Framework of Interpretation Working Group Telephone Conference
20 February 2014

Attendees:

ccNSO:
Martin Boyle, .uk
Keith Davidson, .nz (Chair)
Chris Disspain, .au
Dejan Djukic, .rs
Daniel Kalchev, .bg
Eberhard Lisse, .na
Paulos Nyirenda, .mw
Patricio Poblete, .cl
Nigel Roberts, .gg

Other Liaisons:
Cheryl Langdon Orr, ALAC

Staff Support and Special Advisors:
Jaap Akkerhuis, ICANN / ISO
Bart Boswinkel, ICANN
Kristina Nordström, ICANN
Bernard Turcotte, ICANN

Apologies:

Kim Davies IANA
Maureen Hilyard, ALAC
Stephen Deerhake, .as

Keith Davidson:	Okay. So, Kristina can we have who is on the call, and apologies, please?
Kristina Nordström:	Sure. From ccNSO we have, Martin Boyle, Keith Davidson, Chris Disspain, Dejan Djukic, Daniel Kalchev, Eberhard Lisse, Paulos Nyirenda, Patricio Poblete, Nigel Roberts. From Liaisons we have, Cheryl Langdon Orr; from Staff Support and Special Advisors, we have Jaap Akkerhuis, Bart Boswinkel, Kristina Nordström and Bernard Turcotte. And we have apologies from Kim Davies and Maureen Hilyard . That's all I've got.
Keith Davidson:	Okay. I think there's an apology Stephen Deerhake, too, if it wasn't recorded there.
Kristina Nordström:	I'm sorry. I didn't have that one.

Keith Davidson:	Okay. Stephen and I are here in Malaysia at an APTLD Meeting at the moment, so I know that APTLD have other commitments at the moment, so he's probably otherwise committed, so I'll put this apology in for him. Any further apologies?
Nigel Roberts:	(Inaudible)--
Keith Davidson:	I'm not seeing it, Nigel.
Nigel Roberts:	Well, I'm just seeing, connecting. I have to sign up to the ICANN standard of good behavior, and I've not been--
Kristina Nordström:	Yes. Let's do that.
Nigel Roberts:	--connecting.
Keith Davidson:	Okay, and so those who are present, and apologies. Can we consider the agenda confirmed? I haven't had any response after two posts on the (inaudible/audio skip), so unless anyone has any desired changes, we will move on.
	Meeting reports, we had the meeting report of the 6th of February circulated. It's there on the Adobe Connect now. Bernie, are there any issues arising with that, otherwise covered on the agenda?
Bernard Turcotte:	Not that I'm aware of, sir.
Keith Davidson:	No other comments from anyone? If not, can we move to the public consultation on revocation? And, Bernie, do you want to take us through the submissions received and your proposed responses?
Bernard Turcotte:	Yes, sir. Hold on, I'm trying to get the documents up, so. I will actually have to pull up my comments again, so I ask for your indulgence for a sec, while I go get those.
Nigel Roberts:	Can you make it movable in the meantime? There's definitely something wrong with Adobe Connect Room, I'm trying from two different browsers and getting the same error.
Bernard Turcotte:	It's just you, Nigel.
Nigel Roberts:	Well perhaps you can explain to me what it might be, because I'm using Chrome and I'm using Firefox, and both of them are giving me the same results.
Keith Davidson:	You should (inaudible/audio skip). So when you've been out, and bought your (inaudible), Nigel, can you come back and try that? I'm sorry, I don't have any suggestions as to what you might do, other than reboot. But can we move on please? Bernie, and hopefully Nigel we'll get re-connected in the (inaudible/audio skip). If you can't connect, Nigel, please just make your -- yeah, just ask your question, too, on audio.
Bernard Turcotte:	All right, so, we will begin with the Eggleton Paper. And since we are on a tight timeline, and we didn't really have any major comments last time, I'll do a quick résumé. Basically Mr. Eggleton is either agreeing with what we've done, was suggesting a few areas for additional work, these areas, although interesting, were in all cases beyond the scope of the Working Group, and some of them were not really very clear. The editing was rough, to say the least, and someone should consider that if they are doing a career in law. So that's the quick overview, I don't know if there are any comments.
Nigel Roberts:	I'm just interested in the proposed response.

Bernard Turcotte:	Basically, I think we will be telling him, "Thank you for agreeing with us, and these other points are beyond the scope of the Working Group."
Nigel Roberts:	Agreed.
Bernard Turcotte:	Thank you. Anything else?
Keith Davidson:	No. It looks everybody is happy. Thanks, Bernie.
Bernard Turcotte:	Okay. We'll move onto the next document, if you'll give me a second to get that in my comments, it should be up in front of you. The ALAC comments were much better structured, and the summary is as follows: a) They agree with us on the budget (ph) thing; b) They have made some suggestions which, similarly to the previous paper, are beyond the scope of this Working Group. Cheryl clarified with us at the last meeting, that this was understood when they made the submission.
	Now, there is one comment in the At-Large submission which was very relevant, which was relative to our mandate -- our remit which was to consider the GAC principles, and at the very least we haven't really explained in our recommendations, how we have considered the GAC principles, and there is a point to be made about that, that they have been considering that, and we will have to address that as a group, so to the point though about what we would reply, thank you, for agreeing with us, these items are beyond the scope, we understand they are important but they are not part of our mandate. And finally for the GAC principles, yes we agree with you and we are working on this. I'll be glad to take questions.
Keith Davidson:	Any questions.
Unidentified Participant:	We agreed with which questions? We agree with what point about the GAC principles?
Bernard Turcotte:	That. We said we would consider them, and we really haven't mentioned anything about the GAC principles. So at a minimum we have to say something about that.
Keith Davidson:	No other questions? No other observations? No one is taking the floor. Okay, so if there (inaudible/audio), can we move on to the Technology papers? It seems to be reasonable (inaudible) received on your last call. But, Bernie, do you want to read about the paper as drafted?
Bernard Turcotte:	Yes, sir. Ah, is this the right version? It looks like it. All right, we'll do a quick slide through the early sections; basically, it's just relisting the mandate of what we are trying to do with these objectives, so this is all cut and paste. Except for one section, that didn't come through. Okay. Basically what we've got here -- okay, this is the wrong version of the document.
Nigel Roberts:	Bernie, while you're doing that, can I have the floor?
Bernard Turcotte:	That's the Chair's prerogative.
Nigel Roberts:	If the Chair will agree.
Keith Davidson:	Sure, Nigel.
Nigel Roberts:	Okay. What I'm looking at, I just want to check I've got the right document. It's Version 0.1, of Official Terminology. Is that correct?

Bernard Turcotte:	That is correct.
Nigel Roberts:	Okay. Two points on the title page. First of all it should be relative or related "to" the administration gTLDs, and secondly, I object to the word "official", because I don't know who is making it official.
Bernard Turcotte:	Fine. And I think you missed some of the earlier calls on this and like a usual note (inaudible)--
Nigel Roberts:	Well, I was away from the last call, I had a particular problem the last time, my mother was ill.
Bernard Turcotte:	I'm not blaming you, Nigel, I'm just stating that when I presented this originally, I said, given it's a Version-0-dot-something, as usual it's just my initial take on things, and I'll be very glad to take all those comments and (inaudible).
Nigel Roberts:	Don't take what I said personally.
Bernard Turcotte:	I am not. On our last call, I think a number of us noted that we were, sure, and missing your input relative to these things. So I'm glad to see you back in the saddle.
Nigel Roberts:	Now you have the benefit of it.
Bernard Turcotte:	There you go. All right. So I'm sure that we've got that noted and we'll be -- I don't have a problem with the things you are presenting.
Keith Davidson:	Thank you, Nigel. Please, continue, Bernie.
Bernard Turcotte:	All right. So, as I said, Section 2.1, there's been a minor amendment to what we are delivering given the work we have done which has taken us a little wider than we originally started, and so this has been presented unofficially because we did not have a quorum about a month ago, it was presented two weeks ago seems to be okay. I don't think it's exactly stretching the fabric of reality too much, but there it is regardless. So, if there's nothing major, then we will dive into the actual work, the definitions.
Nigel Roberts:	Please.
Bernard Turcotte:	All right, consent. Consent must be specific, informed and ambiguous, affirmatively communicated and freely given. So, we've got our references there, which RFC1591, and the FOI Working Group consent paper Section 7141. Any questions? Okay no--
Nigel Roberts:	Just one comment. For the future versions of this, can you issue the incredible indentation, because it's doing (inaudible); can we have a version of report format, please?
Bernard Turcotte:	Yes, sir.
Nigel Roberts:	You also don't need to put the word definition, because we know that that's the definition. But that's it--
Bernard Turcotte:	Okay.
Keith Davidson:	Okay. Nobody else is taking the floor, so please continue, Bernie.

Bernard Turcotte:	Delegation. The process by which the IANA operator initially assigns management responsibility or transfers previously assigned responsibility for the management of the ccTLD, and that is a page from -- or two from Section 411, the FOI Working Group, public consultation and revocation.
Nigel Roberts:	We'll, actually I object to this one.
Bernard Turcotte:	Okay.
Keith Davidson:	On what grounds, Nigel.
Nigel Roberts:	Okay. I haven't looked at Section 411 and whether or not it's referring to delegation as used in the context of 411, but here's my thinking, and there are two points here. First of all delegation is not just a process, it is a concept. So the -- so we've talked about the IANA process as being separate from the policy, and so on. First of all the word "process" is exercising me slightly. And secondly, we went through this in the previous working group, we went through it again, and referred (inaudible), Francis, Roberts and so on.
	Delegation has different meanings in different context. It has the meaning of inserting a domain into its parent zone, and it has -- and plain words meaning which is, a higher body gives permission to a lower body to take control of something, and it has the term of art, meaning that we've used to mean appointment of manager or change of manager. And I kind of like it within the definition section, but it addresses the fact that the word delegation is not capable of precise definition, and this definition is to be used whenever you see the word "delegation".
Keith Davidson:	Okay. Thanks, Nigel. Would a footnote -- would you like to construct a footnote with a suggested wording, Nigel?
Nigel Roberts:	I can work with Bernie on this. Yes.
Keith Davidson:	Is that all right, Bernie?
Bernard Turcotte:	Yes, sir.
Keith Davidson:	Okay. Any other problems with delegation? Okay. Please continue.
Bernard Turcotte:	Thank you, sir. Manager, the -- I'm sorry -- the entry, whether an organization, enterprise, government or individual, which is the trustee of the ccTLD -- bracket -- [as the term is used in RFC1591] supervises the domain names in the ccTLD, operates the domain name system in the country or territory associated with the ccTLD, and is listed in the IANA database of ccTLDs as the manager for the ccTLD. And there are a few notes that go along with that in RFC1591, the term "trustee" is used to describe manager's duty to serve the community, and not describe the specific legal relationship, the manager, to the delegated domain. So this was listed directly from our designation section. IANA currently uses sponsoring organization instead of manager.
	So I have a few qualifiers which we agreed we would change qualifiers, before Nigel jumps in. Incumbent manager, same as manager, however, the term is useful in differentiating from proposed manager, in applications for a transfer, and proposed manager, the entity that is listed as the proposed manager in applications for transfer. And I have agreed with Eberhard then, using "proposed" twice will be changed in the next version. And the references RFC1591 section; 3.1 RFC1591, Section 3.2, and FOI Working Group Consent Document Section 7121. Comments?
Nigel Roberts:	Yes.

Keith Davidson:	Anyone else.
Nigel Roberts:	Am I being heard.
Bernard Turcotte:	Yes you are.
Bernard Turcotte:	You are indeed.
Bart Boswinkel:	Keith lost connection, so--
Nigel Roberts:	Oh, I see. Thanks Bart. Okay. Well, in the absence of the Chairman if -- and if everybody else is fine. I like this, it works for me. There are a couple of things that I think will assist rather than change. So first of all the words, which is the trustee of the ccTLD as the term is used in RFC1591, and the clause, as the term is used in RFC1591, attaches to the noun ccTLD, and not the noun trustee, the way it's written. This could be fixed by saying, as the term trustee is used in RFC1591. I would also like to see the word "in" changed for the word "for" to make it neutral, and not provoke any discussion of situations whereby the manager operates a domain name system for the country, but does operate it in the country. Do both those proposed changes help?
Bernard Turcotte:	The first one I don't think I have an issue with. This is a -- sorry, everyone, there's going to be noise for a second, as the family exists for the morning run to the school bus. And as far as the second one, I think that Becky lifted that directly from RFC1591, and that may be something that we have to work on, because if I remember correctly RFC -- and we've had a lot of discussions on this -- the domain system in the country or territory, was quite a clear reflection of what was in RFC 1591.
Nigel Roberts:	Okay. Can I comment onto that?
Bernard Turcotte:	Sure.
Nigel Roberts:	This isn't RFC1591, it's our definition. If we choose to use slightly more expansive words in explaining what we mean by manager, we are free to do so, we are not bound by RFC1591 to use the literal words of RFC1591. And finally, IANA doesn't use sponsoring organization anymore, they just use the word organization, I've just checked on the IANA WHOIS.
Bernard Turcotte:	Okay. So -- but going back to the end point, you know, as you've said very well over the years on this, we try to be very careful and use those words as they were presented in RFC1591 whenever we can. At any rate I don't think you have to win the discussion with me, unfortunately Becky is not with us today, I would suggest--
Nigel Roberts:	And it's not something I'd die in a ditch over, it's just something I think is a little reordering of our definition that we are creating now. Because let's face it, if all we are doing is cut and pasting from RFC1591, we can forget the whole section we don't need it. So I won't die in a ditch over it, this is not something that I'm -- that's going to bother me either way. We are in the country, and we are for the country, where I am, but you know, just diplomacy helps sometimes.
Bernard Turcotte:	Noted. And I think we'll consider this with Becky, and we'll get back to the list. I don't think -- is Keith back?
Nigel Roberts:	No.
Bart Boswinkel:	I'm not sure (inaudible).

Bernard Turcotte:	Okay is (Inaudible) on the line?
Nigel Roberts:	That problem has been (inaudible)--
Bernard Turcotte:	Okay. So we'll take Paulos next.
Paulos Nyirenda:	The last part of the segment, IANA database of ccTLDs, I think the database, is we cannot share these set of issues, not just because it's the ccTLDs--
Bernard Turcotte:	True, but here we are just using an additional specification, but noted. Thank you, Paulos. Anything else?
Paulos Nyirenda:	No. That's it.
Bernard Turcotte:	Okay. I think Keith is back. So I'll hand the Chair over. Keith, we've just finished with Paulos, and I think Martin has his hand up. Over to you, sir.
Keith Davidson:	Okay. And Paulos, can you take your hand down please. And Martin, the floor is yours.
Martin Boyle:	Thanks, Keith. So a simple question about the definition of 4.3.1, and what we've got is a selection of things that all has to apply. So in other words, the manager has to supervise the domain names in ccTLD. It has to operate domain name system (inaudible) for the country or territory, and it has to be listed in the IANA database. What happens if (inaudible) does not apply? Does that then mean that there is a manager of that ccTLD?
Bernard Turcotte:	Hmm? Now there's an interesting question. Where is Becky when we need her? Yeah. That is a very good question I -- let me walk through this for a sec. I think we've covered just about every type of legal and physical person we can cover with organization, enterprise, government or individual, which is the trustee at the ccTLD with the comments from Nigel. I don't think there's any kind of an issue there if they're asking as the manager. Supervises domain names in/for the ccTLD, I think is a conceptual thing, operates domain name systems in the country. Or, again, associated with the ccTLD, and it was listed in the IANA database.

Now, I don't see how you can be the manger for the ccTLD without being in the IANA database, so I think the only point that comes down to is operates the domain name system in the country, and I think given the work we've done in the past, what we've agreed as the general definition to operate the name in-country, is that the domain names for that ccTLD are available in that country, and the documentation is available in the local language. If that's not the case then there's probably something wrong either way. So, I don't see how anyone that is listed as a manager currently would fail that test, although I'll leave that to Becky when she gets back, and that's the best I can do for you right now, Martin. |
Nigel Roberts:	Keith, Bernie? It's Nigel.
Keith Davidson:	Nigel. Well, firstly, before I go to Nigel. Does that help clarify or is there further work required, do you think?
Nigel Roberts:	Well I was going to state a point.
Keith Davidson:	Okay. Carry on, Nigel.
Nigel Roberts:	I can--

Bernard Turcotte:	Sir, who are you asking to speak?
Nigel Roberts:	Well, I think I can assist Martin -- answer Martin's question.
Keith Davidson:	Let's (inaudible) and at the moment, and Martin, and I'll get back to you in a moment.
Nigel Roberts:	Okay. To answer Martin's question. The answer is that we are in the definitions section here, not the policy or legislative section. And what t would mean is, if there was a manager, in the loose sense of the word, that failed one or more of the tests that is set out in how you recognize a manager, as we call it, then they would -- it wouldn't stop them being the manager in the broad sense of the term, but it would stop them being the manager in the terms of as we use the manager in our documentation. So in other words, it wouldn't stop them being the manager, but it would stop then, us calling them the manager; and we would have to call them the manager without portfolio, or something. We would have to call it something else.
	So, I think that's the literal answer to your question. I think at a more broad sense, and I'm glad Martin has raised it, because it's a very good point, is that we shouldn't be too specific in this definition section. To say that -- to be called the manager, you have to tick all these boxes, if what you say is, the manager is the person who manages the ccTLD, you would normally recognize such a person if they are doing these things. Does that assist?
Keith Davidson:	Thanks, Nigel. And Martin, does that, in fact, assist?
Martin Boyle:	Well, it might, because actually that was my concern, that we were -- the words as they are written here require you to tick all the boxes, but I could imagine somebody who is a manager, who supervises the domain names, but actually subcontracts the physical operations of the domain name system to somebody else. I believe that is the case, dot-IN (ph). I also think it's the case, dot-AUs. So it's that writing it down as you have to tick all of the boxes, is a bit that if he goes wrong; whereas, actually we are looking at somebody who supervises and/or operates, and is listed in the IANA database. I suppose that, you know, exactly the words missing, I'll leave to somebody else.
Bernard Turcotte:	I think it was Nigel--
Nigel Roberts:	I think (inaudible) of pornography?
Bernard Turcotte:	So, we'll not go there.
Keith Davidson:	Okay. I think, Nigel, you've given us a hint of a possible way through. So there -- do you have enough to do some redress here, and that should suit Martin.
Bernard Turcotte:	Yes, sir. Just a note relative to what seems to be Martin's main concern on contracting the operation, and I believe that we've gone through this, and as long as the manager maintains responsibility for that contract, it's considered as operating. But I will take all of that in, and I'll certainly go over it with Becky.
Keith Davidson:	Okay, thanks. And Patricio has his hand raised. So it's Patricio, come in, I think Martin is coming back with more, but please, Patricio.
Patricio Poblete:	I just made a comment in the chat window. The word "supervision" worries me a bit. It's exactly to what extent -- how -- why was that, supervision duty be -- or sometimes I asked to supervise things to an extent that we feel that it's not our duty, when we go matters of content, or things of that sort.

Keith Davidson:	Thanks. Any other -- I think, again, noted. And probably something that Bernie could follow up with Becky on, too. Thanks Patricio. And Martin you are seeking the floor again?
Martin Boyle:	Yes. Thanks. I just thought I'd say this, so to hone in on the word that somebody, I now forget who, used. Of the responsibility for operation of the domain name system for the country or territory; remove the word "supervise" and also the context that they must, by definition, be the people doing the operation. So I wonder whether that is the clue for simplifying the number of conditions that -- if they had replied so they have responsibility for the domain name system for the country, and they are listed now on the database. Thanks.
Keith Davidson:	That sounds like a very elegant solution, so thanks for the suggestion, Martin. Bernie, I think (inaudible) looking for the floor, so Bernie can we continue.
Bernard Turcotte:	Thank you, sir. All right, next point will be for revocation. The process by which the IANA operator rescinds responsibility for the management of the ccTLD, from an incumbent manager, full stop, and the reference is Section 413 of the FOI Working Group; public consultation on revenues. Over to you, sir.
Nigel Roberts:	The same objection about the word "process".
Keith Davidson:	Any questions? Okay, rather than object, do you have a suggested other word?
Nigel Roberts:	Whatever Bernie chooses when he replaces the word "process" further up.
Keith Davidson:	Okay. Maybe I was possibly missing from the call when you discussed that.
Nigel Roberts:	Oh, okay.
Keith Davidson:	So, noted, so Bernie. And anyone else has got any comments regarding revocation? I think that's the end of the documents, I think. Isn't it, Bernie?
Bernard Turcotte:	No. Not quite, we have two more. Significantly interested parties: significantly interested parties include but are not limited to (a) the government or territorial authority for the country or territory, associated with the ccTLD; and (b) any 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], so our references are 1591 significantly interested parties, and FOI Working Group Section 711. Over to you, sir.
Keith Davidson:	Yeah. This was that long and hard, fought over along the way so -- but not sure that anyone will have anything to add to subtract from this. So are there any problems at all. If not we could--
Bernard Turcotte:	I'm not seeing any we could move on.
Keith Davidson:	Okay. Can we move on, please, Bernie?
Bernard Turcotte:	And stakeholders. Stakeholders encompass significantly interested parties, interested parties, and other parties referenced in RFC1591, so this is, I don't know if Kim Davies is on the call, but Kim did note last week, for those that weren't there, that he wasn't sure when one would use significantly interested parties and stakeholders, and we had a bit of a discussion around that, and really the idea is that in 1591, there is more than significantly interested parties, and I believe where we ended up is saying when we are

talking about delegations and transfers, there's a very clear reference to significantly interested parties, we've defined that well.

When you're talking about the broader community of people who could be involved in the ccTLD were probably using stakeholders. We are not trying to refer directly to those activities. Over to you, sir.

Nigel Roberts: Comment.

Keith Davidson: Nigel.

Nigel Roberts: Thanks. This isn't a definition. What you ought to do, is try and define the word stakeholder, and then add the sentence that you've got there, to the end -- to following that, so you might want to say something, and I'm not drafting here, along the lines of stakeholders, or a stakeholder, take the singular. A stakeholder is someone who has a direct or indirect interest in the operation of the TLD, it includes significantly interested parties, and other parties referenced in our RFC1591. How does that sound?

Keith Davidson: Well, that sounds okay to me. I don't know about Bernie, and Becky, but that probably does add a layer of clarification --

Bernard Turcotte: I've got it into Chat, and I think that's an excellent, excellent observation and we'll follow up on that.

Nigel Roberts: Okay. Good.

TSpeaker2:   Thanks, Bernie. Anyone else with any comments? No hands are raised, so please continue, Bernie.

Bernard Turcotte: All right. Transfer; reassignment of the incumbent manager's role as trustee or the ccTLD, as the term is used in RFC1591, to the proposed manager, including with the limitation changing the entry in the IANA database. And basically from RFC1591, and the term -- I have a note here, the term re-delegation and I'm concerned with re-delegation, are widely used by the stakeholder community when describing the reassignment of the ccTLD manager. Assume there is no reference to the term re-delegation, in RFC1591, and that there is no policy basis for a non-consensus re-delegation; the FOI Working Group recommends that the use of the term "re-delegation" be dropped. And the references are RFC1591, Section 2, Section 6, the GAC Principles 2005, and FOI Working Group Consent Section 71 -- 21.

Over to you, sir.

Keith Davidson: Okay. That looks fairly straightforward, and I wouldn't imagine there's a lot of debate, but does anyone have any points to raise? If not--

Nigel Roberts: I've got a point of order about the word administrative, okay.

Keith Davidson: Okay. Nigel.

Nigel Roberts: Yeah. I like all the words here, and I like them all in this order, so what I would like to see is the thing that is indented at its maximum that starts "In RFC1591…" moved to the end. Either under the section Commentary, or indeed even demoted to a footnote, because the definition -- it distracts from the correct -- from the definition, which is the sentence which starts "reassignment" and ends in the word "database" which I think is -- I think this is brilliant stuff, but I think you are distracting a little bit by the way you've laid it out, so if you could make that minor change, that would ecstatic.

Bernard Turcotte:	Again, as we discussed previously, I've thrown in a lot of material and a lot of references and the formatting will be different. This was just to facilitate everyone's working with this, especially some of our colleagues, that haven't been involved with as closely as some others of us have been working, but so noted, thank you, Nigel.
Nigel Roberts:	Then we are done.
Keith Davidson:	Okay.
Keith Davidson:	Okay. And no one else is taking the floor, so I think that wraps up the documents. Bernie?
Bernard Turcotte:	All right, so there are some modifications, I will attempt to get a hold of Becky. We will run through this.
Keith Davidson:	Okay. And we are at quite an extraordinarily sort of spot-on time. It's 15 minutes to the hour, and we get 5 minutes really, if this call ends. And so, if we can continue with the agenda, I was going to give you a GAC update and the update that I've been snowed under and not following up with the GAC, so I will be dong that in the next 24 hours, and so I'll report back to the list as soon as I can on where we are at with the GAC.
	With that we have other business and we have, our next meeting is scheduled for March 6th, at 1900 UTC, so I think that will be our final opportunity, or final committed revision of this paper, I hope. And so if we can, Bernie, chase Becky along the way and have her redraft as quickly as possible. I hope that we can sign off on the document at this meeting. And so if--
Bernard Turcotte:	We will try, sir.
Keith Davidson:	Sorry? Was someone seeking to speak?
Bernard Turcotte:	No. I simply said, we will try, sir.
Keith Davidson:	Thank you. Okay. And does anyone else have any other item of general business? If not, thank you all very much for your participation. I think, again, we've made good progress, and we'll have a better document as a result of today's call. So thanks very much, and we'll talk again on the 6th. But I thank you all.
Bernard Turcotte:	Bye.
Nigel Roberts:	Bye all.
Kristina Nordström:	Bye.