

**IRTPC Meeting  
TRANSCRIPTION  
Tuesday 09 October 2012 at 1400 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of IRTPC call on the Tuesday 09 October 2012 at 1400 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.  
The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-irtp-c-20121009-en.mp3>

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

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page  
<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/>

**Attendees:**

James Bladel –RrSG co-chair  
Mike O'Connor – ISPCP  
Phil Corwin – CBUC  
Michele Neylon – RrSG  
Barbara Knight – RySG  
Avri Doria – NCSG co-Chair  
Angie Graves – CBUC  
Simonetta Batteiger – RrSG  
Volker Greimann- RrSG

**ICANN Staff:**

Marika Konings  
Berry Cobb  
Julia Charvolen

**Apologies**

Bob Mountain - RrSG  
Kevin Erdman – IPC  
Chris Chaplow – CBUC  
Roy Dykes – RySG  
Paul Diaz – RrSG                      dfrngb – RrSG      Z  
ahid Jamil  
Hago Dafalla

Coordinator: ...go ahead; we're now recording.

Julia Charvolen: Thank you. Okay so good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the IRTP-C Working Group call on the 9th of October, 2012. On the call today we have Volker Greimann, James Bladel, Mikey O'Connor, Michele Neylon, Avri Doria and Barbara Knight. We have apologies from Hago Dafalla, Roy Dykes, Paul Diaz, Zahid Jamil and Bob Mountain.

From the staff we have Marika Konings, Berry Cobb and Julia Charvolen.

I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking, for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you.

James Bladel: Thank you, Julia. Well done. And welcome to the wonderful whacky world of ICANN.

Julie Charvolen: Thank you very much.

James Bladel: And I see that since that announcement we have - in the room we have Simonetta and Phil Corwin - Simonetta Batteiger and Phil Corwin but I don't know if they're on the call yet so we'll give them just a couple of minutes to join.

So welcome everyone to the IRTP-C PDP Working Group call for the 9th of October and the end; the finish line. The penultimate working group call where we polish up our final report and plan for our meeting and presentation to the community in Toronto which begins - for some of us which will begin here in a couple of days.

So Marika has the latest version of the report on the screen - oh I'm sorry, I skipped right over our usual ceremonial things; does anyone have any

updates to their SOIs? Kind of late for that in this part of the game but thank you.

And then does anyone have any concerns or additions or comments on our agenda? Okay we'll consider that adopted. Thanks.

So Marika has posted the latest version of our working group - or I'm sorry, our working group final report in the window in Adobe. And this final version also includes some very, very last-minute, under-the-wire modifications from Mikey that was submitted to the mailing list oh less than 15 minutes ago. But, you know, Mikey promises me that they're mainly polishing and stylistic additions and that there's very - there's nothing in the way of material changes or anything.

But what we'd like to do for this call is go through these changes; not necessarily read the entire report. Honestly we're well beyond that and hopefully everyone has done that multiple times by now and has many of these sections, including the recommendations, tattooed to the inside of their eyeballs.

But at this point we'd like to read through the changes, make sure that everyone agrees that they are acceptable and we'll tear through those and then we'll get to our finalized wrap-up items on the agenda.

So, Marika, if you would kick is off please? And I'll just kind of - if you read through the changes I'll keep an eye on the queue. We'll stop every couple of pages to make sure that we don't have any hands raised. And assuming that everyone is in agreement - silence is agreement; you only need to raise your hand if you object or spot a problem either in the changes or perhaps around the changes. So with that perhaps, Marika, if you could walk us through and I'll watchdog the queue.

Marika Konings: Yes, thanks, James. So this is Marika. So the first change we see on Page 4 in the Executive Summary and I think this is a change that will come back again in the body of the report. But this follows the discussion we had on last week's meeting which was a modification of one of the sentences related to which method to use for authentication.

So we deleted there a part and have replaced that by using a generally accepted method of authentication. And I think this has been corrected in several parts where the same language was used.

Also added here is a footnote to clarify that when we talk about registrants that we mean the registered name holder as has been defined in the Registrar Accreditation Agreements.

And moving further down on Page 5 you see here the same correction halfway down the page which is basically, you know, replacing that same language from the previous version with the sentence of, "Use a generally accepted method of authentication."

Moving further down then to Page 6 here you see the addition of a paragraph that talks about in which case the Registrar may waive the requirement at the request of the registrant. This is, again, language that was crafted on last week's meeting and I think represents a compromise between the different positions on this particular topic. So that goes into Page 7 as well.

I'm not seeing any hands. I'll just move further down. Then on Page 8 you see a couple of things which are just minor corrections to the language from Mikey in note (i).

And going further down then Page 9 there are a couple of changes here from Mikey. I think the first one represents, again, more language thing; he's changed security in our industry to - for securing domain transfers and corrected an "of" which should be a "for."

And I think the next one then is a more substantial one is basically on Recommendation Number 4 he has added there a comment that states - this is in relation to implementation review team - which states, "The working group suggests that consideration be given to including recommended security experts such as interested members of the SSAC in the implementation team."

James Bladel: This is James. I raised my hand just to point out that that is probably something that we discussed but is a more material change that Mikey is proposing very last-minute here. Wanted to see if there's any thoughts on that. I don't think that there's any issues there.

I would say instead of, you know, I have mixed feeling about, you know, singling out the SSAC. I mean, I understand that's the purpose here but we could just say including recognized security experts. You know, but that - I don't feel very strongly about it.

Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. I have a bit - a similar concern or reservation maybe because I think the idea indeed behind the implementation review team is that it consists of members that have been closely involved in the discussions on the recommendations.

But having said that of course nothing prevents an implementation review team when it's, you know, discussing with staff, to invite experts to that discussion.

But I'm, you know, my sense would be that it's more appropriate to do that as part of the discussions between implementation review team and staff to identify, indeed, what expertise is missing or lacking because maybe some of that expertise is already present within staff or, you know, within the

implementation review team. So I'm not really sure whether calling that out here is, you know, the appropriate place to do that.

James Bladel: Okay I see a checkmark from Avri and Mikey. Avri, are you agreeing with the language or agreeing with Marika?

Avri Doria: I was agreeing with both you and Marika in terms of implementation teams being members...

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: Okay thanks. I didn't see when the checkmark went up...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: I think they can always reach out to experts for expert opinion; that's different than being a member of the team. Sorry I jumped Mikey.

James Bladel: Okay, thanks. And we'll go to Mikey and then Simonetta. Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: The only thing I was trying to capture there was a conversation we had I think either last week or the week before. And I don't feel real strongly about this. But I think one of the things that we do want to do is acknowledge that none of the people in this working group are recognized security experts.

And the concern that I am trying to head off is that, you know, the security community wakes up and says well there's a gigantic hole in what you guys have proposed. When did we get to fix that? So that's why I worded it pretty mushy. Consideration be given rather than, you know, do anything.

But, you know, I don't have strong opinions about this one. And certainly the SSAC thing that was, again, just a recollection of something that was said on the call but I don't care about that either.

James Bladel: Okay. Simonetta, you're next.

Simonetta Batteiger: Sorry, had to unmute myself. I think the idea that Marika raised is the important thing to stress here that we intend to have staff work closely with people in this workgroup to come up with the final policy piece. And this additional sentence kind of puts a different spin to this and kind of suggests that we were - we would be more worried about the security aspects of this.

So maybe it could be worded a different way such that the paragraph really captures that the most important thing we're all concerned with is that this should be done in close collaboration with people in this working group. And we would suggest that a security expert's advice is sought out for the aspects of this implementation where it touches on like - I mean, I guess what you're referring to, Mikey, is like the secure way to retrieve someone's consent to an opt-out policy and things like that.

So I think that the idea that you wanted to capture is that we should look for advice. But I wanted to make sure that this doesn't read as that that's the main point here; the main point here is that we want to make sure that the people who were in this working group who know what the intent of these recommendations were are going to be a part of the implementation review team.

James Bladel: Okay thanks, Simonetta. And, Avri, you're next.

Avri Doria: Yeah, thanks. After I finished talking I started looking at it and listening and I'm wondering if we could amend the statements there by two words to replace "including" with "consulting" and "implementation team" with "by the implementation team."

So consideration be given to consulting recognized security experts such as by the implementation team. Would that tone it down enough? I see Mikey has a check there so maybe...

James Bladel: I see lots of green checkmarks. And in fact that's exactly where I thought we were kind of landing on this as well, Avri. So, Marika...

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: ...did you capture that?

Marika Konings: Yes, I got that.

James Bladel: I think that's exactly what we were aiming at...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: ...I just wanted to give words.

James Bladel: Yeah. That's exactly, I think, where we were going is consulting. And I also didn't want to open up the possibility - and I know this is not what Mikey was driving at - but the possibility that if the implementation review team did not include a member of the SSAC or some recognized security expert that somehow what was coming out of it would be invalidated by that or something.

So - and I'm sure that's not what we were going for so - but I think Avri's language captures that. And I think that we can move on.

Marika Konings: Okay so this is Marika again. Moving on then. The next change I see is on Page 10 at the bottom. Again I think this is more a substantive edit that Mikey made where he added, "The working group suggests that the drafting team

charter - writing the charter for the next IRTP working group consider the possibility of consolidating all remaining IRTP issues into one PDP."

And if I can maybe make the first comment on this one because I know this is something that we didn't discuss but - that we did discuss but I on purpose didn't include that in the report as the report itself is really focused on, you know, IRTP Part C.

What I did do I've prepared a draft motion for the GNSO Council on the adoption of the report which also includes the requests for an issue report on the next IRTP where I have indeed grouped all the remaining issues into that PDP, you know, under the assumption that this is something the working group would talk about to the Council at its meeting in Toronto and explaining the rationale of, you know, why you're making that suggestion.

And I just want to clarify as well the idea behind the motion is it's not the idea to have that motion already formally submitted at this stage but merely to provide a document to start discussing from.

So in order to allow for some time to make those changes instead of what has happened in the past where a motion would get submitted and then people would have loads of comments and would try to make changes while there would also be a time limit at the same time when a motion would need to be considered or voted upon.

So what we've done in previous PDPs is actually, you know, provide a draft motion together with the report as a starting point for discussion and then, you know, have enough time to fine tune that so it can be formally - so it can get formally submitted for the next meeting.

So I'm happy to share what I've prepared which is basically based on, you know, the adoption of the previous IRTP recommendation. So just a note that it's captured in there and that's why, you know, I didn't call it out in the report.

James Bladel: Okay thanks, Marika. And, Avri, go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yeah, two things. One, I think I agree with Marika's way of working it. It isn't really part of the chartered work. And so being outside the chartered work I think putting it in as part of the recommendations or conclusions is the wrong place; I think putting it in the motion is indeed the right place so I like that idea.

The other question I have here - and I know we're not supposed to be adding things to it. But because we just talked about that implementation team is something about creating that implementation team, which is a subgroup, a next step? Or does that wait until after the thing has gone all the way through to the Board and back and then we think about it? And that's really just a question but if anything that would strike me as a next step. Thanks.

James Bladel: Since Avri said exactly what I was thinking about whether or not this belongs in the report versus the motion I'm going to lower my hand. But I would ask Marika, is that also in the motion, the question forming the call for the implementation review team?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. That is also specifically called out. But basically what it, I think, says and what's done as well in previous occasion that the working group is actually formed following the adoption by the ICANN Board of the recommendations.

And at that point the GNSO Secretariat would issue a call for volunteers, you know, to the members of the working group. This is basically, as well, to avoid like should there be any changes between, you know, the Council adoption and the Board because, you know, there is still a public comment period that happens between the Council and the Board.

There might be, you know, there might be recommendations that are going to be sent back to the working group, you know, if the Council doesn't disagree so - or doesn't agree with them. So this is just to make sure that, you know, once that implementation review team forms the recommendations are final and it's clear what that group is going to look at.

And just on Simonetta's question that she posted in the chat - I've posted on the right side in the note part what are the remaining issues also adding the one that was suggested by this working group to be considered as part of the next PDP.

James Bladel: Okay thank you, Marika.

Marika Konings: And maybe to add as well I'm happy, you know, by the end of - you know, if we have time to pull up the draft language for the motion. But I said it basically reflects what's already, you know, in the report here. And then the two items on the formation of the implementation review team and then the request for an issue report on the next PDP outlining these one, two, three, four, five, six issues.

James Bladel: Okay. Okay thank you. And during our discussion I noticed that all parties involved had a green checkmark at one point or another so I'm going to assume that everyone is okay with removing this particular section - particular sentence here and putting that into the motion as opposed to the report since the flurry of green checkmarks for that as well.

So if we can then move to, I believe, the next change, which is - I mean, aside from some grammatical stuff on Page 12.

Marika Konings: I think then we just basically get to changes that we already discussed as part of the Executive Summary. One thing that needs to be updated following this call is, you know, the numbers of meetings attended on Page 21 and 22.

And I think then the next change is another correction by Mikey on Page 24 changing "variety" to "variation" I think is more a language style issue.

Then the next change I have, again, is on Page 26 which is, again, adding the footnote on the - what we mean with the registrants, which we already saw before.

And then again on Page 27 which is also the same as we already saw in the Executive Summary the adding of the using a generally accepted method of authentication in the two places.

And then again on Page 29 adding the paragraph on the exceptions or in which the Registrar may waive the requirement which is, again...

James Bladel: And just pointing out to everyone following that these are mirrors of changes that we made in the Executive Summary; just copy paste.

Marika Konings: Exactly. And then again on Page 30 you see, as well, the changes that Mikey made that were also already the same ones that came up in the Executive Summary. Then again the changes that Mikey made - you see on Page 33, again, I think these are just style language issue and just a correction where I had "of" instead of "for."

And I think then we just get to the Section 7, Conclusions, on Page 39 where, again, the same changes were added as we already saw in the Executive Summary and as well in Section 5. I don't think anything else was changed here.

And then I guess we just need to update the one - the Recommendation Number 4. We just need to update that as well as we just discussed on changing including to consulting into by the implementation team to reflect that.

And I think that was all. I did notice that I think Rob Golding just sent some edits to the mailing list. But I quickly had a look at them and I think these were comments he already sent before and I think these have already been incorporated in this final draft.

James Bladel: Can we check that offline and just confirm that that's the case or is there a danger, I guess, that he did suggest something material and that we need to take a look at it now.

Marika Konings: Yes, we can have a look at that now if you want. I think on the first two already confirmed - I don't know if anyone has his email at hand. Because his first comment relates - and maybe it's easiest to go back to the Executive Summary on Page 8.

His first comment says that it should be - "The working group concludes the FOAs, once obtained by a gaining registrar, should be valid for 60 days." And he says it should be up to a maximum or no longer than 60 days. And this is something we already corrected because it currently reads, "Should be valid for no longer than 60 days."

Then his second comment relates to the - there was - twice there was an A in there that didn't - it belonged there it was just a spelling and I double checked that wasn't there either.

Then he notes that, "Transfers executed or if there is a dispute filed for the domain name or if the domain name is renewed," which I think is covered in there as well. Actually that one we don't have so that's maybe one point we need to look at.

So if you look at the - on Page 8 the last paragraph it says there, "In addition to the 60-day maximum validity restriction FOAs should expire if there is a change of registrant or if the domain expires or if the transfer is executed or if there is a dispute filed for the domain name."

I think Rob was saying that this should also include - or if the domain name is renewed.

James Bladel: Well I think that's an interesting case. And I - I'll let Simonetta go ahead. Simonetta.

Simonetta Batteiger: I disagree with the domain name renewing because that's kind of like the - it conflicts with this option to opt into an automatic renewal of FOAs. If you are someone who's holding domain names and wants to actually list them for sale and trade them you renew them all the time obviously and you wouldn't want to be burdened by having to then renew something with the FOAs as well.

I don't know why we would have to have an FOA expire if the thing is getting renewed because the owner doesn't change, the person still wants to do something with this. So I don't know what benefit there would be to have this thing expire.

I mean, obviously when the registrant changes or if it - if something else is changing with the name but a renewal is basically a continuation of ownership and I wouldn't see why an FOA, in that case, should expire.

James Bladel: Okay thank you, Simonetta. I put my hand up because I agree. I think that renewal is maybe a case that I don't understand why that would necessarily precipitate the expiry of an FOA. The renewal, I think, is, you know, explicitly different in its intention - an explicit renewal or an auto renew, you know, I think it should be fine to leave the FOA valid over that idea.

And then I also think that that's a pretty material change to be dropping into this conversation at this stage of the game. So I would like to suggest that we thank Rob and just leave it as-is. That's my opinion. But I would defer to the

group. I see one checkmark. If anyone has any strong objections to that I think we can move on.

Marika Konings: Yeah and this is Marika. So then his next edit relates to the last sentence on the same page on Page 8. It now says, "In order to preserve the integrity of the FOA there cannot be any opt-in or opt-out provisions for these reasons for expiration." And he suggests changing that to, "In order to preserve the integrity of the FOA there cannot be an opt-in or opt-out provisions for these reasons of the FOA." And I think that's - no...

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: "...expiration of the FOA."

James Bladel: ...FOA expiration?

Marika Konings: Yes. Well and he's suggesting...

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: ...this requirement with of the FOA. So it would read - the end would be, "There cannot be any opt-in or opt-out provisions for these reasons for expiration of the FOA."

James Bladel: Yes, I think that is clarifying because otherwise expiration here is not clear if you're talking about the FOA or the domain name. So I think that is a clarifying statement and that does make sense.

Mikey disagrees. Mikey, please help me out here because I see when it says for expiration. I don't know that it's clear that we're talking about FOA or domain names the way it reads. Oh now he's changing to a green checkmark. Okay Mikey, you've thoroughly got me confused. Oh okay he's

agreeing. Okay all right good. I think that we can accept that. I think that makes sense and it is a confusing sentence without that change.

So what else does Rob have?

Marika Konings: Yeah, and I think that was it. I mean, the last one is just where we missed a space. And I think that was already corrected as well under I think in the next sentence. There was a space missing before but - and I think that was it; there's nothing else in the email.

James Bladel: Okay fantastic. And I don't see that email so I must not have received it yet.

Avri Doria: Yeah, I don't see it either.

James Bladel: Very interesting.

Marika Konings: I mean, he sent it to me directly and copied the mailing list so maybe that's why it's taking a little bit longer to get to all of you. But I got it in my inbox 11 minutes past 4 or, you know, my time so 11 minutes into this call.

James Bladel: Well thank you for helping us bend the time and review those changes before they've even hit our inbox or hit the mailing list. But okay so that's our report. And I think that, you know, for the most part Mikey's and Rob's additions were improvements.

So any other final comments on this? We'll take a queue for a few minutes here and just discuss the changes in total. Avri, go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yeah, hi. I may have missed it but do we have a statement in here that indicates the consensus level of these recommendations? In my quick - in my quick skimming of it I didn't see that.

James Bladel: That's kind of where I was going next.

Avri Doria: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: I see Mikey's pointing out that it's in the body. Marika's got her hand up. I was wondering if we could highlight that or showcase that a little bit earlier but go ahead Marika.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. It's in Section 7 on the conclusions and next steps. But, I agree, it probably would be good to call it out as well in the Executive Summary. Basically there we say all the recommendations listed below have full consensus support from the working group. I think that's easy just to pull it out and add it as a note to the Executive Summary if people agree.

James Bladel: I think that's a good idea; I think that's an excellent catch, Avri. And, Marika, if you could highlight that in the Executive Summary. You know, where you feel it's most appropriate but I think it's when, you know, at the introduction of the recommendations in the Executive Summary.

And want to make sure that everyone is - once again reiterate that full consensus at this point, you know, I think we left the window open for any rough consensus with minority support. We received no minority statements or indications of minority statements.

Of course we could declare that some of these recommendations have unanimous support. But I think that's hair-splitting honestly between full consensus and unanimous support and would probably be another couple of months to source out - flush out all those differences. So hopefully no one has any objections to full consensus as the designation for all recommendations.

Marika.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. And no objection but I just realized that actually if you go to Section 5 for each of the recommendations I've added, as well, a sentence on the level of consensus for this recommendation. And there I've actually used unanimous consensus support. So I'm understanding from your suggestion that you prefer to change that to full consensus support?

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: I think full consensus is a more appropriate characteristic or characterization of what we've reached. I know that we have a lot of folks who would not necessarily be comfortable saying that they unanimously support all the recommendations but I think we've reached a point or language where everyone can live with these recommendations.

Avri, co-chair, please yank back on my leash and put me in my place please.

Avri Doria: No, no, no, well I think I'm agreeing - actually I tend to believe that full and unanimous pretty much mean the same thing but unanimous is a scarier word. So I would tend towards the use of full.

I also think that full is the word that's in the guidelines though I may be remembering wrong. So I think using the - is that beeping mine or somebody else's?

James Bladel: Yeah, I'm not sure where that's coming from.

Avri Doria: Okay, okay it's not just me though. Okay so I'm not hallucinating. So I would go with the word full. Perhaps I would do a quick reminder of what the proper word was listed in the guidelines for, you know, full, i.e. where there's no specific rough consensus, disapproval or second comment in there as opposed to the word unanimity which is a scary word even though I think it means the same as full consensus.

James Bladel: Right, okay great. Marika.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. Just for the record I just pulled up the Working Group Guidelines and it actually says there, you know, the different designations that exist like full consensus when no one in the group speaks against a recommendation in its last readings.

This is also sometimes referred to as unanimous consensus so I think it confirms what Avri was saying that they're basically the same thing although people might feel more comfortable hearing - talking about full consensus.

James Bladel: Got it. Okay thanks. And I think we've reached full consensus on the definition of full consensus.

Okay so any other thoughts, concerns, comments, edits - well, no, edits, no it's too late for that. Any other feedback on this report? I think we're ready to put a bow on this with the changes that we've discussed today and call this complete.

The queue is clear. Thank you very much, everyone. And thank you especially to staff, Marika, for holding the pen and doing all of the heavy working - lifting and for all the folks who contributed the breakout and diagrams and slide shows and training and case studies and sub teams and all of the other materials that go into annexes and appendices and supporting materials.

Those are by no means an afterthought. I think that they constitute the foundation on which this report and these recommendations are based. So thanks, everyone, for that.

Okay next up is our discussion of what we're going to be doing this time next week or actually a little later this time next week in Toronto. There is - I think

we have missed the deadline to submit this report for Council but I don't know that that was necessarily our objective. I think what we wanted to do was get this out for discussion and present this to the community in Toronto.

But - oh, Marika, I see your hand is up so that probably means I've strayed off the reservation here a little bit so go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. And Mikey already posted in the chat as well the deadline is actually today so we are on time. And my intention is, indeed, to clean up the document as we discussed and get this submitted to the GNSO Council together with the draft motion so they can actually start discussing this in Toronto.

And, you know, in addition to the update that's scheduled on the weekend session it's also on the agenda for the Wednesday public meeting, you know, really with the idea of getting the different constituencies and stakeholder groups to talk about these recommendations so that hopefully at the next meeting, you know, they might be ready for adopting them providing that, you know, they don't identify any serious concerns or issue with the recommendations or the process by which they were developed.

James Bladel: Okay thank you. So, no, I thought that was the plan as well but my takeaway from I think it was the last call or the one before was that we may have missed that. But if you think we can still get it in there and we've got some space reserved for it that's great.

I didn't want councilors to grumble, grumble that, you know, we were dropping this on them last minute. But it seems like that they're at least aware that it's coming and probably fully expect that there won't be a vote on this report to adopt it at this meeting; that it will probably be deferred until the next meeting so all councilors have had a chance to review.

But, no that's even better so we'll have this considered by the Council over - during their working sessions over the weekend. I'm sure that they will want an update so I'm hoping that everyone who is available will attend that session.

And then - oh, Avri, go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yeah, I just wanted to ask a question, whether they are precluded from voting on it or if it's getting in in time with a motion in time they could actually vote on it. And I'm not trying to rush them but at this point the smaller number of days we've done it in the happier I am.

James Bladel: I think - and I see Marika has got her hand up. I think that they could vote on it; I'm assuming that they won't. But Marika.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. It would actually require someone to make the motion. At this stage I'll just be submitting it as a draft. You know, my thought here was - and again I said, you know, this is based on previous experience with PDP motions that, you know, we do have this triggering event, which I think is also in the PDP manual that, you know, there's only so many delays you can have once a motion is made and especially when it comes to PDP votes.

So what we've done in some of the past PDPs is actually, you know, put out a draft first and have them discuss and make sure everyone's comfortable with it before actually formally putting it on the table because then you get into a situation where the motion is formally made, it's harder to make changes because then you need to go into voting rounds.

And sometimes it becomes, you know, the difficult and hard discussions while, you know, people actually agree on the substance of it. So the idea would be especially, as well, as we're so close to the meeting in Toronto to maybe just have this as a draft for this meeting with the full intention of having

this submitted as a formal motion for the next one. And hopefully then as well there's no need for deferral as there has been plenty of time to discuss it.

But of course as the same time, you know, if someone wants to pick it up immediately and, you know, after I send it and submit it formally that's an option too. And then, you know, there will be - if it gets submitted, indeed, in time by the deadline, which I think is today - I don't know if there's a UTC time associated with it or it's just, you know, wherever you are on the 9th of October.

It does mean that a formal vote will be called although my guess would be that it's quite likely that a deferral will be asked for as, you know, there's little time between now and Toronto for everyone to really digest the recommendations and discuss them in detail I guess.

James Bladel: You know, I see Avri's got her hand up and I'll defer to her in a moment. I would actually prefer to get this submitted and moved and seconded if you can do that. I can certainly get - I mean, I'm sure we can all go back to our reps and ask them pretty please to, you know, to get this moved with the understanding that it would be deferred until the next meeting.

Avri, go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yeah, except for that last sentence I think I agree with you. I don't think we should presume, you know, we've worked really hard to keep moving in good time. To sort of say at this point and oops, the poor councilors they'll need an extra month because it's a month between meetings I think is unfortunate.

They do have two days, there is a constituency day. Okay if they can't and one of them does want to defer it, you know, (unintelligible). But if we wait a month they still will defer it by a month so it'll be deferred for another month and we've added two months that don't need to be added.

And so it's somewhat outside the concerns of this group and more the concerns of the success of the PDP process and are we learning to do things quickly and efficiently in G-Council and the GNSO.

So I would prefer to see us get the motion on the table. If they defer it they defer it a month; if they don't even better.

James Bladel: Okay thanks. No I think it's a good point. It's better to ask for forgiveness than permission. Let's give it to them, let's ask them to move it and if they defer it well then that's their call but we shouldn't lead them down that path.

Marika, you're up.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. You know, I'm perfectly happy with that. But I've put up on the screen and, you know, just to put a caveat, of course, I haven't made the changes in here yet that we agreed upon today and, you know, some of the little wordings in some of the recommendations. But maybe it's helpful to just briefly take you through the draft motion as it stands.

So basically (unintelligible) the first, you know, the whereas clauses talk more about the process that has led up to this, you know, mentioning that recommendations have received the full consensus of the working group, you know, noting that the working group - or the Council has reviewed and discussed the recommendations.

And then it basically moves into the resolve clauses where the first one is that the GNSO Council recommends to the ICANN Board of Directors and there it basically just has the language of the different recommendations. I think I still need to clean it up a little bit. I've just, you know, done a copy paste.

But it basically needs to reflect that it's the Council that is recommending this to the Board. So I just need to clean it up I think in Recommendation 2 and going forward. And then the resolved B relates to, you know, the convening of

an implementation review team as we discussed once the Board has adopted the recommendations.

And then Resolved C is in relation to requesting the issue report on the Part D. now in order to keep the train moving make sure that all of you are still ready and available when we get to the working group stage for that one and as said, you know, identifies the six different remaining issue - or five remaining issues as well as the sixth one that was identified by the working group assuming that, you know, this is something you'll talk to the Council about in the update you'll provide them in Toronto for, you know, your reasons of putting these all together.

Avri Doria: I have a question.

Marika Konings: Go ahead. I don't know if we lost James in the mean time of he's on mute.

Avri Doria: Yeah, and I think this comes out of Simonetta's question is I'm concerned if we include the wording of all the recommendations in the motion then it becomes something for G-Council to tinker with.

If we resolve that the GNSO Council, you know, receives the final report with blah, blah, blah, thanks and a thing and recommends the adoption of Recommendations, you know, 1-N as documented in the report, A, it makes your writing easier in terms of making sure that things that change in one place don't change for another. It includes it by reference but not explicitly.

And because tinkering with the language in motions is a G-Council sport. And I would prefer - unless there's some new need that I haven't grasped yet to actually include the specific recommendations because it starts to get really long and wordy when we have things like not only the steps but then the notes in a motion it makes it - it makes it ponderous and it makes that motion language, which is G-Council's prerogative - to tinker with.

James Bladel: Okay thanks - thanks, Avri. So do - I think - I tend to agree if that makes Marika's work a lot easier and it gets us further down the road. So any concerns with that approach, Marika?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I've just looked at previous motions that we've done. And, you know, I can have a quick check with our legal counsel if there's any reason indeed why it has to be in the motion itself or, you know, if there's no reason at all to have it there, you know, from my personal perspective it sounds as good to me because indeed it is easier.

And it really makes the report itself, you know, the authoritative document on the recommendations. But I said, you know, just with the caveat that I'll try to have a quick check to see if there's any real strong reasons why it really should be in the motion. You know, then I can redraft this and change it accordingly.

Avri Doria: Sorry to make extra work but...

Marika Konings: No, this might be easier just taking it - it's easier than having to go word by word.

Avri Doria: And I really do worry about the tinkering.

James Bladel: Yeah and I agree and I think Mikey's weighing in as well on the chat that I think we've all - I don't want to say we've seen that before but we've, you know, we've entered that territory before and it's always caused some interesting discussions so I agree.

So - and, Marika, I think you're right it not only, as Avri stated, it doesn't make this drafting of this motion easier but it probably makes future motions easier as well.

Okay and apologies for being on mute before. But so we have a report. We have a motion. We have a plan to introduce the motion and everyone is going out to their councilors today and letting them know that this will be - this is in the pipeline and this will be coming across the Council mailing list here shortly.

We have a plan to meet in Toronto. We will present this report to the community. I fully expect that there will be questions and possibly even objections to some of our recommendations based on things that we're - we've already discussed.

So I would encourage all members of the working group please try to attend. I know that these schedules are very challenging. But if you could please try to attend because I think the more diversity of opinions that we bring to that community working group anyone who has any strong objections or concerns in the - in that session - will hopefully find, at least one friendly member of the working group that shares that concern and that can help to mollify those objections.

When is this one? I believe it is on Wednesday or maybe Thursday, Avri. I don't have my calendar in front of me, I'm sorry. Anyone have that handy?

Marika Konings: Yes, James, this is Marika. I think we're talking about three different meetings basically because we have an update to the GNSO Council that's scheduled for Saturday from 2:30-3:00 local time.

James Bladel: Right.

Marika Konings: So that's more the informal discussion, comparison slides for that where, you know, you present the final report and the recommendations where the Council can ask questions.

Then on Tuesday, sorry, Wednesday morning we also have an IRTP Part C update scheduled more in tended for the community to present the final report and the recommendations, which I believe is from 8:30-10:00 local time.

James Bladel: Yeah.

Marika Konings: And then there's also the GNSO Council meeting on Wednesday afternoon where the report is also on the agenda. And I think that meeting starts like at 3:00 or something but I think it's later on in the agenda and there's a question of keeping an eye on which topic they are because sometimes the agenda is switched around a bit depending on, you know, people that are available to present the different issues. But it's on the agenda for now.

James Bladel: And I would specifically - yeah, and thank you for summarizing those three sessions. I was specifically speaking to the session with the community on Wednesday. But, yes, those other two sessions are also important obviously because they're councilors and they're going to be voting on this stuff so ideally so excellent.

Okay so again if we could - and, Marika, perhaps if someone on your team could send that out to the mailing list just those schedules and remind folks that they're welcome and encouraged to attend and that the more the merrier from this working group.

I think that would be fantastic and folks can be thinking about that now as they're setting up their schedules and meetings unless they're like me and they're schedule for Toronto was etched in stone about a week ago.

Marika Konings: Yes, and this is Marika. I'll do that. And you should also expect to receive remote participation details for those of you that are not able to attend in person.

James Bladel: Yes, always encourage remote if you can't be there in person. Thanks. Okay so that brings us to the end of our agenda of our last meeting with 10 minutes to spare.

I just wanted to personally thank everyone that has made all these Tuesday calls. You know, especially given the somewhat density of the material and the things that we had to untangle. I really appreciate the dedication of all the folks that kept coming to these calls, that kept raising their opinions and working towards resolution.

One of the things about these IRTP calls, at least in my experience - this is the third one - is that the folks on these calls really work towards a compromised solution. I think that there is a genuine and sincere desire for all elements in the stakeholder to - all the stakeholders and all the elements of the community to really get some of these issues worked out.

I contrast that with perhaps some other more controversial issues where, you know, it seems like we hit impasses very easily and just can't find the ways to bridge those gaps. And I think that has not been the case with the IRTP and that's very fortunate and I think also a testament to just how well everyone works together and the good faith effort that everyone's putting into this process.

We did complete this effort I want to say right around a year. I think, you know, that's good; that's a pretty good pace. I think in the ICANN culture there's this idea that PDPs take, you know, 18 months if not longer.

I don't think there's any reason why we have to take that long. There are a couple of things that are built into the PDP process that have fixed timelines like comment periods, etcetera but I don't think that's necessarily the case.

So I would hope that coming out of this group that all the members would be ambassadors for an expedited PDP process especially given the criticisms

that we often hear about PDPs are just ways to bury issues so that there's no progress on them.

I think that we can all of us if we ever hear someone make that comment can hold up the IRTP as an example of how the process can be executed correctly and effectively with a quality output and in a decent amount of time.

And of course none of that works without the folks who do this as part of their day jobs so thank you to Marika, to Berry, to Nathalie, to Glen, to Julie, who just joined us, and to all of the folks on staff who help and very much appreciate that.

And look forward to - I see Avri wants to make some closing statements as well. But I just would add that, you know, I hope that we can find the time where we can meet in the lounge somewhere in Toronto and toast to the completion of this project so thanks. Avri go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yeah, thanks. Definitely want to, you know, support everything you said. I'm especially thrilled - I think the fastest one by the current PDP definition could do one is six and a half to seven months. With three substantive issues on it, 12 months is really remarkable. I don't know for sure but I think we'll hold the record at least for a while. I know that's not what it was all about but that's a good thing.

What I really wanted to say though is you thanked everybody. As your co-chair who did far less of the work than you did I want to thank you for sort of the load you carried on this and the way you sort of, you know, made sure we made it so - and brought us to the consensus point so thank you too in addition to thanking everybody else.

James Bladel: Thanks, Avri. I appreciate that. And, you know, I think one of the - one of my takeaways from this group experience was that investing one or two calls at the beginning to hash out a work plan is I think a really good investment and I

would hope that since everyone on this working group will probably participate in future working groups, IRTP-D, and some of you will probably be chairs and stuff I would just point out that I think that really bought us a lot of time. So thanks again, everyone, and thanks for those kind words; it's very gracious, Avri.

And I'm sure that this is not the end. I know that several of us are already lining up for the implementation team and for IRTP-D. And I know Avri and I have - and perhaps some others - have new careers now as diplomats, which is a whole different story.

But anyway I don't have anything else to say except for thank you and we made it and congratulations everyone.

Marika Konings: Thanks, James.

Man: Thank you.

James Bladel: So with that let's end the call and we'll see everyone in Canada. And hopefully everyone has safe and uneventful travels. And we'll see you there.

Avri Doria: Okay bye-bye.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, James.

Woman: Thank you, bye.

Simonetta Batteiger: Thank you. Bye.

END