

**IRTP C  
TRANSCRIPTION  
Tuesday 17 July 2012 at 1400 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the IRTP C meeting on Tuesday 17 July 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-20120717-en.mp3>

On page:<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar#july>  
(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

**Attendees:**

Mike O'Connor - CBUC  
James Bladel -co-chair  
Chris Chaplow - CBUC  
Volker Greimann – RrSG  
Roy Dykes - RySG

**ICANN Staff:**

Marika Konings  
Berry Cobb  
Nathalie Peregrine

**Apologies**

Michele Neylon – RrSG  
Paul Diaz – RrSg  
Simonetta Batteiger - RrSG  
Jonathan Tenenbaum – RrSG  
Angie Graves – CBUC  
Philip Corwin - CBUC  
Matt Serlin – RrSG  
Avri Doria – co-Chair  
Barbara Knight – RrSG  
Kevin Erdman – IPC  
Rob Golding – RrSG

Coordinator: Thank you. The call is now being recorded. Please go ahead.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you, (Sam). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the IRTP-C call on the 17th of July, 2012. On the call today we have Mikey O'Connor, Volker Greimann, James Bladel, Chris Chaplow and Roy Dykes. From staff we have Marika Konings, Berry Cobb and myself, Nathalie Peregrine.

We have apologies from Avri Doria, Barbara Knight, Michele Neylon, Rob Golding, Alain Berranger, Matt Serlin, Phil Corwin, Kevin Erdman and Angie Graves.

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

James Bladel: Thank you, Nathalie. And good morning, good afternoon, everyone. Welcome to the PDP Working Call for IRTP-C for July 17. As we were discussing prior to the start of the recording we have a number of apologies today and a very, very small group of participants.

So what we have determined - what we've decided to do is have an abbreviated session of our PDP working group today where we just review the work plan and then we will adjourn. So Items - Number 4, which is the bulk of the meeting on our agenda will not be tabled today.

So with that can I just ask if anyone has any updates or changes to their statements of interest?

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey.

James Bladel: Yes, Mikey, go ahead.

Mikey O'Connor: I can't remember if I did this on this one or not. I have those four exact match dotCom strings. Did I announce that on IRTP or not?

James Bladel: You did announce that in our session last week.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh okay. Never mind.

James Bladel: Okay. So - but thanks for the reminder. I think we're good there. And we had some other folks make some minor changes as well.

So with that we'll just continue forward here with Item Number 3 which is just to take a look at the work plan between now and Toronto. And I think when we last left our heroes we were taking a look beginning I think on the third page - beginning on the third page - where it starts to look at mid-July and really focusing on the block of meetings between July 24th - oh I'm sorry - between the close of the public comment period, which is July 25, and the publication of the final report. That's the block of sessions on the calendar that we're looking at.

So, yes, and Marika has pointed out in the chat that July 24 is listed twice. Too bad, I thought we had all this extra time but apparently one of the meetings is counted twice so we'll have to scratch that.

I think that this is - and appreciate our discussion on this last week. We spent a significant amount of time going over this calendar. And I just - I also appreciate Marika and staff making the necessary edits.

So the question to the group is does anyone have any concerns or comments regarding the markup on this work calendar? Do we think that this is a good point to proceed? Do we believe, perhaps, maybe we ought to put a check point in the - along the road here maybe in like early September to see how we're doing? Thoughts?

Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. Just to provide a little bit of explanation on how I divided up. I basically tried to divide the time a little between, you know, review of the comments that we received as part of the public comment forum as well as the meeting in Prague trying to build in some time to start or continue deliberations on the open issues that were identified in initial report.

And then a slot of meetings looking at reviewing the draft final report. And again of course there's a lot of flexibility in there because if it would turn out that we only need two or three meetings to actually review the comments it means we can of course start earlier looking at the open issues or, you know, at the final report.

But I think as James suggested it's probably helpful to build something in maybe for the 4-September meeting to actually take stock where things are, whether indeed we need to make further adjustments or, you know, whether we're on track as planned.

James Bladel: Thank you, Marika. And before I go to Roy I just wanted to propose that does anyone have any objections to slotting an agenda item for September 4 that we would take stock, revisit the work plan and make sure that we're on track for Toronto. Any objections or concerns with that? Silence is consent so I think that we'll go forward with that, Marika, so thanks, good idea there. Roy.

Roy Dykes: Yeah, and - maybe - this is Roy for the transcript. Maybe this is already captured but as I look through and I see review comments or continue to review comments and then continue deliberations. I've seen the - just since from last week at the end where I guess we got down to list maybe one or two - maybe even three items - I can't remember exactly. But there was some deliberation then.

Just a question to the team; are we being careful to kind of separate out review and deliberation so that we don't wind up, you know, sort of 2/3 of the way through in mid-September?

James Bladel: That's a good point, Roy. And I think something we need to be mindful of. I think that the intention was to focus any continued deliberations on those issues that were identified as open questions from our initial report.

I think that Simonetta and I think some others raised the concern that we don't want to go back and significantly rework our - those items that we had determined were closed from the initial report because that would be somewhat disingenuous when folks had already had a chance to comment on those. It would be somewhat of - somewhat of a bait and switch.

I think it was Simonetta that raised that point. Maybe - I may be mistaken on that. But that was certainly a phenomenon that had happened in previous working groups. So I think that was the intent was to focus on the open questions. Does that address your concern or should we maybe strengthen that in this work plan?

Roy Dykes: No, I think that's fine. I just - I think we should all be mindful - and maybe it's a comment for the larger group when more people are back, you know, just be mindful of the time as we go through - because it's a lot of people discussing a lot of issues and it's going to take a lot of time.

James Bladel: I agree. And I think we'll certainly look for you and for others to help keep us focused and keep us on track there. And - but also to ensure that we're not just - what's the ICANN phenomenon where we get into these circular conversations that just eat of calendar without actually creating any progress.

Roy Dykes: Right, right.

James Bladel: But fortunately that has not, you know, I think folks have observed that hasn't always been the case. IRTP I think is a pretty good example of where that doesn't happen very often.

Roy Dykes: Okay.

James Bladel: I put myself in the queue for just one thought here. And I think I may have lost it. Oh, just that, you know, we have two more meetings in July and then we have four meetings scheduled for August. That's six total sessions.

And I'm guessing that we're going to get - this is just me being pessimistic here - I'm guessing we're going to get four - four and a half meaningful sessions out of those six weeks. Just noting that there's going to be, you know, here in the US we're going to have vacations here in the last bit of July and then the Europeans I think traditionally will have a lot of holidays in August.

And then there's a number of back to school and holiday-type activities in the US again. So just from my own personal perspective I think in those six weeks we should budget for approximately four hours of meaningful teleconference time and probably at least one of these abbreviated sessions like we're having today.

So any other comments regarding the work plan? I think that it's a good idea to focus - keep us focused on the narrow issues and to set out a marker on September 4 to revisit this plan at least briefly and make sure we're on track. So we've captured those. Any other thoughts or concerns?

Okay I notice from the chat that we had picked up two new apologies to the already growing list of folks who can't make this call. So I would say thanks to the folks who were able to show up and we'll give you back the balance of your hour today.

Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. There's one item on the agenda that we might want to briefly talk about or at least maybe give people as homework is one of the

items we discussed at the last meeting is that if there is a desire or a need that the working group sees to respond to any of the comments that were received as part of the public comment forum this would need to happen before the 25th of July.

I know on the last call we had I think some questions on some of the comments. You know, looking at them again I couldn't exactly recall whether - what those questions were and I didn't see any further comments on the mailing list whether people felt that a response should be written as part of the public comment forum. So maybe that's just something to either briefly consider or otherwise send out as a reminder to the group.

Because if there's something that needs to be done jointly then, you know, the next meeting would be the last one in order to be able to do so.

James Bladel: Okay so maybe we can start a thread on the mailing list with the subject - with the deadline in the subject line so that folks know that this is a time sensitive issue. And we can then put that on our agenda for next week to see if we have any follow ups and recognizing that that window will close after our meeting next week and so it's kind of a last - a first and last chance to clarify any comments or to - or if you get follow up like that.

Okay, any other items before we adjourn for today, folks? The queue is clear. I guess everyone wants to get back to their morning there. So thank you for the diehards that came in today and we'll see everyone next week. And look for that thread on the mailing list, please.

Roy Dykes: All right.

Mikey O'Connor: Sounds great. Thanks, James.

((Crosstalk))

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you, (Sam), you may now stop the recording. Thank you.

END