

## Transcription

### ccNSO Framework of Interpretation Working Group Telephone Conference 24 November 2011

- Keith Davidson: I think let's make a start, shall we? Recognizing that it's apparently an important day in some part of the world, shall we try and skip through our work as quickly as we can today and start with a list of the present and apologies, Kristina?
- Kristina Nordstrom: Sure. From the ccNSO we have Martin Boyle, Keith Davidson, Dejan Djukic, Desiree Miloshevic, Patricio Poblete. And from liaisons we have Carlos Aguirre. From staff support and special advisors we have Jaap Akkerhuis, Bart Boswinkel, Kristina Nordstrom and Bernie Turcotte. Apologies from Eberhard Lisse and Nigel Roberts. And Matthias (inaudible) is in the Adobe Room, I don't know if he is on the line.
- Keith Davidson: Okay, thanks, Kristina. Any further apologies received by anyone? If not, we'll consider the list of these. Anyone else present on the call whose name wasn't called? Okay, we will consider the list of those present and the apologies. Thank you. Confirmation of the meeting report from the 10th of November was stipulated by Bernie. And Bernie, are there any action points or specific items that are not otherwise covered on the agenda? I can't see any, but anything of significance that we should note?
- Bernie Turcotte: Not that I'm aware of.
- Keith Davidson: Okay, any comments from anyone on the meeting report? If not, we'll accept that as the report for the 10th of November meeting and we go onto item 3 on the agenda, the significantly interested parties document version 2.8. There was both a redline and a clean copy distributed by Bernie to the list and the only discussion point I think we had left on that was 7.1.1.1. And Bernie, do you want to talk us through where we've got to? There's been a little bit of debate on the list so I'm not sure if everyone is fully up to date.
- Bernie Turcotte: There's been no debate about 7.1.1. I think Nigel proposed the text and I think much everyone was okay with it, so it was included as is in the document. Kristina, can you make me a presenter? I can't (inaudible). So really, it's -- the discussion that ensued which we'll take on as a next point was that when I circulated the definition of SIP, all of a sudden it got people excited I guess. And so there was a minor tweak proposed to that.

But I would propose to deal with 7.1.1 first and then we can go back to the definition of SIP if that's okay with you.

Keith Davidson: That's an excellent idea and so you are now a presenter, Bernie, so --

Bernie Turcotte: Excellent. Recently shared 2.8. And we have it. Okay. We've got a minor problem with the redline but on 7.1.1 it's not a really big problem. So 7.1.1.1 now reads, "this interpretation should not be taken as implying the elimination or replacement of any of the requirements relating to consent of the proposed and current managers where applicable". So that's the Nigel clause as is and I guess it's pretty much our final reading of that specific clause and I'll be glad to take questions or comments.

Keith Davidson: Thanks, Bernie. Any questions or comments? Anyone in anyway unhappy? I think this is about iteration 8 of this particular clause by now, isn't it? I think we've done it over fairly solidly. So in the hope that we can finally put the whole document to bed on this call, any final comments from anyone? If not, we will consider the document approved at long last. Thank you all.

Bernie Turcotte: Not quite, because --

Keith Davidson: Not quite?

Bernie Turcotte: The definition of SIP --

Keith Davidson: May come back and haunt us, okay.

Bernie Turcotte: We've got to do 7.1.1 one final time to put that to bed. We've got two points that were raised. The first was from Desiree, so I'm glad she's on the call. Hi, Desiree.

Desiree Miloshevic: Hi, yes, I asked for the incumbent operators to be included in that definition.

Bernie Turcotte: I'm sorry, I missed that Desiree, you're not pushing that anymore?

Desiree Miloshevic: Well, I think I wanted to -- I'm saying that in -- that Becky has sent a reply saying that that is understood. But I want to discuss it on the call if anybody else felt that it should still be there. Because it was removed from an earlier version of the document where we had the operator included in the definition of --

Bernie Turcotte: Yes, that is correct.

Desiree Miloshevic: Significantly interested party.

Bernie Turcotte: And just to give the full background to everyone, if it's a re-delegation, the section on 3.6, on the transfer from RFC1591, is very clear that the proposed and incumbent operator have to give the okay. The question that remains, which we will be discussing next document, is whether section 3.4 of RFC1591, significantly interested parties, applies to transfers/re-delegation. If it does in this case, I could see some point to it, but this being said, as Becky discussed on the list, the fact that we have others that have direct, material, legitimate and demonstrable interest in the operations of the ccTLD, certainly automatically covers incumbent operators. And so I'll throw it open to the floor at this point for guidance. I guess from the exec side, we don't feel it's critical at this point. If we need to, we may go back and revisit it later.

Keith Davidson: Any comments for Bernie? Any guidance?

Desiree Miloshevic: So I wouldn't say -- in trying to understand how this definition would be looked at, it does seem -- it could seem obvious that others that have direct, material, legitimate and demonstrable interest in the operation of the ccTLD does include the operator, but in my opinion, it wouldn't hurt adding such the current operator.

Keith Davidson: Okay, thanks, Desiree, and Martin has his hand up. Martin?

Martin Boyle: Thanks, Keith. I suppose, because I've just been rereading the text, it occurs to me that it is actually a bit of a glaring omission. I can understand the point that, yes, it would be included under all the other organizations or types of organizations there. But the fact that it isn't there might be read into that they were not considered to be a significantly interested party bearing in mind their very basic role in this. So I think I would actually side with Desiree on this that it probably needs to be put in as one of the distinctive elements in the list rather than just left for assumption when people might say, well they must have excluded that for a particular reason.

Keith Davidson: I think sometimes it's excluding the bleeding obvious isn't it? But I think that I'm reasonably convinced, I sort of feel ambivalent, but I think in view of what Desiree and Martin have said, I'm reasonably convinced that we should include and that it does note them. So how do others feel? Is there anyone who has a specific objection to adding the incumbent? Daniel is on the line, Daniel is coming into the room. No other comments? Stephen has his hand up. Stephen?

Stephen Deerhake: I concur with your view on that, Keith.

Keith Davidson: Great. Thanks.

Bernie Turcotte: All right, let's wordsmith exactly where this is going because I think we'd all like to be done with this document. Should I simply add it to the list of organizations, companies, associations, educational institutions, incumbent operator? Or others? Or at the end of direct, material, legitimate and demonstrable interests in the operation of the ccTLD[s] such as the incumbent operators?

Keith Davidson: Good question. And both Stephen and Martin have their hands raised, so I think -- oh, no, Stephen's has just taken his hand down, so Martin has his hand raised and I think this might relate to the earlier point anyway. Martin?

Martin Boyle: No, it was in direct response to your question where to stick it, in the politest use of that phrase. And I think Bernie's approach sounds okay to me that you do include it under B. The reason I put my hand up was to suggest that this could be right at the end of the sentence where you just say, including the incumbent operator. So it's clear that it is included but without people saying, why are they specifically referring to it? Which was why honestly I was a bit ambivalent about whether you needed to include it or not include it in the first place.

Keith Davidson: Okay, and Desiree has her hand raised, too. Desiree?

Desiree Miloshevic: I would like to concur that it would be, if we had a choice where to put it, as part of section B for it to be included at the end of a sentence as Bernie proposed.

Keith Davidson: Okay. So we have remarkable alignment of views. Any opposing views? Bernie, have you got a clear direction there?

Bernie Turcotte: I think so. So at the end of Section B of 7.1.1, we will tag on, including the incumbent operators.

Keith Davidson: Right. Okay. No other questions or issues?

Bernie Turcotte: There is one more on 7.1.1. Hopefully the final one. Nigel posted his usual reasoning for including significant in the list of adjectives at the end of B. Currently we have direct, material, legitimate and demonstrable interest in the operation of the ccTLD. Nigel felt that we should have significant given it's a definition of significantly interested parties. The two counter arguments to that is that it's a definition of significantly interested parties, so one would certainly expect that it would be significant. The second one came from Becky which noted that anything that is material should cover the significant part. However, we will be glad to take direction on this so we can put this to bed.

Keith Davidson: I guess it's a little bit difficult without Nigel on the call.

Bernie Turcotte: I can pull up his email and read the reasons for that.

Keith Davidson: Okay. Any discussion? Desiree, is your hand up again or did you forget to take it down?

Desiree Miloshevic: Sorry, I'll take it down.

Keith Davidson: Any discussion or comments? Okay, Bernie, did you find the email?

Bernie Turcotte: I'm going to get it in about 20 seconds if you can stretch the time here.

Keith Davidson: I don't recall seeing a lot of comments -- I think there were a few comments on the list but two or three people sort of indicating that significant wouldn't be a bad word to use in the context. And again, I'm not particularly fast either way and could be persuaded either way.

Bernie Turcotte: Yes, I have Nigel's original email. "I will raise the following on the call if I can make it. In the definition of SIP, we say the government is automatically SIP, a non government actor is SIP if it has an interest that is direct, material, legitimate, and demonstrable. I agree with this, but this definition encompasses a minor interest. I still think there needs to be a qualifier to express the size of the interest, i.e., that interest is significant. So I suppose adding the word significant cannot hurt. As Eberhard points out, it's contained in the SIP, and for the above reason, I think it helps distinguish and identify SIPs from IPs". There we go, Sir.

Keith Davidson: I guess the question is, does anyone have any objection to -- and I assume the wording that Nigel is looking for is, or others that have a significant direct, material, legitimate and demonstrable interest in the operation of the ccTLD. And so does anyone have any objection to the addition of the word significant in that context? If not, then I suggest we go with it. And again, on the basis that it doesn't appear to me to do harm to the clarity we're seeking. I see Martin has his hand up, so Martin?

Martin Boyle: Thanks, Keith. Just to note that I thought that Nigel had proposed another word in a later email, but as I'm scrolling through my emails, I'm failing to turn it up. I had it in my head that it was yesterday, but as I say, I can't see it.

Bernie Turcotte: A few days ago, and I think it was actually Eberhard that proposed it.

Martin Boyle: No, Eberhard said, "yes, that's right". But anyway, there was another word other than significant which from a neatness point of view describing

significant as somebody who has significant interest just sounds a little bit like a circular approach to it all. I'm not too fast one way or another but I did just for a moment when I saw that --

Bernie Turcotte: The word was substantial. I've got it.

Martin Boyle: Substantial, yes, I've just turned it up as well. Nigel flagged that. Eberhard replied yes, and that seemed to me perhaps helping to avoid the circularity of the definition.

Bernie Turcotte: Okay, so we would add substantial as the first adjective in the laundry list?

Keith Davidson: Yes.

Bernie Turcotte: Okay, done.

Martin Boyle: Can I suggest that it actually might be later in this laundry list?

Bernie Turcotte: Where would you like it, Martin?

Martin Boyle: Frankly, my dear -- bearing in mind the basic principle becomes immaterial, actually I'm not too worried one way or another, it just seemed to me that it might be sort of a lower on the list item. So material, legitimate, demonstrable, and substantial interest. But I'm not going to die in any ditch effort on that one.

Bernie Turcotte: All right, I'll stick it somewhere in the middle. And with that, Sir, I think we are done with this document unless someone else has any other comments. Over to you.

Keith Davidson: Okay, well it sounds like we're coming back to have a final review of 7.1.1 on the 8th of December with those two tweaks to it. And that we've agreed 7.1.1.1 at long last. So we nearly have a final document once again. So before we close the SIP document, any further, final comments from anyone in regards to these specific clauses or anything else? If not, forever hold your peace. Thank you. Okay. Moving on, on the agenda, the next item we have is public consultations and an update on where we're at. Is it Pat or Bernie who will give us an update?

Bernie Turcotte: I can do it. There have been no comments still on the consent to public consultation which will end middle of next week.

Keith Davidson: It's ending for the public but not quite ending for the GAC at this point.

Bernie Turcotte: That is correct. We will leave it open until the middle of January for the GAC.

Keith Davidson: Okay. So on that basis then, a last minute flurry of responses will undoubtedly come in and I see just for the record, Bill Semich has just joined the group. And probably for the record, too, Stephen Deerhake did join the call at some point. Okay, so the process for the consultation -- do we have a timeline in mind, Bart and Bernie, as to when we -- I'm guessing we'll go through exactly the same process with about the same timeframe. Any ideas of when we should aim to start, assuming that we will clear the document on our next call on the 8th of December?

Bernie Turcotte: Really, it's up to the group. We're ahead of the schedule so there's one line of thought which sorts of says stick to our schedule and let's not get the GAC frustrated. However, if we are done and happy, we can certainly post it for public comment while still sticking with our agreed schedule with the GAC. And that doesn't change anything. And personally, that would be my preference. So technically if we agree on the 8th of December, we probably can get this up before the end of year. And so for all those people that get bored on the end of calendar year break, if they do get some, they have something to look at over break.

Bart Boswinkel: Bernie, this is Bart. We still need to do say put it in the same mode as the first interim report. This is the second interim report. So if we're going to publish it, the interim report will be ready around day before Christmas. And then the group needs to read it and then we can post it. So I would suggest to aim somewhere for middle of January.

Bernie Turcotte: That's why I was iffy. Yes, we do have to reformat it and put in the same headers. So we probably can get, I mean in all -- from a practical point of view, let's call it that on the first working group call of the year, we will have had the draft public consultation document out to you for a week and we can get it approved.

Keith Davidson: Okay, so we'll probably in that case be still in the consultation round during the next ICANN meeting whenever it is, I think second week of March.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, and I think it's advisable for the group as well because it's -- if it's out for public comment, it doesn't matter. And the group needs to focus on the first interim report as well to finalize it. That needs to be posted as well way ahead of the Costa Rica meeting to get support from the ccNSO and the GNSO, or the GAC, sorry.

Keith Davidson: I think it's quite useful to have a current consultation going when we're at ICANN because it's an ideal opportunity for anyone who's particularly interested to come and achieve some clarifications and so on. So okay, we'll start to make some moves to progress to that stage. Any other comments? Bill, I saw your hand raised and then dropped.

Bill Semich: I was just letting you know I finally broke away from breakfast and I'm here on the call.

Keith Davidson: Excellent. I noticed that. And we're making record time mastering the call. It's amazing what you can do without a North American audience in the room.

Stephen Deerhake: Hey, watch that.

Keith Davidson: I put you down as an American (inaudible), Stephen.

Stephen Deerhake: Okay, I'll take the pacific region, Appalachia.

Keith Davidson: Okay, moving along on the agenda, we're onto the item 5 on the agenda, terminology, and the approval of the definition of SIP. Is there anything more? Bernie, where are we with that?

Bernie Turcotte: We've reworked it, so I will repost it along with 2.9 of SIP and we will go for final approval on 8 December. Unless people have other comments. But given how tightly those two are intertwined, I can't imagine.

Keith Davidson: It's a direct link to 7.1.1. Is -- I guess the question is, does anyone have any comments on the intended definition for the terminology paper other than the changes made? Is it worthwhile putting the document absent the two paragraph document, Bernie?

Bill Semich: I'd be happy to see that.

Bernie Turcotte: Well I'm not going to change the screen from what it is right now because it's an exact copy of 7.1.1. But I don't know if you caught the modifications, Bill. First of all, we'll go over it for everyone and yourself. Definition of Significantly Interested Parties. As it reads currently in 2.7, significantly interested parties includes but are not limited to A) the government or territorial authority for the country or territory associated with the ccTLD, and B) and other individuals, organizations, companies, associations, educational institutions, or others that have a direct, material, legitimate, and demonstrable interest in the operation of the ccTLD[s]. We have agreed to add at the end of that section, after [s], including the incumbent operator. And we've also agreed to add Nigel's request for substantial somewhere in the middle of the list of adjectives. So it would probably be direct, material, substantial, legitimate, and demonstrable interest in the operation of the ccTLD including the incumbent operator.



Keith Davidson: Okay, so the only other thing that appears in the definition paper is the reference to RFC1591 which states significantly interested parties in the domain should agree that the designated manager is the appropriate party. And other than that, it's just a repeat of the definition, so it should be pretty straightforward. Let's do the changes and re-circulate for the next call then, Bernie.

Bernie Turcotte: Yes, Sir.

Keith Davidson: Okay. Well since we're making such good time, the next topic on the agenda is some general discussion on revocation. And Bernie, do you want to give us your thinking?

Bernie Turcotte: Yes, Sir, thank you. It's less my thinking but more a question of how we're going to interpret the various things. And we know that this is a very critical subject for many of the people on the call. The first point, which is very clear, is in Section 3.5 of RFC1591 which basically says -- and if you'll give me a second I'll put it up so I don't misquote because with Bill around, I would feel very bad.

So in Section 3.5 of RFC1591, it's fairly clear.

The designated manager must do a satisfactory job of operating the DNS service for the domain. That is, the actual management of the assigning of domain names, delegating sub domains, and operating name servers must be done with technical confidence. This includes keeping the central IR in the case of top level domains or other higher level domain managers advised of the status of the domains, responding to requests in a timely manner, and operating the database with accuracy, robustness and resilience. There must be a primary and secondary name server that have IP connectivity to the Internet and can be easily checked for operational status and database accuracy by the IR and IANA. In cases where there are persistent problems with the proper operation of the domain, the delegation may be revoked and possibly delegated to another designated manager.

So that's our first point. Obviously as with the rest of RFC1591, there is no further interpretation of what's doing a satisfactory job of operating the DNS service means. And there is no definition of what persistent problems with the proper operation of the domain means. It's fairly clear what delegation may be revoked means and possible delegated. So that's our first one. And maybe I'll take comments, thoughts, and really the idea here is, before we start writing, to try and gather input just to make sure we're trying to capture the essence of thoughts in the group around that. So anything you can contribute in thoughts would certainly be appreciated.

Keith Davidson: Okay, any questions?

Bill Semich: Actually just to jump in, Bernie, when it says, "may be revoked and possibly delegated to another designated manager", I see that doesn't --

Bernie Turcotte: You're fading in and out, Bill, very badly. I don't know if it's just --

Bill Semich: Okay, is that an improvement?

Bernie Turcotte: Yes, much better. Thank you.

Bill Semich: Where it says, "possibly the delegation may be revoked and possibly delegated to another designated manger", I don't think that's as clear cut as one might want to think. May be revoked sort of implies, in my mind anyway, the provision of some kind of cure period, i.e., slapping of the hand and straighten up and fly right or else.

Bernie Turcotte: I don't think we're arguing that at all. In my mind it's just that from a revocation point, at the end of a long series of actions, there is the clear possibility of revocation. That's all I'm saying, I'm not saying that's the only option here.

Bill Semich: The issue for me is this "may be revoked and possibly delegated to another designated manager". I'm a little concerned about how we're going to deal with that sort of conflicting or contradictory concept. Because if it is revoked and it's not delegated to another designated manager, what does that mean?

Bernie Turcotte: Well I think that's the issue we're all going to have to wrestle with. I certainly don't think or haven't read anyone having, given a very perfect interpretation of this or even proposed a coherent one. So I think the challenge for us as a group is going to be working through those things and somehow coming up with a scheme that's going to allow us to make all the various bits and pieces fit together in a coherent fashion.

Bill Semich: Okay, that was just a comment on the lack of simplicity in even the simplest sentence.

Keith Davidson: I think you raise a very good point, Bill, and I imagine that there are some overarching aspects both in IANA's own processes and with the ICANN board. But whatever they do, they do no harm, and obviously revoking an active ccTLD and then possibly or possibly not re-delegating it or delegating to another designated manager, would indicate that they'd be breaking the Internet people doing harm. So perhaps we should start considering some wording that may come out of the bylaws and so on. I see Martin has his hand raised. So Martin?

Martin Boyle: Yes, if I can just ask what is probably a completely dumb question. But in 3.5, it seems to me that the RFC only gives grounds for revocation in the case of there being persistent problems. And those problems as listed immediately above that statement are all the technical competence of the management of the TLD. And there is nothing, no role in that bit, for significantly interested parties to have a say. Am I reading that right or is it just the fact that I haven't read and remembered the examination standard the whole of RFC1591 here?

Bernie Turcotte: I believe that's correct, Martin, we're not talking about significantly interested parties having a stake here. I guess what is implied, and that's what the group will have to confirm, what the working group will have to confirm, that this is a judgment call from the authorities.

Martin Boyle: And the grounds and the only grounds from RFC1591 is the technical competence of managing the TLD? Is that right?

Bernie Turcotte: That is correct.

Martin Boyle: Thank you.

Keith Davidson: I wonder, too, Bernie, if in the new gTLD process there are any statements expanding or defining what is meant by the requests in the timely manner and operating the database with accuracy and robustness, whether there's any kind of color or depth that arises in the definitions or specifications given for these prospective new gTLD operators and whether we mightn't be able to find something there that could be useful for us.

Bernie Turcotte: As far as I know for IDN ccTLDs, the paperwork doesn't specify anything new. Am I correct in that, Bart?

Keith Davidson: Yeah, I think I can probably answer to that for Bart. No, IDN ccTLDs didn't have any additional requirements over existing ccTLDs. I was thinking more of the new gTLDs.

Bernie Turcotte: As far as the gTLDs, I'm unfamiliar. But it's an interesting point to follow up for one of our next calls and I'll be glad to do so unless someone actually has the information. Probably Kim could tell us but he's not on the call today.

Keith Davidson: Desiree has her hand raised. Desiree?

Desiree Miloshevic: Well I think yes, we should discuss it on the call. Since Kim is not here, there'd certainly be different technical requirements than the current ones, but they are not explained anywhere apart from compliance with the

certain list of RFC when you operate a DNS. And so the [IPV6] and DNS is not something that is currently part of the IDN fast track for ccTLDs according to my knowledge. But they will be in the new gTLD round for example.

Keith Davidson: Yeah, I'm thinking more of where there are issues that are suggested required technical competence in RFC1591 at least at a very subjective set of possible measures. And just if there were slightly more objective measurements to say what our DNA seek time might be or what are -- when they say responding to requests in a timely manner, does it mean registering a domain name within 9 nanoseconds or something? And that might have been quite a bit of work, or there may have been quite a bit of work done on that for the new gTLD process. I'm not suggesting for a moment that we try and expand the brief to cover newer technologies like requiring DNA seek or anything like that. Just purely those things that are already specified in 1591.

So I think it could be worth a read, Bernie. And only useful to comment if there are items that might add color and depth. So a follow up discussion with Kim or an initial discussion with Kim and then following up if he thinks it's worthwhile.

Bernie Turcotte: Will do.

Keith Davidson: Okay. Any other comments in that regard? In regard to those bits of eluding to revocations? If not, do you have anything else, Bernie?

Bernie Turcotte: Yes, our second point goes to Section 3.4 of RFC1591, the significantly interested parties. This is where we had, the IANA tries to have any contending parties reach agreement amongst themselves and generally take no action to change things unless all contending parties agree. Only in cases where the designated manager has substantially misbehaved would the IANA step in.

Now, there's probably a laundry list of issues with this. We certainly have a number of people that claim 3.4 of RFC1591 only applies to delegations and we're going to have to get ourselves through that. If there is an agreement in the group that it can apply to delegated domains, the next point is, what does substantially misbehave mean? Because there's really absolutely no other reference anywhere about that.

And finally, it says the INS can step in. And again, there is no other reference to that. So obviously there are some issues surrounding that ability that we could end up interpreting this as a basis which could generate a revocation. But this is one of the items I feel we're going to

have to finish going through as a group and reach a consensus. Over to you, Sir.

Keith Davidson: Talking about subjectivity, this is objectivity, substantial misbehavior. And no following definition, it's highly subjective. But does anyone have any comments? Any ideas in this regard? I see a lot of impossibilities. I mean, you have substantially misbehaved and IANA steps in, what are they stepping in to do? Are they stepping in to fix the problem or are they stepping in to revoke and re-delegate?

Bernie Turcotte: I think it's one of the things we're just going to have to very carefully walk our way through and just create a very solid foundation so that we can keep building on it so that we can finish generating an interpretation that can be a consensus view of the group.

Bill Semich: I have a comment. I guess I should raise my hand. Okay, I've raised my hand.

Keith Davidson: Sure, Bill, but you're just fading away again a bit, so --

Bill Semich: Okay, it has always been my impression or understanding that this is a process towards revocation process and not some other alternative mechanism. By the IANA stepping in, basically it means, okay, then we'll go down to this process of revoking it and assigning it to someone else. Not there's some other parallel but it's not the same process where you could change who the manager is.

Bernie Turcotte: Thank you, Bill.

Bill Semich: Yep, I'll put my hand down.

Bernie Turcotte: From postings from Eberhard and conversations I've had with him, I believe his position is the same as yours on that.

Keith Davidson: Okay. No other comments? I can see we're going to have some fun with all of this, Bernie.

Bernie Turcotte: Yes, endless fun coming up. I'm sure we can certainly foresee many hours of discussion on specific terms and where commas are placed. But then, this is our remit to come up with -- I mean let's be clear, RFC1591 has been there for what, 30 years? And no one has ever touched that because there has never been a revocation of a domain by IANA that I'm aware of. So we're really in uncharted waters here. And I think this is the meat of our work that's coming up and we are really going to need everyone's thinking caps to generate something that is interesting and reasonable.

Of course from the points that can lead to a possible revocation, then we're going to have to come up with some guidelines about what revocation means and the steps to that. Because I think as Bill has pointed out earlier, it's fine to say something can cause revocation. It doesn't mean that you wake up one morning and say, okay, we've got the basis for this, we're revoking the domain tomorrow morning. I don't think anyone in this group in their right mind would ever think that that would happen. And I think it's part of our job also, once we finish cleaning up the elements for these things, exactly what that means.

There's probably also another point which we're going to have to deal with and that is Section 7 of the GAC principles which probably Martin can talk to us a bit more about. But basically in Section 7 of the GAC principles, we've got a section which sort of says -- not sort of says, which specifically says, "delegation, re-delegation is a national issue and should be resolved nationally and in accordance with national laws taking into account the views of all stakeholders and the rights of the existing ccTLD registry. Once a formal decision has been reached, ICANN should act promptly to initiate the process of delegation or re-delegation in line with authoritative instructions".

Where the registry -- 7.2.1, under guidelines, where the registry operating the country code TLD does not have a formal communication with national government and its core functions are operated under a different jurisdiction, any action to re-delegate needs to take into account the legal framework of the country where the registry is based.

So basically there's a lot of talk about laws and various other things. And I think we're probably going to have to look at how this dovetails into our interpretations of RFC1591 and how that works. Because I may be incorrect, but I don't think we have a choice because otherwise we wouldn't be going through or completing our mandate properly. So a lot of stuff to think and adjust and look at. Over to you, Sir.

Keith Davidson: Yep, all good fun. Any further comments on revocation as a topic? Any further discussion? Anything else, Bernie, on the topic?

Bernie Turcotte: I don't think so. I think we're going to start nice and slow on this one if those are the comments we've got to date. And basically use the old metaphor of how do you eat an elephant? One small piece at a time. So I guess starting with our next meeting, we'll start looking at various very small chunks of this to see if we can start moving it forward. Because I can certainly see this being a long process for us.

Keith Davidson: I thought the way to eat an elephant was to start at the tail and stop when you hit the tusks. Okay. So nothing further on revocation, our next item on the agenda is the follow up on transcripts of calls. And I'm not sure exactly why that's on our agenda. Bernie, can you enlighten us?

Bernie Turcotte: Well, we published our first -- just for those that haven't been on calls, we are now publishing transcripts of these calls which we hope will make it easier for those who miss a call. We have Eberhard who was ecstatic about the first one and posted a comment. So two things here. The first thing is to again note that we're doing this, so if you miss a meeting. And the transcription, from what I saw of the last one, is truly excellent. So there is really a good record of what's on the call. And as several people have pointed out, it's a heck of a lot easier to follow a transcript than to re-listen to the audio version of a call. The second thing, to see if anyone has actually gone through those and if they have comments, positive or negative.

Keith Davidson: I've had a couple of private comments that the transcripts are very useful and Desiree has also just added that in the chat and so has Cheryl. So it's a good idea and working well.

Bernie Turcotte: So then if there are no negative comments, we'll keep going to it.

Keith Davidson: Excellent. There is a cost and so I guess the thing that we should assure ourselves as a working group is that it is useful to people as a result of it.

Bernie Turcotte: Yes, it's about between \$500 and \$700 per call to get the transcript up.

Keith Davidson: Yep. And if there's no comments on the transcripts other than those who tell us also that transcripts are useful, so only positive comments received. And so we'll continue. Any other business? We have a little meeting schedule somewhere. Our next meeting is on the 8th of December at 2100 UTC and then one more possible call before Christmas on December 22nd at 0500 UTC. Is there any other business? Any other item that anyone wishes to raise at this point? If not, I think we've all earned an hour's (inaudible) by completing today's call in one hour. So well done, everybody. Thank you, and we'll speak again on the 8th of December. Thank you all very much.