GNSO
Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy A PDP Jun08 Working Group teleconference
17 February 2009 at 15:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy A PDP Jun08 Working Group teleconference on 17 February 2009. 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-20090217.mp3
http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#feb

Participants present:
Paul Diaz - Working Group Chair - Networksolutions Registrar c.
Mikey O'Connor - CBUC
James Bladel - Godaddy
Barbara Steele - Registry c.
Sébastien Bachollet - ALAC

Absent Apologies:
Kevin Erdman - IPC

Staff:
Olof Nordling - Director, Services Relations and Branch Manager, Brussels office
Marika Konings - Policy Director
Glen de Saint Géry - GNSO Secretariat

Paul Diaz: And Glen, if you would, would you do the roll?

Glen Desaintgery: Certainly I will Paul. On the line we have yourself Paul Diaz,

                     (James Bladel), Mikey O'Connor, and Barbara Steele. And for staff we

                     have Marika Konings and myself. And there's Olof perhaps also

                     listening in.

Olof Nordling: Yes I am.

Glen Desaintgery: Thank you Olof.

Paul Diaz: Excellent. Okay folks. I want to start the recording so this is for the record, anybody who listens in. I guess the last two weeks we've had difficulty scheduling. People are busy and maybe some confusion about the call. We only have four working group members. At least this week we have different constituencies represented.

I have the same concerns I did last week so I put it to those who are on the call in terms of how we want to go through this. Last week I deferred do any line-by-line review of what Marika provided for the final conclusions and what not because I really wanted to make sure, you know, we had enough inputs here to fairly say that we had, you know, group input, group finals on the text.

Again, with the small number of us on the call, I'm not sure what the appropriate way to proceed is. I'm kind of hoping that people are feeling good about the text we had and therefore are not as concerned if they miss a call. You know, it seems that we had a pretty clear sense of where we all stood on the various issues and the text was pretty good.

Nevertheless, I mean, we do have a final report to submit and if that will be for the record, you know, we do want everybody's input. So I ask the group, you know, those who are here now, do you think it's appropriate for us today to start going through the final text that Marika has provided for us? Or should we either look to reschedule a call in between now and next week or really just try to put the - all of this into next week's call?

Our goal ultimately of course is to wrap up before Mexico City. But, you know, we don't want to unnecessarily rush this. And then again, I don't know. If people are feeling pretty good about it maybe, you know, it will be a very quick process nonetheless. But in the interest of getting everybody's opinions, what do you all think? How should we proceed?

Barbara Steele: This is Barbara.

Paul Diaz: Barbara, please.

Barbara Steele: I guess I'm just concerned if we continue to put it off, hoping for more people to show up on the call and nobody does, then we're not going to, you know, continue to further it along. So I would probably be in favor of at least starting to go through it and (unintelligible) general agreement. I mean, I've taken a quick look and it looks pretty good to me so far. I haven't finished my review yet, however.

Paul Diaz: No problem. Thank you. Mikey, (James), how do you guys - what do you all think?

(James Bladel): This is (James). I tend to agree with Barbara. I don't think there's any indication that future calls will be more - better attended. I would say that we should also maybe push - if there are any controversial issues, make sure those are covered on the list so that folks who aren't on the call have a chance to chime. But beyond that, we should just get going. Keep moving forward.

Paul Diaz: Sounds good. Sound like a plan to you Mikey?

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. I think the one thing I'd do is just highlight sort of low attendance to the list and give people a head's up, "Come on, you know, bear back down again." You know, I was watching the list but only casually because I was on vacation and I didn't realize that we'd had a quorum problem last time. And so I think it might be good just to give people a little head's up that they ought to...

Paul Diaz: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: ...get back in the game.

Paul Diaz: Well let's do that then. Let's use our time today - again, I don't think what we have to go through is all that controversial. I think it's pretty straight-forward and accurately captures where we stood going into this final round. And what we'll do is - to Mikey - everybody's point - I'll push a note out, you know, really imploring folks to try to make next week's call. And quite honestly, whether we're really there or not, I'm going to say, "Because this is the final review." I'll deliberately, you know, sensationalize it so that if people are like, "Whoa, wait a minute, what's going on here?" then obviously we'll take whatever time's necessary.

But we do want to wrap this up because we're already starting to get questions from counsel about the follow-on (BTP). They would like to get that underway as soon as possible so it's not unnecessarily delayed here.

Okay. So with that said, and obviously we can, you know, note if there are questions or concerns as we go through this and I guess we'll do that on the list, assuming people don't listen to this MP3. But, you

know, again, if you all have the draft in front of you, I think you're going to see it's pretty straight-forward.

All right. So with that said, obviously as you look at it there's a lot of the editing stuff. So there's actually not as much text changes as might first appear. A lot of things are simply, you know, now it's final report, dates have changed, et cetera. So as we go through the pages I'm not even going to address that, all right. You know, it's just there. It was just Marika being diligent and updating things but there's no real - that's not a real edit that we need to focus on.

So I guess starting just from the top - the status - she's made changes for us. You note that we - this is now our final report. She's got a placeholder in there for I guess the date that it will be submitted on. But - anybody have any problem the way that's being presented? I mean, it's kind of pro forma.

Woman: I don't have any issues.

Paul Diaz: Sure. I'm going to kind of blow though this, folks. So, you know, if you see something, immediately go, "Hang on." Otherwise I'm going to take silence as assent.

Same thing with the Summary. It's just, you know, updating the text to recognize where we stand.

Marika Konings: And just to note that I haven't updated the Executive Summary yet to reflect other changes in the report. I thought it would be better to first finalize the rest and then just update the Executive Summary accordingly.

Paul Diaz: Excellent. Thank you Marika. Of course.

                  Okay. So now we're jumping out and - in the future Marika - just a
                  personal request if the - when you create PDF version, mine came out
                  as a side-by-side PDF rather than like, you know, one page at a time.
                  And it's just - it gets a little tricky because you go to the page, you see
                  two pages. And then I have to expand this so I can read the edits
                  carefully.

Marika Konings: That wasn't done on purpose. I'm not really sure how why it came
                  out...

((Crosstalk))

Paul Diaz: ...how it happened. I've never seen it before.

Marika Konings: I'll look into that.

Mikey O'Connor: This is (Mikey). I'd also love to see line numbers again.

Paul Diaz: Yes. And the line numbers were a huge help because that way we can
                  just immediately zero in. We're not talking about section numbers and
                  all.

Marika Konings: Okay. I'll reintroduce the line numbers for the next version and try to
                  figure out this printing problem.

((Crosstalk))

Paul Diaz: No problem. All right. Let's go on through and, please come with me folks, but I'm pretty sure we don't have anything in the first section.

So we're at Section Number 2. The header is Objective and Next Steps. And we have new text on here. Again, just sort of bringing folks up to date. We chopped out the placeholder stuff we had and now it's simply notes. What we're doing here is the report and it clarifies that our conclusions are outlined in more detail in our Chapter 7. Everybody comfortable with what's there?

Mikey O'Connor: You know, given that - this is Mikey again, sorry. Given that we're describing recommendations for next steps in another chapter, I wonder whether we need this chapter at all. It's confusing until you get to the end and realize that this isn't the real place to go look for this.

Paul Diaz: Fair enough. It made more sense, I think, earlier when we had the initial draft and we kept putting in the placeholder language saying, "We're waiting for inputs. We won't make final decisions without community input," et cetera.

Olaf, Marika, or Glen, is there any problem if we strike this or does - is there a sort of a template for these reports and they like to at least see this section in there?

Woman: We're talking about 2, (no)?

Paul Diaz: Yes, 2.

Olof Nordling: I think we've - well, whether they're prescribed by the bylaws - it's a pretty long-standing tradition that we have it.

Paul Diaz: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: Well, you know - Mikey again. In that case I think what we might want to think about is instead of treating this section as sort of a purely operational description of where we're at as working group, we might want to pull those Chapter 7 items up into this, sort of the way we do with the Executive Summary after we're all done.

Olof Nordling: Right. And perhaps sort of say that the next step - the obvious next step is deliberation and decision by the council. So - but we can keep that.

Woman: The problem is, if you already introduce here the next steps, you don't have the preface of discussions and public comments and - we do have it in the Executive Summary. But it's part I guess of the whole summarized version of the debate, while maybe including it here, might create confusion as it doesn't explain where those conclusions came from.

Mikey O'Connor: I guess, you know, in the interest of carrying on with the call, the main thing that I see here is that this is sort of a bump in the road of reading the report. It's sort of a head-scratcher. You come to it and you don't exactly know what's going on. So it might be a good idea to either clarify that this is purely a description of what needs to happen next in the (BTP) process or it's a description of what needs to happen next as a result of our conclusions. That's one of the kind of confusing parts here.

Olof Nordling: Right. Well could perhaps clarify that - this is sort of the procedure of next step.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

Olof Nordling: That we're looking at.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. And so maybe it's - you know, objective and next steps in the policy making process or, you know, some way to clarify it one way or the other. If it's really just a procedural next step, then I think this is fine. This sort of tells the policy crowd, "Okay, this is what we think you need to do next." And then leave the operational next steps down in Chapter 7. That would work fine for me.

Paul Diaz: Okay. Does that sound good to you Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes.

Paul Diaz: Make little text changes there. Yes. And my only feeling also was not to repeat the objectives again because of course we're going to have an update to the Executive Summary, which just precedes it. If we keep bringing up the same points over and over, the thought was it starts making the report that much longer and kind of unnecessarily longer.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, I agree.

Paul Diaz: Okay. So let's make the changes described and we can look at whatever those text changes are next week, next call.

All right. So for our Section 3, the background stuff, I don't believe there are any changes. Everything's there that we had previously from the initial report. It all carries forward.

Section 4 (presents) the membership. Is this the section Marika where we'll have the attendance?

Marika Konings: Probably as people prefer. We can make a note here and put it in annex or include it here. I don't know what people prefer. I don't know - Glen what has been the practice in the past?

Glen Desaintgery: Probably put in the annex Marika and then it doesn't clog up the report.

Marika Konings: So we can just include a link here mentioning that...

Glen Desaintgery: Yes.

Marika Konings: ...the attendance sheet is included in annex - I don't know which number we gave it but...

Paul Diaz: Right. And for everybody on the call, just recall part of the (BTP) process, we do need to include - we're expected to include an attendance sheet. So that's what we're getting at here.

And as Marika notes, we'll simply have a footer - footnote saying look to whatever appendix, whatever letter it's going to be. It just captures - so that we had all the people initially signed up and when you look at the list obviously some of them do not follow it all the way through. So

for council's sake and what not for the record, that's all that that's about.

All right then. Section 5, deliberations. So - okay. Based on quick discussions last week and the previous call, with the inputs that we had gotten from the public comments - one gentleman (Patrick) who had very extensive comments. And we all wanted to make sure that it was very clear, for the record, that the working group did really take on board all the comments that were received. To that end, we do have some edits in here.

The subsection about Internet registry info service, the (IRIS) system - obviously we talked about it and we had it in our initial draft. What we've added here now -- I guess, it's the fourth bullet down -- is a new sentence. And it reads, as you can see, "(IRIS) was also raised as a possible solution for the secure transmission of data between registrars and/or registries. In one of the comments submitted during the public comment (unintelligible) in the initial report. See Section 6.4 for more details." 6.4 is the - that's the verbatim, right Marika?

Marika Konings: Sorry?

Paul Diaz: 6.4, is that the verbatim or is that your summary of this fellow (Patrick)'s - jumping ahead, but I don't recall...

Marika Konings: 6.4 refers to the section of the report. Chapter 6, Section 4.

((Crosstalk))

Paul Diaz: Right. Okay. So, you know, again, we're just for the record making it clear that, you know, this working group - basically there have been criticisms in the past that working groups may not be taking all public comments very seriously. And then we wanted to make it clear for the record. Hence this additional bullet. No problems? Everybody's good with that? Okay.

So then, moving forward, again not many changes. All administrative stuff until we get out to (auth) info code. Page 21 now. And again, it's just a new bullet to capture discussion in the public comment period related to (auth) info codes. And the same thing - that we make reference to our Section 6.4 which explains what the discussion was in more detail. No problems with that? Okay.

We have - same concept on Page 23. Our conclusion for Issue 2. We've added a new clause that again captures this idea that we're presenting our conclusions but underscoring the idea that this is - they've been informed by the public comments. And the constituency statements of course. Okay, no problem with that. Okay.

And same thing - jumping out to Page 26, conclusions for Issue 3. Two things here. I think it's the same clause, recognizing the outside inputs, constituency and public comments.

We've also added a new sentence at the end now - for summarizing conclusions the sentence is reading, "The working group would recommend that the (GNSL) council to clarify..." okay, there's a typo there. I guess we don't need "to." "That the (GNSL) council clarify that the current bulk transfer positions also apply to both transfer of domain names in only one (TLD)." This sentence is getting at what we

discovered during the work of the group and the comments from senior staff based on Legal's - ICANN Legal's input.

But there is some - but it wasn't very clear and there could be a misunderstanding about how it applies. And so our suggestion here is that there is clarity, that clarity be made, that when we're talking about bulk transfer it can apply to all the names within one (TLD). It doesn't necessarily have to mean every name under management by a particular registrar. Is everybody comfortable with the way we've characterized it there?

Barbara Steele: This is Barbara. I am.

Paul Diaz: Okay. Okay. A change to the header in Number 6 because we did have two public comment periods. It's now plural.

And scrolling through - okay now we get to 6.4. And 6.4 Marika is - you took everything that you provided us on the list and simply dropped it in. Correct?

Marika Konings: Correct.

Paul Diaz: Did you make any other changes? So this is text people should be familiar with?

Marika Konings: It's the same text as was circulated to the group. The only difference is that this one doesn't have at the end, like, the listing of the people that contributed. And some of the headers had to include when submitting it to the public comment forum that - who wrote it and when it was submitted and things like that. But the rest of the text is the same.

Paul Diaz: Very good. All right. So for the group here, you know - and now this is something that could - I would think people would maybe want to tweak language. Might have been interpreted a little differently because we are summarizing. We're not providing the verbatim. By the way, the verbatim is in an appendix at the end. But if you don't want to dig it out of the public comments list you can simply look to the end.

This fellow (Patrick) is very technical and his comments were quite extensive. Having read them and, to the best of my abilities, I think that Marika has very ably captured all the things that (Patrick) was getting at. But don't let me put words in people's mouths. What I would ask is, you know, we can look at this. We've got a week.

As we've discussed already, after this call I will be posting a note to the group noting that next week is going to - again, amongst us - going to be the last call, last chance to edit text. And clearly a section like this, it's very important that we're all comfortable with the way things have been summarized. If there are any additional reviews, perspectives, and what not, let's get it in. But, you know, from what it's worth from my perspective I think that Marika captured the comments very ably.

Mikey O'Connor: Paul this is Mikey.

Paul Diaz: Yes Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: When you send out that last call email, why don't you give us some action items, this being one of them. I don't want to soak up all the time on the call right now just jumping back and forth between his super technical thing, but I'd be happy to do it between now and then.

Paul Diaz: Yes.

Mikey O'Connor: I think we all kind of need a reminder that there is some substance here that we should take a look at and make sure that something hasn't been missed.

Paul Diaz: I will. I was thinking of doing that, but thank you for making it clear Mikey. I will. This is definitely one of the things - one of the few sections in our report right now that really does need people to look at it, make sure they're comfortable with what's said and any changes we want to make, you know, we can get them in.

So with that said, I'm going to skip over 6.4 right now so that everybody will have time at their convenience to review it in more detail.

And with that then we're out to, what is this, Page 36? Or Section 7, Conclusions and Next Steps. And perhaps - I don't know how you all feel - this too may be something to be called out in the email. You know, there's a bit of text here and it might be too much right now. Granted, we are just - I think we all know, as members of this working group, you know, where things generally stand.

But let's be sure that the text that we're presenting - because ultimately this is probably the most important part - Section 7, you know. So what do you come back with? Here's what the group is saying. That's what the council's going to focus on. So in the same way why don't we ask 6.4 and Section 7 - over the course of the next week please take an

especially close look at that and make sure that we've characterized the conclusions accurately.

Mikey O'Connor: I think that's - this is Mikey. I think that's a great approach.

Paul Diaz: And it's fair. You know, people can't be put on the spot. A lot of the text you're going to recognize. You know, it's stuff we've discussed and to some degrees even have carried over previously. It's just been firmed up now that, hey, we're done. Here's where we think we stand. And let's be sure that everybody's comfortable with that.

Mikey O'Connor: I notice that we haven't opened the "who is" privacy issue. I'm wondering if we want to add that somewhere. (Unintelligible). Never mind.

Paul Diaz: I was going to ask where are you going with this one Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Sorry. Joke.

Paul Diaz: Bad joke. Bad Mikey. But joking aside, anything that wants to be changed, you know, we've got a week and we will sign off - you know, address those issues and then sign off on our next Tuesday's call.

So for the remainder of the report, we have our Annex A. Simply the template, nothing new there. Annex B are the constituency statements that were received. And this includes the first (round).

And scroll through - business - okay. Marika there where we have the constituency statements we have the initial report statements, right? And then what you've done is you put in Annex D the public

comments. So for example when the registrars weighed back in, that's in Annex D now?

Marika Konings: Yes, correct.

Paul Diaz: No problem...

Marika Konings: I'm happy - if any of the constituencies feel that they would like to replace the one they had, you know, as their initial constituency statements - I'm happy to do it that way around as well if people prefer.

Paul Diaz: Okay. That offer's on the table. You know, for the record I think it might be more helpful to be able to show, "Hey, if there was any change in thinking over time, here were the initial statements and then here's the statements on the draft report."

What I'd suggest for now, just so - maybe a little clarity - the title for Annex A - the template for the statement - excuse me - Annex B constituency statements - that we clarify that this was, you know, like the first round or initial constituency statements. I think that becomes sort of obvious by the date that they were received.

But just so it's clear that between B as in boy and D as in dog - that registrars, for example, submitted twice. And Barbara in her capacity - there was a registry statement the first time and then there were inputs from a member of the constituency. But just - this way we avoid any potential for confusion about what was being submitted and when. I think Annex B - just add an initial constituency statement.

Marika Konings: Okay.

Paul Diaz: That will address that little concern I had. Anything in there is just formatting minor - very, very minor edits.

Annex C - the flow chart that we had - (James) had raised on the list the question of whether that's really adding value or perhaps is not very helpful right now because it's - the flow that is being described could be applied to any number of (EPP) processes, not just transfer related. How do you all feel about that graphic now? Is it still helping you or do you think it's kind of superfluous and can be cut?

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey.

Paul Diaz: Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: I'm with (James) on that. I was going to comment on the list but decided I'd just wait until the day. I think, you know, it was very helpful when we were learning but I don't think that it's - I don't think it's necessary for the report. Especially given that, you know, we've also got (IRIS) out there. And since we're not really choosing four people between (IRIS) and (EGT), et cetera, et cetera, I think we could probably just drop it.

Paul Diaz: You okay with that Barbara.

Barbara Steele: I'm fine with that.

Paul Diaz: Sorry - (James)?

(James Bladel): Oh, I'd - you know, what initially caught my eye was just that the formatting was off a little bit. But I think that the transfer commands specifically - that flow chart or diagram is captured very well on Page 15. And so having a generic (EPP) - now one question is, and I guess I didn't look - is the acronym (EPP) defined properly or does it need to be maybe a sentence just describing what we mean when we say (EPP)? Is that addressed somewhere in the early part in the document?

Paul Diaz: I believe it was.

(James Bladel): Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: If not, it certainly bears - both (EPP) and (IRIS) probably bear a little...

Paul Diaz: Yes. I know for sure (IRIS) because when we were looking at it I cited - you know, it did spell it out. I also forget all the acronyms...

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: ...give a little explanation of what it is. In that section - it's actually on Page 15...

Paul Diaz: Right.

Marika Konings: ...taking out the annex - I'll take out here as well the reference to that annex.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. Good plan.

Paul Diaz: Okay. Yes. It was defined but if we're all in agreement that this Annex C is not really adding a lot, then I guess it's moot and we can drop it.

(James Bladel):   Yes, I agree. It's probably defined sufficiently there and then we can drop the annex and...

Paul Diaz: We don't need this. If you would, Marika, if you could do the score-through for this section just so that it's clear to people that aren't on the call but, you know, we'll be pushing them to look at this report in regard to next Tuesday's call we're dropping that. I'll also add that in my note. You know, "You'll see some changes to include dropping Annex C. Please focus on Sections 6.4 and 7."

                  So then finally Annex D - these are just verbatim. Correct Marika?

Marika Konings: Correct.

Paul Diaz: Yes. So, you know, it's copy and paste. There's no editing involved. But it's obviously all new to this report, to this draft.

                  All right, then. So there's the report. And as I think it was kind of clear from the outset it's pretty straight-forward what we have left to do. Again, the Section 6.4 and 7 - our group homework is to review those and make sure that they are accurately capturing, you know, the positions that we're stating. And that will be the focus of next week's call.

                  If there are any changes that need to be made - personally I'm kind of hoping that we can easily get through that within the call. In fact I'm hoping next week's call will actually be kind of quick. And we can wrap

this up. But again, however much time we need, we will take. But I think we are fast approaching the end and we appreciate everybody's efforts.

As I alluded to earlier, council is already starting to inquire about interest in the second (BTP). B-B-B. Thank you. And, you know, the hope is that members of this working group will be able to contribute their time and participate in the next round.

If you recall the issues that are to be addressed and the actual agenda, or charter, for the B transfer policy (BTP) - that's not been fully set yet. But at least the questions that were originally proposed by the first working group that came up with them you'll recognize. There's some more - it's a little more complicated, a little more controversial, some of the issues that are being touched on.

And, you know, the group that went through A, you know, I think we worked well together, we had a difference of opinion but got through it. And the hope is that, you know, you all will be able to continue to contribute in the forthcoming round. Look for an announcement - my guess at this point is that it will probably - the formation, the next group will be shortly after Mexico City but keep an eye and obviously we can reach out to everyone in time.

Mikey O'Connor: Paul, this is Mikey.

Paul Diaz: Yes Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: One more item for your email...

Paul Diaz: Yes.

Mikey O'Connor: ...or at least something to puzzle about. Suppose that we don't get a quorum next week and, you know, we chug along and we get everything pretty much wrapped up. Can we go ahead and approve a final report without a quorum or do we need to really beat on people to be on that call?

Paul Diaz: Olaf, Glen, Marika, please weigh in but my sense would be if we don't have a quorum, you know, we can't in good faith pass this up to council as the final report because not all the working group members have - were able to present their view.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey again. I've got an idea on that, and that is...

Paul Diaz: Yes.

Mikey O'Connor: ...I know that, for example, (Michael Collins) is no longer the executive director of the ICA and...

Paul Diaz: Right.

Mikey O'Connor: ...may not be on these calls partly because it's no longer in his job description. And so what we might want to do in this week is see if anybody else is essentially dropping off so that we could reduce our quorum number. That's where I was headed, is...

Paul Diaz: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor:...you know, maybe we're using too high a bar for the quorum at this point.

Olof Nordling: (Unintelligible) comment from Olaf here if I may. I mean, there's no, sort of, firm requirement or anything of that nature, but of course you want to have something that has - where you pretty sure that you have the support of the working group.

However, if there is low attendance at the conference call, we can make it very, very clear on the list that now or never is the time when you can - if you're not going to attend the next conference call, well please make yourself heard and check out this latest, latest, latest version and signal any objections you might - may have. Because otherwise we can, of course, die of starvation while waiting for people to join in to a call.

So perhaps that's - in order to see some kind of clear deadline for when we can submit it to the council, maybe that's an approach we should take since our experience not only for this working group but also previous working groups on these matters on transfers have been - a certain tendency to low attendance.

Paul Diaz: Yes.

Mikey O'Connor:No, I think that's a great approach. I just - I want to avoid the problem of - as Olaf just described, which is we get to the end and then we don't have a quorum and we can't approve it. So, you know...

Paul Diaz: Yes.

Mikey O'Connor:...maybe you should stick that into your email as well, Paul.

Paul Diaz: I will. And, you know, in fairness I think since this isn't, like, a - one of the highly controversial issues, it's not like Who Is and so, you know, we'll give folks opportunity and certainly push them.

But at some point, quite honestly, if the, you know, for whatever reason people just were not responding, after we've given opportunity and made it very clear that, you know, the time is nigh, you know, I think that we can communicate the report to Council with, you know, some explanation of, hey we tried, people just aren't here. We didn't take a final vote, if you will, or have an official quorum yet. Here it is, and move this forward.

Again since we're, you know, by our own text we're pretty much in agreement at least where we stand on the various issues. You know, we won't drag this one out interminably. That's the key point.

And worst case, if we can't wrap it up next Tuesday we can at least present when we talk to Council - give them the update report over the weekend in Mexico City. We can explain, you know, where we stand so that even if it's not official - an official final report, you know, that we're very close to actually delivering. And the text that they can see on our Wiki is pretty much, you know, the final deal. But hopefully we're getting ahead of ourselves. Hopefully folks will make the time and, you know, we can wrap this up next week.

But with that, again, look for the email. You all know 6.4 and 7 are the key sections to focus on. Should you see anything else in the report

please, you know, raise it either directly through Marika or I, or better yet on the list and we will have a meeting reminder sent out as well.

Maybe it's just folks are more used to seeing it from Glen than from me but, you know, we look forward to seeing you all next Tuesday, same time, and again any questions or issues shoot them out to the list or reach out to Marika or I and we'll get them answered.

Anything else?

Man: Paul can I...

Paul Diaz: Yes, please (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...ask an administrative question?

Paul Diaz: Yes.

Man: And this is not limited to the (IRTP) working group but just wanted to take advantage of having Marika and Glen on the call at the same time.

Is there a centralized place - I'm looking at the (GNSO) calendar and the schedule, or the agenda for the Mexico City meeting. But I'm sure, like many folks on this call, I'm involved in a lot of different (BTP) working groups and I was wondering if there was one centralized place where we could, kind of, gather all of the in-person sessions?

Glen Desaintgery: Hi this is Glen. Just to say that that is busy being made.

Man: Okay great.

Glen Desaintgery: I am going to, in the next couple of days, put out an agenda which I
                  usually call (GNS) related meetings. So it doesn't contain all the
                  meetings on the official agenda but the ones that, you know, (GNS) -
                  our people - will be concerned about such as working groups. And
                  what I'm actually waiting for is to have a clearer picture of times that -
                  time slots that we can put in on Saturday and Sunday for the meetings.

Man: That sounds like exactly what I could use right now.

Paul Diaz: Yes.

Man: So I will wait for that to be published. Thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Glen Desaintgery: Okay. And I usually print some of those too so they'll be available
                  on Saturday and Sunday and during the meetings as well.

Mikey O'Connor: Glen this is Mikey.

Glen Desaintgery: Yes.

Paul Diaz: Yes Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: I'm not going to be in Mexico City but could you include any of those that will have dial-in capabilities, because a lot of those I'd like to drop in on if I can over the phone.

Glen Desaintgery: Absolutely. What I'll do Mikey is I'll send out the remote participation to the constituency lists. So each constituency should send it to all their members.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh cool. Yes.

Glen Desaintgery: And what I will do also is I will send to the working group lists for those that can't be there.

Paul Diaz: Terrific.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks.

Paul Diaz: Yes.

Glen Desaintgery: Okay. Pleasure.

Paul Diaz: And just for the record folks, this particular working group we are not planning any face-to-face - trying to do any work while in Mexico City. Again, the hope is that we wrap it up next week and if there's any leftover issues to be dealt with, they be dealt with after we all - those of us who are going - the second week of March, not while we're all down in Mexico City.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks for clarifying.

Paul Diaz: Any other issues anyone? Well with that I'll let everybody get going a couple minutes early today. Thank you very much for your time and attendance. Again take a close look at 6.4 and 7 and we'll see you all this time next Tuesday.

Man: Thanks Paul. Great job.

Man: Thank you.

Man: Thank you Paul.

Paul Diaz: Thank you guys. Take care now. Bye-bye.

END