

**IRTP C
TRANSCRIPTION**

Tuesday 27 March 2012 at 1400 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the IRTP C meeting on Tuesday 27 March 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/gns0/gns0-irtp-c-20120327-en.mp3>

On page:<http://gns0.icann.org/calendar#mar>

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Attendees:

Mike O'Connor - ISPCP
Philip Corwin - CBUC
Simonetta Batteiger - RrSG
James Bladel -co-chair
Avri Doria - co-chair
Michele Neylon - RrSG
Bob Mountain - Registrar SG
Jonathan Tenebaum – RrSG
Roy Dykes – RySG
Angie Graves – CBUC
Chris Chaplow - CBUC
Zahid Jamil –CBUC
Matt Serlin – RrSG
Hago Dafalla -NCSG
Kevin Erdman – IPC

ICANN Staff:

Marika Konings
Glen de Saint Géry

Apologies

Barbara Knight – RySG
Jacob Williams

Man: We're now recording.

Glen Desaintgery: Thank you very much. Good morning. Good afternoon. Good evening, everyone. This is the IRTPC call on the 27th of March, and on the call we have (Haggard Defalla), James Bladel, Michele Neylon, Avri Doria, Mikey O'Connor, Matt Serlin, Bob Mountain, and Simonetta Batteiger. For staff we have Marika Konings, and myself Glen Desaintgery. We've tried to call out to Zahid Jamil, but I think he's probably traveling, and we have apologies from (Barbara Knight) and (Jacob Williams). Thank you very - thank you James. Over to you.

James Bladel: Thank you, Glen. And welcome everyone to the IRTPC working group call for the 27th of March, 2012. I think it's a couple of orders that's housekeeping first off. Does anyone have any updated statements of interest? I believe we'll have one taker today. Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, I - and thanks Glen for sending a note to the list. I'm now a member of the ISP constituency, and I've updated my SOI.

James Bladel: Thank you, Mikey. I see you're getting some applause from the - virtual applause from the virtual meeting room. Any other statements of interest changes? Okay, seeing none.

We'll move onto a review of the agenda, which has been sent to the list by Marika. Thank you, Marika, and it's posted in the right-hand column of your Adobe chat room. Does anyone have any questions, additions, comments, proposals or criticisms of the agenda for today? Okay. Don't see any of those either.

So thanks for - thanks for the housekeeping and welcome back to our Tuesday calls. For everyone that was in Costa Rica, certainly was a

pleasure to meet face-to-face and see everyone in person. And I think that it was a good session. Overall I think we may actually pick up some new members based on some of the feedback that I've heard, and so we'll look forward to broadening the conversation as we go.

I think - do we have any new members on this call? Or have any new members joined the list since Costa Rica, Glen or Marika, I guess, whoever's...

Glen Desaintgery: Not...

Marika Konings: (Unintelligible) no, I don't think so.

Glen Desaintgery: I don't think so, no.

James Bladel: Okay. Well, we've had a couple of inquiries, so let's maybe keep an out for some folks, and if they - we don't have any new members, then I'll reach out personally and follow up.

So our first order of business today is the work plan. We want to take a review of that. We've seen one of those, I believe what we call a milestone or a checkpoint where we take a look at what we've accomplished, where we are, what we planned for the next few sessions, and, you know, what we foresee coming forward over the horizon.

So I wanted to give everyone and especially Avri, who very graciously has spent a lot of time looking at this and looking at some of the dates and how they line up with upcoming ICANN meetings and definite deadlines. So if we could open it up that conversation to the schedule

beginning with today's session, March 27th and going forward through
- looks like through Prague is kind of our next checkpoint.

I see Avri has her hand up, so I'll turn it over to her. Avri.

Avri Doria: Yes, thank you. Yes, since I took the first stab at this and unfortunately got it done so late last night that my co-chair, (Ann Marie) just barely had a chance to look at it, I figured I should probably explain what I was trying to do in taking this stab at the schedule and, you know, upfront admit that it is a first look. Like we talked about in the meeting, all of a sudden looking at Prague, looking at initial report coming out in time for Prague and trying to schedule back from that became a very difficult and scary thing.

And in fact, Marika after seeing this scary schedule looked at it and said, you know, "Maybe we have to start having alternate strategies." So we'll get into that later. But one of the things that I was trying to look at is not quite surrender to we can't make our original goal at this point. So taking a presumption that we have to try and find a way to do that, I played around with the schedule and came with this look.

Today's meeting is pretty already covered, you know, in terms of recapping from meeting, getting an update and perhaps plans for completion from the current subteam that meshed with the schedule, because doing a schedule without having them look at it and say, "That's impossible," or "Yes, that could be done," is kind of senseless. And then if we get to it, continuing discussion on Item A.

Then looking at progressing on how we finish the work from the subteam, get cranking on work that may be needed for B, in terms of

anything that needs sort of a corresponding deep dive, like subteams are doing now, that we haven't looked at. So next time starting out with an update from the subteams, then looking - taking a break from where we're at and looking at B and seeing, do we anticipate any place where some extra work should be done and completed by the time we come back to those discussions.

Then going through and basically getting the Subteam A work completed, discussed, looking how it affects the questions that need to be answered yet on Item A. This has taken us through 10 April. Using the following meeting to basically bring discussion of Item A to draft conclusion so that the initial report can, you know, get - or the draft of the initial report can start being written, although I assume that parts of it are already underway.

At that point defining any issues that still remain unresolved and having a plan for resolving them fairly quickly. Then going into discussions on Item B, hopefully the groundwork that was necessary (unintelligible)...

Man 2: (Unintelligible). I didn't know we had a second line (unintelligible) a month ago.

James Bladel: Excuse me. If you're not Avri, could you please put your phone on mute? Thanks.

Avri Doria: So then all of a sudden with that much time left you look at it. Wow, there's like two weeks left to talk about B, one week left to talk about C, and then start working on making sure that we have a final draft review on the schedule. Now I don't know that B can be discussed in two meetings, if there's enough groundwork.

And so I'm picking a quick stab on Item C that, you know, I guess there's surveys and such that there's probably not that much to discuss on that at that point in terms of getting something into the initial report. And what the initial report may be doing is, you know, reporting on the viewpoints and looking for more feedback.

So I don't know that I was being unfair to C giving it only a day, but perhaps. Then basically reviewing initial reports for two weeks, and that's the talking through paragraph-by-paragraph kind of thing, looking where we still have issues to get discussed. Then there's an initial report and then, of course, there's slippage planning if necessary if we don't make that.

And then one of the options that Marika presented was that, of course, if the initial report is not done, the initial report is not done, we keep working on the initial report, and we have a workshop that's on where the initial report is at as opposed to, "Here's the initial report, and this is what has." But that's definite secondary. So that's kind of one way of dealing with slippage if we slip.

Now upfront ways that can be suggested is, gee, maybe we need more time to do the work, and do we meet more frequently? Do we have longer meetings? Do we put more pressure on subteams to meet several times during the week to make sure the work's done? I don't know. It definitely is a pressured schedule. I'm not sure that I got the first guesses right, but that's kind of the reasoning that I used to get to what's in front of you. Thanks.

James Bladel: So thank you, Avri, and thanks - I especially appreciate the effort and thought that went into putting this together, and I agree with you that we have a compressed timeline before the Prague publication deadline. I think that might even be an artifact of the calendar.

It seems like there was a lot of time between Dakar and San Jose, and I think that we're paying for that a little bit with less time between San Jose and Prague. But maybe that's just my impression. But I haven't actually run those numbers on the calendar, but it seems that that's the case.

So just initial impressions from the group. Anyone see anything that's missing? Have we overlooked something? Have we perhaps given too much time to any phase? I think that that's probably unlikely.

One thought that I had, and I think it goes back to some of Avri's suggestions on how we can perhaps pick up the pace a little bit, would be Avri's suggestion to maybe take this work plan and then dial it down into a second-level work plan where they're working - the subteams are meeting more frequently to produce something that aligns with these milestones or deadlines.

I think particularly with Issue A, and to a lesser extent Issue B, we can perhaps get something a little more tangible into the group. And then when it reaches the main group, we can at least send - have more of a cursory review so that we're not doing a deep dive into the details of all those issues every single call. I mean obviously it's certainly the prerogative of every working group member to comment on any piece that they want, but we certainly want to make sure that we're using everyone's time efficiently as well. So it's that balance.

And that's one of the reasons why I think that working group - subteams and the mailing list should probably carry a larger share of the burden. So any other thought? I see Marika's hand up. But I wanted to make sure that the folks on the working team, especially the subteam leaders, had thoughts about this. Go ahead Bob.

Bob Mountain: Yes, thanks James. This is Bob. Yes, I guess the only question or suggestion I might have is - and Avri, you may have already covered this. I'm sorry if I missed it. But on April 24th, for example, and May 1st, we've got discussion on Item B and then on May 8th we move onto Item C. So I guess the only thing I would wonder is if there is a way if possible to work these in more in parallel rather than serially, if that's an opportunity for us to compress the schedule?

James Bladel: That's a good idea, Bob. If we were to just say Item B and C for three weeks, it might buy us at least, you know, if one of those issues, particularly Item C doesn't take the entire call, then we can use the balance. Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. Two suggestions, I mean one thing that has been done, for example, in previous IRTP working group is where one, there was a - once there was realization that, you know, the working group was getting close but needed a little bit more time, and your working group calls would get extended by 30 minutes or a second calls are scheduled during a week. That might be something to consider, you know, later down the road.

And just to maybe clarify that the suggestion I had made to Avri on if the group would miss the 1st of June deadline, because that specific

deadline is for documents that are intended for discussion and review at an ICANN meeting.

So another approach to - the group could take if, you know, it looks like the group wouldn't make the 1st of June deadline but it is able to publish the report before the ICANN meeting or during the ICANN meeting is to actually say, "Well, we're not here to actually discuss it or give you input now. This is just our opportunity to present to you the report and present our conclusions, allow you to ask questions, and just, you know, highlight that the public forum is open, and that's where we want your input."

So basically you, you know, turned it a little bit around and justify why you're missing the deadline but still want to take the opportunity to talk about it in Costa Rica, although you're not expecting people to provide input to you on the spot. So there might be some flexibility there if needed, you know, to meet that or if that deadline would be missed.

James Bladel: Okay, thank you Marika. Good points. Avri, go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yes, I think the parallelization that Bob suggested is a really good idea. I mean certainly, you know, two separate items can be covered in a meeting, and that gives a little bit more time on each of them. So I think that, you know, certainly that's a good idea.

And I think all of Marika's suggestions, especially having a checkpoint, you know, perhaps putting in a checkpoint in a month and looking where we're at on things. And is there a need to add to more meetings and lengthen it et cetera? May be a way to intentionally cover that eventuality of sort of thing. Yes, on 17th April, you know, we have a

checkpoint, if that's the halfway, and I don't know if it is. It may be 1 May.

You know, and realign and make those extra decisions then but still start out pushing for publication as was originally planned. And if we notice in three weeks, four weeks that we're not getting there, and you're absolutely right, there are fewer meetings. There are fewer weeks between these two meetings than there were between Dakar and - where was it - oh, yes, Costa Rica. Okay, thanks.

James Bladel: Okay, thanks Avri, and I had put myself in the queue. I think I am agreeing with everyone so far, and I have a suggestion, which would be that extending the meetings by a half-an-hour I think was pretty effective in terms of what we were able to do in IRTPB. And, you know, I know that it can be inconvenient for schedules, but what I was thinking perhaps is if we plan ahead by just saying that all of the meetings from May 1st to May 29th will be 90-minute meetings. That gives everyone a chance to adjust their schedules to do that.

And if you look, that's 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 - so that'll give us an extra - basically it means we almost have 2-1/2 extra calls at our current pace in the month of May, which is when we meet it'll be crunch time. So that would be just one suggestion is that we plan ahead and just build in that increase, because I do believe that - I think we can make that June 1st publication deadline.

But I think that, you know, as a good fallback, it's good to note that we can still - we don't have to go into Prague empty-handed, that we can at least start more of a discussion paper at that time. And I think that's even - in some respects that's even preferred just because I think that

people will go to ICANN meetings. They'll attend a workshop, and then they'll say, "Boy, I sure have a lot of ideas here. I would like to comment on that. But, you know, I'm vacation after this or I'm traveling or whatever."

And I think that what I - what just personally I've never been a fan of is the comment periods that are open during ICANN meetings and that close while you're still, you know, traveling home and unpacking your suitcase. Whereas in this case, the comment period would open some point after immediately following that and would give folks maybe a wider opportunity to send their thoughts in.

So I just wanted to put those proposals on the table, and then go to Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, James. It's Mikey. I've got a few ideas that I'll just toss out there. This is a pretty compressed schedule. So here's some ideas to add to the mix. One is I think it's probably not a bad idea to hand the pen for the interim report to somebody and start drafting it now and treat it sort of like a hologram where the goal could be to get the report drafted at least in outline very quickly, like maybe within a week, recognizing that then successive iterations of that report week-by-week are going to fill in details, iron things out.

We basically, I think in order to hit this date, are going to have to move pretty much right away into editing mode. If we follow the typical pattern where we have long conversations that sort of wander all over the place, you can look at the mine maps, they go everywhere, I think we're doomed to hit this deadline. But I think if somebody were to draft an outline and sketch out preliminary conclusions and then we

basically went into editing mode for two months, that, you know, we stand a chance.

So another idea in terms of the report is once the outline is there, hopefully in a level of detail that inspires people, what I've done on very, very short schedule report writing jobs like this is to put the outline out there essentially as a Chinese restaurant menu and say, "Anybody interested in writing a paragraph about any of these topics," and try and get at least a paragraph or two per outline topic.

Again, extremely fast by spreading the paragraph writing across a whole bunch of people, recognizing that the paragraphs may change a lot by the time the report is done. But at least there's then again something for people to edit against. So that's another idea.

And then the final idea is that Marika, James and Avri may want to initiate something that I'd typically do on other working groups where I form an ops team that's the leadership group that deals with essentially issues like this, process issues separate from the working group calls. So that, you know, on this call we've spent a half-an-hour of the call on process stuff. We essentially gain a half-an-hour of time to talk about the issues by removing the process discussion from the call altogether.

And in - you know, if anybody gets bent out of shape about process stuff, then they can go hang out on the ops calls, but that's another way to pick up some time within the meetings themselves. And I think given, again, this very compressed schedule, you might want to think about doing that. So there are my ideas.

James Bladel: Okay, thanks, Mikey. Just a couple of responses off the cuff. As far as starting drafting, I believe Marika has already indicated that she has done that naturally. She's probably reluctant to start filling in findings or recommendations, but at least capturing the outline of the discussion in the topics, I think would be something that's already underway and could possibly be shared, as pursuing that as suggestion. Although Marika might be a little bashful, but it's not up to her usual A-plus standard, at least we can get something out there.

The idea of an op team or an ops call, I think is a good one, being that it would certainly buy us about a half-an-hour per week. Well, this week being maybe unusual maybe it'd buy us 15 minutes a week at least if not more. I think that we could also do that via the mailing list and just keep, you know, that going on the list.

And then as far as sharing the pen and drafting, I think that once we've seen Marika's skeleton, we can possibly do that. But I do - I guess I'm not ready to say that we're - I think this is aggressive, I guess. I'm not ready to say that we've already missed it. But I think that we should pick up the pace definitely, and I think that those are good suggestions.

I see I've got a couple other folks in the queue, but I did kind of want to saw off this part of the discussion and recap our discussions in Costa Rica, especially with the (PTNSO) and then get some updates from the subteam. So Avri, go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yes, that's exactly what I was going to suggest that we cut this one off. I think we've gotten some really good suggestions. I'll do an update. On talking process stuff in meetings, we've done precious little of it other than this checkpoint, and I think it was necessary to come back

to the group periodically and say, "This is kind of what the schedule looks like. Can you buy into it?"

Having done that, I agree, we should move on. Thanks.

James Bladel: Okay, okay, thanks, Avri. And thanks everyone for their suggestions. I think that there's some good ideas here. We'll go back. We'll capture those and we'll get the updated work plan to the list and probably pole the mailing list for some of the questions on how we'd like to proceed like whether we want to extend the meetings in May or whether we want to start handing our writing assignments per Mikey's suggestion.

So let's move on then to Number 4, and this is the recap of the session in Costa Rica. I think overall it was a productive session. I think that we did have a good face-to-face meeting. We had a couple of I felt (unintelligible) comments from the participants there and attendees in (unintelligible). It maybe was not a large volume feedback, because it seemed like the room was fairly empty.

But those who did contribute I thought were excellent and I believe there were a couple of points that were discussed as takeaways, and I'll have to go back and review whether or not we sufficiently addressed those. One I believe was the discussion between (Rob Foldings) and Paul Diaz for PIR. So let's - we just need to make sure we close the loop on that, and that everyone's satisfied with that follow-up.

After that several of us then joined the ccNSO in their room, which was all the way on the other side of the compound and discussed the change of control issue in greater detail and sort of poled many of the ccTLD representatives in the room on their process, some of their

challenges, some of their, you know, just the benefit of their experience.

Overall I felt that that session was very helpful. I don't believe, and I - I've looked back through that calendar - I don't believe that that was a transcribed session. Marika could possibly prove me wrong, but I wasn't able to find any - a transcript of that session.

But I can say that we did have discussions not just with some of the Europeans ccTLDs that are listed here, but even, for example, some of the other less common ccTLDs were able to share some of their experience. And I think that there's a nice list here. Going down even through - if you can scroll down - going down to including folks like New Zealand and Canada, that they were very gracious in sharing some of their experiences. We also touched base a little bit with AU and FR.

So anyone who attended that meeting have anything that they would like to add? I think that there were no real, you know, lightning bolt, eureka-type moments, but I think that overall the exchange was positive in that it indicated that we were on the right track.

I think in general the country codes were a little - I'm trying to think here - the right word - they were maybe a little - well, I don't want to say this, discouraged or a little put off, which maybe kind of recognize that it was - our situation was a little different, a little more challenging in that it was going to be a registrar-centric function as opposed to a registry-centered operation.

And that's something that is just one of the distinctions between the G-space and the cc-space is that they had much more latitude and control over what registrants did outside of the relationship that they had with their registrars. And that's somewhat outside of the model, gTLDs, and so I think that they recognize that that was something that was going to be a pretty important distinction between our process and anything that they were currently using.

So go ahead, Bob.

Bob Mountain: Yes, thanks, James. I guess just in terms of feedback, the one thing that jumped out at me was - I remember there was a little bit of back and forth, and it started out when we were debating terminology around gaining and losing registrar and the, you know, relative appropriateness of those terms.

And if - and then we - I think we transitioned to the fact that we're somewhat surprised at the feedback that we're getting from people who perhaps weren't, you know, weren't participating or weren't paying attention to some of the other, you know, some of the previous work. I think there was a - some comments that came through from somewhere on IRTPB that certainly caught some of us by surprise.

So I think the - you know, the only - my only takeaway on that was, you know, are we doing everything to sort of publicize and solicit comments on the work we do? I suspect yes, but I'm just wondering based on those comments if there is a little bit more that we should be doing just to make sure that the registrar - larger registrar, you know, organization is fully aware of what we're doing.

Man: Yes, thanks Bob. That was a good point. I was also - I remember very specifically it was in the registrar section that there were concerns over some of the IRTPB recommendations and I had some folks that wanted to dig up that poor skeleton and start beating it again. And I think (Mikali) probably wants to weigh in on that. But let's - I understand and I agree with you, we need to - that should be our indication that we need to make sure, especially registrars are - were publicizing as much (as helpful). Go ahead (Mikali).

(Mikali): I'll keep this short and sweet and monosyllabic. Grrrr - is my comment. I don't know how that's going to work in the transcript. And to be perfectly honest, I don't see how we or ICANN can do any more than we've already done in terms of raising awareness of this.

I mean, the registrar stakeholder group mailing list, whenever there are any comment periods that are open, the execs are informed of this and they inform the membership. We, as individual members of the working groups inform the membership.

A lot of the domain bloggers blog about all this kind of thing. What more can we do? I mean, I don't know what the analogy is, what even to do. Drag the horse kicking and screaming to the water and shove his head into the water?

I'm sorry, I'm not going to do any more here. I'm done. I'm more than happy to do what I do at present but expecting us to do any more than this, we can't. If people refuse to pay attention to what's going on when they're being sent the emails on multiple occasions, there is nothing we can do about it.

James Bladel:: I agree with (Mikali) and I sense and share your frustration and, you know, I think that one thing...

(Mikali): Well, I mean, to be perfectly, perfectly honest James, I mean I got ganged up on at the gala dinner for Christ sake. I had somebody in my face for 20 minutes ranting and practically frothing at the mouth about a subject of which there had been, like, four public comment periods for God's sake, two interim reports, God knows how many updates to GNSO. Grrrr. I'll say no more.

James Bladel: No, I share your frustration. And I - but (Mikali), one quick question and I don't want to belabor this point because it is - we are now talking about RTPB and we're wasting our IRTPC momentum here but just, was it more than one person? I think it was just one person that I'm aware of, one registrar.

(Mikali): It was just - it was one person in particular.

James Bladel: Okay. Okay, so before we say that we have some kind of endemic procedural failure...

(Mikali): No, we just have one person who...

James Bladel: One individual who's making a lot of noise on this.

(Mikali): Yes.

James Bladel: Okay. All right, thanks. Simonetta, go ahead.

Simonetta Batteiger: I was just wondering if maybe for Prague, we can try to get on the agenda of the registrar stakeholder group because I think we got some really valuable and good feedback and the ccNSO and I don't know what the process is to actually get on the agenda and go over where the registrars are because if they don't come where we are, maybe we need to just try 30 minutes in their session and then really there is no excuse anymore for never having heard of this when you've actually been at their own session.

James Bladel: I agree completely Simonetta and that was going to be one of my takeaways from the topic and then, you know, I just wanted to mention, there have been a number of - for those of you who aren't aware, there are a number of high visibility issues going on within the registrar stakeholder group that means getting even 15 minutes on the schedule has been - I want to say that they're a great group of men and women but they can be very stubborn about their agenda.

So definitely want to, you know, continue to push for that idea and using the example on (desktop) on IRTPB as a reason why we can't, you know, let those meetings go without an update on policies. Go ahead Marika.

Marika Koning: Yes, this is Marika. Just a note as well - policy staff is normally also requested to provide an update to the registrar stakeholder group on any policy issues that might be of interest to them. And I know we always cover and have covered as well, IRTP related issues as we know that, you know, those are of core interest to registrars so for sure this would be included if we're asked again to provide an update at the next meeting.

James Bladel: Thanks. Simonetta, is that a new hand or?

Simonetta Batteiger: Yes, it's a new hand. I mean, and I'm just also thinking about who got up in our workgroup session in Costa Rica and I think she was from the Japanese registry or somewhere from Japan and sat with all the registrars. So I think she also thought that registrars should be there and so maybe we should just push for it a little more.

James Bladel: I agree and I'll reach out to (Graham) on that or (Clause) because I agree completely that we can do more to avoid that kind of stuff. Well, any other thoughts about either the session that we had Wednesday morning in Costa Rica or the session that we shared, some of us who were able to attend - was at ccNSO. And I believe, Marika, this document is on the Wiki for folks to review.

Marika Koning: Yes, this is Marika. So it was circulated as well with the email yesterday of the agenda but it's also posted on the Wiki. And, you know, if people have further comments that they would like to add to this or further, you know, information or other ccTLDs that they think should be added as, you know, useful comparison, you know, feel free to add it and circulate to the mailing list.

James Bladel: Okay thank you. And then I would encourage the sub-teams, everyone really, but especially sub-team A to take a close look at this document and as we continue because I think there's some good experienced here aside from the fact that it's mainly a registry centric process.
Simonetta.

Simonetta Batteiger: I just wanted to offer one thing. I think this is a great list. And what I would like to do is I would like to take this list and basically tap it

onto the (field) transfer team to ask them to add their comments on this particular TLD list and I can tell you just from talking to them that they would agree with the considered easiest process piece that's sitting right next to that on (LMX of the E) because they mentioned this to me specifically that they really like working with these processes.

They seem to be very easy to follow, very simple, very quick. And I remember specifically the gentleman - I think it was the (BE) registry for - spoke at the end of our meeting at the ccNSO session and said they went from the very secure model that was - that had all these verification steps built into a model that is very quick and easy to do.

And he mentioned the survey that they did with the registrars that registered at (the E names) and asked them how they felt about making that process switch, and they said that they loved it. They went from I don't know what satisfaction level to 90% of the people saying they loved the new process.

And then I asked him - and that wasn't spoken out loud in the room I guess - if he felt that as a result of this, going the less secure route, that he would see more hijacking cases or more complaints about issues with transfers, and he said no.

And I asked the same question to (Sabina Dauterer) from the eRegistry and asked her also because I said to her, "Look, we're looking at this right now and we're discussing what needs to be in a good process and it seems to me that this process with the eRegistry is following is very simple, however, it doesn't have a lot of these check steps built in. Did you think that - or did you have any reason to think

that because of the - your process is more prone to hijacking cases or abuse,” and she said, “No.”

And one thing that they are doing is they basically - they set off codes for names at the registry level and these off codes expire after I believe 30 days or something like this. And because of this process where these off coats don't live forever and that's kind of different from an idea that was bounced around earlier with FOAs.

Maybe you have them to be time limited. That seemed to kind of provide a little bit of security in their process there. And other than that, it's a very simple thing where you don't need a lot of confirmation left and right to go through the process. And she does not feel that this leads to more abuse than other registries in her point of view. Just wanted to share those with the group.

James Bladel: Okay, thanks Simonetta and I think that's an astute observation. You know, one of the things that we continue to discuss in this group and in previous transfers is that balance between portability and security. And I think that, you know, BE is definitely a good case study in testing that balance where, you know, the security is so elaborate and so comprehensive that no one uses it versus something that's so loose and user friendly that it's vulnerable.

And I think that maybe what they're trying to say is that they feel like they've hit a good balance, once again, acknowledging that some of that may not necessarily translate well into say, for example, a think registry environment like a common net where some additional safeguards or at least some additional security checks might be required by the registrar just to ensure that everything is okay because

there's a limited amount of - that the registry can do to protect or monitor or prevent any kind of security flaws.

So I think that's a good observation. I think that's the - my - one of my takeaways if I can just kind of put myself in the queue, would be that the discussion that we had about eligibility of new versus old registrars or gaining versus losing or whatever terminology we settle on.

I thought Canada had a good response to that in that they don't - as a registry they don't really take any pre - or check the eligibility at the time of a transfer. They do a post-transfer check. So they let it go through and then it's up to the new registrant to demonstrate that they meet eligibility requirements otherwise they face the same sanctions, cancellation or suspension if they do not that a new registrant would face.

And I think that that perhaps is a good model for how we might tailor a proposed process so that it is compatible with the sponsored TLDs and with the upcoming community TLDs. So I think BE is probably a good model for security and CA was probably a good model for a discussion of eligibility.

And if we could just maybe think of those as case studies, I don't say that we need to copy them wholesale but I think that there're some good lessons to be learned from those two. So any other takeaways from our meeting with the ccNSO? And once again, we will make sure that this document is widely available for anyone that want to take a closer look. And I would encourage everyone to do so. Okay, (Mikali), you want to close us off on this topic?

(Mikali): Yes, I just think - I think it was good. I just think it was very, very short. It - I mean, for a lot of these things, there's this ridiculous fear of within the GNSO of talking to the ccNSO so I'm thinking it's a lot of the ccTLDs. They've already resolved most of these problems and, you know, and these resolutions that they found are backed by government whereas our may not be. I think it's a good idea. I'd like to see more of it. Thanks.

James Bladel: Yes, thanks (Mikali). I was a little surprised to hear that we were the first team that's ever done that...

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: And I agree it was a great meeting. It was short. You know, I don't know, and we're grateful for the time that they were able to give us. I mean, obviously they have a pretty full agenda as well, so they were able to carve out some time for us. I don't want to disparage or dismiss how difficult that might've been for them.

So anyway - so that's the feedback from the CNSO and I think that wherever we come down on this particular issue, I think that we'll let no one say that we haven't done our utmost to reach out to the CC space (from) experience with registrars after market and then going to the ccTLD organization directly.

I think that's a good - whatever we come up with in terms of a recommendation I think it's legitimacy. It's supported significantly by this effort. So I thank everyone who was able to attend that. And all those registrars particularly - (like monitor), NCO and any media that

has and (Mikali Blacknight) that has contributed their thoughts on this.
Simonetta.

Simonetta Batteiger: (I just want to also invite everyone who is at one of these meetings, like if we do get on the agenda for ccNSO again or if we do get on the agenda of the registrar stakeholder group, I think it's really helpful for the members of this workgroup to be there when we are there to hear firsthand what these folks are saying because we got some really good input and I feel like I would've missed out on something if I had not been in the room.

James Bladel: That's a good point and certainly thank everyone who was able to attend. Okay, we have now it looks like just over - or just under 15 minutes, just over ten minutes remaining in our call.

I'd like to use this time to get some quick updates from the subteam and in recognition that they may not have had the - a lot of material updates since Costa Rica. Then perhaps since our discussion of the overall work plan, subteam leaders can give us an update on where they believe their efforts will tie into that plan and if there're any ideas to accelerate that or compress those efforts, we can discuss that as well. So maybe let's start alphabetically and go with Bob and by alphabetically I mean, B comes before S so go ahead Bob.

Bob Mountain: Yes, thanks James. This is Bob. Let's see, at this point, the survey was reviewed amongst the subteam and then forwarded to the working group. We didn't get a lot of feedback but what we did get we have incorporated and Marika was kind enough to put it into actual survey form.

That has gone back out to the subteam so I'm awaiting their comments and once that's done I expect that by the end of the week, we'll send the survey in survey form to the working group for any final comments. At that point we'll be ready to go and send it out to the ultimate recipients of the survey, so I think we're getting close and hopefully we'll have it out in process very soon.

James Bladel: Okay thanks Bob and Simonetta, any (face) with your subteam or plans for the near term future?

Simonetta Batteiger: Well, there's not much of an update since Costa Rica. I sent around a doodle yesterday to ask for when people have time to get on the next call. It looks like tomorrow morning 10:00 am is so far where everyone has time but, James, I think we're waiting for your response. So as soon as I have all the responses back, Marika will schedule the next call for this team and we'll regather and keep working.

James Bladel: Okay, thank you Simonetta. I believe that only took three minutes so I appreciate both the subteam leaders for their brevity. Any other thoughts or suggestions or concerns, comments on the activities of the subteam or particularly their schedule?

Okay, I don't see anything in the queue. Well, at this point in the agenda, then we would typically take another look at charter Question A which is change of control mechanism.

One of the things I wanted to point out is that we sort of kind of scratch the surface of a concept document that, you know, has been kind of circulated amongst the folks on subteam A. And I know we discussed a couple of different things. I think the first one was we got bogged down

a little bit by the terminology and then we got into maybe the second or third item on the list.

And then we just kind of ran out of time. So the question for this group was that useful use of meeting time? Should that be done? Is that something that the group expects the idea process subteam to work on and then come back to the group with something or would they feel - would the working group feel maybe shortchanged if that were the case? Is this something that's better addressed on the mailing list or should we proceed as we began in that group?

So if we can spend just a couple of minutes discussing the thoughts from the folks who were either on the call or in the room in Costa Rica for that session because my personal feeling is that I thought it was a very useful, it was a very substantive and detailed conversation, however, if we do that on each call, then the schedule and work plan that Avri has drafted starts to go out the window in a big hurry.

So I guess I'm looking for feedback from the group on where do we strike that balance so that folks feel that we tackled those things fairly but haven't invested the next eight sessions in that list? I see Bob. Go ahead Bob.

Bob Mountain: Yes, James so I'm sorry. Maybe I misunderstood the question. Was it how - the comments on the use of time at Costa Rica or were you looking for something else? I'm sorry.

James Bladel: Oh, I'm just saying, based on our experience in Costa Rica, even small items that I thought were fairly small and non-controversial on that list, in fact, prompted a very lengthy discussion so the question is do we

want to continue going at it from that angle or do we want to say okay, these aren't baked enough. We need to send them back to the (ideal) subteam and then have a more finished product coming back before we tackle that as a group.

Or does the working group feel like, you know, no, we're not ready to delegate that much of the work to a subteam. We really need to discuss that. I'm trying to find that balance there, Bob, between efficient use of the time and making sure that all the stuff is happening out in the open and everybody has a chance to weigh in.

Bob Mountain: Oh right. Okay, well I guess my comment on the meeting itself was that it was, I think, it would seem seamless and somewhat more effective working in the room where we were altogether and I think we did maybe go down a little bit of a rat hole but it's I think somewhat necessary sometimes to just get these things kind of hashed out.

But yes, exactly. I think it is a balance. There are times when everyone just needs to be heard on things. And, you know, we'll probably just need to have those out. And it's just going to, you know, you need nine months to have a baby. I think it's just kind of takes that time sometimes.

You know, other times I think we can effectively delegate, you know, I think the two subteams right now is a perfect way to grab things and delegate them and do a lot of stuff offline. So, you know, I'm not sure there's a pat answer or a formula. I think it probably is on a case by case basis. But I think the way it's going so far it seems to be working pretty well.

James Bladel: Okay thank Bob. I think that's - if I can summarize, your thoughts is that really just, you know, that's just the nature of the beast. We have to do that on the calls to make sure everybody has a chance to figure it out.

And then maybe just it falls to me to keep it from going too far down a (fraxle) rabbit hole, right. Okay, we'll go ahead next with - I can't see who came first so I'll go ladies first with Avri and then Mikey and then Simonetta so Avri go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yes, thanks. I think the discussions were useful. I think, though, those discussions when we're not in a face-to-face meeting, things that should be happening either in comments on Wikis or on the mailing list so that the questions that were put to the group in the physical meeting can perhaps also be put to the group by the subteams and others but as primarily discussions on mailing lists and I think that as the running chair, when we get past one or two comments on something in one of these teleconferences that shows there's further discussion to be done, it should be moved to the list.

And I think we have to get better at moving discussions to the list after we see oh, this isn't as quick and easy as I thought. Cool, let's discuss it more on the list. Thanks.

James Bladel: Okay, good advice. Thank you Avri and I agree that once we kind of - we need to have an agreed upon threshold for detecting when we're in one of those issues and it needs to be moved to the lists. Mikey, go ahead.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks James. It's Mikey. Just a comment on the (flucipherious) by (Mikali) on chat that he will not touch a Wiki. So I guess we'll have to figure out another way to do that. In terms of the discussion stuff, this is sort of the transition point. If we're going to really gun for Prague, I think we're going to have to recognize that the kind of discussion that we've typically been having on these calls is brainstorming.

It's very wide ranging and it tends to increase the number of options to think about. And I think that given the timeline we're on, we're going to have to change our discussion from broadening type discussion to narrowing. And so again, this gets back to the report.

It seems to me that one approach is to take your list of suggestions, the concept list that you pushed out, James, to the ideal process team and essentially just staple that into the report as a first draft set of recommendations. And then we on the list and on the calls, start editing those and refining them and narrowing it down to a final solution.

And so for the very first time in my life, I'm going to actually oppose the idea of wide ranging conversations on phone calls or in face-to-face meetings right now. I mean, not emphatically like (Mikali) but we do have to get into this narrowing mode now.

And I think one way to do that is to start drafting the report complete with recommendations even though they're preliminary and we should probably stamp draft all over it so people don't hit the panic button of they read our mailing list.

But if, you know, if we aren't careful, we will debate this one right past our deadline I think.

James Bladel: Thanks Mikey. I agree that we should probably - or treating at least, you know, maybe having a placeholder for findings and recommendations because of the (skeleton) policy. With a - provide thought that it either, A, is going to change or be a (twill). You know, we haven't even really concluded whether we need a policy at all, although I think that it seems to be the general direction of the conversation.

So I'm going to go Simonetta for the last comment of the day and then we'll close up the call. Simonetta.

Simonetta Batteiger: I was just thinking that we could (save) tomorrow's call and the subteam to take a look at this list. And at least within the subgroup come up with our first draft version of the thing that we're going to put forward as the initial draft recommendation piece. And then maybe identify the questions that we still think are open and need to be discussed in further detail from amongst these principles and also ask ourselves if we believe this list is complete and then take this back to the larger group next week to introduce this back into the group and ask for comments.

And maybe then - maybe put it to the mailing list for comments or maybe put it in some kind of other form where people can comment on each specific item so we can gather these comments offline and work through them in the coming week.

James Bladel: Okay, thank you Simonetta. Okay. All right everyone. Well, we're just about a minute past our time here. (Halgo), just very quick, I'll let you finish the call. Go ahead.

(Halgo): Yes, I think the committee in email is easier and you can (reply to) commence at any time. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thank you. And I think that that's also a good observation. So that's the rap for this week's call. A number of times to follow up then on the list. I think we look forward to both the subteams continuing their efforts this week and I do owe you a doodle response Simonetta. I'm working on that now.

So thanks everyone for your time and let's take the schedule to heart and let's push forward towards June 1 and I'm still optimistic. I think that we can make that and we can continue to find ways to accelerate the process. So thank you.

Man: Thank you James.

Woman: Thanks.

Woman: Thank you.

Man: Thank you.

Man: Thanks James>

Man: Thanks everyone. Take care.

Man: Thanks. Bye now.

Man: Thank (unintelligible).

Woman: (Ricardo)?

Man: (Thank you).

Man: Please stop the recording.

(Ricardo): Okay.

Woman: Thank you very much.

END