IRTP C
TRANSCRIPTION
Tuesday 28 August 2012 at 1400 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the IRTP C meeting on Tuesday 28 August 2012 at 1400 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-irtp-c-20120828-en.mp3

On page:http://gnso.icann.org/calendar#aug
(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Attendees:
James Bladel –RrSG co-chair
Michele Neylon – RrSG
Roy Dykes – RySG
Avri Doria – NCSG co-Chair
Angie Graves – CBUC
Kevin Erdman – IPC
Chris Chaplow - CBUC
Bob Mountain – RrSG
Barbara Knight – RySG
Phil Corwin – CBUC
Mike O'Connor – ISPCP
Rob Golding – RrSG
ICANN Staff:
Marika Konings
Berry Cobb
Glen de Saint Géry
Apologies
Simonetta Batteiger – RrSG
Paul Diaz – RrSg
Oliver Hope - RrSG
Hago Dafalla – NCUC – Operator called and no response

Coordinator: Go ahead with the recording.

Glen DeSaintgery: Thank you very much (Ricardo). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. This is the IRTPC call on the 28th of August.

And on the line we have James Bladel, Angie Graves, Avri Doria, Barbara Knight, Mikey O'Connor, Bob Mountain, Kevin Erdman, (McKailey Milan), Phil Corwin.

And we have - we cannot get through to Hago Dafalla. We've been trying to call him. Chris Chaplow says he will be coming on to the call but will be late. And for staff we have Marika Konings, Berry Cobb and myself, Glen DeSaintgery. Before I hand over, may I just ask you please to remember to say your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much.

James Bladel: Thank you Glen and welcome everyone to the IRTPC PDP call for the 20th of August 2012. Thank you very much. We wanted to welcome back Marika from her odyssey to the Southern Hemisphere and beyond. So welcome back Marika.

Marika Konings: Thank you very much. Glad to be back with you all.

James Bladel: I'm sure you're not glad to be back on the IRTPC call. But we'll take that as a pleasant formality. But I hope you enjoyed your vacation. It sounded like you and the family had a great time.

And then thank you as well to Berry, not only for covering in Marika's absence, but also stepping in and sharing the discussions last week

when both co-chairs were otherwise disposed. So appreciate that Berry, thank you very much.

And let that be a lesson to all of us ICANN volunteers when we start to feel proud of what we're able to do in this community that staff is - the depth of the talent is such that we can replace us like it ain't no thing. We can debate whether or not that's a positive thing. But it is I think a practical reality.

So welcome everyone. And let's kind of get back on track. I believe from looking over the agenda that most of the comments were reviewed. So let's get started there.

First off, are there any comments or additions to the agenda that was circulated by Berry and Marika, I'm sorry I guess Marika yesterday. And is posted in the right-hand column on the Adobe chat room. Any comments there? Okay thank you.

And anyone have any updates to their statement of interest? Okay the queue is clear. So let's dive right in. Berry perhaps you could give us a 30 second summary of where you guys left last week? And I apologize. I had not had an opportunity to read the transcript or listen to the recording. So I am coming at this cold.

Berry Cobb: No problem James. This is Berry for the transcript. Basically we completed through the entire public comment review tool. There were just two action items that we needed to cover, both of which were comments from Prague I believe. And we needed context around some of the statements.

So the first one to review is Row 18. And the comment itself was when you change house or telephone number. You also need to provide proof of ownership. So it's not unreasonable to ask for a similar confirmation in the context of change of registrant.

And originally I had, when we first crossed reviewing this, we needed that context. And I had sent it to the list. And I put a note here in the tool. And then we reviewed it the next meeting. And I had forgot that I had sent it to the list.

So this time I actually cut and pasted the chat around that comment, which I believe was from (Christian Meuer). And that context is in the working group response field, which is probably three or four rows deep. And I don't know that we want to read through those here on the call.

James Bladel: Well what is the, I guess the - what was the open question that we were requiring some context? Was it just that the comment itself wasn't making sense on its own until we put some - put it in, you know, in the - in its foundation of where it was the base of the discussion? Or was it - what are the generals?

Berry Cobb: Yes okay, so he's really mainly talking about, just scrolling back to this here, I mean it seems like there was a pretty healthy discussion about the length of time periods for any sort of locks. And (Christian) I think advises us to keep it simple.

And then there was a discussion a little bit about whether the change was material or just a correction or a routine Whois update. Does that capture the sentiment?

James Bladel: Correct.

Berry Cobb: And we discussed this fairly extensively two meetings ago as well as on the list when I published the, kind of an overview of our practices. And I think that (Kelly) and some other registrar's waiting on that as well.

James Bladel: So is there anyone that wants to raise any other issues with regard to Item Number 18? Or should we go then to our last action item? Okay, boy lively group this time. Berry if you could move us to our next action item please.

Berry Cobb: And this is the same type of review. Basically the comment that was pasted here we didn't understand...

James Bladel: I'm sorry, which row number are we on?

Berry Cobb: I'm sorry, Row 32.

James Bladel: Row 32, okay thanks.

Berry Cobb: I forgot the synch button wasn't on. And this comment I believe was from (Gavin Brown). And the comment itself is one of the things that surprised me is that EPP never defined registrars as an object to be queried.

                  So it occurred to me that it would make sense to have this option because obviously in a registry database, registrars are first class

objects so they can exist. So they exist and can be queried through. But there is no way to query for them through EPP.

And again, just pasted in the working group response the context around the - what (Gavin) was stating. And I believe that there was a little bit more dialogue.

And for the most part I believe that there's reference to publishing the IANA ID versus the proprietary ID.

James Bladel: Well I think if I can paraphrase (Gavin)'s comment here, it's that registrars, you can query any object in a registry database and get them more information about it. Obviously you have more control - more information is displayed and more control points are displayed if you are the managing registrar.

But even if you're not the managing registrar, or if you're just someone using the public Whois, you can get some information on things like names, (servers), contacts, etcetera. But I think what (Gavin) is getting at here is that registrars are also an object. And that cannot be queried through the EPP system.

That's an interesting point because there is, especially in the context of ICANN there is a registrar information form that has to be provided that lists things like, you know, primary contact or for example from IRTP(B) it would list the (TX) Website, what country you're based in and etcetera.

So I think it would be interesting. But I think I question whether that's outside of the scope of what we're trying to achieve with the IANA ID charter questions.

It sounds like to me it would be something that would be nice to have. But I don't know that it's necessarily on the critical path of what we're trying to do. I see a queue building up here. So I will go to that and start with (McKailey).

(McKailey Milan):   Good afternoon James, so nice to talk to you over the telephone actually like this on such a beautiful afternoon. With respect to this thing here, I mean this comment is kind of interesting. And it's opened up a whole set of things that kind of interest me.

For AS numbers in registered with (Ripe), you can do a Whois look up on the AS number. And you can get back a bunch of data. So from a command line if you were to type Whois space AS39122 space minus H space Whois.(ripe).net, you'd get back a bunch of information about our network.

I think (Aaron)'s Whois will return similar types of data. Maybe in a slightly different format, which I think is - it is quite useful. Whether it's out of scope here or not, okay. I don't have any strong feelings either one way or the other.

But I mean if a network operator can be listed in a database, then I don't see any reason why a registrar's contact information cannot be listed in something similar. Same with registries and other objects thanks.

James Bladel: Okay thanks (McKailey). And I agree this is an interesting thing. There are other services out there. But I just, again, I think that the charter question was looking at the use of IANA IDs for the use of the registrar that was managing the names and not necessarily the other registrars or the general public.

But I'll go to Mikey and then I'll just put myself in the queue. Go ahead Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. I remember (Gavin)'s comment as maybe too much information making a simple point. I think his simple point was supporting our suggestion that IANA IDs and proprietary IDs co-exist.

And then went into some fairly technical length as to why he supported it. And indeed, by the end of then meeting he had built the IANA ID in parallel with the proprietary ID that's (Central Neck) uses into their system.

So he was basically just saying this should be a simple thing. It sounds like a good idea. I support it. And then maybe gave us more information than we needed.

But I wouldn't read a whole lot into all of the other stuff. I think he was mostly just trying to make the point, hey this is an easy thing and a good idea.

James Bladel: Okay thanks Mikey. I kind of remember it the same way. And I especially wouldn't want to encourage this group to go down the path of recommending that registrars, I'm sorry, registries duplicate the radar functions in their SRS.

But that's probably a conversation for another day. So does anyone have any strong objections to that approach? I think that it was (McKailey) said he was fine one way or the other. I think Mikey and I are saying (Gavin)'s making a point here. But he's not asking us to rush out and build a new system.

And hopefully our registry reps on the call, (Roy) and (Barbara) are breathing a sigh of relief as we say that. So I don't know if anyone else has - sees that in a shockingly different way? Or if we can - green check. That's the most underrated green check I've ever seen (Barbara) and (Roy). So thanks.

Okay, let's move on then. And appreciate the context Berry. I think (Gavin) made a good point. And I appreciate Mikey's caution as well that we shouldn't read too much into it.

So that concludes our review and our remaining action items associated with public comments received during the public comment forum and in our workshop in Prague.

Does anyone else feel like there's any remaining work to be done with review of public comments? Are there any that you feel like perhaps we didn't cover sufficiently? Or do you have any parting thoughts on any one comment or just in general? I'll give you a few seconds to put your hand up before we move on.

Oh there we are. Hello Avri, go ahead please. You may be on mute.

Avri Doria: I was on mute. It takes a long time. We've got the long message on mute as opposed to the short message. No, I don't want to bring up any specific issue.

What I want to recommend is that we do sort of consider this a first call on any of the comments. Then perhaps whatever clean up and documentation is done on comments is done.

And then we do a second call on it. So anybody that's not sure of anything relating, anybody that wants to go back to a (Gavin) or other person to check on something one last time. They'll have the time to go. So doing it almost like a first reading and a second reading thanks.

James Bladel: Okay. I think that's a good idea and sound advice. So how about this Avri, what if we posted this comment review tool to the distribution list with the request that folks review it? And if they have any other comments that we bring those to the next meeting, which is one week from today.

And when that - that will be the final call. And I see agreement, okay. So let's do it that way. Berry and Marika if you wouldn't mind, let's send this out for a final seven-day review with the understanding that any edits will be closed after next week's call.

Okay, the next item here is we a couple weeks ago decided to undertake an IRTP process diagram. I think that that was one of the bits of feedback we had noting that that was absent from our discussions.

And of course our amazingly awesome diagram guru, Mikey O'Connor, took it upon himself to bring his talents to bear on this issue. So I see it's up on the screen now.

I'm going to put Mikey into service here, and ask him to walk us through this document. Mikey if you could spend maybe ten minutes max, ten, 15 minutes max on this?

Mikey O'Connor: Sure. Actually Marika could you make me a presenter because there's a new version that's better. And my anonymous co-conspirator, do you want to name yourself? Or do you want to just remain nameless?

Anyway I've had a co-conspirator that we've been working on this. And it's pretty much better. It's not done yet. So Mountain confessed, cool. Okay, so let me just change around things a little bit. I've got it on my screen here.

And then - yes, ten minutes sounds about right for this. I just have to click a few things so that I can see it too. So I can make sure it's working. There, everybody can you see that okay? Is it big enough because I can make it a little bit bigger, but not much?

There is now five pages in this deck. And so let me just step you through them real quick. Basically there is the summary page that you can see in front of you, which is four cases.

And then each subsequent page is a kind of ham-handed try at describing what the user would see. And I think what I'm going to do is just sketch this out. Send it to the list.

Mountain and I are still going back and forth on this. We actually did a little email this morning. So you have to treat this as a work in progress. And we probably do want to form a sub-team around this just to beat it up some more.

But let me give you the story as it stands right now. There are sort of four basic cases. The first one is the IRTP as we know it today. You're changing registrar.

The stuff on the left is the customer interface and so that's what I'm going to show you in the next four slides. And I think one of the big debates is the whole discussion about inconvenience for the customer and the, you know, the delays and the non-instantaneous nature of this.

And I think one of the points that I really was trying to get at on this slide is to say look, the customer interface is where the authentication takes place. And we'll see that in a second.

But once that's all done, all of the changes can happen in automation. They can essentially change registrar and registrant instantaneously if the registrars and registries have the right systems and plumbing in place. And so that's one distinction that I want to highlight on this page. That's the reason I drew it the way I did.

So then the remaining three business cases are Number 2 where you're changing registrant information. And this is where the safeguard pops in to prevent registrar hopping. That's the little black gismo over on the right side of the page.

Case 3 is where you're doing both at the same time. And again, this is the one where I would want to emphasize that this could feel instantaneous even though the events are happening from a system standpoint in a sequence. Or, you know, you could do a change of registrar and a change of registrant at the same time, at least from the customer viewpoint.

And then finally, the fourth case is the one where you're changing registrar. You're changing registrant. And you want to leave the option open for the new registrant to move the name on quickly after the changes have taken place.

And - but I think what I'm going - since I'm creating a rat hole rich environment, let me just step through all of this. And then we can circle back and go down all these rat holes together.

So anyway that's the fast view of that front page. Then what we've done is come up with sort of the customer view of this. And so we wrote a little case that says, in this one Mike wants to move his domain from one registrar to another. No other parties are involved.

And because the registrant hasn't changed, registrant info must remain the same between the registrars and the wave safeguard option is not needed because we're not changing registrant info.

Now I know there's a rat hole there. I'll point that out. But I don't want to cover it right now because I think I cover it in a minute. But down at the bottom we say there registrant information would need to match in this case.

And from a user interface side, the registrant would see two screens. They'd see one at their new registrar where they had requested the change. And then they'd see one at their registrar of record where they'd authorize it.

And down below I'm sort of waving my hands at what all is involved there. I'm just sort of say there's a bunch of stuff that you have to do. This is often referred to as a miracle happens here.

The second case, this is Case Number 2 is (Mary), a business owner, wants to buy a domain from Mike to use for her business. She and Mike are using the same registrar. Because she plans to use the name for a long time and wants to protect it from hijacking, she leaves the safeguard in place because of the change of registrant stuff.

She ticks the box that requests the change. And Mikey, in this case, gets a not - presumably gets a notification on his account. And he ticks the box to authorize it. And off goes a bunch of authorization. And a miracle happens. And it's changed.

Third case is changing registrant and registrar. And Bob and I just started talking about this before the call. So I'm going to try out my preliminary answer on Bob as well for all of you and see how this goes.

And the case that we wrote is a different person. (Ann) is an individual who wants to buy a domain from Mikey to use for her blog. She and Mike are not using the same registrar.

And because she plans to use the name for a long time and wants to protect it, she leaves the safeguard in place. In this case she gets to

tick two boxes on her screen. She wants to change the registrant and change the registrar.

And then she doesn't want to change to waive the safeguard. So she gets presented the option to do it, but she doesn't tick that box. And she gets presented with a whole bunch of stuff authenticate, which she fills out.

Mikey authorizes both the change of registrant and the change of registrar, fills out a bunch of stuff and off it goes. Now the case that Bob was raising was - in the previous one was well what if a person in this situation - oh no, I guess it was Case 1.

They think of themselves as Mike in the new registry, or at the new registrar. But he thinks of himself as Mikey at the registrar of record. And so his registrant information wouldn't match.

And I think that, you know, my answer to that is then that wouldn't be this case. That would be this case. It would be the one where they're both changing. And he would have to tick two boxes and change his registrant information.

But, you know, he could just do a little bit more authentication. Get that done. And then pouf, it would all happen behind the scenes in the systems environment.

But having done that he would have a safeguard that he triggered that he wouldn't be able to transfer the name from - to a different registrar for 60 days unless he elected to waive the safeguard.

But presumably if he's just changing registrars and changing his name a little bit, that wouldn't matter. He'd just do the need full and it would go across and he'd be fine.

The last case is the one that hopefully, and this is what Bob and I have been working on, solves the problems of the aftermarket where (Susan), a domain investor, wants to buy a domain from Mike.

She and Mike are not using the same registrar. So this is the most difficult case. And because she wants the flexibility to sell the name right away and has sophisticated anti-hijacking stuff of her own anyway, she waives the safeguard.

So she starts. She ticks all three boxes. She does more elaborate authentication to get the safeguard waived. And in fact that's the note at the bottom that says the safeguard waiving authentication has to be pretty tricky because otherwise a hijacker could just waive the safeguard for her. And we haven't accomplished anything.

And the same goes for the current registrant. Mikey would have to tick all three boxes and go through a couple extra hoops, preferably with information that a hijacker couldn't get access through just by hijacking the account.

And then quote "instantaneously" unquote the domain would move to a new registrant and a new registrar at the same time and leave the safeguards off so that (Susan) could immediately turn around and dispose of the name is she so chose.

So there's the rat hole rich environment and I did it in about 10 minutes. (James), back to you. I'm happy to go further but, you know, one way to do this would be to just stop here, let people chew on it. I'll send it to the list right after the call. I haven't sent it to the list yet because (Bob) and I were working on it. Sort of up to you, o, chair.

James Bladel: Thanks, Mikey. Thanks, (Bob). And that's exactly what I was thinking is this was really excellent. I like the way you guys have organized this (unintelligible) into the various use cases. Certainly appreciate I think both perspectives being brought to bear here and I think I would welcome the opportunity too and digest this a little bit more.

So if you could send this to the list and maybe give us a chance to review this diagram, you know, over the course of the next few days and then bring it back to the group next week and we can discuss on next Tuesday's call. But does anyone have any comments or questions that jumps out at them from this initial run-through that they would like to cover before Mikey and (Bob) post this to the list? (Mike Kelly), go ahead please.

(Mike Kelly):   One thing I wanted to say was they did a fantastic job and very thorough and visualizations of some of these things can be very helpful. So just to thank them for their work on this so far. Thanks.

James Bladel: Yeah, I agree. I hope everyone else does. What I appreciate about this - if I can editorialize it a minute here - is that I think that in PDPs sometimes folks will crystallize on one view or another, you know? The main portability is, you know, paramount or safety and security is paramount.

And I think what I love about this document and I think that in this working group in general is that it's very balanced and I think that the documents and the idea and the concept appreciates that we're trying to have it both ways and we know that it's not always going to be possible and so we're trying to find that Goldilocks solution that everybody can live with but still provide some basic safeguards.

And I think this is all really great effort on the part of Mikey and Bob and I hope that we can maybe polish off some of - any of the rough edges that we might find over the next week and take this as a good incorporated finished product into our final report. I see that Marika is in the queue so I'll go to her.

Marika Konings: Thanks, James. Yeah, I'm going to wait for a bit. I'm familiar with everything that's here...

James Bladel: Do you remember what IRTP stands for, Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes, I needed to look it up in the acronym help so it all came back to me. On the last case one question I did have was why the current registrant would need to authenticate waive and to safeguard because from where I'm sitting I would think that that's really then the new registrant's business. Why would the current registrant be able to plan the new registrant from moving the domain name around if he or she so decides? So that's one of the questions that just jumped out at me.

James Bladel: I see Mikey has his hand up to answer but can I compound Marika's question and ask a follow-up which is does that have to be done at the time that the transfer sequences? Can it be done in advance? Can that

be done within a reasonable time and use air quotes in advance of this transfer? Mikey, go ahead.

Mikey O'Connor: Thank, James. This is Mikey. And thanks, Marika. I'm thinking here is that the safeguard is to prevent registrar hopping. It's to prevent hijacking. So if we only ask the new registrant the way of the safeguard and they're a crook, they're a thief, of course they're going to waive the safeguard.

So what we need to do is we need to get authentication from the losing registrant, from the old registrant that yes indeed that's okay so that they can then - so that the new registrant can merrily hop away across you know, registrants, registrars.

One of the key points and maybe I'll go back to the all in one picture here is that in no place on this process does it say that there's a limit on the number of times can change registrant information. You know, if you want to change from Mike to Mikey, Mikey to Michael, Michael to Paul, you can do that in this model as many times as you want and the last time you do it - let's say you did that, you know, you did four of those in one day and the last time you did it would be the day that however many day restriction to change registrars would kick in.

But if two weeks later you decided to change back again you could do that because the goal here is to keep the transactions in the same registrar so that if there's a dispute the registrar of record is the same on both sides of the dispute. So that's a key concept.

And at the same time the reason why the losing registrant has to approve it is because this is a safeguard to prevent registrar hopping.

And so we need to get both sides of that transaction agreeing that they don't want it - that it's okay to hop because otherwise the losing registrant may be seeing their domain hop many steps down the road.

Now in terms of the case that you're bringing up, (James), essentially that could be another case of instance case three. Let's say that I want to pre-authorize the release of my domain from that waiver. Actually, no. I'm sorry, it's case two.

In that case, I think what I'm hearing you say, (James), is Mikey wants to free up his domain from that waiver ahead of time and so what he would do in that case and I guess it does need to have another - yeah, it needs to have another page because in that case - yeah, go ahead, James.

James Bladel: I mean, that's sort of kind of what I was getting at but I also wanted to say when we say the authentication process, should we do that in advance. So you authenticate once according to this very stringent process and then we give you a PIN or a FOB or a register or cell phone number or something like that so that when the actual time to come the transfer comes along is an expedited process. All you have to do is verify that you're still in possession of that second factor or something like that.

I mean, is that more of an implementation thing what you're getting at here or is that something where we can do the authentication in advance? You'd still have to request the waiver at the time but then the authentication for the waiver is already done in advance.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, I think that's right. And I think that's the kind of stuff that we need to hammer on because, you know, what I'm trying to do is solve the instantaneous problem but if people want to do this stuff in advance certainly that would be, you know, I'm certainly not trying to exclude that in this discussion for sure. Let's see. I haven't been paying any attention to chat and just realized there's a bunch going on in there.

James Bladel: Yeah, I think Bob has some thoughts here of making sure that that puts an extra layer but we need to collectively think it through and make sure that it's genuinely adding security and not just another hoop to jump through. And I think that's definitely always something we need to be mindful of.

And really that suggestion that I laid out there I think was more of an implementation example of how registrars and even after-market systems might leave this process along so it might even fall into the guise of while that might be somebody's secret sauce that they put together as a service. But anyway, I think that addresses...

Mikey O'Connor: (James), let me follow up a little bit on that. I think one of the things that we will want to do is write an FAQ just like we did on the emergency action channel contact whatever we wound up calling it. And I think that the question that you raised and probably a boat load of other ones with the good things to put into that FAQ for sure.

James Bladel: I think that's an excellent idea. But let's hammer out the diagram in the use cases first. I hate to put rocks here at something that's admittedly still only 90 to 95% complete. So any other thoughts or comments on this diagram, folks, before we move on to our next item?

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey again. One last thing. On the agenda we did sort of hint that the notion of a sub group and I think (Bob) and I would welcome anybody else joining our gang. (Bob) sort of reached out to me and we went back and forth over the weekend a bit. But, you know, it's by no means intended to be exclusive so if anybody wants to join the gang by all means this would be a good time to do it.

James Bladel: Okay, thanks, good point and maybe when we send this diagram around we can also solicit additional volunteers. I would encourage if we could have one registry volunteer I think that would be excellent. Simonetta's not on the call but she might also want to get involved. She's been pretty outspoken on some of these concepts as well. So perhaps we can just put that call for volunteers out when we hand out the first draft. (Barbara), go ahead.

(Barbara): This is (Barbara). I'll volunteer.

James Bladel: Thank you, (Barbara). Fantastic. And with Verisign on board you can't fail, Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Right on.

(Barbara): You're very kind.

James Bladel: Okay. Thanks everyone. Let's move on then to - and I think we also kind of hit on number five although we may not have comprehensively discussed the chain of registrant versus change of registrar or do we need to I think (unintelligible) reading that parcel of the use cases that Mikey and (Bob) and (Barbara) are working on or is that a separate

action item. I guess I'm directing that question to Berry and Marika. Berry, go ahead.

Berry Cobb: Thanks, James. This is Berry. Yeah, the only main reason I put it on the agenda to begin with is that was a common theme that was repeated several times and reviewed as a public comment and it seemed pretty clear that we needed to nail that down. Without a doubt the diagrams we just reviewed through with Mikey touched on most of that so I don't know if we need to add more to it or not. That's the reason it's there.

James Bladel: Okay. Thanks, Berry. And maybe what we should do is I think it's still an important concept. I don't think we'll ever have it fully completed but I think we probably have gone about as far down that path as we can today and we can certainly recognize it's going to be a big part of the diagram from Mikey and the sub-team there.

So let's say that we'll check that box for item number five. Item number six is to confirm the work plan schedule for creation of the final report. And let's just review here our goal is Toronto and remains Toronto.

I think that we did okay and I especially appreciate the folks that did work on this last week when so many were absent. And we did have a call I think that was fairly lightly attended.

But if we scroll down to - it looks like we're now on the last page of our work schedule, the document and Berry and Marika has posted into the Adobe screen - but if you scroll down to the August 28, you see that we have identified one, two, three sessions - well, actually, not

really, just two sessions - to deliberate the open issues identified in our initial report.

I think that we're concerned that we're not going to have enough time based on this work schedule we're not going to have enough time to address those so we're going to have to I think start to emphasize deliberations on the mailing list as much as possible. And I think that that has been an underutilized tool up until this point and I think that we could make better use of that.

So one thought I had and I'm just putting this out here as a brainstorm and I would welcome any other feedback that we first off create a shopping list of all of our remaining open issues that we still have to address or the open questions from our initial report and the new questions that we collected during the public comments and feedback so that we have some sort of a master authoritative list of the open questions and that we begin to open a thread on the discussion - the mailing list for each of those open questions with the goal of augmenting our very scarce time that we had together on the telephone each Tuesday and hopefully driving some of these issues to closure in between the teleconferences.

So that would be my proposal on how to tackle these remaining items. I see one checkmark here and I appreciate that Avri. I think I see a couple more. I think that it might give us some hope of still hitting the Toronto deadline with a final report. It really depends on how much time we need to get through some of these issues.

I think some might be simpler than others. I think for example we're getting very close to sawing off on charter question C for sure, the

INID. So probably getting much close to charter question B although there may be some loose ends that need to be resolved there. Charter question A I think still has a lot of gaps that need to be filled and that's where we're - I think not surprisingly focusing our efforts.

So if we could start on that, maybe that's something I can meet with Avri and I could start that effort with Berry and Marika and get a master list put together and then start a - we'll give each an open question and number or a title or whatever and we'll just work them on the list as much as we can.

And then the hope or the goal being that by the time we get into the meeting schedule for September 18th and we're really just hammering out language in our follow-up - final report at this point.

So I see a couple of check marks and I see some folks that are on board with that. Is there anyone that thinks that it's a terrible idea or that they would like to add some thoughts to that or any objections or concerns with that approach or should we precede in that.

I'm hoping that the group still shares the goal of final report by Toronto. We'll see if that's still achievable. I think it is but it's going to require us to buckle down I think on the list. Mikey, go ahead.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. I think the one caution is fixed deadlines can sometimes be the enemy of consensus. And the concern that I'm going to probably reserve the right to raise is that we get so locked into that - so fixated on that deadline that we roll right over somebody's point of view.

And, you know, in sort of more traditional voting-based kinds of decision making that's no problem. You call a vote, you roll right over them and (ta-da), you're done. That's not what we're about.

And so I'm fine trying to do it but I do want to hold out the option for sort of that last look that says we're close but it's no cigar. We need to preserve the consensus underpinning more than we need to preserve the schedule. That's my only thought.

James Bladel: Okay. Thanks, Mikey. And I tend to agree. I thinkn that there is a flip side to what you're saying which is at some point if you haven't reached consensus more time is not necessarily going to get you there.

You know, there's some issues like for example with who is where we've had years to reach consensus and we can't get there so I don't know that if another week or another month or another year on some of these topics are actually going to move anyone any closer.

So we need to recognize when we're in that situation as well. And I think that if you can't get that when you get to your scheduled deadline and you say we haven't reached consensus, here are the - you know, you write out the various viewpoints and you say we got as close as we could but unless everyone is nodding their heads at the end of the day I don't think you could say that you've reached consensus. And Avri, go ahead please.

Avri Doria: Thank you, this is Avri. Yeah, going to what Mikey said and perhaps recapitulating a bit of what you said. But first of all I think the process of saying we're now in the consensus determining stage. I think that

we've also got guidelines on how to go about it when we think there might be consensus, when we think there might not be, when we think there may be split positions that aren't going to move.

This all also blends in with the notion of calling questions several times and then once you've got something that's documented that documents the consensus the (near) consensus and the split support you make sure that the documentation is indeed agreeable to people.

Of course schedules will slip if all that can't be completed and I can't imagine anyone in this group being steamrollered into being violent on the report that comes out of here.

And so I especially think that as we now basically, you know, (James) and I and working with the group private determined where consensus where support is people are going to speak up loud when we get it wrong. But that's the nature of the process that we go into and if it can't settle in time then it won't have settled in time and we won't make the deadline. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks, Avri. And I agree. I agree with just about everything we said and I was thinking here that it's good to have co-chairs in this particular situation, Mikey, just to ensure that the concerns that you raised that don't come to pass that hopefully there's checks and balances in place to ensure that no one is I want to say thrown overboard in order to meet an arbitrary deadline.

And I actually probably in this regard trust Avri more than I trust myself just because I, you know, coming from a commercial side of things and

want to, you know, deadlines are something where we tend to always be trying to hit that goal.

So I think a good point and I think that we will mindful of that as we approach this and I think you're correct, Avri, as we now start to enumerate our open questions and start to work those we should be mindful that we need to be driving towards some sort of measurable determination of consensus and if we can't get there we can't get there.

But we need to also recognize that throwing a couple more weeks at the deliberations may not also result in any sort of movement. So that happened as well. Well, okay. I have a hard stop at the top of the hour. We are just a few minutes away from winding down this call so let's maybe put a marker here as a stopping point.

We have a few action items to follow up. Primarily we want to see that document circulated and then Avri and staff I will meet later this week to put together a list.

Our next meeting will be Tuesday as per usual so all of you Americans that are taking a holiday break make sure you're back and ready to go first thing Tuesday morning for IRTC. And it looks like we have a closing comment from Mikey. Go ahead, Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: It's not really a comment. I threw this into the chat too. It's just an invitation. (Bob) and I were planning to sort of linger on after this call and anybody who'd like to join us because we were going to hammer on this gizmo that we've been working on a little bit more. So if

anybody wants to join us we certainly don't want to exclude anyone. That's all.

James Bladel: Thanks, Mikey and (Bob). And I guess check with staff that we can continue to use this bridge but otherwise I think that's a good plan. I will have to drop off and I think another couple other folks have indicated that as well but if the bridge is available I encourage you guys to use it.

So with that I will say for those folks that are dropping off we'll see you next week and thanks again to everyone for your work. Thanks again to Berry. Welcome back, Marika and we'll try not to overwhelm you with everything. I imagine your inbox looks like some kind of an email nightmare right now, Marika. So I'll give you another week to dig out of that. And thanks everyone. We'll see you next week.

Woman: Thank you, everyone. Bye.

Man: Bye.

James Bladel: Hey, (Bob), do you want to stay on this bridge or shall we just go back to the old way.

(Bob):   Either way is fine. I can just hang here. If someone else jumps on we can always jump out.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, that's true. Marika, is it okay if we just...

Marika: Mikey, I've just talked to the operator and I think it's fine.

Woman: I think we just need to stop the recording, right?

Mikey O'Connor: Oh, yeah.

Marika: Yes, do you want to stop the recording?

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, I think so.

Marika: Okay.

END