

**IRTP C
TRANSCRIPTION
Tuesday 15 May 2012 at 1400 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the IRTP C meeting on Tuesday 15 May 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-20120515-en.mp3>

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

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Attendees:

Mike O'Connor - CBUC
Philip Corwin - CBUC
Michele Neylon - RrSG
Bob Mountain - Rr SG
Hago Dafalla – NCSG
Kevin Erdman - IPC
Chris Chaplow – CBUC
Avri Doria - co-chair
Paul Diaz - RrSg
Angie Graves – CBUC
Matt Serlin – RrSG
Barbara Knight - RySG
Rob Golding – RrSG

ICANN Staff:

Marika Konings
Gisella Gruber

Apologies

James Attendees:

Mike O'Connor - CBUC
James Bladel -co-chair
Simonetta Batteiger - RrSG
Jonathan Tenenbaum - RrSG
Rob Golding - RrSG
Michele Neylon – RrSG
Philip Corwin - CBUC
Bob Mountain - Rr SG
Kevin Erdman - IPC

Angie Graves – CBUC

ICANN Staff:

Marika Konings
Nathalie Peregrine

Apologies

Paul Diaz - RrSg
Matt Serlin – RrSG
Avri Doria – co-Chair
Barbara Knight – RrSG
Alain Berranger - NPOC
Roy Dykes – RySG
Hago Dafalla – NCSG

Coordinator: ...(Ricardo). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the IRTP-C call on the 15th of May, 2012. On the call today we have James Bladel, Kevin Erdman, Bob Mountain, Angie Graves, Mikey O'Connor, Simonetta Batteiger, Philip Corwin, Jonathan Tenenbaum and Rob Golding. We have Michele Neylon who will dial in shortly.

From staff we have Marika Konings and myself, Nathalie Peregrine. We have apologies from Avri Doria, Alain Berranger, Paul Diaz, Roy Dykes, Barbara Knight, Matt Serlin and Hago Dafalla. I would like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you.

James Bladel: Thank you, Nathalie and good morning, good afternoon everyone. Welcome to the IRTP-C working group call for May 14. As per our usual procedure does anyone have any updates or changes to their statements of interest?

Seeing none I would ask does anyone have any recommended changes or updates to the proposed agenda that is posted in the right hand column of the Adobe screen and was circulated to the mailing list. Okay excellent then we'll adopt that agenda and go forward.

As Marika had noted and then Nathalie - you heard her call out the names - we have a significant number of individuals who are absent from this call due to a conflicting meeting that's occurring I believe is it in Switzerland or where are they, Marika?

Marika Konings: Which meeting - (WISUS) you mean?

James Bladel: Yes, yeah.

Marika Konings: I think they're in Geneva.

James Bladel: In Geneva. So we do have a number of our usual attendees that are absent however I think we have a good number - a fair number of folks to attend on this call so we can call - we can declare that we have a quorum and proceed.

I would note, however, that we have all three of our registry representatives absent. So the question I would pose to the group was does anyone believe that we do not have a sufficient quorum to continue today's call? All right, everyone feels good about it then. We'll continue. Thanks, I appreciate it. I don't think we can afford to lose the week anyway.

So - oh I lost the agenda, there we go. You know, we can get ready here and dive into the reports of the sub teams. I wanted to point out that we went through the data gathering sub team findings presentation fairly comprehensively last week.

And while he's now on the call I think he wasn't able to join us last week - we should all say thank you to Bob for putting this together not only for doing a lot of the heavy lifting in that group but also presenting it in such a readable and easy to understand format so thank you for that, Bob, certainly appreciate that.

And then there were a few changes that we noted. Marika, can you perhaps walk us through the changes that we discussed last time and were they accepted by the sub team?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. If you just hold on a second I'm pulling up the email which has all that in it. I think there was one typo on the - well I think starting off on the title page we added there a clarification that, you know, this is a summary and with a link to the full report where also all the comments can be found and the full details of each of the questions.

Second change was on the Slide 3 - oh no it's actually Slide - I think here it comes up as Page 2 and Bullet 3 it actually said I think registrants instead of respondents so it was just a typo and that was fixed.

On Slide - let me see where that is - I think it's Slide 5 - no it's actually - well it had 6 so the heading - yeah it's numbered Slide 5 I think it comes up as - yeah, Number 5. There was a confusion over the 32% and I think we initially assumed that there was a miscalculation that it was supposed to be the 29% but when I read the - this actually - again it actually talks about 32% of the comments that were received. So I just highlighted the comments so that it's clear that that percentage relates to the comments.

Then there was - on Slide 7 a bit of additional explanation in the text box to explain what the other category included as I think we, you know, there was some confusion on the call as well whether, you know, what other answers could there be instead of a yes or no.

And then I think a last change that was made was on Slide 12 there was a word at the end that didn't seem to belong there so we just removed that. And I don't think there were any further changes made by the sub team. I don't know - Bob, was there anything else that was changed that you recall?

Bob Mountain: Yeah, Marika. This is Bob. No, I think you covered it. That's all the changes we had for this round.

Marika Konings: So that's it.

James Bladel: Okay thank you. And, Bob, those were taken as friendly changes by the sub team - by the authors of the report?

Bob Mountain: Yes, James, absolutely; it was all good. I think very constructive and I think improved the clarity of the final summary.

James Bladel: Excellent. So I think we can say that this is adopted and complete and well done for that group. Does anyone else have anything to add on the data gathering report or the effort in general? Michele, please go ahead. And thanks for joining us.

Michele Neylon: Sorry for the delay and I won't go into the details of why it took longer than it should have done. No just wanted to say, you know, thanks to Bob and the others for putting in all the effort and doing this. You know, we all volunteer for these things and we've got other - we've got day jobs and everything so, you know, the effort is always appreciated. That's all. Thanks.

James Bladel: Agreed. Thanks, Michele. Okay well if there are no other comments on that then we can proceed to Item Number 3 which is the ideal process team. It looks like Marika has her hand up. Go ahead, Marika.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. Just to come back to Agenda Item 2 because there was actually a second question in that agenda item that, you know, you may want to take that after looking at the other sub team. But I guess it's now for also the work team to actually look at the, you know, the executive summary and the findings of the working group and decide how to move from that to, you know, go into recommendations.

So that was a principle part of Agenda Item 2 but, you know, just as a reminder maybe you want to take that as a later discussion point.

James Bladel: Good point. I think that - well I guess rather than make a decision we should probably pose this question to the group which is would you like to see some draft recommendations written by let's say myself and Avri and Marika and put those back to the group based on the findings of the data gathering sub team?

Or do you believe that the data gathering sub team is more appropriately tasked with coming up with some draft recommendations based on their findings? I suppose either way is probably permissible under the structure of our work. But so it's more of a preference thing. Bob, do you have some thoughts here?

Bob Mountain: James, I'm happy to coordinate, you know, some recommendations following the work we did if you think that would help. And then obviously turn it over to you for, you know, for final, you know, final drafting if you think that's a, you know, a reasonable approach.

James Bladel: Yeah sure. I think that - I guess we probably should have asked first. But, yeah, it sounds like you're willing to take the first stab at this. Does anyone have any concerns with Bob and/or some portion of the membership of the sub team taking a first stab at those? Mikey, go ahead.

Mikey O'Connor: I think - this is Mikey for the transcript. I think the concern I've got is that if we sort of look back in time in the early parts of this working group we proposed a bunch of questions that we've never answered. You know, one of the things that we got to in our planning was oh it would be a good idea to go out and gather some data.

But there are a whole bunch of other things that we were going to look into a bit. I can't rattle them off because it didn't occur to me bring the notes up until

just now. But I'm not feeling comfortable going straight from this data gathering effort to recommendations because I think there were other issues that we wanted to explore that we haven't. So that's my concern.

James Bladel: Mikey, just a question and perhaps a homework assignment. Do you have - do you think that we have captured those on one of the mind maps - those open questions; do we have a list of them somewhere? Or do you think it would be more of a scavenger hunt to go get those things?

Mikey O'Connor: No, I think if you - if you go back to - you know, I've been posting that work plan mind map out on the list. And it's - I'm looking at V12 of it but that particular chunk of the mind map has been in almost all of them.

You know, we wrote down a whole bunch of stuff that we were going to do. And some of that stuff is covered in this survey. But some of it is not. And it seems to me - I mean, I hate to duck but I'm in the middle of writing a different report. I'm happy to sort of chop out the piece of the mind map and ship it to the list.

But in terms of structuring a go-forward plan based on the stuff we talked about I kind of want to throw the ball back to the co chairs on that because I just think we've missed a chunk of work that we thought was a good idea back in the day.

James Bladel: Okay so if I'm understanding you correctly, Mikey, you believe that there's still some preliminary work that has to happen before we can build some recommendations around these - this report and these findings. And that we - so maybe what I'm asking is before we dive into drafting recommendations, Bob, maybe the sub team can work with Marika to pull out - because it sounds like Mikey got some conflicts here.

So, you know, maybe we can just go back to the mind map with Marika and make sure that we capture all of the outstanding questions that are

associated with Charter Question B and Charter Question C. And at least, you know, if we don't have a recommendation based on this data - these findings then we can at least make a note that they still remain open. Does that sound like a reasonable approach, Mikey?

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, that's fine...

James Bladel: To proceed on those items that we do have data we can proceed with those but we should at least keep a tracking list of those things that are still open.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, I think that's right. I think that's fine. I'm just sort of flying intuitively here that, you know, I think we've got a punch list with items on it that we haven't touched yet.

James Bladel: Okay well we'll touch those items that are untouched, how's that?

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, sounds great.

James Bladel: So we'll start touching them.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah.

James Bladel: Marika, if you could go ahead please.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. I'm just looking at what Mikey sent to the mailing list I think on the 24th of April. I presume that is from the mind map. And looking at those questions I think many of those were covered as part of the data gathering effort at least in relation to the IANA issue where, you know, people were asked like, you know, do you think there's any harm, you know, what are the effects of requiring or not requiring, you know, what are the current situations? Are there any, you know, security issues or, you know, as well the effect of - or the effort involved in changing.

So I do believe that a lot of that information is at least captured in what the sub team already did. I do believe, you know, that part of that work probably links closely as well once, you know, the group gets to a recommendation to try to describe, you know, what the effect or the expected impact is going to be which is also one of the requirements as part of the new PDP that, you know, the working group tries to assess what the impact is going to be.

So some of those questions also, you know, come at the other side out of when you look at the recommendations. But, you know, Mikey, maybe - because I'm looking at the - what did you say was the latest version? Because the one I see on the - on our wiki is version 10. Didn't you say version 14? Did I hear that well?

Mikey O'Connor: Oh - this is Mikey again. Marika, I think version 10 is fine. I'm up to version 12 but that may just be because I was taking some notes and haven't published it because they were so minor. So I think version 10 is - and this part of the mind map is quite old and dusty so version 10 will certainly be fine.

And I think it's just an intuitive reaction. It may be - and I would be delighted if it's true - that all of the issues that we thought about were covered by this that would be fantastic. It's just sort of the ex-auditor in me...

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: ...that you said it's good to look back at it and just looking as well at the FOA question I could ask as well, you know, identify use cases and scenarios, current practices and current policy. I think that's, you know, for example that's something the sub team did do because, you know, this specifically asked are you time limiting or not and why are you doing it.

Understand issues and concerns - I think also that's something that also came forward in the data gathering - it may be indeed it's something that needs to be more spelled out. So I think some of those elements are probably

there but I agree it's a good idea probably to put the mind map next to the data gathering server and see if there are any areas that were not covered and need to be, you know, further understood or explored.

Mikey O'Connor: Perfect. Thanks.

James Bladel: Okay thanks, Marika and Mikey. And I think that's just a prudent thing to do is to go back and check the resulting work here with what we set out to do initially. I think that's just (unintelligible).

Mr. Mountain - Bob, thank you for being so patient. You're up.

Bob Mountain: No, this is Bob. I guess I may be getting ahead of myself but I'm wondering even if we identify areas where we need to go back and rework would it not make sense to, you know, publish recommendations based on the things that we have closed on in our final so we can check those off and then move onto the open issues?

James Bladel: I think that's exactly correct. And that was - essentially what I was proposing earlier which was that we just go forward with what we have and make a note that certain questions may still be outstanding. And I don't believe that anything would necessarily cause any rework of the data gathering effort.

I think that it would just be an add-on to what's already been published here so - at least that's my takeaway. But I think we can go back and we can check. I think as Mikey noted it may be just a few loose ends as opposed to something significant that was omitted but it probably makes sense to check. I don't know, Bob, does that address your concerns or...

Bob Mountain: Oh yeah, sorry. Yeah, no I'm in agreement that...

James Bladel: Okay, yeah and I agree we should just go forward with the recommendations on what we have and then see if there's anything missing. Okay and then I

think we decided in our last call that the impact analysis or the impact statement, which is due for all three charter questions or the recommendations associated with the charter questions is going to be one of our major tasks once we have collected feedback during the public comment period and the workshop in Prague.

Once we have some more input from various areas of the community and they've had a chance to view and digest some of the recommendations that we're coming up with I think we'll have a better handle on what needs to be included in the statement of impact.

Okay so if there are no other questions - and thanks for that, Mikey, I mean, I think it's always a good practice to just make sure you go back to the beginning and check your work versus the plan to make sure that we haven't forgotten anything on our shopping list.

If we can move on to Item Number 3 which was the change of control sub team. I note that we had a couple of specific action items for the change of control sub team the first one being to review the locking procedures described in Reason for Denials Number 8 and Number 9.

I believe that's actually now Reason for Denial Number 7 and Number 8 effective June 1. And perhaps Marika can check on that because IRTP-D deleted one of the reasons for denial which just changed up all the numbering and it's got everybody's numbers a little messed up.

The second item was this open question and I don't believe - regarding whether it should be a - whether the change of control should be a separate policy, a standalone separate policy or part of the existing IRTP consensus policy.

And I think what we arrived at last week was it's less important for this group to solve that issue, although it should probably make some

recommendations. But we should find a good way to pose that question to the attendees in Prague and to the readers of the - and respondents of the initial report.

So those were the two outstanding items for that sub team. I know that Simonetta was traveling and has been very busy and hasn't had an opportunity to set up a sub team call. So I guess my question is was there anything else that I'm missing or leaving out? Do we have to - do we have other items that we need to update on that?

And then what do we think is the best approach to getting that sub team to have at least one more meeting between now and the next call on Tuesday? Simonetta. I'm sorry, I didn't see that you had joined. Simonetta, please go ahead.

Simonetta Batteiger: Hi, sorry; first of all apologies that yes I have been very busy and I ignored emails and did not make a lot of progress with the sub team in the past week. But I do have a little lighter week this week so if it works for the rest of the sub team - and I know that all of you guys are actually on this call right now so I'll just ask you right here if Thursday would be time that would work for you guys to schedule another hour to discuss these open items and hopefully come up with some output that the group can then discuss again.

I already see Michele saying that Thursday is not an option. How about Friday?

James Bladel: Just to point out there's another North American Regional meeting Thursday and Friday in Los Angeles for ICANN so I think at least some of the US registrars may have to bow out.

Simonetta Batteiger: I see. I already see lots of red crosses. So what days would work between now and next Tuesday? Because tomorrow is completely booked on my end until very late in the day which means that Michele couldn't be a part

of the call. I could do tomorrow late; after 4:00 pm Eastern or on Monday next week after 11:00 am.

James Bladel: Just speaking for myself I think if we can try and send out a Doodle poll for some times on Monday we can probably come up with at least partial attendance from the group.

Simonetta Batteiger: Okay.

James Bladel: I see Michele is agreeing.

Simonetta Batteiger: Marika, could you do me a big favor and put that poll together?

Marika Konings: Okay so just only Monday, right?

Simonetta Batteiger: Yes.

Marika Konings: Okay, yeah, I'll do something.

James Bladel: Yeah, it looks like we're spanning European and US time zones so I guess morning in the US, afternoon in Europe that way we don't have people missing dinners and stuff but. And then maybe, Simonetta, I think anything that we can do to - and I will help in this regard as well just to kind of keep the discussion going on the list so that we can, you know, prepare as much as possible in advance so that - go ahead, Marika.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. Just in relation to you were listing the items that the sub team still needs to look at or shouldn't forget about. I think there is also the email that was sent by Barbara concerning the auth info code.

And I don't know if that's maybe a, you know, broader working group discussion as we have spoken about it before. And I think there was also an email from Rob Golding providing I think his views on how a ideal process

might look. So those are I think two items that may need to be added to that agenda as well.

James Bladel: I agree. I think both of those - both of those messages were important and should be reviewed. So okay I guess that's the update then for that sub team that we have a few specific tasks and we'll try and gather that - as many as folks are willing and available to meet on Monday of next week.

Okay and that kind of segues nicely to Agenda Item Number 4 where we discuss the items that were raised by Barbara and Rob and also the draft language that I circulated on the mailing list. I've received no interest or comment on it so I assume it's either perfect or disastrous language regarding our findings for the - from our discussions - I'm sorry, our investigation of this function in the ccTLD space.

So let's just maybe knock that one out of the way first. Is - has anyone had a chance to see this? This is essentially taking the - taking a step back and looking at the chart that we've built, looking at the notes that we circulated from our meeting with the ccNSO and some of the messages that were circulated on the mailing list by folks like (Michaela) and Matt Serlin. And we were just trying to put together a narrative that would fit into the draft report that describes what we found when we went to look at this function in the ccTLD space.

So I circulated some draft language here. I think, you know, the first three paragraphs are really just an overview of what we did and what we learned. And then the - when you get into the bullet points there at the bottom it is more of a point for a discussion or just outlining what our findings were and whether or not we want to make any recommendations based on what we found in the ccTLD space or if we're simply just using this information to support the recommendations that will be forthcoming on charter question A.

So I guess the first question is does anyone have any concerns or feel like we've missed something - we. Does anyone feel like I have missed something in constructing this narrative? Does anyone believe that we've got some important points that we have, you know, omitted from this and do we want to go forward with these findings and this recommendation? Simonetta.

Simonetta Batteiger: I actually really like what you wrote there. I think it should be supporting whatever the final recommendation is. I mean this in itself isn't the recommendation. It's just a summary of comments we've received that give a picture of as you wrote there yourself that there's all kinds of models out there. I just have a comment on the very last point. It's not just one ccTLD. I think you are referring to the dot DE right?

James Bladel: I was yes. Were there more?

Simonetta Batteiger: And the - well I mean the dot DE kind of made those change maybe like a year ago or two years ago. And they kind of had the exact same experience. So I - if you want to you can add the specific TLDs that made a change like that that made very good experiences with it.

James Bladel: So there were two of them - BE for (Beltema) and ZE for (Germany) correct?

Simonetta Batteiger: And I also see Marika typing on the left hand also dot NO made a change from paper to automatic system. I haven't heard them comment on it but it might be worthwhile to just briefly ask them how they feel about it and then capture this here as well.

James Bladel: I think -- Marika correct me if I'm wrong -- that that was raised in our meeting with the ccNSO and just didn't hit my notes. Was that?

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. Exactly. I think she was speaking about it that they before had like a paper system where everything had to be filed on paper but now they went to kind of online system and people seem to be happy about that

as well as it made it easier to conduct such a change. So that's from the meeting with the ccNSO.

James Bladel: Okay so perhaps we should make a note without listing a specific ccTLD perhaps we can make a note that a few ccTLDs recently changed their processes and we can just pluralize that sentence. Would that be an improvement? Okay I don't see any objections with that. So we can - I can take that edit. One thinking here just the scientist in me wants to point out that one ccTLD has recently changed its process to make it more restrictive and this has been very poorly received. But I hate to call anybody out in a report like this. But I think Simonetta and Bob probably know exactly which one I'm talking about. Anyway it's - I think it's from a scientific perspective however it's always interesting to include a counter example to demonstrate the veracity of your point. Go ahead Simonetta.

Simonetta Batteiger: I think it's a worthwhile point to include that. I mean you don't mention which ccTLD has changed to make it more flexible. So why not put one in that has one ccTLD made it harder and received quite a bit of criticism for it.

James Bladel: But I have to ask and I think we're talking about the same one. So let's just kind of maybe establish that first. But I don't know that their changes were done specifically for - and I'm just kind of shooting from the hip here a little bit. I don't know what the reason for their changes were. So I don't know if it's a security thing or if they were doing it based on new privacy laws in that country. I'm not really sure what the impetus was behind those changes. So I don't know if we can say that it's this reason that's caused it to be poorly received. Mikey go ahead.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. As I listen to this I'm sort of going back to why did we ask them? And we asked them about this in order to get ideas for good processes. I'm getting a little uncomfortable with the evaluation that's creeping into this, good or bad. If I had been asked about my processes to help somebody else do something and then in addition to having my

contribution be used to help that group do whatever they were doing I also got a little grade at the end that I hadn't been told I was going to get. Even if I was anonymous I think I'd be cranky and I'm not sure it really helps our cause. It doesn't materially affect the work that we're doing. We used it to get good examples. But I'm getting a little uncomfortable with this well received, badly received stuff in this conversation.

James Bladel: Mikey I think you have a good point and maybe we kind of slipped a little bit down the path. I would say however that those who are saying that they made a change and the change was well received that is reflective of what we were told in the ccNSO meeting by a couple of country code representatives. So that is - in some respect that is an accurate reflection of what we were - the feedback that we were given.

Mikey O'Connor: I think it's (unintelligible) though...

James Bladel: I think you're correct however. I - if I can finish Mikey I think that you are correct that then going back and saying that some others injecting our opinions or our own maybe is a little out of bounds in that regard.

Mikey O'Connor: Well and just to respond. You know, in an unstructured conversation like we had with the ccNSO we got a lot of information that wasn't really terribly germane to what we were asking them for. And I think it's fine that they gave it but I'm not sure that it belongs in a report either way.

James Bladel: Oh okay. Simonetta do you have some thoughts on this?

Simonetta Batteiger: I'm wondering. I hear you and I agree with you Mikey that putting it in in a way that makes someone look bad is not what we want to do. I'm wondering if we can find a way to objectively make a statement that captures kind of both experiences. So for example rather than saying that some - one ccTLD had simply changed its process to make it more - to offer more flexibility. Maybe we can capture both ideas in one like general statement such that we

basically say we've received feedback on that making the process I don't know less complicated or whatever as something that users value. Or something like that. I don't know where it's more - I'm trying to find a good phrase and I can't think on the spot like this.

But where we capture this idea because I think the idea is something that justifies why we may make certain changes in how we design the process and if someone ever came back to us and asked us why did we do it I'd like to have something that we can point to and say because we received feedback like this without blaming anybody or point fingers at anybody. So if we can find a creative way to state this I think it would be good.

James Bladel: Okay thanks Simonetta. Mikey go ahead and then I'm going to try and bring this in for a landing. Go ahead.

Mikey O'Connor: The caution that I'm kind of landing on here is I think that we could - it's the relationship between the GNSO and the ccNSO and the ccNSO and ICANN that I'm concerned about. In our charter we said let's go ask them if there are some good ideas from the ccNSO space that we could incorporate into our best practice. And we did and they gave us those. And we should say thank you and stop.

I think that we can certainly use Simonetta's approach if asked. Well why did you put those in and not these other ones? We could say well, you know, we did get some feedback from the ccNSO that some of these improved the user experience. But I would prefer not to put evaluative statements about ccNSO processes plus or minus into GNSO reports. I think that treads in very sensitive territory. And now I'll be quiet.

James Bladel: Well but Mikey I mean I see your point Mikey and you actually persuaded me that that is probably out of bounds. However I think it is fair to say that, you know, with regard to the last bullet point that we were told this, that we could

say something like at least one ccTLD told us that they had recently changed their processes to offer more flexibility and in their opinion.

So now we're attributing it to the first, you know, the ccNSO that provided the - the ccTLD that provided the feedback. And in their opinion this is has been positively received. You know, I think that that is probably more what do we want to say a less of a subjective. We're not inserting our judgment into that. We're reflecting what has been told. And none of the ccTLDs I believe from that meeting stood up and said, you know, we have a process and it's the best.

So if someone had said that I think that we would be obligated to include that feedback as well. So, you know, I think you're correct that we probably should not be citing counter examples and I think that you're correct that we need to structure the language such that it's properly attributed and constructed as feedback received rather than the judgment of the working group members even though some of us have some pretty strong feelings about some of these ccTLDs. I think that we should resist weighing in and making judgments.

On my recommendation and I'll just kind of throw this out to the group with Mikey, you know, in mind is that we change the language of that last bullet point to say something along the lines of one ccTLD notified us that it had changed its process and in its opinion or it believes that this change had positively received. Something like that. Any concerns or objections about going forward and then leaving out the counter example? Mikey go ahead.

Mikey O'Connor: I liked one version a whole lot better than the other in the two versions that you just rattled off. I really don't, you know, if you're going to do it which I would still prefer that you just strike it but since I don't seem to be able to persuade you to do that. At a minimum make it extremely clear that it's their opinion not ours. And so when you said in their opinion it improved flexibility that's a lot better than the less attributed version that you came up with later.

You know, I think at a minimum you got to make it really clear that this was the view of a ccNSO registry sharing their experience with us. And, you know, I'm okay with that. I'm not a fan of it but I'm okay with it...

James Bladel: Okay. Okay. So there's only where we establish that as clearly as possible and I see there's - well Bob has his hand raised and there's some exchanges going on in the chat. So Bob can you weigh in on this?

Bob Mountain: Yes I guess I just wanted to comment that Simonetta and I were going back and forth. But is there a, you know, way we can word it so it does not appear to be a criticism but, you know, you could obviously read between the lines and interpret it however you might like. But so rather than saying, you know, complicated, you know, use words like lengthy or involved or involved multiple steps. You know, just kind of rephrase it so it's not pejorative. So but, you know, obviously the, you know, through the explanation the ultimate implication is clear. It involves some more work on the writing but, you know, it might get the point across without necessarily appearing to be critical.

James Bladel: Bob just for clarity you're talking about a way to get the (temper) example back in there?

Bob Mountain: That's exactly, yes.

James Bladel: Okay. I, you know, my and I see Mikey's got his hand up again but I'm going to go ahead and jump the cue a little bit Mikey and say that I've been convinced that that's probably not a good thing because not only does it, you know, require us to get I think creative with the language so we're not disparaging a secret country code but they were not in the room during that time. They did not provide us feedback on why they had made that change or why they felt that it was, you know, appropriate. And they had also - I just learned now that that particular country code is actually not even a member of the ccNSO. So based on, you know, just the feedback from Mikey and just some of those other open questions I think we should stay away from it.

I know what we want to say but, you know, I don't - I think it's inserting - I'm trying to think of a parallel here but it's kind of like we're taking a reporting job here as more of a journalist and reporting back of what we found and then we're kind of - we're editorializing a little bit too much for my comfort. But, you know, and I think Mikey's on that page as well because he raised the issue originally but anyone else want to weigh in on that? I know we're spending a lot of time on this but I think it is important. We don't want to go too far off the rides here. So go ahead.

I mean I see Simonetta in the chat and I would just point out Ms. Simonetta that they - because we didn't get this directly from the ccTLD in question we don't know that they think it's a mistake. They may think it's great even though registrars and registrants have verbally expressed how much they hate it. Oh okay. I'm sorry. She says now in the chat that she was joking and not meant to be taken seriously. Sorry I missed the smiley face. So I mean Bob do you see? I mean what are your thoughts now? I think that there is a benefit to including the counter example but I'm just concerned that's outweighed by all of the perils.

Bob Mountain: Yes this is Bob. I - yes I totally get that. I wouldn't want to be, you know, impolite to the people who gave us the information. So I'm just - but, you know, on the other hand it's good to be able to cite the extremes. I think if we just word it so that it's not - we're not making a judgment about goodness or badness but just the attributes themselves. You know, I think we could potentially get away with it. So because we wouldn't be at that point being overly critical, you know, at least in an obvious way. But it's just a matter it's going to take more time to word which I know we don't have a lot of. So I think we just have to make a decision whether it's worth it or whether that's the right approach and then if it's worth the time investing in kind of tiptoeing around with the wording.

James Bladel: Well, you know, I'm an open minded guy. So I would be willing to see any drafts that you and Simonetta could come up with that you felt would be adequately finessing that counter example. However I would say I'm just - I'm disinclined to include it. But maybe, you know, take a shot. Let's see. But I think Mikey's point that he posted in the chat is very germane. We didn't use it. We didn't ask for it and it doesn't address the question or at least doesn't directly. Maybe obliquely it addresses the question. But Simonetta can you get the last word on this point?...

Simonetta Batteiger: I have a completely different thought on how to maybe use this information. So first of all I'm wondering if it's not going there does it need to go into the impact discussion because if we're making a process enroll more steps then most likely the impact of that will be some feedback from users that they don't like it. So whether or not we then cite the specific example is the next question we should be discussing.

Maybe we can even go to them and ask them hey which language would be something that you are comfortable to see included here. We don't want to make you look bad at all but we do feel that we have learned as part of this process that feedback seem to be if you make the process simpler people like it. If you may the process involve more steps then people don't like it as much.

And I think that is a learning and that is an impact step whatever the output of this will have and I think in that regard it needs to be captured in some form. I don't know if it needs to be in this list because it's a specific report of a meeting we had at the Costa Rica conference. So maybe that's a way to think about it and actually reach out and see what they're comfortable with and also ask them why they made that change because maybe there is something we can learn from that as well.

James Bladel: Okay. Thank you Simonetta and I think definitely we want to draw the ccNSO's attention to this section of the draft report and perhaps we can ask

Marika to reach out to her counterparts when the time comes to ensure that we have accurately captured their input. And then we can see if we want to build on that either there or elsewhere in the report. I think there is a value. I mean Mikey has convinced me on this but I think there is a value to establishing that there is - in theory and in practice there is a cliff edge that we shouldn't drive over with this process. I think there's a value to that. I don't know how to say that without actually pointing out who has, you know, established that cliff edge and that, you know, it is - but it is out there and it is noteworthy.

And it is something that the not just the aftermarket but just, you know, even large registrars that deal in country codes that have customers who want to update their name or update their contact information or change their phone number are finding that, you know, this is an unworkable, unnecessarily bureaucratic procedure and they want their registrar to fix it for them and we're not authorized to do so and it's just - it's causing a bit of consternation out there and I think it's - we should at least acknowledge that somehow tactfully and diplomatically without throwing anyone over that cliff.

So anyway that's my feeling. So if we can just and like I said Bob and Simonetta if you want to take a stab at it here go ahead. I think the odds are against it but maybe if we can take a look at where that might fit later on down the road. So we've got eight minutes left. I'm hesitant to dive into the next item which was the messages from Rob Golding and Barbara Knight. And I especially don't want to dive into Barbara's message as tempting as it may be until she has a chance to be on the call.

So, you know, at this point maybe we can, you know, give everybody the last four or five minutes back of their time saying that we weren't even - we were in danger of not having a session today just because of the quorum issue but I think we did make some decent progress and we've updated a number of the action items. So why don't we call it for here and just go forward with those items and I think we'll see some movement on some of these open

tasks and the sub teams will also pick a few loose ends including I'm leaving on Monday for the - tentatively on Monday for the Ideal Process Update. So if there are no other items of business we'll close for today and I'll say thanks everybody.

James Bladel: Thanks James.

Woman: Thank you James.

Woman: Bye.

Man: Thank you James.

Woman: Thank you (unintelligible). You may now stop the recording.

END