

**ICANN
Transcription
IRTP Part D Working Group meeting
Monday 17 June 2013 at 15:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of IRTP Part D Working Group call on the Monday 17 June 2013 at 15:00 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-d-20130617-en.mp3>

On page: <http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#jun>

Attendees:

Chris Chaplow - CBUC
Avri Doria – NCSG
Kristine Dorrain – NAF
Kevin Erdman – IPC
Volker Greimann – RrSG
Barbara Knight – RySG
Mikey O'Connor – ISPCP
Bartlett Morgan – NCUC
Jill Titzer – RrSG
Simonetta Batteiger - RrSG
Graeme Bunton - RrSG

Apologies:

James Bladel - RrSG
Alan Greenberg – ALAC
Bob Mountain – RySG
Holly Raiche – ALAC
Michele Neylon – RrSG
Paul Diaz - RySG

ICANN staff:

Lars Hoffman
Julia Charvolen

Coordinator: I'd like to remind all participants this conference is being recorded if you have any objections you may disconnect at this time. You may begin.

Julia Charvolen: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Welcome to the IRTD Working Group call on Monday 17th of June.

On the call today we have Avri Doria, Kristine Dorrain, Volker Greimann, Mickey O'Connor, Simonetta Batteiger, Graeme Bunton.

We have Barbara Knight who will be joining 30 minutes late.

We have apologies from James Bladel, Alan Greenberg, Holly Raiche, Michelle Neylon, and Bob Mountain.

And from staff we have Lars Hoffmann and myself Julia Charvolen.

May I remind all participants to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Julia and welcome all. We have a fairly light attendance although I see people coming in so I think we'll probably be fine.

I think what we'll do is the usual pause to take a look at the agenda. It's an (update to) give people an opportunity to update their statements of interest and then we'll dive right in. Anybody got any of those that they want to share?

Okay. Well our agenda is pretty straightforward. We're very close I think to the end of the process of reviewing the community input.

And I think for today's call what we'll do is focus on the process that we went through before where we sort of pull out the key points for further discussion (load) the input document that's in front of you that's coming off my screen. That's why you can't scroll it.

And then take a look where we're at, next steps and not sure we need to discuss E and F I think we've already done those.

That is my mistake. I missed that on the agenda, in fact I think, I think we'll pick that last one off. I think that one's done.

So unless anybody's got anything to add I think we'll just dive right in. Basically what we are doing today is already done on what's in front of you is Charter Question E. And I hope that it's big enough that you can read. Let me know if it's not and I'll (bigger).

The nice thing about this is that it's all off the screen.

And what we did before is we just sort of went through these and highlighted the interesting parts and then pulled out what we called - I'll give you an example, key discussion points that we want to highlight for both the Durban meeting where what we'll do is we'll sort of introduce the charter questions, introduce this summary about what the Working Group wants to talk further about.

So today our job is really to go through...

((Crosstalk))

Lars Hoffmann: Yes Mikey. Mikey sorry this is Lars. I'm just letting, you know, people...

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. Go ahead.

Lars Hoffmann: ...(unintelligible) have trouble hearing you properly. I don't know if you can maybe move to the mic or otherwise maybe dial-in on another phone if you're on the Adobe. But it's tough to hear you.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes let me fiddle with both of those. I think another thing I can do is turn up - what happens if I crank up the mic volume a little bit? Does that make it better...

Lars Hoffmann: That's much better.

Mikey O'Connor: ...or not? Better, worse?

Lars Hoffmann: This is Lars. It's better here right now.

((Crosstalk)):

Lars Hoffmann: Yes on the chat it seems to be better Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Go ahead Lars. Oh okay. I'm not I get so much going on my screen I'm not watching it. Okay all right thanks for the feedback there.

Okay so with that here's the first - I think we really only have two so I think this is going to go fairly quickly. The first one is Charter Question E.

And the question is are existing panel for policy violations sufficient or should additional provisions and penalties be added?

And the theme that we got in this is that we are considering stating explicitly that we sort of want to shy away from (sanctionalization) of a policy working group. So I'm going to highlight that and then highlighting that we really want to have this notion of uniformity and consistency of penalties across all policies. That's just sort of highlighting the theme and the discussion.

And I didn't get any subsequent discussion topics out of this. So (whereas) this is to say that at least at this point the Working Group feels (unintelligible) that they're sufficient and that there are no additional discussion topics planned. Lars go ahead.

It's still cutting out? Is still having (unintelligible).

Lars Hoffmann: Yes.

Mikey O'Connor: I will dial-in.

Lars Hoffmann: Now - I mean the sound is good but you're cutting out.

Mikey O'Connor: All right, well with rural broadband. Why - Avri I'm going to draft you as temporary interim acting chair. I know that you're not really but if you're (unintelligible) dialed in your name is at the top of the list starting with A.

And so while I dial-in if you could just keep the queue going and keep a conversation going about this that would be nifty and...

Avri Doria: Okay. This is Avri. Can I be heard? If I can't I don't see anybody in the queue but me so oh dear. Was I paying close enough attention?

Somebody remind me where we were?

Lars Hoffmann: Avri this is Lars. I think Mikey was going through the Charter Question E on the penalties and seeing whether the group has any other comments or thoughts on the points that were already raised in the right-hand column.

So the group was considering...

Avri Doria: You mean the (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Thanks. Did anyone have any comments or does lack of hands mean that that is fine and there are no comments to add? Okay (unintelligible).

Right so I can barely read his screen and I didn't bring up the other one so there was E had that okay. Oh, I can't even move his screen. It's set to not think so I can't actually see beyond it.

Somebody move to the next question so that we can see what the second question that we needed to deal with was today?

Lars Hoffmann: Avri this is Lars again. I see it...

Avri Doria: Oh no.

Lars Hoffmann: ...as we can't do that. I think we have to wait for him to come back. I cannot move the screen. He's taking control and for me to take over Mike...

Avri Doria: Okay because it's his screen right. Okay. So what was the other issue or should we wait for Mikey to get (unintelligible) get back at this. But he's sticking up their hands.

Lars Hoffmann: This is Lars. I think Mikey's...

Avri Doria: Sorry (unintelligible) as well.

Lars Hoffmann: ...back on.

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: I'm back. Is this any better?

Avri Doria: Oh thank you Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Sorry Avri. Real (unintelligible).

Avri Doria: I can hear you fine but then again I can hear you - right. So anyhow where we got to what is I managed to get somebody to remind me we were talking about E and that you were asking comments.

And then I asked if they were further comments and nobody had any. And so we were looking to move on but of course your screen is fixed with you so we're so...

Mikey O'Connor: I completely screwed everybody up.

Avri Doria: You're back. Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: I'm so sorry. I - so I hope people can hear me better. I'm having rural (unintelligible) and so my apologies for that.

I'm going to just follow our little rule here and put our key discussion points documenting this saying (unintelligible) on this one and we'll carry on.

So the last one for today is that is good old Number F, did universal adoption and implementation EPP eliminate the need for standard (unintelligible)?

And this one there's a little bit more to summarize. So what we did in the last few is highlight the thing. So here's kind of a thinning out of the comment there.

I'm going to go ahead and do this and then just because I'm (away) from the chat window just interrupt me if I say something terrible there.

So this was the one from the BC saying that this is still helpful. And then the registries also said that this is a key document and the nation could (unintelligible) impact it. And then what we're trying for here is just easy to digest sound bites basically.

Now what we said in our conversation is F. We found they were useful, that there's a chance of confusion Oh Simonetta go ahead and just jump right in while I'm stumbling here.

Simonetta Batteiger: I'm having a question about the can help protect the domain name from being hijacked (these). Because I am I'm trying to understand in what way the FOA does that.

Because I understand how the registry doesn't document that, how (unintelligible) as a dispute resolution process because it's just one piece of information took out of RW or say of actions of what has happened in whichever case.

However I'm trying to understand how the FOA actually prevents a hijack case from happening because I'm not - I just don't understand how that's happened. So maybe someone can help explain that to me.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. And I think that for today what we'll do is we'll (unintelligible) those as topics for further discussion rather than try and actually figure them out because we're missing so many people.

Simonetta Batteiger: Okay...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: But, you know, I think that's in the spirit of what we were trying to do with key discussion points is just capture things that we don't feel like we're done with so that we circle back to this after Durban. We pick that right up and dig in.

Simonetta Batteiger: So you (unintelligible) I see the other question need to understand how FOAs prevent hijacking because I am - I'm puzzled by that.

I don't know - I understand how they help or how they're one thing to look at when you're trying to resolve things but that piece we need to just get more clarity around.

Yes. Yes maybe that...

Lars Hoffmann: Mikey can I just cut in there? It's Lars.

Simonetta Batteiger: Yes. Go ahead.

Lars Hoffmann: I did some because this came up actually on the ICANN compliance reports they wrote about this too that they would like to keep it because it can help prevent hijacking.

And I guess you want to discuss this with the full group. Just to Simonetta and everyone else who's interested when I send out the agenda on the 12th of June 5 PM my time 3 PM UTC there's an attachment called clarification.doc.

And that's got a rough summary of how compliance sees that before - when the group wants to discuss it in Durban after that we can go into the detail.

But if you want to have a look it's like three paragraphs that I wrote up that explain that I spoke to compliance again how they see the situation why they would like to keep it with regards of preventing potentially preventing hijacks.

And I'm happy to send that out again right now in fact as some sort of (unintelligible) people don't want to dig through emails I'll just send it out once more.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. And I don't want to do that today. You know, today is a summarizing day not a discussion day.

And so rather than try and actually have that discussion I think what we do is we leave it on the list as something for the full group to pick up once it's sort of back together (unintelligible).

We're missing a co-chair and a bunch of the kind of core contributors. I think today is more of a summarizing and get ready for Durban day than it is an actual substantive discussion day.

So we'll just know that there is such a document from compliance and then carry on.

Okay so consolidate the FOA into those separate (unintelligible). That one I want to put in the topics for further discussion. I'm not even sure it's feasible.

So I'm going to Lars oh you've got a request to control the screen. Do you want me to give you the screen Lars or can I decline that?

Lars Hoffmann: You decline - you can decline that Mikey. It was just earlier on we tried to (unintelligible).

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. Sorry about that. (Unintelligible) again I think that falls in that same bucket. So I think that's sort of the two big (unintelligible) that come out of that one.

Part of the reason I do this so slowly is because I'm lame and I can't (unintelligible) so that you can look at what I've highlighted and see if there's anything you would like to add to that.

And I'm not seeing anybody in the queue started saying that's terrible so let me give you one last look at our sort of additional topics to discuss pile get a better understanding of how prevents hijacking put in the wrong place. Let me fix that.

And then the whole (screen) visibility of process changes, clearly a big topic for discussion later.

And that brings us to sort of the anything else category. So let's highlight the resellers and that that's responded to in our comments.

And basically at this point we're documenting but I think that at this point there are additional discussion points.

Julia Charvolen: Mikey this is Julia.

Mikey O'Connor: Go ahead Julia.

Julia Charvolen: No Mikey we can't hear you properly. Do you think maybe we could dial out to you? If we dial out to you we might hear you better because your line is cutting off.

Mikey O'Connor: Let me just check something with the microphone. Yes. See the problem is you can't call out to me because my normal telephone line is not working.

So as a result I think that's what's causing the trouble. And if I speak really loudly does that improve the situation at all?

Julia Charvolen: Not really but...

Mikey O'Connor: Well I thought...

Julia Charvolen: It was better through the computer actually.

Mikey O'Connor: Was it? Well I can...

Julia Charvolen: Yes it was Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay tell you what, let me - I mean I think the problem is that everything on the Internet and the Internet is getting killed now here for some reason.

And the only real way to fix it is - all right so this is coming through the computer. Is that any better? We'll try it and see.

Julia Charvolen: It looks good.

Mikey O'Connor: Sorry about all the technical...

Julia Charvolen: We can hear you better. Let's hope...

Mikey O'Connor: Okay.

Julia Charvolen: ...crossing your fingers (that) it works.

Mikey O'Connor: Well we'll keep our fingers crossed and I'll get right on top of the microphone of the computer and then I promise I'll call the (phone) right after this is done.

Okay so and I think we're done with this section of the agenda. So let me do that and take us on to the next agenda item which is really sort of taking stock of where (unintelligible) and planning for Durban.

Essentially I think that what we are planning to do is take this document that's now just been touched up a little bit -- and I apologize for all the bandwidth issues -- turn it into essentially a, you know, a series of slides that we can take to the public meeting that we've got planned and use this as a discussion prompter where we'll sort of say, you know, here are our charter questions, here's sort of the highlights that we're at so far, here are the questions that we are still thinking need more discussion and what do you people in the community think?

Does that - if that seems like a reasonable approach then I think what we could go ahead and do is talk a little bit Lars if there's, you know, is there any update on the Durban plans that the Working Group needs to go through or is it pretty much on rails and we're just to the mechanics of planning it at which point what we could do is probably cut this call short because I think really the only substantive thing we needed to get through is this little final bit we did on the comment review tool. So...

Lars Hoffmann: Mikey this is Lars.

Mikey O'Connor: Go ahead.

Lars Hoffmann: I don't think we need to do anything specifically for the Durban meeting. I think it might be useful however if we just discuss or if the group discuss how to proceed for the next few meetings now that we've gone through the public review tool.

Whether you want to start with the low-hanging fruit as it was called the Charter Question E and F or that you want to get stuck in with the may be more difficult question, the first - those three or four I think that might be helpful.

Those that have - people can have the right document and to get people on to the right state of mind as it were.

Mikey O'Connor: How many meetings do we have left before Durbin? A couple right, two or three? I would be - given that let's see, people are going to leave for Durban on July 10. It's now June 17.

So we basically have two or three meetings left. I don't know. I'd be curious to hear what other folks think. My inclination well I just don't know.

I could go either way. I could either do - see us doing a series of meetings where we chip away at some of the easy stuff or we pick a hard one.

I'm inclined to think in terms of easy stuff because the hard ones we're likely to get more public comment on at Durban and we might have to retrace our steps.

So that would be my - not having checked with my co-chair choice right off the bat. What do other people think of that? Does seem like a reasonable thing to do?

And then Lars maybe what we could do is pull out those low-hanging fruit items and assemble them in a document for the next call along with preparing a draft of those slides for the Durban meeting so that the group can take a look at those as well.

I'm a little - I'm reluctant to get into anything really complicated between now and Durban just because there's so much going on.

People have so many other things that they're preparing for the Durban meeting in other working groups. We've lost Holly to being the chair of the drafting team for the policy versus compliance - Implementation Working Group.

So I think that's my tentative thought on that. And I'm not seeing anybody leaping forward saying that's a terrible idea so let's proceed that way.

Low-hanging fruit between now and Durban. Low-hanging fruit plus take a look at our slides and I think that'll probably consume the next two or three meetings and then we're done.

Anything else? Lars I'm sort of leaning on you because at this stage of the game I think the Working Group is sort of done at least with the content of today's call.

So unless there's something else that you need I think we can wrap this call up.

Lars Hoffmann: This is Lars. So there's nothing from my side so if you want...

Mikey O'Connor: Okay.

Lars Hoffmann: ...to wrap up go ahead.

Mikey O'Connor: Avri is saying - oh yes and Avri is saying policy and implementation. I don't know if it's policy and or V. I've been using V Avri but you're probably right.

Anyway I think that's it for today. Sorry about the terrible connectivity. I will call my phone company get that squared away.

And we'll see you in a week with a list of low-hanging fruit and a set of slides, a preliminary set of slides for Durban and hopefully another co-chair. Talk to you then.

Julia Charvolen: Thanks Mikey. Thanks everyone.

Lars Hoffmann: Thanks Mikey. Talk to you next meeting.

Man: Thanks Mikey.

END