

GNSO
Inter-registrar Transfer Working Group teleconference
12 March, 2008 at 16:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Inter-registrar Working Group teleconference on 12 March 2008. 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/inter-registrar-transfer-wg-20080312.mp3>
<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#mar>

Participants on the call:

Chuck Gomes - gTLD Registry constituency
Mike O'Connor - CBUC
Tim Ruiz - Registrar c.
Tom Keller - Registrar c.

ICANN Staff:

Olof Nordling - Manager Policy Development
Robert Hoggarth -
Glen de Saint Géry - GNSO Secretariat

Man: I haven't seen anything from (Tim) indicating that he wouldn't be able to attend. So hopefully he will be able to join us.

I don't know if the recording started or not. What do you think?

Man: I don't know they usually let us know when it started.

Man: Yeah I just started it for you.

Man: Thank you very much.

Man: That's all right.

Man: All right let's get going. I sent around yesterday a suggested agenda. Any suggestions for changing that or add anything to it?

Man: Looked fine to me.

Man: Okay then the first agenda item would be to talk about (Tom)'s suggestion for moving recommendation 9 to join 2 and 7. Does anybody have any discussion on that? Any comments you want to make on that? What's your feeling on that? Notice that in the draft I sent around I went ahead and did that. That doesn't mean that it has to stay that way.

Man: I thought that was a good idea. And so when it went by in the email I nodded sagely and didn't say a thing.

Man: Thank you.

Man: Anybody opposed to that change?

Man: No.

Man: Well not to oppose (unintelligible). But the one thing I would be kind of opposed against is the wording still.

Man: Okay.

Man: The old wording off of the former 9 were already pre done that simultaneous would not be the right wording. So you should just put in the last word would be figured out why.

Man: Let's go down to that. You mean the wording for 9?

Man: Yeah.

Man: Okay let's go down to that right now and fix that so that we capture that. And what changes did you want to make there?

Man: I'm just trying to – just hold on a second.

Man: Does the proposal have it near simultaneous or something in order to capture both – well changes of names taking place before or after the transfer?

Man: Yeah we had a big discussion in email on that. I'm looking for the last one. I know that we came up with another choice so.

Man: I think near simultaneous would be a quick and easy fix. But I'm not sure of that.

Man: I think that's where we settled was near simultaneous.

Man: It was change of registrant near change of registrar.

Man: Is that it? I'm still screaming backwards through email trying to find it.

Man: That's the last (unintelligible).

Man: Yeah is that where we wound up?

- Man: Yeah and I think it makes a lot of sense. I mean that it came from (Chuck), (Tim) consented to it. I would actually.
- Man: Yeah it's fine.
- Man: It makes it much clearer. It gets away without simultaneous talk and everybody knows what we're talking about.
- Man: Yeah so let's restate that new wording one time for the record because I still haven't found that email.
- Man: All right it would be with the special provisions are needed for and now it's new. The change of registrant near change of registrar.
- Man: Bear with me a second I'm trying to – okay now let me capture that. So now that I've got the document ready I wanted to get all the old changes accepted. So that it's clearer when I send this around. Go ahead (Tom). Give me the change in number 9.
- (Tom): Okay the sentence stays the same until, "whether special provisions are needed for." All the rest of the sentence, "change of registrant simultaneous to transfer" goes away. And it's being substituted by the wording, "change of registrant near change of registrar."
- Man: All right, "change of registrant near change of registrar?"
- (Tom): Yes.
- Man: And then the period right?

(Tom): Yes. And the rest of the sentence would be fine to me actually.

Man: So it now reads, "Whether special provisions are needed for change of registrant near change of registrar."

(Tom): Yeah maybe we can still put an "A" in there something. Change of registrar something. I think it covered pretty good that we mean a change before and after in a close time.

Man: Okay and so and then the last sentence the policy does not clearly deal with change of registrant with often figures in high jacking cases.

(Tom): Right.

Man: I'm okay with that. Anybody have a problem with that change?

Man: No really good.

Man: Hi (Tim).

((Crosstalk))

Man: All we've done is kind of approved the agenda. And then we're talking about (Tom)'s suggested change of moving 9 to join 2 and 7 in the PDP number 4. And we just modified the language of that to say the following, "whether special provisions are needed for a change of registrant near a change of registrar. The policy does not currently deal with change of registrant which often figures in high jacking cases."

So in other words we just changed the first sentence. Are you okay with that? Did you want me to read that again?

(Tim): No I'm good with that.

Man: Okay good okay. Anything else on that change?

Man: Nope.

Man: Okay good. Then let's go to the next item on the agenda which is the – just approving the highlighted edits to document – to the document – and excluding the last section which has to do with PDP order. We'll cover that separately. But are there any suggested changes to any of the edits we made in the document last meeting and between now and then?

Man: Not really. I've got one thing that we need to update. And that's the executive summaries which should mention something when we agree upon the PDP sequencing. Well that should be covered in the executive summary. But of course we have to agree upon that first.

Man: So on the order – yeah good point. So what I'll do in my document here is just put a little parenthetical at a paragraph regarding PDP order. In fact we may even want to – one of the things that we may want to do is – and I think I suggested this in the draft agenda. Was that in the tables – the tables that are there – we probably should reorder them according to our priority. At least I suggested that's something we can talk about. So we can deal with that. Okay good.

Anything else?

(Mike): I think this is the right time to bring this up. We may want to beef up the explanations of the deleted items just a little bit. Especially if we're thinking that we're going to take those back out to the constituents to have them bless those.

It's not that they're wrong it's just that they're all so far out, you know.

Man: We already spent a lot of time on that change.

(Mike): Our own internal code. We might want to expand those paragraphs to bring the people up to speed that weren't in the discussion.

Man: Do you want to work on that right now?

Man: No I was thinking we might want to put that in the action items pile.

Man: Okay.

Man: And make sure that we know – I'll put a little parenthetical here.

Man: Did anybody disagree with that?

Man: No that's fine with me.

Man: Okay I just put a little note in there to do that. So that will be an action item. Okay an item. Okay any other comments before we get to the PDP order?

Man: No I think it's good.

Man: Okay good.

Man: Good job.

Man: Then with regard to the PDP order let's talk about that. See what I did is I tried to kind of capture what we talked about last week in the document. Why don't we just kind of use that as a guide to go down to the last section of the document there.

First of all any suggestions on the wording of how I led into that? I tried to clean it up a little bit.

Man: I thought that was fine. Is our thought to leave that decision to the council?

Man: That's what we're going to talk about today.

Man: Okay.

Man: Whether we leave it to the council – ultimately it's going to be in the council's hands and the public will get to comment on it and so forth. But we can make a – so even if we make a specific recommendation, you know, it's not as if we have any authority to actually finalize it.

So it just depends how we want to approach it. Now let's start – is everybody okay – we're actually making a recommendation in the first bullet there. That, you know, before deciding any final plan in terms of order, you know, we need to explore the availability of people to work on the PDPs.

So is everybody okay? Anybody not okay with that first bullet? So that's in essence our first recommendation with regard to order. Before you finalize order we should assess availability of workers – of volunteers.

Man: Yeah I think that's a great.

Man: Okay and then we talked about several ideas and I tried to capture those here. And to get back to (Mike)'s question here, you know, this is – what we have here could be our – just throw out these ideas for consideration. And then once we know the availability of volunteers, you know, these ideas could be considered further and a decision made. That's one approach.

If we do that, you know, regardless of whether we do that or not, you know, we probably ought to look at what we have down here. See if we want to change any of the things based on what we have. Notice that I did – in the document at the beginning – put the priorities from the previous work. I just listed them order to the way the recommendations are listed in the table at the beginning.

So hopefully that will help us, you know, kind of evaluate whether we've kind of got them grouped order appropriate – as appropriate as possible to the priorities that were previously assigned.

Man: A quick little added thing and that's on the second and third bullet points. That's where we say – you introduced PDP number 1 and 2 and so on. And I think we should - on track 1 and track 2 under a second bullet - we should not say group 1 followed by group 2.

Man: Oh yeah, yeah, yeah. Thank you. I missed that one didn't I? PDP 1 followed by PDP 2.

Man: And then we got a numbering irregularity too which is in the second idea. We've only got 1, 2, 3, and 4 whereas in the first idea we had a PDP 5 as well.

Man: One of those orphan things.

Man: Yeah so we need to just tidy that up as well. Hold on a second let me get these – the groups changed to PDP. Oops okay I got (Olaf)'s change now. (Mike) what was that again now?

(Mike): Well in the first idea we've got 5 PDPs. And in the second idea we've only got 4.

Man: Well notice that it says in the intro, "After which the individual PDP would be done."

(Mike): Oh never mind.

Man: Yeah that one I did catch. That's okay now if you get – now what we could do, we could actually add an item 3 underneath that shows PDP number 5. That might not be a bad idea. What do you think?

Man: It would just be easier on dyslexic guys like you that don't read paragraphs.

Man: Okay that sounds okay. Lets just add PDP 5 then and I think that works with the intro bullet. Anybody disagree with that?

Man: I think it does make it abundantly clear that the two – all of tracks 1 and 2 when they're completed.

Man: Well it becomes the substance of the track. And kind of vary whether crew 1 – or PDP 1 and 2 – could really be running parallel. Because they would use up a lot of the same people actually.

Man: One and two?

Man: Yeah.

(Mike): One and two or one and three? Looks like one and three running parallel

Man: Well that's the way it's proposed here (Mike). But I think (Tom) if I'm hearing you correctly – what you're suggesting is that instead of doing PDP two after PDP one that PDP one and two be combined. Is that what you're saying?

(Tom): No I just misunderstood what you're saying. So track one and track two would be launched simultaneously and it would be prove one and prove three which would be very – that is something I cannot fully agree with. I thought that one and two would be running parallel – the PDPs. I was kind of confused by the set up.

Man: If I captured this idea correctly – and I may not have...

Man: I think that's maybe what's going on. Because that part of the conversation was sort of confusing for me too. And so I'm wondering whether what we meant to say was that one and two would go in parallel. And then three and four would go in parallel after one and two. And then number five.

Man: By the same group I assume? Same working group?

Man: Yeah.

Man: So what we're – now which one would three go with? Which one would four go with?

Man: Hang on a minute I got to get back to the...

Man: I was thinking that one and three went to one clump of folks – one working group. And two and four – being a little bit more technical – could go to a different group. And so I'm just wondering if the digits didn't get transposed in that.

Man: Yeah let's just do – keep in mind we can adjust it however we think that.

Man: Does that work for you as well?

Man: What was that?

Man: I'm just asking (Tom) if that's the way he sees it too.

(Tom): I'm getting confused by all these numbers. So I'm not sure what we're talking about now. So just to make that clear we talked about PDP.

Man: Instead of groups think of PDPs. Okay which is...

(Tom): Okay I'm going to read it out that is easier. I think that the operational rule enhancements will use the same people as the undoing transfer thing.

Man: The one and four would be together.

(Tom): Yes, one and four would be together. And five and two – that would be the penalties and the dispute policy enhancement – they're pretty close.

Man: And so then we would – so it would be two and five. Two followed by five for track two?

(Tom): Yes.

Man: Yeah that works for me.

(Tom): But maybe we should not use numbers because there are an awfully lot of numbers in that sheet. But just write it out what we think the two tracks should be and in which order they actually come. So that would mean that in parallel we would run – the first thing would be the operational rule enhancement and the dispute policy enhancements. Because we kind of figure that we need two different kind of people for that anyway.

Man: Yeah I think that absolutely for sure. If we drove a stake in the ground on that one first...

(Tom): Yes.

Man: Run that by me again.

Man: So we would do the first and second PDP. I'm going to stick with numbers sorry (Tom). But PDP one and two would run in parallel. The operational one and the policy one would run in parallel.

(Tom): Yes.

Man: So let's drive a stake in the ground as a group on that. And say that those are our two lead offs.

Man: So which two are our lead offs? One and two?

Man: One and two.

Man: So are we moving away from the tracking idea?

Man: No, no and then we got three more divvy up. And then I'm inclined to agree with (Tom) that undoing registrar transfers one goes with the operational one. So four goes after one and then five goes after. And then we leave the new issues as the trailing one which is done after the first four are finished.

Man: Anybody – go ahead (Tim).

(Tim): I'm just trying to gather the reasoning I guess. Just the small objective is why one and two would lead with one and two in parallel over three and – I'm just thinking a little bit about, you know, expectations as far as the priorities. Example the highest rated priorities for – the two highest rated priority elements are actually in number three and then followed by number four.

You know, five I kind of look at as being out there in my opinion. And then, you know, followed by – then one and two are actually the lower priority for our priority stuff. I don't know if that's – someone had said the case for number one and two needing to be somehow replaced or done before three and four make sense. I guess that's the reasoning there.

Man: By the way you are going in a direction I was going to head down anyway. So it's really good that you brought that up (Tim). I think that's what we need to do both in terms of the previous bullet where we listed them in some sort of priority. And in this case we need to evaluate our thinking against the priorities from the previous group. And so your point is really important right now.

And so the highest priority was number four is that right? Yeah probably – they had a 9 and a 6.

Man: Well someone could make the argument that three had 5 and 6 in there.

Man: Oh that's right.

Man: Yeah three has the highest with number 5 and...

Man: Three is the highest. Four may be second highest?

Man: Well that's what I was thinking. It has the third highest rated – well the tides are the second highest rated element in number 6.

Man: Yeah.

Man: But also have the three in number 9 in there.

Man: Well using that then if we isolate PDP three it should go before the two tracks.

Man: I think the tricky bitch here is that we've really got a multi dimensional choice. Because we've got priority which is certainly important. We've also got the nature of the group of people which is important. And we've got the problem that – or the puzzle – that industries which is some of these may need to be done before others can be done. I think those are three different ways to make the choice all of which are equally valid.

Man: One way we could bring this together is we could – and I'm talking just about the second bullet with the two tracks and the one other one – is we could start off with PDP three which is the highest priority. Right? Pretty clear on that one I think. And then we could have tracks one and two. Track one reverse the order of four and one so that four starts off and then followed by one. And then track two I guess could stay the same.

How do the priorities for two and five compare? Let's see – two and five – that's probably okay I think isn't it? It's a debate, you know, you've got – because two has a lot more items. But I would think that we have track two right now – two followed by five – is probably okay. But based on priorities it would be better to reverse four and one in order. And then start off with PDP three.

(Tom): Yeah but PDP three could go endlessly. I mean that are really hard issues. And I mean we do have some kind of an expectancy that the order other people made for us before is being kept. But then again with all this regrouping I don't really see a good way of figuring out which is the most important group by the old prioritization. I would rather make an independent judgment on that actually.

Man: Well all we need to do then – if we go that route (Tom) – is to give some rationale as to why we did that in light of the fact that three is fairly high priority.

(Tom): So why don't we – I mean we don't really have to make a decision on that. I think if we do one and two – bullet point two – and leave the rest out of it. Well first of all we have to figure out what people are available. Then we can kind of see which PDPs will run parallel if that's possible at all. And if not we suggest a serial order. And the council can still pick.

Man: So are you suggesting dropping the tracking idea totally right at this point?

(Tom): I think we will have a hard time to actually figure it out. And if we just suggest something to the council, the council will go through the work

of looking at it and betting about it again. You know, I don't know if you're really doing us a favor. We can debate it now before the council but debate it again.

Man: Other thought?

Man: Yeah I've got – well it's sort of administration thought with hindsight. And what happened when we had three things running parallel regarding transfers. If we do things in parallel the risk for confusion is apparently obvious. I think that's a conclusion we can draw from what we tried to do with the trials as PDP.

Doing that in parallel with all the other activities on prioritization and such and the people respond. One of constituents statements we have two PDPs running in parallel. I feel a little of the same when we're discussing this even right now. The risk of confusion is almost disproportionate to the added complexity. Because it's not so much an added complexity as just sheer fact that we're running things that, well, relate to the same instances in parallel. So I'm inclined to say that perhaps it's better to run it in – to propose a sequential approach. I don't know.

Man: (Ian) that was what I was going to follow up what you're saying with. In other words the one conclusion we could draw from that is that we just recommend a serial approach. Now the draw back to that is it's going, you know, we're going to make less progress. It's going to be spread out over a much longer period of time to cover all these things.

Now if we still think that that's the best way to go that's fine. Which is more important – the confusion risk or the time frame that it might take?

Man: I don't think that confusion risk is overly important. But we have to keep that in mind that it could be said. That would be an argument in favor around the idea of sequentially. I wouldn't say it's a strong argument. But...

Man: No it's a good point. Before we grapple with these others let's look a third bullet – the third main bullet there – third sub bullet. Which says - a third idea is to select a lead PDP that has both technical and policy issues – for example group four – initiate that PDP team and task them with deciding on how to proceed on other PDPs.

Now four was one of the higher priorities, I think we agreed on that. It maybe isn't the highest. But considering all three of these ideas – and realizing that there could be other ways of approaching this as well – anybody have any leaning?

Man: I sort of lean toward the last one in that it sort of does some good things in terms of building that team. And let's them know that the faster the better. But that it's sort of up to them. If they feel they can go faster, great. Figure out a way and in the process of figuring out that way maybe that would reduce some of the confusion issues. But if they can't figure out a way or they do feel it's just really hard to run them in parallel then they do them in sequence and let them do that.

Man: Now before we – I want to pursue that with other people commenting as well. But before we do that let me ask kind of a formatting questions

that somebody kind of hinted at a little bit ago. Would it be better if I called the PDP A, B, C, D, E instead of 1, 2, 3, 4, 5? Or does it matter? We just want to use the titles?

Man: That would reduce the number of numbers.

Man: We've already got numbers used. So from that perspective at least some other denominator is perhaps a good idea.

Man: Yeah it would make it more of an outline format. It would be a lot easier to track and refer to. You know like A-5.

Man: I think it's a good idea (Chuck).

Man: Okay so I'll just write myself a note. We won't take the – I won't try and do that right now and waste everybody's time. So I just wrote myself a note in that regard. So I'll take care of that when I revise this.

So now back to (Mike)'s thought – as I said I'd like to spend some more time on that. Leaning towards recommending the third idea there – what do some of the rest of you think about that?

Man: Well if we read that particular one – whether we call it group four or PDP 4 or PDP D or something – if you read it hasn't this got a particular degree of urgency in the eyes of the users? It's all dealing with undoing high (unintelligible) and all of that.

Man: I think that's one of the appeals. That's certainly why the priority was so high on that first priority setting group.

Man: So from that perspective it sounds like a pretty good idea to start off with that one. Would get people's attention.

Man: And it's got both technical and policy aspects.

Man: (Tim) what's your thought?

(Tim): I agree with that. I think that for a good lead PDP, you know, it even includes an issue that may affect the report on. And it could expose even other issues that might relate back to some of the other elements in the other potential PDPs.

Man: (Tom)?

(Tom): Well actually I'm kind of opposed again to that. I see that four is certainly very important but it's not low hanging fruit. I think the whole world would be a lot better if you would make one and maybe two first. Because it as if people have already have considered – they're easily be done for parts of it at least. You know, and something of being more forward.

I see four as something that can be very contentious and might go for a long run. And so I would rather pick something that where we can have some success.

Man: Well if we go literally by highest priority – again using the other group's work – we could take that third idea. And instead of using group four use group three - or PDP three or PDP C – the new IRP issues as the first case. Now that doesn't involve as much technical and policy like four does. But that may still be okay. What about that approach?

In other words we would change – our primary recommendation would be to start off with the new IRTP issues PDP. And task that team with making recommendations for proceeding with the other PDPs. It's just one more thing to throw into the mix and to deal with (Tom)'s issue there.

Man: I think that, you know, it certainly fits the bill in terms of (Tom)'s approach. I think if I were trying to create a team that was pretty – you know, these three are fairly technical.

Man: The ones on PDP what we're now calling three?

Man: C and the new C.

Man: Yeah.

Man: And I'm certainly okay with that. I get the early success notion for sure.

Man: I don't know that doing that would make for early success because I think recommendation three may get a little bit complicated. And twelve is really more of a policy issue than technical. So actually – three may actually have a mix of technical and policy.

Man: Never mind.

Man: I'd be okay with starting with three instead of four.

Man: (Tom) I agree. It's tough on a team to start on something that's really hard and takes forever. And they get no early feedback that they're doing okay.

Man: There is two issues I have this way. The first one is even if you get it resolved in a timely manner we have a success but it's not really meaningful in terms of making the current process a lot better. So we're dealing with chronic cases actually, you know. Especially with three I don't think that we can find an answer except of no. Because all that is suggested there ...

Man: You're talking about the electronic authentication?

Man: Yeah, yeah. So it's not really fixing any of the problems people deal with right now. And the second concern I would have is I don't think that we really need a group which includes experts in policy making as well as the operational issues. I would think it goes much farther forward if we pick specialists just for one thing and focus on that one thing.

It would be a hard issue to actually bring a tech person together with a lawyer. And that is exactly what will happen. It will not necessarily move in a speed just operational people would or just lawyers would – policy people.

Man: So you're arguing against ...

Man: Yes I'm arguing to...

Man: Combining technical and policy.

Man: I'm really stuck with the idea from the very beginning from bullet part one that we should check on availability. And if there are people available for more than one PDP why not run that in parallel? But aside that I wouldn't spend too much thought on how we might prioritize it. I don't even – I'm not even sure whether that's feasible or not. And when we have that experience from the past that mostly there are only a few people participating in such exercises anyway.

Man: Well now if we go that route – and we're going to continue to discuss this – if we go that route – and regardless of whether – whatever we do I think up there in the first bullet where we say if they need to be done totally serially here is our priorities.

Regardless we're going to have to come up with our own assessment of the five PDPs in terms of priority order. So we'll come back to that. But let's talk about this. Where are other people at? (Tom) it sounds like you're leaning towards just, you know, recommending we assess availability and then with that we need to provide some – our sense of the priorities of the five PDPs. And then just leave it at that I think. Is that correct?

(Tom): Yeah. And actually I would go for everything until the first of the third bullet point where we talking about the idea of ordering. And I like the ordering actually. I think that makes a lot of sense. And I would just cut the rest out.

Man: And cut what out? Let me make sure I'm following you.

(Tom): The rest – the one idea – the total track, you know, and the third idea.

Man: Okay so the last two ideas would be scrapped? Okay.

(Tom): That was my idea. That's something I would feel very comfortable with.

Man: Okay, others?

Man: I could go with that.

Man: I think it's perhaps to simplify things for the council if we come up with three very different ideas we'll have this same discussion in the council on how to approach it. So the closer we can get to a proposal - which is sort of a base proposal rather than a full pallet of options – I think that would be helpful for council.

Man: And those of us on the council could share - if we think it's helpful – the thoughts – some of the thought processes we went through with regard to like the tracking or the third idea and so forth. If we thought it was constructive at the time. Without actually confusing our recommendations by those.

Man: Yeah I think that's right.

Man: (Tim) where you at on this?

(Tim): Well, you know, I'm okay with it. I don't particularly like the order of the grouping and that bullet point.

Man: Well I agree. I think we've got to go back. And I think that's our next step. If we – regardless of what we decide on the other ideas I think

we've got to re look at the order of those five PDPs. So I think you're right on on that.

Man: I have to ask a newbie question. And that is do things like this get assigned leaders before teams get created?

Man: You mean a chair?

Man: Yeah.

Man: Not necessarily. And of course that is a big very important issue in the GNSO improvement effort that's going on that will probably take longer than maybe some of these things to get kicked off. But no often times you get volunteers for the work effort – whatever that might be – and then that group selects a chair.

And in other cases a chair can be appointed up front. That's a process issue that's been kind of loosely handled to date. And I don't mean that unkindly but – and probably will be firmed up more as the GNSO improvements progress happens.

Man: Yeah I mean we've got two sort of basic approaches that we've been using so far. Well just based on the bylaws in the PDPs. And that's one is in all cases it starts off with initial support and then the decision is taken whether to launch a PDP or not. And also at the same time the decision is taken whether to have it as a committee of the whole or to have it assigned a task force. Which then in the future may be called a working group. Just basing on what has been happening so far. And if there is committee of the whole it's usually shared by the chair of the council.

Man: Although we've moved away from that (Olaf).

Man: Yeah we have. And there otherwise – well we may assign a task force or working group. And well it has varied really. A chair has been appointed by the council – that has happened. Or the group has elected it's own chair – that has also happened. So there are quite a few options.

Man: You sort of hit it with this. This is back to the days when I worked for (L&D). And that is that project leaders are kind of scarce. And good ones are really scarce. And in my past experience I would generally want to know who the project leader is before the team gets formed. And then I would to ask the project leader what their preferences are in terms of methodology. Because those things all kind of go together in a mix.

So the reason I was asking that is just to get a sense of whether that first bullet – which we're all pretty agreed on – needs or could benefit from a third actor. Which is we've got the council thing – one thing. We've got the team sort of thing another. And then a project leader also gets to weigh in in terms of how they do the work. But it sounds like that concept of a project leader sort of responsible for the whole shebang is elusive. So I think maybe I will withdraw this for now.

Man: That's probably best at this point. But it's a really valid point. And just to throw a little side recommendation in I would suggest that you seriously – if you're available and willing – consider representing your constituency in the working group model of groups that will probably be formed in the next month of two.

Man: I'd love to do that. I'll ask (Rodenbaugh).

Man: Asking him now might – well you can mention it to him now but keep in mind that it's a little premature. The plans for establishing that working group have been talked about at least by a small subset of people in the GNSO. But it hasn't been serviced to the whole council yet.

Man: Oh okay I'll sit tight.

Man: Your thoughts on this – at least partially – are reflected as well in the GNSO improvements proposal.

Man: Well I didn't mean to derail.

Man: Of course the subjects there and all of that there are scarce resource. And that well – so I think point well taken.

Man: So I mean is there anybody objectionable to go with (Tom)'s suggestion? Keeping in mind that we're going to look at the priorities and the ones revised there - the way it looks now A through E. But in other words we just delete the tracking idea and the third idea. Anybody opposed to that?

Okay I'm going to do that.

Man: We need to reorder the bullets under the last bit there.

Man: Under what last bit?

Man: (Tim)'s point.

Man: Oh yeah that's what I said we're coming back to. Yes okay. Now let's reorder the bullets. You know what I've got listed as one through five right there – the priorities. Now if we literally go by the highest priority from the previous group's work we would put three first. But as (Tom) pointed out that probably isn't a good one to start with.

So would four be the first one based on priorities?

Man: You know I'm not convinced that it's not a good one to start with.

Man: Okay all right.

Man: My personal feeling is it may be some of the harder issues but then how long do we want to put off before we start that? Seems to me the sooner the better because it could be contentious and it could take awhile. And so, you know, let's not wait for six months before we start down the path.

That's another way to think about it. And I think any of those others – even in one – you know that first one about locking, you know, I still think that's going to be much more contentious potentially that what anyone is thinking perhaps. So I think that could happen in any of these. And just as it can happen in any policy that we – development process that we actually perceive.

You know, and I don't know if it's a case where, you know, if we think three is going to be that bad if maybe, you know that gets started, goes

off on its own. And we could look at a completely different group then and figure out how to deal with all the others.

Man: Well another thing we could do with three – I think its recommendation three within that group that (Tom) was concerned about. We could actually move that recommendation somewhere else to deal with that concern. Now I'm not suggesting that I'm just throwing that out as another modification we could make to make three a little more palatable.

Now if we did that though that was – hold on a second let me go back – that would be recommendation six, excuse me recommendation three was fairly high priority though – it was number six in the priorities.

Man: Well no it was really tied for number two. Remember that five is really the top priority. Six and six are tied.

Man: No I was using the priority numbers not order – not an ordinal number.

Man: I'm going to propose the sort of Damocles which would be that take these in the sequence that the priority group essentially has defined. So if you were to do that you didn't have to quibble about whether three or four went first. But one of those two would go first.

Man: Well it seems to me that three is before four if you go by the work of the other group. I don't think that's debatable.

Man: Right and so then I think the easy way to resolve this is to say look at some point all of these have contentious issues in them. Brace yourself

team, you're going to have a hard time and do your best. And here is the order that came out of the priority team.

Man: And keep in mind that depending on the availability of volunteers it is possible that a couple of these things could be done in parallel.

Man: Yeah but we'll have to wait for the teams to form to know that.

Man: So maybe in the bullet we could say, you know, one idea for ordering your PDPs would be based on the priorities of the previous group. And we see that as, you know, 3, 4, 1, 2, 5 or whatever.

Man: Yeah I think that's right.

Man: And maybe with a comment that, you know, some of the other caveats that we've discussed. You know that ...

Man: Yeah we'll probably have to put some language around it. Well and, you know, we might want to even leave the team some leeway to say – as they get into this – to (Tom)'s point. If they get into one of the PDPs and they find that they've got a couple of things that they can move through very quickly maybe they need some sort of mechanism to throw out the hard ones. Or at least proceed with the easy ones to get those off the board. And not hold them hostage to the difficult one that's taking a whole long time. You know, leave them some process leeway to break some of that stuff apart as they go.

Man: Well I have to leave in another five to ten minutes.

Man: Okay let's try and get our priorities.

(Tom): I would really like the idea that we use the former work that has already been done by prioritization. And just put that in as one idea and leave it up to the council to decide on that.

Man: Say that one more time (Tom).

(Tom): That we just do what you suggested. That we kind of put that in as one possible idea to go by the original ordering and that period. And if the council really wants to change something on that – they might, you know, but they might do that anyway. So I think that's okay. I mean we've done some of exercise.

Man: Let's agree on the priorities. I'm concluding – and correct me if I'm wrong – that PDP 3, new IRTP issues would be the first one.

(Tom): Yeah.

Man: Those seem to jump out the clearest to me. Anybody disagree with that?

Man: Nope.

Man: Say again (Chuck) real quick.

(Chuck): New IRTP issues – what we now call PDP 3 – would be first. Because that's got a – what does it got five and six priority rating or whatever? And then four would be second. Just looking at that table at the beginning. Well wait a second – yeah that's right. Those seem to be the clearest ones. It gets a little bit fuzzier after that. Looks like one and

two aren't too terribly different. Which one would you put first – one or two?

Man: I think one would win since we've got a five and a six. No, sorry sorry.

Man: Look at the priorities.

Man: Well oh I'm looking at the wrong.

Man: What does CT stand for? That doesn't make any sense to me. Is it supposed to be CR? You know for the consensus – what was that from that report?

Man: It's something (Rob) came up with to rank it.

Man: I tried to figure out what CT stood for. In the report it actually – CR would have made sense. I think it was the consensus ranking is what it was called.

Man: No actually the consensus ranking is a number. So five would be the consensus ranking. That's where we kind of settled where this position should be.

Man: Why in the report did it – in the recommendations – did they use CT? Shouldn't it be CR?

Man: I have no clue.

Man: CR five point zero or CT ...

((Crosstalk))

Man: I take that as homework for me.

Man: Thanks okay. I was trying to make some sense of that. So what would we put – so we would put...

Man: Here are two factoids. I just averaged those ...

Man: He's doing what he wouldn't let me do.

Man: I know.

Man: Go ahead (Mike).

Man: We've now concluded that we're going to do this and so I am yielding to the broader consensus. And it turns out the average of number 1 is 11.5. The average of number 2 is 11.4 which I will call a statistical tie. And that puts number 5 with a 10 as our next one in this.

Man: That's interesting. Again realizing that the council can look at this in different ways I would be okay with that.

Man: I was kind of looking at it more like, you know, if we were to look at the priorities – the priority of the elements that each of these contained. And we did some regrouping because some of the more lower priority ones it made more sense to group with some of these others. But I don't think lower priority ones added to that reason should diminish the priority of the ones they have been grouped with.

Man: Fine.

Man: Ones that it had been grouped with. Not some other way of looking at it, you know.

Man: You know here is a thought that will really throw everybody into a spin. And that is, you know, I think it's possible that somewhere down the road we might decide that number 5, you know, doesn't even belong in the transfer thing. Because it actually is related to a bigger issue about graduated sanctions blah, blah, blah.

Man: Right.

Man: I don't know if we want to go there now. But, you know..

Man: (Tim) some very good thoughts. Now it's your turn to suggest what would be the third priority.

(Tim): I guess I would go with 3, 4 – and then, you know, really to me it really doesn't matter – 1, 2 then 2, 1 decide last. I think those – there is two higher priorities in number 1. There is just one in number 2 but it's higher than the both in number 1. So it could go either way.

Man: Now did you say the penalties one last?

(Tim): That's my opinion. No matter how we look at it the penalties one should be last in my opinion.

Man: Okay so others what would you put first – one or two?

(Tim): Well I would put one because of the issues – since it's pretty much tied – I think one because it has more impact than what two is going to have. Which is more dealing with, you know, reporting and those kind of things.

Man: I agree. What do others think on that?

Man: Well I am going to chime in now from the business constituencies standpoint. And I know that just don't want to lose the dispute resolution stuff. Because those lads are very keen to keep that, you know, in mind. I don't think I'd throw my body on the tracks on this one. But – and in a way maybe it's better to have it second because then immediately following that would be the penalties one. And people would be in sort of the same frame of mind for that.

Man: So it sound like you might go with one before two and then five last.

Man: Yeah.

Man: And (Tom)?

(Tom): That sounds good to me as far as I understood it. And I really have to go now. But I'm looking for the email to maybe come.

Man: Now before you jump off do you think we can resolve the rest of this through email? Or should we schedule one more call for next week?

(Tom): I think we can do it by email.

Man: Yeah me too. I think we're pretty close.

Man: Okay all right. So that's good and now there is going to be some action items following up this (Tom) so I'll put those in an email that goes out to everybody.

(Tom): That would be great. Okay thanks bye.

Man: Okay so what we have then is that number 1 becomes the third priority. Number 2 becomes – oh I'm sorry, yeah that's right.

Man: That's right.

Man: And two becomes the fourth - and again everybody will get a chance to look at this. And then the penalties one is fifth in priority in our recommendations. Okay now so my action is going to be to clean this document up and get it out to everybody. As well as talk, you know, remind everybody of the action items that we have for everybody. So I've got that one.

(Olaf) you've taken the action item with regard to the CT versus CR or whatever it is. And then (Mike) made the suggestion that we beef up the rationale for the ones we're suggesting no PDP be initiated. Do we have a volunteer who would like to take a crack at that and send it to the list? Or do we want to divvy those up? What's the thinking?

Man: I'd like to volunteer but I'm going to be traveling for the next week and a half. And so I'm not going to be able to do a real good job on it.

Man: Okay.

Man: What is the volunteer going to do?

Man: (Mike) had suggested that for the recommendations that we're not recommending be included in a PDP – there are five of them 11, 13, 14, 15, and 17. Now there are some notes with each one of those. So we have a little bit there. (Mike) is suggesting that should beef up our thinking, you know, our communication of why we suggested those be deleted. And so we need somebody to take a crack at that if we agree that needs to be done.

Man: And who suggested that?

Man: An MIP.

Man: And he's traveling and can't work on it.

Man: That was pretty clever wasn't it?

Man: I don't feel super strongly about this. I think the one thing that we probably want to do is run that – since that's essentially a policy decision – we probably want to run that policy decision by the constituencies again. To make sure we've got buy in on that before we take it to the ...

Man: Well let's not over complicate the process okay. The constituencies are going to be involved via the council on this. And I think that is more than sufficient. If we try to go back now to the constituencies on this and they haven't had our – we're just going to have two enervations of the same discussion - at the council level and the constituency level. I think its better that it all be combined into part of the council process.

The council is going to have to out to constituencies for their input into this. And it's going to have to go out for public comment. I really think that adequately covers your concern there (Mike).

(Mike): Well it's actually not mine. It's actually (Rodenbaugh)'s. So the time to – when you talk to (Rodenbaugh) the next time...

Man: I'll be glad to visit with him about that.

Man: Yeah well we can do that. There will be opportunity for what (Mike) is looking for. We understood that when we formed this group from the very beginning that we're just putting some stuff forward. Now it's up to the council which means the council and the constituencies and the non com reps to decide what to do with what we suggest.

Man: Cool.

Man: I think if that's the case then the need for the beefing up declines precipitously.

Man: (Olaf) you were going to say something. What was your?

(Olaf): Well I just said it. Of course I can have a crack at it – to put it in words. But I can try to expand a little on them.

Man: How about if we have (Olaf) do that – and not spend too much time on it. But if you see some areas where it's fairly easy to do go ahead and put it around to the list for consideration. And we'll continue the dialogue via the list.

(Olaf): And I cut that out of sort of a separate little piece not to confuse any versions that we have on the list for general review.

(Mike): Okay that sounds great. And then I'll try to edit too when I'm on the road.

Man: Now what I'd like to – let's see we're talking about the council meeting is on the 27th. So we should try to have a final document to the council by the 20th if we can. Now there's no mandated requirement then. But it would be nice to get something like this in council's hands a week before the council meeting on the 27th. So that then possibly the council can at least decide how, you know, comment period and constituency statements whatever like that.

And whether or not we may even want to put forward a motion. But we can talk about that on the list.

Man: It seems doable to me.

Man: Okay?

Man: Yep understand it.

Man: All right. Thanks guys this has been a good group.

Man: Okay thank you.

Man: Thanks for being our leader (Chuck).

Man: Yeah.

Man: Back to the question you asked (Mike). How did I become leader? Well you asked for the sign language.

Man: I'd say (Chuck) the curse of competence.

Man: You know it's an example of what (Olaf) was describing. That there is no specific process that is always followed for things like this. This isn't a PDP of course but it is lesson in how these things happen.

Man: Well it does also tend to fall into the let no good deed go unpunished category.

Man: That's true yeah. So okay guys have a good rest of the day.

((Crosstalk))

Man: All right bye.

Man: Bye.

END