've done something, because we don't want to put IANA in the position of having to interpret whether somebody has followed due process, or not. So what I'm referencing is sort of generally accepted and our international treaties, but even countries that don't subscribe to those will generally recognized and enforced foreign judgments under certain circumstances, provided that they -- that the judgments are not inconsistent with fundamental rights.

So, for example, you know, government could come to a court in the United States, or somebody could come to a court in the United States, and to get a judgment enforced, and a U.S. court would do that, except in situations where, for example, it violated the first amendment or something like that.

Eberhard Lisse: So, by the way, Patricio correctly mentioned that "effect" IANA's --

Unidentified Participant: (Inaudible)

Eberhard Lisse: --must be changed to "affect."

Bernard Turcotte: It's affect.

Eberhard Lisse: I agree with what Becky is saying but the language that we are having here needs to be rewritten to be more -- clearer to make the (inaudible) -- if that's what you want to say, maybe just say that.

Becky Burr: Well, so I did this very deliberately, Eberhard, because this language is language that is responding to a GAC concern. And I think that it is counterproductive for us to get into a discussion with the GAC about, sort of, what a government has to do to demonstrate it, when we can use what is a -- what is a legal term that's well understood, and it's harder

for the GAC to argue with. So I would just say that, being clear is likely to make this very -
- make for a very complicated discussion with the GAC.

- Eberhard Lisse: The way this written at the moment, however, it can be also read totally the other way around.
- Bernard Turcotte: Hmm? In what way, Eberhard?
- Bernard Turcotte: The way I read it here, it says: if a local decision is made that it must be given a way to -- the IANA operator must -- is obligated to implement it.
- Becky Burr: No. It's obligation --
- Bernard Turcotte: No.
- Becky Burr: --to implement consistent with applicable international law. It means with a judgment being enforced in a court that has jurisdiction over ICANN.
- Eberhard Lisse: Can I request that this sentence is going to be rewritten somehow again? Think about it, and maybe try to be a little bit clearer in a way that doesn't -- doesn't -- I mean, that addresses the GAC concern as well, but also our concerns.
- Keith Davidson: Maybe Bill has a suggestion. Bill has his hand raised, so Bill.
- Bill Semich: Yeah. I'm not sure it's a suggestion, as additional concern. We went through this before and we had that sentence up there that should be resolved locally was sort of -- was a broad brush that allowed various things to be pushed back to the local decision-making. But I'm concerned here in this sentence, that we are making it really general to say, IANA's obligation to implement local decisions. I think "obligation" is a very strong word, but even a greater concern to me is "local decisions" is a very soft word, what does that mean?
- You know, I know we were trying to make this kind of a soft mandate, but in this particular case since we are talking about local--
- Becky Burr: Can we--
- Bill Semich: --and we are talking about sovereignty and local law, I'm wondering, shouldn't we just say, to implement, you know, local -- decisions -- local decisions under--
- Eberhard Lisse: No, judge--
- Bill Semich: --under local law are, you know, under -- you know, something--
- Eberhard Lisse: Use the word judgment.
- Bill Semich: Whatever. What I'm saying is the local decision could be a bunch of people getting, just a bunch of local people saying X, Y, Z, we want this.
- Becky Burr: So I think that, you know, well polled (ph) -- yeah, I have -- I mean, I understand I could -- you know, we could get rid of the "obligation" I mean, I'll try to ... I'll try to play with the sentence and send it around, and we can just approve it, this one sentence on the list. I don't want to -- I don't want to draft this on the fly, Bernie, I think it's dangerous.
- Keith Davidson: Certainly, with the discussions we've had with the GAC it would be really dangerous to (inaudible) --

Bill Semich: Well, you know, I don't have any problem with a general statement that it's a -- there's a local legal action, and as El says, a legal judgment or ruling. You know, as long as it's consistent with applicable international law, IANA needs to pay attention to it, so you know--

Becky Burr: Yeah, I hear you. I hear you. I need to keep -- I think we need to keep international -- "applicable international law" in there--

Bill Semich: Yeah.

Becky Burr: --but I understand both -- the concern about the use of the "obligation" and the vagueness of potential over-reading of "local decision."

Bill Semich: Yeah. I mean, I've said it many times in the past, there are gazillions of different decisions, departments, and even though they will (inaudible) leaders in various governments in various countries who decide they want to do things and, you know, just because someone or some department, or some department head, decides something is going to be a certain way, that's not really IANA's purview to just say: okay we'll do it. Another department might come up and say: no, no, no, the telecom department shouldn't be doing this; it should be the library, or some other thing. You know, you get yourself involved in those kinds of battles.

Becky Burr: Got you.

Keith Davidson: Okay. I want--

Eberhard Lisse: All right. I have to go -- I have to go.

Keith Davidson: Yes. Thank you, Eberhard, for your contributions, and we'll note that you've left the meeting at this stage. I don't -- I have a feeling we are not going to resolve everything on tonight's call, and so I think we will need another call, but I also think that we -- while we scheduled only one hour for this call, our hour is now up, but I wonder if there are people who have other things ahead of them, if they need to go, they should proceed to their other engagements. But if -- while we have some forward impetus, if we could extend the call for another 30 minutes, I'd be very happy to do so.

So if we are not going to lose everybody, could we keep going for another -- up to 30 minutes? And as I'm--

Unidentified Participant: (Inaudible)

Keith Davidson: Yes. It's looking like most people are happy, and Patricio also has his hand raised, so Patricio, and then Chris.

Patricio Poblete: Yeah. I love this paragraph with the applicable international law. I would suggest that when Becky submits a revised text for this paragraph, it would be useful if she could also include a description of what problems we are trying to solve with that language; so specifically, what the GAC's concern is that we are trying to address?

Becky Burr: Sure. Would you like me to talk about that a little bit now?

Chris Disspain: I think that would be a very good idea, Becky.

Keith Davidson: Thanks, Chris.

Becky Burr: So, we had a very, very useful conversation with Frank March from New Zealand, and Peter, whose last name I don't know, from Australia.

Keith Davidson: Nettlefold.

Becky Burr: And the concern that Peter had, was that it was possible to read this document saying that the only time IANA could act was in one of the situations described above. And so, for example, where, you know, local law was followed and a decision -- a legally binding decision in-country, consistent with relevant due process requirements, was passed, that unless the government, you know, got consent, IANA would have no ability to comply with, you know, a binding obligation. Which is not what we intended at all as -- and I think, you know, that was the import of Bill's last statement.

So the other thing that they were concerned about, was just that generally, the GAC would be coming to this cold, they would not have read the document all the way through. Even if they had read the document all the way through, they would not have, you know, enough of the context and discussion, and what we were likely to get, you know, to a lot of pushback on, you know, local decision-making. So the point of this introduction was to sort of address the GAC concerns upfront, and lay -- you know, lay out a specific -- you know, specifically say that IANA, of course, can act in other situations where a local, you know, binding decision was enforced through applicable international law.

So it was really to address the -- both the context and the concern about inter -- about, you know, IANA's ability to affect, with an A, local decision-making. And this was intended to clarify that, intended to clarify, although not in a manner that is too in your face. The fact that, you know, a letter from a minister saying: we want to change the delegation, if not -- does not fall into category of things that IANA would be able to affect.

Unidentified Participant: It makes sense to me.

Bernard Turcotte: So I think that the concerns have been noted, and Becky is going to look at that paragraph anyways. Shall we carry on, sir?

Keith Davidson: Yes, please.

Bernard Turcotte: All right, and finally, nothing in the third bullet -- finally nothing in the framework of interpretations, constrains, the applicability of GAC and the GAC principles and guidelines for the delegation and administration of country code top-level domains. The one bullet point below the previous point: the ccNSO discussed its views on resolution of complex regarding the operation of the ccTLD in greater length, in response to NTIA's further notice of inquiry on the IANA Function Contract, and the URL is there, that's a published document that was approved by the ccNSO

Any other questions around the introduction before we leave it?

Keith Davidson: Everyone is happy.

Bernard Turcotte: All right. Recommendations: regarding consent, Significantly Interested Parties and un-consented re-delegations (revocations). The IANA operator should adopt and implement the interpretations of RFC 1591, provided by the framework of Interpretation Working Group as presented in this document.

So, fairly straightforward, and (inaudible), I have Bill.

Bill Semich: Yeah. I'm a little confused. Why are we bringing up un-consented re-delegations as the primary phrase, and revocations as the parenthetical phrase?

Becky Burr: Yeah, I--

Bernard Turcotte: Because the written mandate of the FOI Working Group, if you go back the many years, but if you go back to our original Charter, that was the actual wording that was used, which is why we have that big, yellow paragraph that we went through describing why we didn't -- why we were recommending not using un-consented re-delegations anymore, but technically, our Charter still states that.

Bill Semich: I'd still feel better if we swapped the parentheses.

Bernard Turcotte: I don't have a big issue with that. Becky?

Becky Burr: I think that's okay.

Bill Semich: Thanks.

Bernard Turcotte: All right. There we go. Anything else, Bill? I guess not. Anybody else? Okay. Point two, so these are sort of points for how IANA should look at implementing the first recommendation. So regarding IANA adoption and implementation of the FOI interpretation; so basically what we've done is, when Bart was going through this, he thought it would be a good idea to actually copy some of the stuff, that was agreed to in the IDN policy recommendation which was approved, and seems to be quite applicable to the kind of stuff we are doing here.

So there's been a little surgery done to adapt it to our environment, sure, and we will walk through it since it is new text.

Verification of implementation: it is anticipated that some parts of the recommendations may need to be further refined, operationalized or interpreted by ICANN staff in order to implement. It is further anticipated that this will be done through an implementation plan, or similar planning document. It is therefore recommended that -- oops, I see Chris.

Chris Disspain: Carry on, Bernie. I'll deal with it when you're finished.

Bernard Turcotte: Okay. IANA should work with the ccNSO to develop a mutually-acceptable implementation plan with respect to the FOI Working Group recommendations, which should also include a schedule for reporting progress. The ccNSO Council will review and approved the final planning document before implementation by Staff.

Chris?

Chris Disspain: No, no. Finish it off.

Bernard Turcotte: Okay. Due to the significant complexities, sensitivities and interests involved in some delegations, transfers and revocations, it is recommended that a permanent RFC 1591 ccTLD Advisory Panel, be appoint to assist and provide guidance to ICANN Staff, and the Board, on the interpretation of RFC 1591. In the event the policy does not provide sufficient guidance -- oops -- the word "policy" there is wrong; in case -- in the event the interpretations do not provide sufficient guidance, and/or the impact of the interpretations is considered to be unreasonable or unfair or, of a particular case or class of cases.

Is this a good point to break for you, Chris, or are we doing okay?

Chris Disspain: You're doing fine, keep going.

Bernard Turcotte: Okay. So, basically, I have to remove the "policy" sorry about that, sort of a brain freeze on that one, and change the policies for the interpretations.

IANA should continue to publish a public report for each ccTLD delegation, transfer and revocations -- actions it completes. However, these reports should be published in a timely fashion, following the action and clearly identify the parties involved; the decision process leading to the action, as well as information which would allow the average reader to understand how the IANA contractor has, as per FOI Working Group's interpretations, met its obligations for undertaking the action under RFC 1591.

This is a jumble of, actually, many things; I call it my (inaudible) statement, which sort of gathered up a bunch of things into one.

And I see Becky has her hand up, so we will go to her.

Becky Burr: Actually I want to -- I want to ask a question about the very last bullet.

Bernard Turcotte: Okay. Well then, I will get to you there. Any questions on the (inaudible) statement.

Unidentified Participant: Yeah.

Bernard Turcotte: Okay.

Chris Disspain: Well, I've got a comment on the last bullet point as well, but I just want you to be very, very careful. This is not policy, most of this stuff is taken, as you've said, out of the IDN Policy stuff, and it's there to guard against -- what as in the IDN stuff, to guard against implementation hiccups, where Staff are interpreting what is broad-brush policy statements, and in implementing it in a way that the CC's are not happy with; and so we wrote in stuff to talk about -- taking in with us on implementation. This is not policy; this is, in fact, implementation and we are telling IANA how to implement what is effectively a broad-brushed policy statement.

And I've been sitting here listening to you and I think I've come to the conclusion that I'm actually uncomfortable with this. I don't think it's -- I don't think it's either wise or necessary at this stage.

Bernard Turcotte: I have no issue with this. And you know, this was taken --

Becky Burr: Maybe--

Chris Disspain: Why would we need an implementation plan to do the stuff that we've talked about?

Bernard Turcotte: Well, on that part, if we go back to what we've always discussed, we don't do process, and the transition from our Working Group interpretations, to actually implementable process, I think is not necessarily a one-to-one.

Chris Disspain: What if we said -- what if we said that it's in conflict with existing process?

Bernard Turcotte: Hmm?

Chris Disspain: (Inaudible) process here, we are talking about -- we are talking about philosophy, we are talking about what needs to happen. I'm really not clear as to why we would need to treat what we are talking about, in the same as we treat -- as we would treat a broad-brush policy recommendation. This is fine details.

Bernard Turcotte: I -- well--

Chris Disspain: And let me (inaudible) to say something in second.

Becky Burr: Yeah. If I could -- I was struck by the last bullet point about: changes things subject to a public consultation. It seems to me that there is no way for changes to this interpretation to be done, except through a chartered working group or policy development process.

Unidentified Participant: Right.

Becky Burr: So that one jumped out at me as kind of odd. And then the Permanent Advisory Panel, I mean at some level I think that's a good thing, but I wonder if, you know, we are in this IANA transition, and maybe what we should be saying is that, you know, this sort of guidance -- you know, ongoing guidance should be accounted for as part of the IANA transition consistent with, you know, input from the ccNSO, as opposed to -- it just seems like, you know, we may be receding into a process, particularly since we are trying to make that process, you know, more responsive, and more -- you know, to have -- the CC to have a bigger role in that process.

Chris Disspain: Yeah, but that -- I mean, I agree with you Becky, but that's -- and again that's a step -- right now there is a process, right, and our -- it's not the job of this Working Group to change the -- to change the relationship to suggest there should be some intermediary step between IANA and the -- I mean, the current process is IANA and the Board, right, I'm not saying it's a great wonder that's a current one. It's not our job to say there should be some sort of interim step, that may well be the job of the USG -- government role's transition thing, and I'm just concerned that -- we have been really, really careful here all along, to say: we are not changing anything, we are not doing policy, we are simply providing color and depth, and almost all of these bullet points imply significant changes and need to make sure that everything is done properly.

I've been involved in management and implementation, and I'm really, really, uncomfortable about that.

Becky Burr: So, I think we are in radical agreement, Chris, I was not suggesting anything--

Chris Disspain: No, no. That's correct, I wasn't saying we weren't.

Becky Burr: Yeah, other than that -- this interpretation should rather (inaudible) on -- you know, IANA's handling of revocation delegation, you know, et cetera, the things we talked about, and just a suggestion that, you know, that this is relevant to that transition.

Chris Disspain: Yeah. I agree, 100%. If we go back to the very beginning of all of this, the deal was -- as I recall, the deal was, if the Board endorsed this then it would -- you know, the Board would say, make it so, and it would be made so. And if there was a problem with any of that, what we -- I think we agreed, was that the fees would turn into a fairly quick policy development process, and if it had been endorsed by the GAC, then they would, effectively, be able to join in that and we could make it policy pretty quickly if we chose to do so.

Keith Davidson: All the named hosts have left the meeting, and the (inaudible)--

Chris Disspain: Exactly, I was just agreeing. But you're a host, aren't you?

Keith Davidson: I thought I was. I'm listed as a host but I'm probably (inaudible)--

Chris Disspain: You're the -- you're the holy person?

Keith Davidson: No. This, the holy host (ph) -- Kristina is -- thanking goodness for that. Okay, I'm not sure where we've got with this, but Becky and Bill, both have their hands raised, so--

Becky Burr: Sorry. I just forgot to take mine down.

Keith Davidson: Okay. Bill?

Bill Semich: You know, I do recall over the years, as Bernie points out, that many of these things have come up in discussions including the last bullet, and I'm a little concerned that we just hand this thing off and not have any kind of expected results, or expected plan from IANA, and any kind of reporting in the event this recommendation, or whatever we are calling it, is ignored, you know, it could be ignored. You know, we are talking about changes and relationships, transfers and responsibility, you know, a lot of changes will happen; and this just can end up being a report that ends up on a shelf.

I'm not saying it will, but all I'm saying is that when you put together things like this, you want to have a complete package and provide for all eventualities. So I think something like this for the last section would be a good thing to include.

Bernard Turcotte: Just as a note, the last two bullet points were included in the consent final report.

Becky Burr: Okay. But I think the last one, at least, it just -- it occurs to me now, it's like the only way we can change this is through the processes that -- the only these can be changed is through the processes that the ccNSO has, which is, you know, a working group, charter, or a PDP.

Bernard Turcotte: I think what we were trying to say there, and probably failed to do appropriately, was that if IANA, unilaterally, decides to change some of the recommendations, that they cannot do that. So this was probably not written very well. The actual objective of that final bullet was that -- and given the way things are structured, it may actually be irrelevant.

Chris, you have your hand--?

Chris Disspain: Yeah. So the last -- I have some -- I have some (inaudible), and I understand what you are saying, I think it was we are in agreement, but we are just coming at it from a slightly different way. I'm very concerned -- look, the broader reality is if this were to be ignored, or treated in any way other than, you know, being what it is, which is a very clear set of statements of how things should be dealt with, we would -- we would be into territory of saying: we need to make it policy. I would far rather take that road, than create some kind of new thing with new permanent RFC 1591 ccTLD's Advisory Panel, the devil is in the detail with all of this stuff. And it's no detail here, it's just a thing that we've plucked out of the middle of the air, and it makes me extremely uncomfortable.

It is an IANA transition -- sorry -- USG role transition process going on right now in which the ccNSO has its own future -- sorry -- the future of how delegations, re-delegations are handled in its own hands, that's the place to do it. Setting up ad hoc committees with this report is not the place to do it. I'm equally unclear as to why -- as to what is -- what implementation? You're not talking about -- there is nothing to implement here, what you're talking about is how each individual, revocation, re-delegation, delegation is handled, and that's a thing you judge on a case-by-case basis.

I'm just concerned that these paragraphs were written not for a purpose like this. They were written to deal with the way that a full-blown policy development process -- recommendations are interpreted; and I don't think it's appropriate here. I've got no problem whatsoever in saying that, making a statement along the lines of the ccNSO will work closely with IANA staff to ensure that the recommendations -- or the guidelines

provided in this report can be implemented in a timely manner, et cetera, et cetera. That's all fine.

These sort of formal -- formal things which flow from a completely different process, and not sensibly (inaudible)--

Keith Davidson: Hmm?

Bernard Turcotte: So I think we need a rewrite on this section.

Chris Disspain: I think we do.

Keith Davidson: Yeah. I think that's quite clear. I think -- again, I agree with Chris, but I think this is something that we haven't discussed as a group or agreed, and it's -- addition at this late stage should make us all feel a little bit uneasy, and that's appropriate -- appropriateness, it's questionable. So let's have a look at the intent of what we were trying to do here, and get some new words. I think we--

Bernard Turcotte: Will do, sir.

Keith Davidson: Yes. We've got something to go ahead with here. Thank you. Bernie. And that's the end of the--

Bernard Turcotte: All right -- that's the end of it sir, over to you. We will be adding an introduction which is basically a charter and how we've flowed from that and the constitution of the group, to get us here. And then the two key sections, as far as I'm concerned, with an impact we've just finished going through. The Section 2 of recommendations needs a major rewrite, and we'll be doing that over the next few days, and we will have a meeting in two weeks to close off the sections where there are questions. Over to you, sir.

Keith Davidson: Okay, thanks. Yeah, it was my hope that we would have concluded the framework tonight and had a fairly much-agreed (inaudible) was only a hope, as it appears now. So I think our next meeting is scheduled for the 5th of June, at 21:00, and we will need to relook at the text then. So I think that might put us out of the deadline that we had of 31 May, of getting the framework to the GAC for them to get their (inaudible), and then in a position to approve in London. So it looks like we will be missing our London deadline to progress this, and it will go to--

Unidentified Participant: (Inaudible) is there any way that we can--

Becky Burr: I can try to -- I can try and take a stab at this quickly, like today.

Unidentified Participant: I'd really like to try and make that deadline if we can, I know it's hard but--

Keith Davidson: We could call for a meeting, or we could -- see if we could bring the 5th of June Meeting back a week and have it next week, on the 29th of May.

Unidentified Participant: I don't see why -- I don't see why we shouldn't be able to do that.

Keith Davidson: Okay. I think -- I think we should try, I think we are so close to being there.

Unidentified Participant: And if it's of any -- if it's of any worth doing from the point of view of numbers, why not have two meetings -- why not take a leaf of the GAC's book and have two meetings in a day.

Keith Davidson: We could do that, yeah. Okay. I'll put that to the list that we will have one meeting at 21:00, and if there's a need for a second meeting, we'll have a meeting as apart from that on the 29th.

Unidentified Participant: Hmm. That makes sense.

Becky Burr: Yeah.

Keith Davidson: Will that give us enough time, Bernie and Becky, to work on the rewording?

Becky Burr: Yeah. Bernie, if you send me a word version, which you probably already did, I'll take a crack at it this morning. And I have two assignments, one is to deal with the -- you know, that sentence about international law, and then the recommendations section.

Keith Davidson: Okay. I think we have agreement from everybody, so the action point is to meet again on the 29th, hopefully, we might have the list very, very shortly, and see if we need two calls or one call, but the main call will be 21:00, on the 5th of June.

And with that, brings us very neatly to 30 minutes after the hour. So unless -- if there's anything else that's of major import to anyone, I'll bring the meeting to a conclusion. So thank you, all and I'll see you all in a week's time. Thank you so much.

Unidentified Participant: Thank you, see you. Bye.

Keith Davidson: Cheers. Bye.