

**GNSO**  
**Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy A PDP Jun08 Working Group teleconference**  
**24 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 24 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/gns0/gns0-irtp-20090224.mp3>

On page:

<http://gns0.icann.org/calendar/#feb>

Participants present:

Paul Diaz - Working Group Chair - Networksolutions Registrar c.  
Mikey O'Connor - CBUC  
Mike Rodenbaugh - CBUC  
Kevin Erdman - IPC  
Marc Trachtenberg - IPC  
James Bladel - Godaddy  
Barbara Steele - Registry c.  
Michael Collins - Individual  
Sébastien Bachollet - ALAC

Staff:

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

Paul Diaz:           If you would Glen, could you do the roll?

Glen Desaintgery:   Yes certainly Paul. We have on the line Kevin Erdman, Michael O'Connor, Barbara Steele, Paul Diaz is the leader of the group, James Bladel), Mike Rodenbaugh, and Michael Collins. And for staff we have Marika Konings, Olof Nordling, and myself, Glen Desaintgery.

Paul Diaz:           Terrific. Thank you and thank you everybody. I have almost perfect attendance now so this is great. As we've noted on the list we're in the final stretch on this report. We do have some issues to address -

concerns that were raised on the list - we want to get straight to them and then we'll take it from here.

As we noted at the beginning for the Mexico City meeting there will an opportunity for this group to update the counsel on status. Depending at the end of today's call whether that status is, "Here is our final report" or just straight forward update and we'll need a little time afterwards. The time -- can you all still hear me?

Man: Yes.

Paul Diaz: Thank you, I'm sorry. I have a new headset here and I get some feedback sometimes. I thought I had disconnected myself. For the update the timing has shifted a little. If anybody will be in Mexico City wants to attend you're more than welcome. The time will now be Sunday at 12:30 to 2 o'clock. Don't really anticipate needing 90 minutes but since that is over the working lunch - it's not clear exactly when we'll start but that is the time slot that we've been allotted.

Okay so with that let's get right to the draft. Marika had pushed it out - it's available on the Wiki site. Hopefully you have it in front of you. In the interest of time and to focus on the things that people are really concerned about - open question for the group - are you relatively comfortable with the language and would like to just focus on the concerns that have been expressed on our list? Or shall we go through this line by line?

Man: I don't think we need to do it line by line. We've done that.

Man: Previously.

Man: I agree.

Paul Diaz: Very well, okay. Then let's do that - take it from the top. A lot of what we see of course in the edits are sort of the administrative type things. The dates of changed that it's now a final report versus drafts. On every single page I'm not going to highlight that, okay? So as far as text goes the first page - pretty straight forward - these are just administrative things. Pardon me - nothing of a...

Woman: Paul?

Paul Diaz: Yes?

Woman: I think that I heard the two lads - and I would agree with them - say that we don't really need to go through this line by line and jump right to the issues.

Paul Diaz: I'm sorry. Thanks for correcting it because as I said I'm dealing with this headphone and I'm not hearing things very clearly. Okay with that said then - off of the list we have the suggestions that Mike Rodenbaugh has raised. Are there other suggestions people would like to make? Other things that we want to highlight - put on our agenda for today's call?

Okay. Of course if something comes up please raise it. So then let's focus on Mike's issues here. Surrounding the IRIS question - in our report - I guess starting on Page 6 and again on Page 9 we have some treatment about the IRIS protocol. The questions or concerns that Mike is raising - just paraphrasing from his email - said we say in our report

that we've reviewed and discussed but we don't have broad agreement on using IRIS as a solution. His question, "Is this really an accurate statement?"

So, you know, for the call as you all remember we discussed IRIS with the expert from (Verisye) who joined us - (Scott Hollenbach)?

Marika Konings: That's correct.

Paul Diaz: In particular - let's see - just to draw upon Mike's note - and if we jump out to Page 26 on 26 we have - and I hope the numbering is correct.

Marika Konings: I think it's Page 18 in the new draft.

Paul Diaz: Yeah okay.

Marika Konings: I think probably the comments of Mike were probably to an earlier draft on a different page.

Paul Diaz: To a previous draft. Thank you Marika - yes. She nailed it and there it is for us highlighted in fact so it makes it even easier. Okay so for the group, you know, the question that we have before us is, "Is it really an accurate statement that we have collectively concluded that there is not broad agreement that IRIS could be a potential solution for this issue?"

Barbara Steele: This is Barbara.

Paul Diaz: Okay Barbara.

Barbara Steele: I think I would agree with Mike that, you know, I personally think that it could be a viable solution. So I don't know that there are others. You know, I'd like to hear if anybody disagrees that it could be a viable solution or that maybe we could come to some consensus that we agree that it's a potential.

(Mikey): Hello this is (Mikey).

Paul Diaz: (Mikey).

(Mikey): I'd agree too. I think that we could amp up our language just a bit. I am not sure that we want to go so far as to say this is the solution. But I think we could also come forward a little bit from where we're at right now. So I'd support that as well.

(James): This is (James). I think that what we're looking at here is probably just an omission of any kind of strong language for a consensus rather than a declaration that there wasn't consensus.

Paul Diaz: Okay.

Michael Collins: I agree. This is Michael.

Paul Diaz: Okay. Kevin, this sounds good to you as well?

Kevin Erdman: Yes.

Paul Diaz: Excellent. Ah (Sebastian) you've joined us.

(Sebastian): Yes thank you very much. Just the question it's - are we sure that we're discussing about the fact that IRIS could solve the question we have in front of us. And that IRIS - it's a good solution for other things like Whois or other purpose (unintelligible). I am not sure that we are sure that we will get the solution by implementing IRIS to solve the question of the mail registrant to be transmitted from one registrar to another one. If you are sure about that then I will be agree to say that we have got a consensus where we think that it could be a good way to think about - also to further study. I would like just to be sure that it's that we are looking for now.

Paul Diaz: Excellent points. You know, based on what others have said and what (Sebastian) just said Mike were you looking to try and recast - Mike Rodenbaugh - try to recast the text to underscore the possibility of IRIS? Or rather make sure that we add additional text highlighting this as a potential solution? And then - as you say in your notes - perhaps proposing some further next steps would be studying the feasibility of IRIS in this capacity?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yeah the latter definitely. I mean just like I said. I mean I agree with someone who said it's really not be the solution. But I think we at least have enough commentary or support in the group and in the public comments to look at it as a possible solution to this issue.

Paul Diaz: Okay.

Mike Rodenbaugh: I mean and alternatively frankly I didn't know how that would go - how they would feel about this this morning. But the alternative is to insert text as to, you know, why there is not broad agreement. Again I

only saw positive commentary on it in the report. So if there is negative commentary on it then we ought to include that.

(Mikey): This is (Mikey).

Paul Diaz: Go ahead (Mikey).

(Mikey): I'm looking on Page 18 - (unintelligible) numbers, oh well - of the language that we have in there, Mike Rodenbaugh can you take a look at that language? How could we amp that up to get it to where you want to be? Or is it strong enough right now?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Page 18 - is that in the Word document? That is what I was going off of last time.

(Mikey): Yeah - it's - I'm looking at the PDF but I would assume that the page numbering is the same.

Mike Rodenbaugh: I don't think it is.

Paul Diaz: Okay there is the confusion that we had earlier. So it would be a lot earlier. If you were quoting Page 26 - Mike Rodenbaugh.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Wait - no this is something else.

(Mikey): What language is it that you're talking about Mike?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Basically when we got - we have a little section in there that is called The Internet Registry Information Services - IRIS.

(Mikey): Right.

Mike Rodenbaugh: And we have three old bullets and then we have a red new bullet.

(Mikey): Yeah that is the text I cut and pasted right into my email. Is that strong enough or do you feel like we need to amp that up?

Paul Diaz: For example Mike perhaps a third bullet is what we should be focused on? Because here we've noted as we EPP the cost and time of implementation would need to be assessed in order to determine whether this would be a viable option. If I am hearing you correctly we should make this more declarative.

(Mikey): Yeah.

Paul Diaz: You know this should be further researched and looked into.

Man: I think that's right. Maybe move it to the fourth bullet it would make more sense. Swap the order of those bullets.

Paul Diaz: Yeah.

Man: And yeah say that - you can eliminate the add of EPP clause and just say the working group supports that cost and time implementation be assessed in order to determine whether this would be a viable option.

Paul Diaz: Did you catch that Marika?



Marika Konings: I think I did.

Man: I'm good with that.

Marika Konings: It would read as an EPP the working group supports that costs and - was it implementation? And time of implementation would need to be assessed. And then the rest of the sentence is basically new?

Man: Yeah should be assessed.

Paul Diaz: I think it should. And we're going to drop the as with EPP right?

Man: Yeah.

Paul Diaz: So it makes it more declarative.

Man: Yeah not necessary here.

Marika Konings: Is there something as well that we want to include in the conclusions and basically making a recommendation for further study on this? It really comes out as well in the conclusions and recommendations for our next step?

Barbara Steele: This is Barbara. I think it should.

(Mikey): (Mikey) I think....

((Crosstalk))

Man: Can someone tell me where the conclusions are? On what page on this issue?

Marika Konings: That is on Page - it started on Page 22. Apologize that the line number - I see that the line numbers actually were included in the first part but for some reason it didn't go through the whole document. Apologize for that. The first part where the conclusions come up is on Page 22. But this comes back again as well at the end of the document. And I think it's Chapter 7 if I'm not mistaken.

Man: Before we skip to that page just to conclude on Page 18 - if I understood it right we should shift the order of the two last bullets as well. So we're finished with what is the basis for recommendation.

Man: Yes.

Paul Diaz: That's correct.

Man: I think I would also propose that we add another bullet - maybe the second bullet - providing these links to the SFAC advisories that discuss IRIS.

(Mikey): I think that is a good idea. This is (Mikey).

Paul Diaz: Sure. That makes sense as well because we'll be paving the way for whatever future work is done. When they refer back to this report they'll have those resources immediately available. So you can cut and paste those in for us Marika?

Marika Konings: Yep no problem.

Paul Diaz: Okay. So...

Marika Konings: I'll reverse the order.

Paul Diaz: Yes. I was going to say for this section again the first two bullets will be there. Added into that second bullet will be the links that were provided for the SFAC stuff. In the order third will now be the bullet that begins, "IRIS was also raised as a possible solution" etcetera, etcetera. That will be third. And then finally what we've just reworked. A more declarative statement encouraging should that the assessment should be done to determine whether it should be a viable option. So with that then if we jump out to Page...

(Sebastian): Sorry I have one question. This is (Sebastian).

Paul Diaz: Yes Sir?

(Sebastian): The current status of IRIS - it's like it's the last document on ITF? And - or what then? Just why I ask this question is that it is always the question of the chicken and egg. I don't want that this - if we take this position that it's we think for anybody that we want to push IRIS as a solution for other things.

And at the same time I think it's important to say what we want to say. If IRIS is to become the replacement of the Whois then it will have to solve the question where we print others. If it's not coming - it's not because we have a solution for that - that we need to have IRIS. It's a more broader study who have to be done to decide if IRIS is to replace Whois. If you filed the same corrections I'm sorry for that.

Paul Diaz: Is anybody in the position to explain the actual status of IRIS? I'm trying to remember from when (Scott) was on the call. And was he suggesting that perhaps some registry operators have begun implementing? Or is this still in a true development stage?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. If I recall, well I think I've seen an article where I think a German registry has actually started implementing it. I would need to double check but I think I've seen something there. But I think it was one of very few that have actually started the implementation if I'm correct.

Barbara Steele: This is Barbara. I believe that Marika is correct there. I think that especially in Europe where there are some privacy issues I think that there may be some registry operators who either have or are in the process of implementing IRIS.

(Sebastian): Yes but if you are giving this as example of CCTLD they are not to go to any privacy process to have a new rules. They cannot venue who they want. If they decide to use IRIS it's good. It shows that this could be implemented and that it could be useful. But I am not sure that its released any information on how it will be done and used as (gside) level.

(James): Hi this is (James).

Paul Diaz: Go ahead (James).

(James): In addition to cost and time of implementation perhaps we can put that the applicability or the appropriateness of IRIS to address these

questions should be assessed using those instances where it has been deployed like in CCTLDs as a model. So maybe we can encapsulate this discussion and put it into our recommendations and make that part of the assessment.

Olaf Nordling: This is Olaf here. I think (Sebastian) is fundamentally right. I think the development of such has been concluded. But while the acceptance level on gside is so far very hesitant. So some kind of caveat if probably needed.

Paul Diaz: Okay. Would (James) suggestion be enough for the group or should we be even more explicate in terms of a caveat?

(Sebastian): I would be okay with the proper (unintelligible).

Paul Diaz: Okay I got two there. (Sebastian) liked what (James) said. Olaf did we cut you off? Sorry.

Olaf Nordling: No that's - again I'm just concerned that as soon as we start poking fingers into the Whois well, here we go. We're at a risk of having much bigger debates in front of us. But well I would be happy with what (James) suggested. That I've realized that all right this could ignite a much bigger fire than we're intending to.

(Mikey): This is (Mikey).

Paul Diaz: Go ahead (Mikey).

(Mikey): You know I think that we want to encourage - I'm not going to try and propose language - I'm going to and capture what I think is the sense

of the group which is that we want to encourage operational innovation. And encourage the deployment of more robust and flexible technologies to run registries. And whenever that comes around in the larger scheme of things, that would be the right time for our endorsement to be included.

I think I agree with Olaf. All my joking aside, I don't think we really want to open up the Whois right now. But I think that when the time is right our report could land rapport for people who want to pursue IRIS. I think that is where I would like to stop. I wouldn't want to start a process that gets in front of some of those other issues.

Paul Diaz: Yeah. On Page 21 our first bullet in our Whois section captures that sentiment exactly. We note the working group agreed that even though Whois should not be the main topic of discussion it's not specifically remit for working group to make any recommendations for Whois modification. It would not be off limit to include in the discussion - if deemed appropriate - for providing insight into Issue 1.

So I guess the question for the group is should we paraphrase that bullet as an into? Basically saying, "Look we're not taking a position for or against IRIS right now. And we're definitely not trying to open up another front in the whole Whois debate. However IRIS - and then, you know, what we've been saying - cost - time of implementation."

(James) we're going to have to repeat your clause in there - should be assessed in order to blah, blah, blah. Would that work for people?

Kevin Erdman: I think it's fair - okay.

Paul Diaz: Sorry I didn't catch that Kevin.

Kevin Erdman: Right now I think that is a fair characterization.

Paul Diaz: Okay.

Man: Yeah I'm sorry Paul - would you just read it one more time?

Paul Diaz: I don't actually have something to read you because I was just kind of speaking out loud. We would want to paraphrase that first bullet on Page 21 under Whois as the intro to this question about IRIS. The paraphrasing being what we say on Page 21 that Whois issues in and of themselves are beyond the remit.

However if there are - getting back to this question of operational aspects that should be addressed under Issue 1 - you know it would be appropriate. We're not taking a position necessarily for or against the adoption of IRIS. However the group does believe - and then we come back to the language that we have - the cost, time of implementation should be assessed to determine whether this would be a viable - IRIS would be a viable option.

Man: Okay. I think that generally sounds reasonable.

Paul Diaz: We're going in the right direction here?

Barbara Steele: This is Barbara. I think we are.

Man: I agree. I would like to see it written but I think we're on the right path.

Paul Diaz: Much easier to see it - okay. Okay so we'll work on that and obviously there is going to be a new draft that will get pushed out. So that will go on Page 18. And then I guess based on what we have let's look at on Page - I guess it now begins Page 22 - our conclusions for Issue 1. Just skimming through this where do we need to make sure that whatever we've said previously is accurately reflected now in our conclusion?

Man: This first bullet I think is (unintelligible) space then change. Because it ends - however, after review and discussion none of these options received broad agreement.

Paul Diaz: Right.

Man: That is what we need to change.

Paul Diaz: Okay so to the group then - we actually do appear to have broad agreement on the suggestion that these things should be researched in the future. That should be the final statement? That final sentence should be recast?

Barbara Steele: This is Barbara. I would agree with that.

(Mark): This is (Mark). I agree.

Paul Diaz: Basically nobody disagrees? Nobody thinks that we're done - we don't have to look at this any further? Okay.

Mike: Well to be clear - I mean this group could still wrap this up in the final report. And this issue can go into the next - or double - the counsel



could say that this issue could go into the next PDP on the IRTP that should be kicking off very quickly.

Paul Diaz: Yeah I think that's actually what will flow out of this Mike. That any of the things that we're saying, you know, for future study - future consideration - that counsel will take that under advisement and try and work it into the future groups.

Man: Right.

Paul Diaz: Whether it's be - I guess it will depend on the issue - there will probably be a very logical place where it would fit in.

(Mikey): This is (Mikey). It would be great if we could - if Paul at least by the meeting, you know, where we present this to counsel we could maybe have a suggestion for them.

Paul Diaz: So you're thinking which PDP perhaps? Looking, you know....

Man: Yeah. We don't have to do that on the call now. I mean I don't think it needs to go into this report. It's just something that the counsel - if we could advise the counsel on that I'm sure they would appreciate it.

Paul Diaz: Okay. (Mikey) do you have something?

(Mikey): Yeah this is - my reaction to this is that we might want to be careful about putting a feasibility - this is essentially a technical, financial, and operational feasibility study. We might be well advised not to cram that into a PDP but put it in some other kind of a project. And feasibility studies and policy making are quite different endeavors. And so rather

than just rolling it over into subsequent PDPs we might want to encourage chartering a separate project to do that.

Paul Diaz: Yeah, understood (Mikey). I took it more as the recommendation of counsel that this group - based on our research and discussions - believes that further investigation is warranted. And we can make a suggestion to the counsel - hey, and it would fit in with the particular issue that is slated for a PDP. Or it may be a stand alone issue that they can say, "Great. We'll create a research group." And, you know, then the issue will be addressed in that way - not necessarily as part of a PDP.

(Mikey): Yeah that is the key thing for me - just a chartering clip.

Paul Diaz: Sure.

(Mikey): We ran into some trouble with that on another group. I just want to raise that as a possibility that we might want to charter this in such a way that it's not just acclaimed by the PDP process.

Paul Diaz: Okay. Is there anything else in this section - that conclusion for Issue 1, Page 22 onto Page 23? We're going to recast that final sentence in the first bullet. Anything else?

(Mikey): This is (Mikey). Could we just eliminate that sentence?

Paul Diaz: What does the group feel? Are we....

(Mikey): Not quite as positive. I suppose we ought to write a different sentence like talked about carrying on another study. Never mind.

Paul Diaz: Yeah.

(Mikey): I'll retract that.

Man: Okay. I kind of think as a group we need to sort of provide some insight of where we're coming down - not leave it hanging.

Paul Diaz: Alright so we work on these edits and obviously get another draft out to folks for review and hopefully approval by this working group. I guess the question I had for everybody else is given all the edits that appear, you know, without having to go through them line by line was there anything else that people saw they were uncomfortable with? Thought weren't accurately capturing the overall views - their views on whatever we were discussing?

Okay. Yeah for what it's worth I think Marika has done a fantastic job of capturing our discussions and our thoughts. And it's very accurate now. All right are there other issues - any other issues people would like to raise?

Mike Rodenbaugh: I raised one other issue about Issue Number 2.

Paul Diaz: Sorry, Mike - right - Issue Number 2 potential. Okay, yeah and the question was for Issue 2 Mike is asking can we recommend potential next steps or document any existing proposed market solutions?

Mike Rodenbaugh: I just felt that our conclusion there was very vague. It alludes to market solutions I don't recall that we ever discussed any specifically.

Paul Diaz: Yeah correct me if I'm wrong (James) but when we were discussing this I think the market solutions it said, you know, registrars basically have developed personal relationships with one another. And they do sort of a behind the scenes work around when there are issues or challenges here. Hence, you know, we call it a market solution.

Man: Which bullet point? I mean help me get caught up - we're on Page 23 on Issue 2?

Paul Diaz: Yeah.

Mike Rodenbaugh: This is Mike. This is possibly cursed. Is that really all we've got on Issue 2?

Paul Diaz: Are you talking about the top of Page 24 Mike and (Mikey) - conclusions for Issue 2?

Man: Yes.

Paul Diaz: Okay. And the last sentence should be left to market solutions?

Man: Yes.

Man: I think we could describe them there as - you know for example - and I'm just throwing out examples here I'm not stating that this is what we use or don't use. But we talked about secure access to a control panel, separate forms of authorization including transaction ID numbers as opposed to just auth info codes. So it's the match of two forms of authentication as opposed to just a single one key to the city kind of...

Man: Effectively a double factor authentication.

Man: Exactly.

Man: And I think that is probably - if we want to mention that there - it's not universally implemented. I know of one registrar - not us - that simply allows all transfer requests to expire and go the five does not respond at all. And just automatically occur at the five days - I don't know if they consider that to be a ad hock security approach or not. But...

Man: We can put some more meat on that one.

(Mikey): Well and maybe we - this is (Mikey), sorry - maybe we ought to amp this up just a little bit. Just given the conversation we just had about IRIS this seems fairly weak by comparison.

Paul Diaz: How so (Mikey)? Short doesn't necessarily mean weak kneed.

(Mikey): Well except what we basically say is...

Man: They're not sure whether we should do this by policy making of left to the market. I hadn't zeroed in on this one until Rodenbaugh brought us back to it.

Man: (Mikey) I'm sorry to interrupt. I just was thinking are we - I thought that Mike's concern was that market solutions needed to be flushed out. Are we revisiting the discussion about where the group consensus is?

Man: Maybe not. Maybe that is all we should do at this point.

Man: Yeah I mean I'm comfortable with counsel making the decision whether these options should be developed by means of counsel or left to market solution. But I don't see any documentation in the report as to what the suggested market solutions are or could be.

Paul Diaz: So it's the term market solutions that's too nondescript and needs to be maybe specified a little bit better?

Man: Well either that or maybe some examples. You know like you were rattling off.

Man: Right.

Paul Diaz: Okay. I mean that makes perfect sense - let's do that. And (James) if you can just recommit your thoughts - shoot an email to Marika.

(James): Yeah I'll send a message to Marika on the list and we can hammer out what some market solutions might include.

Man: I mean more examples should be left as examples because in the - when the third bullet - one just before it, you know, we don't want to get in a position where we're recommending mandating certain technologies. You know we're aware things like this exist so let's be more specific about market solutions are. I don't think we want to go down the path of saying, "And folks should do it this way" because again that is the security related. One size doesn't fit all - it's just a recipe for disaster.

Man: Well I definitely do not want to use the example of just letting all transfer requests expire as an example of security measures that we admire.

Man: Agreed. I think (James) is - the quick list he provided a proactive and really active solutions are what we want to highlight in the report.

Man: Right.

((Crosstalk))

Man: For example - one example - doesn't Nominet use a PGP for this sort of thing? Or require PGP communication?

Man: Yeah.

Man: Didn't we address this in our discussions? When we have the CCTLD realm it's very different than the GTLD realm. You know and now requiring PGP - okay how do we get that done short of a contractual change?

Marika Konings: When that was raised it was around the context of the issues report. Some examples were included there from the CC world.

Man: Yes indeed. That's way back (unintelligible).

Man: Yeah maybe we can pull those forward and add a couple from (James). You know think in terms of best practices rather than just examples. So drain out the ones that we don't think are best practices like the ones that Michael Collins is talking about.

Man: Okay question for the group - if we start listing things that CCs are doing - recognizing that they are a very different playing field often - are we sort of putting the GNSO counsel in a very difficult position? Because if they like the idea - want to pursue policy making - that, you know, we're kind of setting them up to fail because they are a very different work environment. I mean I understand listing out the things that are currently exist in the market place - you know, active security conscience solutions.

Man: I think if we're putting them as examples of market based solutions I don't think that we're encouraging policy making.

Man: I think if we just make it clear that we don't recommend any of these. They just are examples of existing market place solutions.

Paul Diaz: Okay.

Man: Yeah maybe the best practices thing got us into a quagmire we don't want to go into.

Man: Yeah. Let me take a stab at sending something to the list - some examples. And by no means would that list be comprehensive as far as examples. So if anyone has any other examples that they're aware of please include them.

I would caution however that I wouldn't want to go too deep into the discussion of any one example because once a form of authorization or security practice is exposed then it is subject to attack and



manipulation. I think we all want to avoid that so I think that maybe we should just speak about them in generic terms?

Man: Yeah I agree with that.

Man: Okay. But I can take that as an action item to have before our next group or faster than actually if we want to have a report prepared for counsel and give everyone a chance to review and modify and comment on that.

Paul Diaz: Yeah. I would ask if you can just shoot something to Marika to a list change. Might even be easier to just send it to Marika so that when she provides the next iteration of this draft report she can just plug it in and then everybody can speak to it from there. Rather than having a debate on the list it might just make things move along a little quicker.

Man: Okay.

Paul Diaz: Sorry I missed that Mike. Other questions - issues with the report? In particular the highlights because what I'd ask is when Marika is going to send us all the next iteration that those things now which is marked as having had changes that we can turn those into regular text. So it will just be the things we were discussing today that will be highlighted. Is that acceptable to folks?

Man: That makes sense to me.

Paul Diaz: Okay. I just want to make sure that, you know, people agree they've gone through - things look fine. So the changes that we have in front of us right now people are thumbs up - it's okay. And so in the next

iteration that comes out everything will be regular black text. Only things highlighted will be the issues that we discussed on today's call. Okay then let's do it that way please.

And question for the group - in terms of people's time and resources - again we've never had an artificial deadline. We've just tried to push ourselves to get this done quickly. We will be updating counsel in Mexico City as we noted. But it seems we're quite close to the end. If we can get another draft out - and Marika I don't want to speak for you because I'm sure you've got a gazillion things to do in preparation. Sorry to put you on the spot but Marika, when realistically do you think you might be able to get another draft out to the list on the Wiki?

Marika Konings: I think if (James) could send me his suggestions today I would be able to put it out later today provided he sends it before the end of the European day. Because there are only a few changes and I don't think it should be a problem to do that.

Paul Diaz: So let's see - I'm on Central Time - what is the end of the European day UTC?

Marika Konings: Well for me like 10 o'clock UTC.

Paul Diaz: Ten pm UTC?

Marika Konings: And otherwise you can send it later and then I will have it up first thing tomorrow morning basically before everyone else wakes up they should have the email. So it's just I'll say we don't have a chance anyway to look at it today we can shoot for first thing tomorrow morning.

(James): I'll try to have something to you by noon Central which is what - I think 19:00 UTC?

Marika Konings: Okay that's great.

(James): Now that's not right all.

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: If I can get it up today and if not it will be first thing tomorrow morning if that is okay for the group.

Paul Diaz: All right that's fantastic Marika. And again I did not mean to put you on the spot.

Marika Konings: No problem.

Paul Diaz: But if we have this revised draft for all of us sometime by tomorrow morning for review and, you know, I guess the question for the group is do we want to have another call to go through it? If people are comfortable with what we said in the draft can we agree to it on the list? Again there is flexibility in how this is done so what are people more comfortable with?

Is it enough to - you know, and I would ask if we're going to do it on the list everybody to weigh in. You know, whoever you are - Paul Diaz, I agree with the text changes. And, you know, we'll have a record. Sort of a vote if you will. Or would you prefer let's have another call after Mexico City to go through this thing one last time and wrap it up then?

Michael Collins: This is Michael. I'm in favor of being able to basically approve the final draft on the list. But I would say that if anyone - after they saw the final - wasn't comfortable with it they should be able to ask for us to postpone so we can have another call.

Paul Diaz: Okay. How does that work for folks?

Man: I agree with that.

Man: Yep I think that's acceptable.

Woman: I side with that.

Man: Yeah that's fine.

Paul Diaz: Terrific. Okay so then let's do it that way folks. Where we're going to have the revised draft sometime by tomorrow morning for all of us. We'll - you know, please go through it and see. And I would ask, you know, post to the list whether you concur with the draft as is or if you would like additional. And if you're not comfortable being the one guy or one woman who says I'd like another - please just reach out to me and we will schedule another call. There is absolutely no problem. We want to do this well and inclusively, etcetera.

It just - I have a feeling that given how collegial we've all been in trying to work the solutions as long as the language is right we're probably very close to the end here. And the thought is if we could, you know, basically voice our ascent so much the better that we can go to counsel. And then we can say we effectively have our report done. We

have, you know, some minor word snipping and the report will be on its way. But again I'm not going to prejudge.

If there are any questions, concerns, etcetera about the edits that are made, you know, let's make sure we go through them. And we'll simply take it from there. So please look for the new draft. Go over it and if you concur let the list know. If there are additional questions, concerns, issues that you want to raise - again - let us know. And if it's just a simple word snipping we can probably do that on the list.

If rather, you know, we want to have a debate make sure that we've got it right - then we will schedule another call after Mexico City. We'll just wait to see how the group feels with the revised draft. Okay and just for myself again those who will be attending - obviously Mike Rodenbaugh and (James) - anybody else going to be in Mexico City? Staff of course but any other working group participants? Not this time? Okay.

(Sebastian): (Unintelligible). I don't know what your question to that is.

Paul Diaz: (Sebastian) will you be in Mexico City? That was the question.

(Sebastian): And my answer is yes, I am in Mexico City already. And I just want to give you all advice to take a pullover because at night and in the morning it's quite chilly here.

Paul Diaz: Very good. Yeah we saw that daytime highs are what - upper 20's, 80 degrees Fahrenheit. But it gets very cool at night you are saying?

(Sebastian): Yeah and even when you have a good snow and good sun - sorry - it's some wind and the wind it's not very - it's quite cold. And just take care.

Paul Diaz: Very good.

Man: So we shouldn't bring our skis - our skiing equipment?

Paul Diaz: Not that cold.

(Sebastian): Not yet.

Paul Diaz: Okay. Well obviously for those who will be in Mexico City you're quite welcome to attend - please encouraged to attend Sunday if you are there 12:30 to 2:00 when we update counsel. Again the exact start of the time might be a little flexible because it's a working lunch. But, you know, for those who are not - I don't know - Glen is there a way to listen in? I don't know if anybody is...

Glen Desaintgery: Yes there will be. But as I said it will be a working lunch so there will be clattering. But there will be because there is an open line in both working rooms all day.

Paul Diaz: If anybody wants to listen in then please reach out to Glen.

Glen Desaintgery: As far as actually if you just like to make a note the numbers are exactly the same as the ones that are sent out for this call.

Paul Diaz: Fantastic.

Glen Desaintgery: But I will send out because there is a pass code for GNSL. The pass code is GNSL2.

Paul Diaz: Okay. Glen you had offered to just post to the list a reminder that Sunday there is a session.

Glen Desaintgery: I'll do that.

Paul Diaz: The number and the line. Remember everybody Mexico City is I guess like Central Time. It's an hour behind the East Coast. I guess that would be what?

Man: I love it.

Paul Diaz: UTC plus 6?

Man: Minus 6.

Paul Diaz: Minus 6 - pardon me.

Glen Desaintgery: Minus 6.

(Sebastian): And just a question Glen - you send the mail on Monday saying that the schedule of those meeting change.

Glen Desaintgery: Yes that's right. Yes I am sorry about that but I have had a number of changes. And I'm just waiting for a confirmation of another meeting before I send out yet another change schedule.

(Sebastian): Then it may be not at lunch time or it will be at lunch time?

Glen Desaintgery: No it will be at lunch time. It will be at lunch time.

Paul Diaz: Yeah.

Glen Desaintgery: That we've settled.

Paul Diaz: That part is the change (Sebastian). So it will be during a working lunch Sunday afternoon.

Glen Desaintgery: It will be during the working lunch.

(Sebastian): I don't know if I will be able to join you because as you know we have the summit of the (unintelligible). And I am sharing one of the working group and I guess it will be all the Sunday long and then I will not be able to skip away from that meeting. But I will be with you and thank you for your job.

Paul Diaz: Excellent. Okay everyone - well again thank you for the attendance. I really appreciate everybody making the time. Look for the revised draft - it will be coming out shortly. And then post to the list any additional changes you would like to see or your ascent with the draft so that we know whether we need to schedule one more call or if we are ready to wrap this process up.

And then we'll communicate all that on the list as appropriate. Very good. Well with that I'll let you all go about five minutes early. And for those colleagues we'll see you in Mexico City. And as (Sebastian) said bring a little - a good jacket for the evening hours because it will be cool.



END