IRTP C
TRANSCRIPTION
Tuesday 15 November 2011 at 1500 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Consumer Metrics Project Discussion meeting on Tuesday 15 November 2011 at 1500 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-20111115-en.mp3
On page :
http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#nov
(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Attendees:
James Bladel – Registrar SG
Avri Doria - NCSG & ALAC
Mike O'Connor – CBUC
Anil George - IPC
Bob Mountain – Registrar SG
Rob Villeneuve – Registrar SG
Volker Greimann - Registrar SG
Kevin Erdman – IPC
Paul Diaz – PIR
Chris Chaplow – CBUS
Allain Berranger - NPOC
Adam Eisner - Registrar SG
Philip Corwin - CBUC
Erik Iriarte - ALAC
Jonathan Tennenbaum - IPC
Simonetta Batteiger – Registrar SG
Rob Golding - Registrar SG

ICANN Staff:
Marika Könings
Glen de Saint Gery
Nathalie Peregrine

Apologies:
Barbara Steele – Registries SG

Matt Serlin - Registrar SG
Michele Neylon – Registrar SG Chair
Jacob Williams -

Coordinator: Excuse me. This is the operator. Today's conference is being recorded. If you have any objections, you may disconnect at this time. Please go ahead. Your lines are open.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the IRTPC call on the 15th of November. On the line today, we have Zahid Jamil, James Bladel, Barbara Steele, Mikey O'Connor, Avri Doria, Kevin Erdman, (unintelligible), and Phil Corwin. From staff we have Marika Konings, Glen de Saint Gery, and myself, Nathalie Peregrine. We have apologies from Michele Neylon, Matt Serlin, Chris Chaplow, Jacobs Williams, Alain Berranger, Paul Diaz, and Bob Mountain.

I would like to remind you all to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you.

Marika Konings: Thanks Nathalie. This is Marika. I will just take you to the first item on our list. We just did the roll call. And on the Statements of Interest, just to remind everyone, you will see on the screen the latest mix of members, and I have included for everyone links to the Statements of Interest that can be found in the Wiki.

As you will note, there is still a couple I think - one person that hasn't completed a Statement of Interest yet, but there are also a couple of people that actually have their old Statements of Interest listed there. You are still required to complete a new Statement of Interest because there's some I think new language and headings that are required as a part of the new operating procedures.

So please if you have any issues, let Glen know and she can send you the (marking) details and the information that is required. Please complete your Statement of Interest.

So then going on to Item 2, I would like to hand it over I think to James at this point to discuss with you the leadership positions and how to move forward on that specific item together with Avri.

James Bladel: Thanks Marika and good morning everyone. This is James.

So when we last left our heroes last week we were discussing the possibility of chair, vice-chair, or co-chairs. And I think that if I remember, we had some discussion on that, but I don't know that we ever came down on one side or the other, so certainly willing to have a brief recap of that.

And at the time, we had discussed having the individuals representing one registrar and one non-registrar/non-contracted party entirely. And I think that the thinking behind that was found that while IRTP is essentially a coordination policy between registrars and forcing them to play nicely where their natural inclinations might not be to do so. We certainly need that balance on a PDP where a non-registrar/non-contracted party can also ensure that those concerns are addressed.

Since that time, the only names that remain - you know the only folks that have volunteered to jump into the volcano have been myself on the contracted party side and Avri Doria on the non-contracted party side. so I guess short of you know anything formal, I think maybe we should throw it open to the group and say do we have any objections to going forward with Avri and myself.

And now would be - you know this is the part in the movies and the weddings where they say speak now if any...

Avri Doria: This is Avri. If I had the thing up to raise my hand, I would raise my hand.

James Bladel: Go ahead.

Avri Doria: Okay, yeah I just wanted to say that in doing this, I mean we talked and I think we were both comfortable with the notion of co-chairs. Of course, when it comes to this subject, I'm not the subject area experts. James is and so you know with co-chairs, I would be taking the supporting role, but would be able to jump in to cover and would be assisting and taking on some of the background work if this is what is acceptable. But as I think you put it, carrying the heavy load, would be James. That's what we talked about. So if that is okay with the group, I just wanted to pass that along as well.

James Bladel: Thanks Avri. I think that's a good point. The other item we addressed as well in our chat was just that there may be areas in our charter where (I may be wished away) and as a registrar, and chairs, and vice-chairs, and co-chairs are supposed to make an effort to remain neutral. And I think those would be good calls when we see those things coming up on the agenda for Avri to take the lead and to chair those meetings.

                 But it seems like - I don't know. I see thumbs up. I see green checkmarks, so I think that we can assume that everyone is okay with this Avri - with this arrangement.

Avri Doria: Okay.

James Bladel: Okay, great. Well we will move forward there, and I think Marika you have to notify the GNSO Council or Zahid has to do that or something.

Avri Doria: This is Avri again. I guess at the moment, we count as interim co-chairs until such time as they approve it. And I guess since we have a liaison now, I don't know. I didn't catch whether he was on the call. He would be able to take it to

the council or Marika can, but typically, I think it would be the liaison that (helped with that).

James Bladel: Okay, excellent. So I'm getting some background noise there, so make sure you are on mute as judiciously as possible.

Okay, the next item in the agenda - oops. Marika says she has her hand up. I'm sorry Marika. I didn't see that. I scrolled down to the bottom of the list. Go ahead please.

Marika Konings: No, this is Marika again. Just to indeed mention that the GNSO Council is having a call coming Thursday, and I already mentioned to the leadership -- we had a call early this week - that this might be an issue that you know could be raised and they agreed that it would be no problem to raise it on any other business. And you know I will check with Zahid as to whether he prefers to notify the council or I can do it alternatively, but we will make sure that it gets mentioned on Thursday and hopefully followed by immediate confirmation.

James Bladel: Excellent. Thank you. So I think we can move on to Item Number 3, which was questions or comments with regard to materials circulated for review.

And I wanted to just kind of turn it over to Marika here for a couple of minutes. Marika, can you refresh us on what materials were circulated for review and what sort of comments or feedback you were seeking?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. There were quite a number of materials I took people through on the last call. You know one was the GNSO Working Group Guidelines, the (interim reports). There was a comparison of the new PDP versus the old PDP, and I guess that might be something we can discuss as well in the next charter or in the next item.

There's a document with - that has been taken from the registrar training with regards to the IRTP that I circulated for review. There are a couple of items

that are you know also posted on the Wiki and it's just a question you know of does anyone still have any questions on the materials circulated. Any issues they would like to have further clarified, any additional information that people think would be helpful for people to review. We are at the start of this process and are there any issues that you know we might need to cover in more detail.

I'm just for example thinking on the IRTP itself. I know there are several of you on the call that, you know, know the issue in and out, but there might be others that are less familiar with you know what the IRTP entails and how it works. Is there any need to spend more time on that or maybe set a separate call on that topic, so that was more the question I had in relation to this issue?

James Bladel: Okay, I had a couple of thoughts, but I will put myself in the queue in case there are others that want to jump in. Okay, I will go ahead and jump in.

So the first question is that with regard to the comparison between the old PDP process and the new PDP process, that we are understanding that we are still operating under the old PDP process at least at the outset of this particular working group and I think that we are bound to do so until told otherwise.

So you know I don't know that we have the option at least at this point in the game to change that. Is that correct?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. That is correct. Although I think I did point out last week as well that there are a number of (items in the new PDP) that are not you know required elements or are not elements that would you know in any way contravene what is currently in the PDP. So there might be certain parts where you know for good measure the working group might want to consider taking certain steps.

And I'm just thinking for example there is a specific reference to making sure that other SOs and ACs are provided with the opportunity to provide input or

asked to you know provide comments, so you know that might be something that the working group can take up, which doesn't really contravene anything that is currently in the PDP rules.

So that is just something to you know take into account, but again you are correct. We are currently operating under the old or the existing PDP rules until the board adopts the other ones, and then it will be up to the GNSO Council to decide which PDPs will be transitioned and at what point in the process.

James Bladel: Okay and then do we have any anticipated ETA on when that might happen - when the changeover may occur?

Marika Konings: Yeah, so this is Marika. At the earliest, the board will consider it in December. This is partly dependent on the number or substantive comments that are being received. There's a public comment period open on the new Annex A, which I think runs until the 5th of December and the board meets on the 8th of December, so it might be only in cases where you know there are no comments or no substantive comments that the board might act on it.

You know otherwise, I think the next opportunity - although I'm not sure whether the board schedule is already published. I guess it is likely to be January, but of course, there might be some areas as well if any substantial issues are raised either through community comment or for discussion. It might of course take longer.

And I think the proposal does say that you know once the board has adopted, basically then the GNSO Council makes an evaluation or assessment you know based on the different PDPs that are ongoing and you know which stages they are. And then based on that, it will you know recommend whether they should be transitioned or not. And I think there is an option as well for the working group itself to request or ask for that change.

But I think if you look as well at the comparison you know overall, you know some of the major milestones remain the same. It's just some of the details that are different and some of the timelines that have more flexibility in the near PDP process, but some of the, you know, main elements. You know Constituency Stakeholder Group statements, initial report, final report, and those elements basically are the same.

James Bladel: Okay Avri is in the queue. Go ahead Avri.

Avri Doria: Just as a point. And on those timelines where the new PDP defines them, basically what if defining very much is what has become habitual under the old PDPs where we never met our timeline? And we never met the bylaw's timelines, and we're always basically going to the G Council with a - you know we are late, but it is coming kind of notice.

So I think that you know trying to follow the new guidelines as much as possible except for when of course they directly conflict if we can meet a new timeline I think is our best option. Thanks.

James Bladel: That's an excellent point Avri, and that was why I put myself in the queue. I think that you know I agree that we should - we are bound to follow the old process, but the new process has some important improvements and that we should adopt them except in cases where they might directly conflict or contravene the old process.

And I think that this would basically make IRTP see as far as I know one of the first hybrid PDPs through this transition just by kind of a quirk on the calendar that that's what we would end up with. And then once the new process comes into play sometime early next year that we would then adopt that going forward from that point on.

Does that sound like a reasonable approach or is there something I am overlooking that makes that unworkable Marika? Or is that - does that sound like a reasonable approach to our work forward?

Marika Konings: Yes, to me it does.

James Bladel: Okay, well let's just proceed that way and then until you know someone smacks our hands or we hit a brick wall.

If there are no other questions on that, I have a second topic, which is moving on to something else you mentioned relative to just overall IRTP training for folks who are possibly new to this policy. Or maybe casual users of the IRTP and really are wondering and scratching their heads and saying why is this such a big deal that we have to have five separate PDPs for it.

So I think the suggestion that Marika had was a good one that we would have a training sessions perhaps outside of the typical PDP working group calendar where anyone can join, and that the IRTP process would be kind of in a survey or a walkthrough. We can call it IRTP 101.

I guess Marika I would recommend that we pose that to the list since we have so many apologies this week. That maybe we could put that particular question to the list and see if we can gauge if there is any interest in that. I think that a lot of the veterans of the previous two might skip that session, but I think it could be valuable for folks that are newcomers and want to get up to speed quickly.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I can include that in the action items for this call. And do you then also look for a volunteer to provide that presentation or do you have someone in mind?

James Bladel: Well, yeah I had staff in mind, but yeah that's a good point. I think we could possibly get a volunteer or we could - you know if we could even borrow one

of the videos from the registrar training. I don't know if the licensing allows us to do that or if we could just provide some of that same material in a PowerPoint. I think that a one-hour session to lay the groundwork for some of the new folks would be valuable.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. You know I'm happy to provide more of like the overview where this is all comes from, but I think it would be helpful if a registrar with more on hands experience with the IRTP as such and maybe goes through that training material. I don't think at this stage it is possible to actually have these videos because it is linked to actual training I think where you know you need to go through it and you know answer the questions.

But you know I did already share the transcript with the group. So you know I presume it wouldn't be too difficult to extract from there the relevant points and you know put them in a PowerPoint format. So I will put out a note and we can first see if there is interest and maybe then take it from there.

James Bladel: Okay, I will volunteer to do that and it just won't be as cool with the video, and the cartoons, and everything. It is just going to be a clunky black and white PowerPoint, but I will do it. Assuming - you know I see a couple of folks in the chat window have said that that would be valuable, but you know it's assuming that there is you know this groundswell of support for the idea. Then I will volunteer.

Okay, I think are we ready to move to Number 4? Did we lose Marika?

Marika Konings: No, I'm here.

James Bladel: Okay, so are we then clear to move to Number 4 or do we have any other thoughts, comments, or statements regarding the materials or the training. Okay, the queue is clear, so let's move to Number 4. Could you put the draft work plan in the Adobe window Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes.

James Bladel: Fantastic. Thank you. So as we discussed in our first call and I think a little bit on the list prior to even the kickoff meeting was that I think the consensus was that this group wants to see the process happen at a little faster pace than we've seen for previous IRTP PDPs and in general just PDP working groups possibly with the exception of BI.

So with that in mind, we kind of set a (skittish) out in the mud in the Toronto meeting, which is slightly less than a year from today, as target for the final report. And with that in mind, we kind of - I think Marika did a fantastic job. A lot of this stuff was just kind of rattling around in my head, but Marika did a fantastic job of actually laying it out in a chart with dates and milestones that you can see there in the Adobe screen.

And I think we - if we could spend a few minutes just going over this and making sure that A, everyone still believes that the Toronto deadline is realistic and achievable and desirable. And B, that we can take a look at just maybe the major milestones recognizing that we are going to be plus or minus two weeks in any given direction for any milestone here. And given that this is ICANN, I can tell you it's going to be plus and not minus.

But if we can kind of keep that in mind and just real quickly run through some of the milestones here. And if anyone sees any milestones that are missing or thinks that some are just way too close together, then maybe we can discuss those now.

So Marika, can we spend the next maybe eight to ten minutes just going through this? Can you walk us through the milestones here? And then we will just kind of take a queue as we go along and see if anyone wants to chime in.

Marika Konings: Sure. So this is Marika again. So the first item on here is the opening of a public comment period, and I think that comes back to a conversation we had

last week. One of the required steps in the current PDP is the opening up of a public comment period upon the initiation of a PDP.

And (password and dates) have actually been a little bit more flexible with that and said basically it makes more sense to do that once the working group is formed. And so it also allows the possibility for the working group to add any specific questions or comments to the opening up such a public comment period. In this case, the charter questions are relatively straightforward. The proposal would be just to open the public comment period you know and asking for input on the charter questions.

So if the working group agrees with that approach, that could be done relatively quickly and have that open by the beginning of next week. However, if the working group feels that you know this might be an opportunity to ask for specific information or data on certain issues, we might need to spend a little bit more time on framing the public comment period.

So then the next step is basically listing as well the different working group meetings and for the first one I've tried to identify you know deliverables and topics for discussion. So one question would be in you know enhancing this work plan and timeline is whether it would be desirable or possible to try to identify for the different meetings what specific topics for discussion are or specific deliverables of each of the meetings.

So the idea would be that you know at the next meeting we would be able to finalize a work plan based on discussions today and hopefully further comments on the mailing list. Also a finalization of a stakeholder group or a constituency statement's request pamphlet. Just for your information as well, that's also a required step in the PDP that stakeholder groups and the constituency statements are requested to provide their input on the charter questions.

What we've done in previous working groups to make that easier for our stakeholder groups and constituencies is to actually develop a pamphlet where we ask them to provide specific - you know we are able to ask for specific questions. Again, I think in this case as we are looking at very specific charter questions, it might be relatively straightforward and it's just putting forward those questions.

So I'm happy to you know circulate one of the pamphlets that we've used in previous instances with the information that is relevant to this working group and then you know the working group can build on that if they would like.

James do you want to comment on this stage or do you want me to run through it and...?

James Bladel: Yeah, just a quick question here. So I think there's a balance that we're trying to strike, and I put this question to the group and maybe we can put it onto the list as well. That you know by putting out the charter questions as they are defined in the charter or issue report as is, we kind of cast the widest possible net and make sure that we don't - you know we restrict the feedback that we receive.

However, if there is a specific piece of information we are looking for for a specific question, then it is possible you know we could get it with that and we need to develop a customized template. So I guess the question that we should probably put to the list is which is more desirable?

I tend to think that leaving it as a free flowing and as wide open a discussion as possible is more desirable because that will possibly shake the trees a little bit and give us some insight into questions we hadn't considered if we attempted to you know put that all into a template. But you know I would certainly defer to the group on that.

Simonetta had her hand up as well. Are you withdrawing that Simonetta?

Simonetta Batteiger: Well I was actually a little bit on the opposite end of what you just said, James, in terms of like one question in particular I was wondering if we should add to the list. And that was basically one of the main reasons why we put forward this (work piece) about taking a look at what are the ccTLDs doing in order to facilitate a transfer process from A to B with owner update at the same time that may work or may not work very well.

I wonder if we should put a question forward there to ask people for their experience with this and really specifically ask them what about this they like and/or dislike so that we have an opportunity to learn also whether it even is a good idea to try and mirror some of that stuff for other - or for a more general policy or if people actually don't like this at all or don't like certain aspects of it. And we would be able to get that type of input right away if we asked the question about that on the get go rather than having to guess down the road what people may have thought about this.

James Bladel: Okay, thanks Simonetta. So there is a vote for customizing the template and asking for some specific information. Go ahead Avri.

Avri Doria: Yeah thanks. On the issue of the ccNSO - and this is not so much to do with the template. It may actually be good to think about inviting either a ccNSO Councilperson or perhaps one of the support staff for the ccNSO to come in and just spend a brief time talking about that while we are even thinking of developing the template so we know what kinds of questions are reasonable to put forward. Thanks.

James Bladel: Okay, thank you Avri. And although I see Marika has her hand raised, but Mikey had a comment in the chat box. Mikey did you want to raise that?

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. I kind of thinking that there is value in both of those. That maybe what we do is we have two sections to this request for information where we say well here are our charter questions. Please tell us anything you

can think of about those. And then another chuck of it that says by the way, here are a bunch of detailed questions that we've thought of that we are interested in like the one that Simonetta just raised. So sort of do both. I don't think that that would be too confusing.

James Bladel: Okay. All right, Marika and Avri are agreeing. And Marika has her hand up. Go ahead Marika.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. I basically agree with what Mikey said. I mean the template can be you know formed in the way that the working group feels is best suited to the information they are looking for. And I think in addition to the charter questions, there were also a number of questions that were raised in the issues report also with regard to potential data gathering. So those might be specific questions and I'm happy to you know look through the issue report and pick out some of those and add those to the template, and then the working group can add other items as they feel appropriate.

With regard to inviting the ccNSO support staff, I don't think that would be that useful in this stage because I doubt that they have the hands on experience with each of the ccTLDs that have a process in place. I mean the issue report identifies a number of those and describes those, but I think as Simonetta said, it would be very helpful to get user experiences of you know how easy it is to use that process or whether there have been issues encountered with those different models.

And again, I think something we raised in the issue report as well is we only - I think I only identified three specific ones, but I'm sure there might be others. So it would be worth it as well maybe asking for specific input for other examples and models that are being used that are not included in the issue report, but that might be worth considering.

James Bladel: Okay, thank you Marika. I think the general consensus in reading the chat box as well while you were speaking was that we want to do both. That we

want to have a customized request for comment and a stakeholder group or constituency request a statement template.

I think that Avri very correctly pointed out that some working groups have in the past been bogged down on getting the language just right. So I think if this group agrees, we can put this entire function to the mailing list with a very tight deadline. Say for example this time next week or the beginning of next week where we would have folks submitting their specific questions in addition to kind of the generic template.

The question would be Marika is if you or your team would be able to get us started with that on a draft template based on kind of the standard generic template plus the items you mentioned from the issues report and from the charter.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I should be able to get something out probably tomorrow morning and (there is input as well in the chat). I mean the (timing is right is basic). It has like a header basically saying you know you are requested to provide input by X date and these are the issues we are looking for input on.

So again, as I said, I could put the charter questions there and then have a look through the issue report and highlight those issues that you know we raised in the issue report. And I think that would be a good basis for others to ask further questions on - you know encouraging people to provide input on the mailing list. And then indeed hopefully we will be able to finalize that on next week's call.

James Bladel: Okay, does that - is that acceptable to Avri, Simonetta, Mikey, and all the other folks that wanted to make sure they had an opportunity to get some specific questions in this? Okay, green checkmarks, so I think we are good. And Barbara is supporting that as well.

Okay, so let's proceed in that direction Marika.

Marika Konings: Okay, so then move on to the work plan. You see I've listed the different working group meetings assuming weekly calls. Assuming for the moment that we are continuing on a weekly Tuesday as scheduled, so I'm listing those. And as I said, you know we might want to consider providing more details on what our aim is to cover on each of those working group calls. And did someone want to speak up?

James Bladel: Yeah, I wanted to just jump in there. I don't know that we necessarily need to define now what we're going to do for each of those individual calls, however, I think that when we see a group of four or five working group meetings clumped together or more, as we see at the beginning of the year, that we would establish what we want to have deliverable at the end of that section of the working groups.

So if that helps - I know it takes the resolution of this plan down a little bit but I think it gives us a little bit more flexibility in the interim to pursue, you know, if a certain issue takes a little more time than another one then we can adjust accordingly.

So I was thinking for example we see a group of calls for November 29th through December 20th and of course there are holidays floating around in there as well that we just kind of clump those together and say here are the four things that we want to accomplish out of this group and then the same thing we would do from January 10th through February that we would have a list of what we want the outputs to be for that particular group. I see Mikey's got his hand up so we'll go to him next.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, James, it's Mikey. I'm going to push back a little bit on that. I think one of the things that projects often run into trouble on is if they don't have enough intermediate milestones and the work isn't granular enough and then at the end there's this scramble.

So I understand why you don't want to get it too detailed but I propose something at least in the middle that says let's make a list of the key deliverables that we want to have done by the milestone date, whatever it is, and put them in order and at least put tentative dates around them and drive them into the work plan.

Otherwise I think what will happen is what often happens in projects is all the liquid flows to the very bottom of the pile and then in the very last week you've suddenly got six big deliverables to get done at once. So intermediate, I'm lobbying for intermediate milestones there.

James Bladel: Okay. I think that's a good idea, Mikey. You mean as far as, for example, in that group of four from the four meetings from the 29th through the 20th of December that we would lay out something in the middle there on December 6th or the 13th and say, you know, we will have this done - these three things or these four things - done by the 1st or by this so that we can spend the second half of this meeting as, you know, set some floors and ceilings in those groups. Is that kind of what you're saying?

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, that's, you know - it may be that we'll want to - it's hard to say until we know what the stack of deliverables looks like. If it turns out that there's really only two deliverables between now and the milestone of closing of public comments, well, then maybe we, you know - I think before it's possible to know how many intermediate millstones we've got we've got to know what our deliverables are and I think once we've got that list it'll be a lot easier to figure out when we can realistically get them done.

James Bladel: Okay. And I think that your approach also makes sense as well for very large strings of uninterrupted working group meetings to put some better definition in there as well. Like when you have three months of meetings.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah. I think so.

James Bladel: So, okay. I want to go to Avri but I just have a pushback question there, Mikey. Where do we get this list of deliverables in advance? We're going to have to come up with it, right?

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, I think so although there are a bunch of us that have been through this a bunch of times before and if we either spend some time on this call or took a call offline and brainstormed it a little bit I bet we can come up with that list pretty fast.

Marika's been through a bunch of them, you and I have, Avri has, a bunch of us have done that and I don't think it's real hard to come up with that list based on the work that we've done before but I think it will be hugely useful for setting out these intermediate dates.

James Bladel: Okay. I'll go to Avri next and then I had an idea so I'll put myself in the queue behind you. So, Avri.

Avri Doria: Yeah. I actually support the idea and I think - I mean, as long as we know that when we're putting these things down that they're not set in stone, they're penciled in and we're reviewing.

I certainly think it's a thing that between, you know, the chairs, the co-chairs, Marika and other interested group members we can come up with an initial list and then we can periodically adjust it as reality impinges on us but we'll be doing it deliberately. We'll know that we're changing something earlier or later because of some, you know, difference.

And I don't think that we need to have something on every date and I think it's good enough to do some, you know, end-based scheduling where we say, okay, we've decided that we want to try and deliver, you know, by this date which means we need to be in review by this, we need to be in this by then, et cetera.

And then basically at first approximation just sort of say - and have the topics established here and start working on the topics here, and come to tentative, you know, results on the topics by here and then we can progressively refine it as we know more so it's not a question that we're waiting for all the information before we do anything.

But I think, you know, if for example three of us take a first crack at it or four of us and then put it out for other people to refine it, you know - and we can do it in some dynamic way - I think it's a good idea to start penciling in in the near future.

James Bladel: Okay. Thank, Avri. I think that's a good approach. Can we - I'll just go to Simonetta next. I'll put myself behind you, Simonetta. Go ahead.

Simonetta Batteiger: I just had a thought as well that maybe we could use the beginning of one of these blocks of workgroup meetings to just review quickly what we're trying to get done and the coming block of meetings be this from the 29th of November through the 20th of December.

So when we're starting one of these pieces and we probably have learned by the 10th of January a bunch of new stuff that we should consider from that block that we might now even think about right now.

If we just take the first meeting of one of these blocks to kind of review if we are on track with our deliverables for the next block until the next major milestone hits then I think we can adjust there.

James Bladel: Thank you, Simonetta. That's similar to what I was going to propose actually. That's a much better version of what I was going to propose. So I think if I'm understanding you, when we look at the first meeting or a series of meetings so, for example, 29th of November and perhaps the 3rd or the 10th of January and then the first meeting after Costa Rica, et cetera, and maybe

something in between there that we would revisit the work plan and see how we were doing and just kind of take a pause, take a reading and make sure that we're on track and lay out the deliverables for that next batch of meetings. I think that's a great idea.

So the question then for the group is how to get to this - what's a reasonable time frame to get to this first list of deliverables. Is it reasonable to think that we would have something like that by the 29th of November or is that too soon? Simonetta?

Simonetta Batteiger: Well, I think we can think at least about what we want to get done between the 29th of November and the 20th of December thinking that basically between now and then we're going to get a lot of input so we can establish all the topics we need to talk about and maybe we can already put a question forward about this last piece of the charter questions or are we already - all of us kind of asked is there any reason to think that this shouldn't' just be done that way.

So if the common kind of indicate that this might be something that we can easily get squared away at the beginning and there's no major issues raised in the common period then by the end of this thing we could probably even look at like taking this away at the beginning of the next roadblock and just like kind of move forward that way.

But maybe we can just brainstorm some of those initial ideas of what to do when and share it either through the mailing list or through a separate call between now next week so that we have some initial ideas that we can present back to the group on the 29th of November and then just see if there's more feedback coming on the call and just start working that way.

James Bladel: Okay. Excellent. Thank you, Simonetta. Marika, you had your hand up and then you lowered it. Did you want to chime in on this.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. Just to mention I think on some blocks it's quite obvious what are going to be, you know, the main discussion items. For example, after the 22nd of December, presumably the next couple of meetings will be dedicated to reviewing public comments or, you know, after the 2nd of January it'll be, you know, a couple meetings that will be spent on stakeholder group and constituency statements. So I think some deliverables might be relatively easy to fill in.

I think it's part of the other question is is it relates to how the working group is going to, you know, tackle the charter questions because I guess that probably relates as well as to how you identify to your deliverables.

Are you, you know, going to tackle them one by one and then identify for each of them if you need additional research or additional information or, you know, sub-team or, you know, are you going to do them (impartial).

Is there, you know, some have already said maybe the (unintelligible) issue is the easy one. Would the idea be to start with that first and square that one away and then move on to the other items.

So, I guess, it partly relates as well to that discussion on how to manage the work and, you know, how you're going to fill in the different deliverables and at which stage.

James Bladel: Okay. Thanks, Marika. Any other thoughts on this? Okay. So I think that there's a good consensus of what we want to do here as far as the resolution of the work plan and coming up with the list of deliverables and then establishing where it is isn't obvious what we will be working on, establishing at least some pretty clear deliverables for each batch of those working group meetings and then establishing those at the outset so we can take a periodic survey to make sure we're on track with our overall project plan.

One of the thoughts that I wanted to put out there for discussion is if we in just trying to sum all of this up and kind of wrap up this discussion would be to identify that the next working group meeting for finalization of the work plan would be that we would have some further completion of this draft and I will go ahead and volunteer for myself with Marika to help put some definition into here.

But I would ask that perhaps someone like Avri or Mikey or Simonetta or someone else maybe to get together a small group to volunteer to track the overall deliverables and kind of put those together with the other major milestones and that we would start to put together a list of those. I'm getting bombed by a couple of inputs here. So, Avri, go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yeah, I'm certainly willing to take responsibility for trashing the schedule and to work with Mikey, Simonetta and anyone else that's into doing that. So I'll certainly as a co-chair option take that responsibility and (subtract) it not only with putting together the original one but as time goes on to do the progressive refinement of it and to work, of course, with Marika making sure we're not putting anything in a scheduled place that makes her life impossible. Thanks.

James Bladel: Okay. Thanks. And I see from the chat that Mikey's in as well. And then that takes us - I mean, you can see for yourself here that we have other milestones that will hit throughout the year. You know, strolling down we see we're now into a, you know, face to face meeting in Costa Rica which as we get closer I think we'll have a better understanding of what we want to accomplish at that meeting.

As you look out a little bit further we'll be putting out an initial report for comments in the early summer and presenting that at the meeting in Prague. Certainly that will generate a number of comments in the middle of the summer that we will then - and I'm just deliberately glossing over a lot of this here so bear with me, just trying to mind our time allotment for today.

And then, you know, as we get into the late summer we'll be reviewing public feedback to that initial report and adjusting our final report as necessary, putting that up for public comment and presenting that to - I guess we don't put the final report up for public comments.

So and then we'll be presenting that to council, we'll begin to be wrapping up the PDPs sometime around middle of the fall. So, okay. And I think that - okay, go ahead, Marika.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. Maybe the working group I would consider as well building in some tentative, you know, milestones because, for example, something we've seen with recent PDPs was that there was a need or a desire to put out a proposed final report as the report had changed between the initial version and the final version in such a manner that people thought it was, you know, needed to have another round of public comment.

So I don't' know if that's something that people maybe want to pencil in and saying, look, if we see there's a need this would be the time where we are planning to put it out to still hit our deadline or whether people feel that, you know, maybe halfway through this schedule is just review and then and adapt it as appropriate.

Or maybe there is just a question of putting a little footnote in saying in case more opportunities for public comment are needed and the working group will build this in as necessary.

James Bladel: Well, I think, yeah, this is something we need to account for. I mean, I think that my old project management days that would be considered a risk, right, that later on in a process we would have to revisit something in a significantly material way and that we would have to then put that back out for comment. I'm not sure that - I mean, I guess I would leave it to the group whether we

would want to account for that at the outset or plan for that because I think if you plan for it then it will happen. But, anyway, Simonetta, go ahead.

Simonetta Batteiger: I would plan for it actually but you could even preface it as needed. I think we don't know right now what the reactions will be to our initial report. So if we come up with something that won't face any resistance then perfect, we might not need another public commentary.

But if the reaction to the initial report are quite strongly and people would feel very unhappy with us putting something to the GNSO council without further consultation and we can already kind of gauge this by the tone and type of comments we received on the initial report. Then it would be kind of funny to not ask for more input at that point in time but we don't know this right now.

James Bladel: Yeah, and I think that's a good point. First of all let's say that I expect that the reception to our initial report will be something around the lines of a ticker tape parade with people throwing rose petals and cheering our names and carrying us around Prague - the streets of Prague on our shoulders. But anything short of that, yes, we would have to go back to get some additional public comments.

I see that there's' a batch of meetings there, Marika, between, let's say, it's in the July through September time frame so perhaps we should back out from October, leave us a couple of meetings there to analyze public comments and then back out perhaps 30 days maybe into the early part of August and say that, you know, we put a marker down and say that if we need to have another public comment session that it would begin - it must begin no later than this particular date.

And I think that that's probably right around the - you know, right around the first week of August. You know, of course, that's a time when a lot of people kind of check out from ICANN stuff and I understand that's part of the risk that

we have in the schedule. But I think that at least if we have a marker down, Simonetta, then we can account for that if we need it.

Okay. So we have a few extra items there but we've only got eight minutes and I wanted to cover the other two things fairly quickly and I don't want to have Marika read this next bit because it was my idea and if it's completely out of (school) then I want to be the one that takes the criticism for it.

One of the things that I wanted to float out for public discussion would be something called a commitment to participate. And this if, of course, this is ICANN, we're all volunteers, this is a non-binding promise for working group members to do their best to attend meetings, to join sub-teams if they feel they can contribute to those and to respond to extra items, surveys, questions and consensus calls on the mailing list.

I think that, you know, there's a of veterans here, PDPs and I think that we can all account - we all have our war stories or antics of PDPs that start with a lot of enthusiasm and a big crowd and then, you know, a couple months into it there's just a couple of diehards.

And then as you get close to producing a report or possibly even wrapping up the PDP, a lot of folks kind of reactivate and come back into the PDP and in some cases - and I know this happens, you know, this is not going to shock some people - in some cases they want to reopen some of the items that have been included in the report or readdress some of the recommendations. You know, it's just human nature. We're all here for our various interests and we all have our positions that we have to advance.

So, you know, I think I wanted to get this kind of out there on the mailing list circulated out, have everybody say yes, this is my plan, I intend to participate, you can count on me working group and then maybe we all feel like we have a little bit more of a mutual interest in the outcomes of the group.

The second part of this would be something like we would have to take into account that some folks join working groups just to monitor them, just to monitor the mailing list and keep up with the developments and discussions. And that's perfectly acceptable as well but I think that if someone intends to take that particular role then perhaps we should state that at the outset.

So that's my thinking here. This is not something required or even prescribed by the PDP process but it's just sort of a brainstorm coloring outside the lines a little bit and I wanted to get thoughts on if anyone is, you know, vehemently opposed to this idea. Avri?

Avri Doria: Yeah, I just wanted to add one point. I think it's a good idea. I support it. One thing though that if we do decide to do it we should try to make sure that there's at least - you know, you're calling it commitment to participate, in another context it was called (stuckees) - but that there's at least one committed to participate from each of the constituencies and others who might be interested, for example, if we have a lot of participation or whatever so that we have a good case to make as in the final analysis that there was, you know, a good distribution of effort because we did have one committed to participate from each of the constituents and indeed they did participate all the way through.

So at least, you know, we have that because that's one of our responsibilities and it's one of the liaison's responsibilities under the new PDP rules to ensure that we've got that.

So this is one way of sort of ensuring it and being able to check on it that, you know, that we don't have to check all of the people who are participating in the group and say, okay, which one is from constituency one, which one is from constituency two. We know that we've got our six (stuckees). Thanks.

James Bladel: That's a good idea and I think that does address one of those recurring themes or concerns that we're - that we don't have everyone at the (table).

So I think that's a good idea as well and it certainly makes Zahid's position a little more straightforward in that he can tell exactly who's there and who isn't.

Mikey has question so if you want to raise that on the call, Mikey, or if it's just something, you know, there's certainly a lot of questions and holes in this idea, Mikey, a grant you that. It's just something to - just trying to take a swing of something here.

Mikey O'Connor   I had two - this is Mikey - I had two questions. One is what happens to people who don't live up to this and we've talked a little bit about that.

James Bladel: Nothing at all.

Mikey O'Connor: Guilt. Guilt is a good motivator. We could, you know, post it to the wiki that, you know, who's showing up and who's not or whatever. But anyway then the other one is that in terms of the monitor status thing, it would be nice if people, perhaps, could self-identify so that we didn't beat them up for not showing up.

James Bladel: Yeah, but, you know, I think it's possible to think that someone would start off in a working group with, you know, a commitment to participate fully and then have to drop down into a palm tree function passed on something that they hadn't anticipated. And you certainly don't want to, you know, publicly shame people for that.

But I think Simonetta's idea is good too. We usually typically have an attendance sheet that goes into the final report showing the individuals who participated throughout the process. And maybe some kind of a, you know, gold star next to the folks who stuck it out all the way through.

But, yeah, I think - just wanted to put this out here and we can circulate it through the list and maybe continue that conversation via email and see if we want to adopt something like this.

But I just wanted to make sure that folks understood that this was a - in order to hit this aggressive time frame we're going to need a commitment from folks that they're not necessarily just going to put this on autopilot and catch up on their email every Tuesday.

This is an active role that we're asking everyone to take in order to make that goal and I think that's understood and I think that for the most part everyone value's that.

So real quickly I want to move on to the next item, the last item. We just have a minute here but the meeting time and dates, you know, traditionally - there is such a thing as ICANN as tradition - is that the IRTP groups met at this time for one hour every Tuesday.

I've had a couple of folks ping me and say that this is not going to work for them all the time, every Tuesday or perhaps that it will work for them for I think through the first of the year and then folks start to run into conflicts.

So I'm totally open to the idea of reopening the IRTP schedule and possibly putting out a doodle poll by Marika. I think that the status quo has some inertia here because there are so many other meetings going on that are recurring that when we start moving one it starts to creates a bit of a cascade failure throughout the whole ICANN calendar.

But if it is Tuesday at this time which I believe is 1500 UTC, if that is a serious problem for a significant portion of the folks that are attending this working group I think that we need to know that now so that we can start looking at some other ideas whether that's moving the time, moving the days or changing the length of the meetings.

So what I would then ask is that Marika will work with staff to put out a doodle to just see - a couple of questions, one, can you live with this time frame most

of the time even if it's not perfect and two, if you can't, you know, what does work for you on a recurring basis.

And I see that Simonetta's got a good point here about the (stuckee) schedule. So look for that please and please we'll send that around and we'll ask folks to respond as quickly as possible because I think, you know, we need to get that nailed down as part of our work plan.

So with that I see that we are one minute over our time frame which isn't really too terrible considering, you know, how things usually go in ICANN world. So I wanted to put out any other final comments before we adjourn for today.

Avri Doria: Thank you for taking the active chair role.

James Bladel: My pleasure. And thank you, Avri. I think I may be leaning on your more than you might anticipate.

Okay. Well, everybody have a great Tuesday if it's evening or afternoon and we'll look for some additional follow-up items on the list and we'll talk next week.

Man: Thanks a lot, James. Great job, folks. Thanks, Avri.

Coordinator: Thank you and we'll now stop the recordings.

Man: Thanks.

END