

**IRTP C
TRANSCRIPTION
Tuesday 10 July 2012 at 1400 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the IRTP C meeting on Tuesday 10 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-20120710-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
Philip Corwin - CBUC
Bob Mountain - RrSG
Matt Serlin – RrSG
Avri Doria – co-Chair
Barbara Knight – RrSG
Kevin Erdman – IPC
Rob Golding – RrSG
Hago Dafalla - NCUC
Chris Chaplow - CBUC
Paul Diaz – RrSg
Simonetta Batteiger - RrSG
Jonathan Tenenbaum – RrSG
Angie Graves – CBUC
Volker Greimann – RrSG
Roy Dykes - RySG

ICANN Staff:

Marika Konings
Berry Cobb
Nathalie Peregrine

Apologies

Michele Neylon – RrSG

Nathalie Peregrine: Perfect. I can see the recordings have just been started. So good morning, good afternoon, good evening to all. This is the IRTP-C call on the 10th of July, 2012. On the call today we have Simonetta Batteiger, Paul Diaz, Barbara Knight, Kevin Erdman, James Bladel, Hago Dafalla, Mikey O'Connor, Avri Doria, Bob Mountain, Roy Dykes, Rob Golding and Philip Corwin.

From staff we have Marika Konings, Berry Cobb and myself, Nathalie Peregrine. And we have an apology from Michele Neylon. 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.

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: Thank you, Nathalie. And there's some significant background noise so please be certain to mute your line if you are not speaking. Thank you.

And good morning, good day, everyone. Welcome to IRTP-C for our first call in several weeks. I hope everyone enjoyed the brief hiatus that - from this working group. And for those of you who traveled it was great to see you in Prague and hope everyone had a good trip there.

I see that we have a few folks that are still trying to get in so we'll hope that Mikey and some others will be joining us here. And of course Michele is absent. We wish him a pleasant holiday if he ever gets there from following his tweets and Facebook status it looked like he was having some travel delays.

So with that we'll just kick off with our normal procedure here and ask that - does anyone have any comments, additions, to our agenda that was circulated yesterday? Avri, was that...

Avri Doria: No, my hand was actually for the SOI update so I put it down.

James Bladel: Oh okay - okay that's next. So does anyone have any updates or - for their SOI?

Avri Doria: Yeah, I do. Yeah, after over 10 years as just a consultant and educational I've taken a half-time job as Vice President Policy and Governance for dotGayLLC and half time as still as consultancy and educationally as ever. But I figured I should note that. Thanks.

James Bladel: Okay thank you. And then should we then be on the alert for an updated SOI to the wiki?

Avri Doria: That's already done.

James Bladel: Oh okay. Thanks. So anyone with any questions...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: ...that I did it. Right.

James Bladel: Okay fantastic. And I don't know if it's appropriate to say welcome to the dark side of contracted parties.

Avri Doria: Well I'm not there yet. We don't have a contract yet. But I'm aspiring to the dark side I guess.

James Bladel: Okay. That's fair enough. Mikey, it looks like you have an update as well.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, this is Mikey. My update is that - is minor but perhaps significant in some conversations. It turns out four of my generic dot com names are exact matches to applied for strings. And I don't really know what that means in terms of a statement of interest but it's in there now just in case it means something so there you go. It's also updated on the wiki.

James Bladel: Okay thank you, Mikey. And I agree, it's not clear that that is a direct conflict but I think in the interest of transparency and full disclosure we certainly appreciate you making us aware of that. So any other updates or...

Kevin Erdman: Yes.

James Bladel: Okay.

Kevin Erdman: This is Kevin Erdman.

James Bladel: Hi, Kevin. Go ahead, please.

Kevin Erdman: Yeah, my update - I haven't update on the wiki yet but I'll get around to it. It's a minor one in terms of the statement of interest but I've just - have started a new law firm - or I shall - (IPLLV) and that's my current affiliation.

James Bladel: Okay. And does that change any of your affiliations relative to the group that you're associated with as participating in this PDP?

Kevin Erdman: No sort of the same game different law firm.

James Bladel: Oh okay. Thank you, Kevin. And appreciate that update. Any other updates to statement of interest - updates or changes? Okay thank you, everyone. What is normally a pro forma agenda item actually turned into an interesting discussion. And anyone who has any questions or further curiosities I would refer you to the wiki where the statements of interest are kept. And maybe Nathalie or Marika can post a link to that to the mailing list or something just as a reminder of how to get there. So thank you.

So the next item on our agenda is to recap our meetings in Prague. And I think meetings plural because there were at least two - there may have been more - there was a review or an update - a status report given to the GNSO

Council over the weekend by Marika and myself and I believe Avri was there and some other members of the working group as well to field questions.

I thought that went fairly well and there were no - at least I don't recall any major issues or questions or concerns on the part of the Council. So I think that in that regard that was more of a formality and that went really well.

I think the - the really exciting session came on Wednesday when the group reached out to various stakeholder groups and constituencies and other interested segments of the community to participate in a workshop in - where we discussed the various questions. We discussed our initial report and some of the recommendations.

And I thought that was a really fantastic turnout and healthy exchange of ideas. Some of the thoughts and comments that were expressed were reintroductions of topics that had been covered in this working group. But some of it was I think novel and worth considering. And it was always good to have fresh voices on the discussion. So it was a great session. I really thank everyone for spreading the word about that session and getting the attendance up and for coming and participating in a very lively conversation.

If you were in Costa Rica I think - and also in Prague you would know that there was - I think it was pretty readily apparent that there's no comparison between the two; the session in Prague was much more substantial. So thanks to everyone for that.

And that leads us to our - well it's actually Agenda Item Number 5. But we can discuss our work plans here in a moment and then look into what we need to do as far as incorporating the feedback that we heard in that session in Prague as well as the public comments that have been received in the public comment fora, which is open, I think, for another two weeks roughly - or at least the reply period is open for another two weeks.

And we're going to start to build the feedback and the comments into our initial report and look at them in the context of our recommendations and say is this something that needs to be revisited? Is it something that we've missed entirely or how can we - how can we review the comments and the feedback and start to take that into account? So that will be our - I think roughly our mission between Prague and the delivery of our final report in Toronto.

But before we dive into our work plan let's take a look at the queue at go with Mr. Golding. Rob. Rob, you may be on mute and his hand goes down.

Rob Golding: Apologies.

James Bladel: Okay, false alarm. Okay so let's take a look at the review - review the work plan. So if you take a look at the document that Marika has in the Adobe room you see - I'm going to scroll down here a little bit - that we are on the second page and it looks like we are into the bit in July.

Now it says July 16 is the close of the public comment period on the initial report. I believe that's been pushed and I believe that's now July 25. Marika, can you confirm?

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. This work plan dates back from March I think when we still had some other timelines in there so this indeed hasn't been updated to reflect, you know, the timeframe for the current public comment forum which indeed is I think the 25th of July. And also to note that of course, you know, the first meeting we're having now is not the 24th of July but it's the day (on the 10th).

James Bladel: Okay thank you. Avri.

Avri Doria: Yeah, in looking at this - and this is often an exercise that we do right about now. So I think there's two things to this work plan that we need to look at.

One is the backward scheduling. We need to check the timeline and make sure that we've got the backwards scheduling done for Toronto to make sure that it reflects proper days for when we need to submit, when we need to have final copy due, you know, next to last final draft work walk through, a couple like that.

So I think like in the last three or four weeks, you know, basically the - certainly in September sometime, I'm not quite sure how early, we have to start on that process. I think until we actually see the comments we could have some idea but until we see the comments scheduling down from the 24th of July, if that's our next meeting - no it's not, we have one more before that - is basically deciding how much time we need on each of the topics that's coming up and how we need to approach it.

So I think our first meeting after the publication of the comments and the closing is the sort of discuss the comments and figure out our approach. Then basically we know which ones are short, which ones are long. We can group them into the following three, four meetings and then - so in terms of the growth scheduling what I'm seeing is a meeting right after the report has come out where we figure out the rest.

Three, four meetings, you know, maybe more where we parse the particular topics according to how we figure out to work them. And then certainly by September go into an end game on the final report which takes at least three to four weeks of, you know, updating drafts, reviewing, talking, working, seeing the update, etcetera. So that's kind of, you know, my initial chunking of it.

I don't know how much detail we can get into yet on the end of July through August. And I also think we have to figure out how much participation we have during July and August. I know for myself I will be somewhat flaky for some of the weeks because I'll be taking one of those working vacations where I'm still writing but I'm vacationing.

James Bladel: Okay thank you, Avri. And I think that you made several good points here. You know, I think for starters we probably - when we built this schedule were anticipating that we would have more than two public comments and more than I think - I checked yesterday - how many replies.

So how, you know, how we approach those in the late July and August timeframe is I think going to determine how much time we'll need and how we structure those meetings.

I agree that September we should be moving into reviewing the final report. I wonder if we have now one, two, three, four, five, six meetings between the - from September, let's say, under the document deadline for Toronto. I wonder if we'll need all six weeks? I think that it's - ICANN efforts are definitely in that vein where, you know, they'll take as much time as you give them and so I think we need to, you know, be judicious about how much time we allocate for those functions.

And it also raises the question of whether or not we have substantial material or work to be done between now and the close of the comment period, which is in two weeks. I think that's a fair question. So we'll take those into account. I think that right now - as you mentioned it's very difficult to paint with any fine brush strokes and we're just going to have to kind of adjust as we go along. But I think that that's a good plan. There's several important points there.

Simonetta, do you mind if I go with Marika first even though you were ahead of her in the queue? I think maybe she could shed some light.

Okay thanks, Simonetta. Go ahead, Marika.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. I just want to share one comment that was made in one of the discussions the GNSO Council had over the weekend about managing workload and that one of the comments was that, you know, maybe there

would be a way for working groups to, you know, avoid having a lot of reports just coming out prior to ICANN meetings; that there are already many other reports that are being launched by that date.

You know, in certain cases that is a really good reason for that like in the Prague meeting, you know, we wanted to publish it to have a discussion in Prague and get feedback from people there. But in this case, as it's merely submitting the report to the GNSO Council for them to consider it, you know, decide whether they want to adopt the recommendations or not.

The working group might also want to consider whether it would be more timely then to actually submit it for, you know, the meeting just after the Toronto meeting or, you know, if we would meet that deadline prior to the Toronto meeting so it doesn't, you know, add to the whole pile of other documents in there and, you know, might run the risk that the Council would say well we haven't had adequate time to actually review the recommendations, you know, we're happy to discuss it or have you present it but we're not in the position yet to consider it.

So, you know, just to note that that 9-October deadline is a bit of an artificial deadline and you might want to consider whether, you know, in light of the comments received, you know, you want to stick to that or maybe push it a little bit ahead so it comes at a time when it's a bit more quiet for the GNSO Council; not many other things happening at the same time. So that's just something I wanted to note on that.

And just on the comments when we get to that as well. In the next point, I mean, as you can what I've tried to do already is to put all the comments received as part of the public forum to date in that public comment review tool as well as trying to extract from the discussions that we had in Prague, you know, looking at the transcript and the notes I took.

The document there are already some items that were discussed. So, you know, one thing the working group might want to do is already start looking at those. Just noting that of course there might be other comments coming in as part of the reply period. But it might also be an opportunity for the working group to ask clarifying questions to those that have submitted comments as part of that reply period. That's just what I wanted to share.

James Bladel: Okay thank you, Marika, and excellent points. I think that, you know, I think if we can finish earlier we should. One basically citing your concern relative to the workload I think that when you said that was the Council let's be fair, it's Stéphane.

But he's not wrong that - that is definitely a phenomenon where everyone is racing for a certain document cutoff deadline and the result is just the volumes of reports that have to be read on flights. And unfortunately my flight to Toronto is about an hour and a half so I won't have much time to do that amount of reading.

But so I think that, you know, if we can finish earlier it dramatically increases the likelihood that our report will actually be read and considered by those who need to do that. And - well I had another thoughts so I put myself in the queue but I'll go to Simonetta and Avri so Simonetta.

Simonetta Batteiger: Hi. I'm just wondering - Marika just said something that I wanted to ask if - have we actually written capture of what was discussed in Prague? Because there was more than two comments that came up as part of the actual workgroup session.

So I would actually consider these as equally important as what has been written in a public comment period because that's also feedback that we received. And maybe the people who were in that workshop and voiced their opinions there think that because they've been there and they've said what

they think about this whole process there that kind of replaces them having to also go into the public comment period.

So I would think that - I mean, I'm thinking back to that workgroup session there were definitely more than two comments that (unintelligible) made. And then also I think just looking at our initial draft report there are still a lot of areas where we basically wrote in there, give us feedback. We haven't come to a final conclusion or consideration yet.

So I'm not so sure if we're thinking too simplistic when we're saying we might not need all this time because there still is a number of topics that we haven't really come to a consensus on. So I am just wondering if we are a little short sighted in thinking that we don't need all this time to really work through the remaining open issues that we still have.

And then based on whatever the final recommendations are there might be further comments coming to us. I'm just thinking back to IRTP Part B and that's exactly what happened. At the very end when we were done that's when we got some very vocal and emotional feedback.

James Bladel: Yes, thank you. I'll see if I can remember to address your points. I think that we - you're absolutely correct, we need to treat the participants in that forum as though - on equal ground, I guess, as those who submitted comments to the public forum.

Although I did encourage everyone at the meeting to help us make sure that we didn't miss their thoughts by sending a note to the forum. I don't know if that's possible now since we're in the reply period. But we'll do our best I think to capture all of that and to treat them all without discrimination because we want to make it easy - lower the barriers for folks to submit feedback.

I agree with you, there's still a lot of open issues. I guess maybe I'm optimistic in one hand and a little cynical on the other. I'm optimistic that I think that we

can resolve those open issues and come to some sort of a consensus in the 12, you know, 10, 12 weeks that we have and still, you know, save ourselves a few weeks here or there.

I'm also a little cynical that sometimes when we have an open issues that's very, very contentious that, you know, having three weeks to just debate it or having 10 weeks to debate it is really not necessarily going to bring people closer together. So we need to identify when an issue is really just not going anywhere and note that in our report that we're, you know, we're divided on this issue or something like that.

And so I think that, you know, we can probably make that determination as well in the time that we have. But I think, agreed, that it's not just a - we're not just reviewing comments, we do have some open areas that need to be - some blanks that need to be filled in and I appreciate that. And we will take all comments into account with that.

So Avri is next but do you mind if I go to Marika, Avri?

Avri Doria: Not at all. I was going to suggest it.

James Bladel: Okay thanks. Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. Just to respond to what Simonetta was saying about the public comments and just to clarify, indeed, what you see in the public comment review tool and the two comments I refer to are those that were officially submitted as part of the public comment forum; one from the Registry Stakeholder Group and the other from (Michael Showhad). And I think he was also a participant in the Prague meeting or at least I recognize a lot of the comments that were in his submission as comments that were also made as part of the workshop.

But if you see I think there are like - I made 29 entries and many of those actually come from the Prague meeting. I went through the transcript as well as my own notes and tried to derive from there any points that weren't made as part of the official or the two submissions to the public comment forum to really make sure as well that we, you know, indeed capture all those that were made during that session as well.

And I would just like to encourage everyone if you feel there's anything missing because, you know, there might be some points where I thought that, you know, maybe they were clear or already made by others but do you feel that they haven't been captured adequately, you know, feel free to add them to the public comment review tool so we have an overall view of what was submitted.

And, you know, I agree with Simonetta, I think those have the same kind of validity as the ones that are officially submitted because we did use that session as a way of obtaining input. So I think - I hope most of that is actually already in there from, you know, what has been submitted and received to date.

James Bladel: Okay thank you, Marika. Avri, you're next.

Avri Doria: Yeah, jumping in. Simonetta and Marika said most of what I wanted to say so I won't reiterate. Though I wonder if we could replace what was in the screen at the moment with what Marika created so that we can all be looking at that while we're talking about all this.

The only other - two points I wanted to make were ones that even on those things where we can't come to consensus. It's almost as challenging to figure out okay we have strong support for this statement and we have additional support for that statement that coming to a proper description of the state of non-consensus can be as difficult as writing the consensus statement.

So we have to do one or the other, you know, in terms of this. So I think the time is there. I totally agree that if we can do it early and get the thing out early it's a good thing to do.

I tend to believe that despite what various people say I know that I won't start reading all the stuff I need for the meeting until the week before the meeting, you know, etcetera. So we can say we're all going to do it early and some small percentage of us will but most of us are still going to prep for the meeting right before the meeting.

And so I think that that, you know, and I think there is a reason to submit to this deadline is because I think that this time we had sort of a working group session. I do think that having submitted the final report we will want to consider doing a presentation of the content of that. And so having that in the queue in time for this meeting - so this is sort of an argument against flipping beyond that meeting if we don't.

The final thing we're trying to show and we're really doing quite well at is the speed with which one can do a PDP. And we've been on track. And I think at this point we should still, you know, work our way towards a final by that date and not sort of push beyond because of the too much stuff to read issue.
Thanks.

James Bladel: Okay thank you, Avri. And good point particularly regarding the demonstration of the validity of the PDP and also having more of a presentation than a feedback session in Toronto where we can present our report and our recommendations to the community.

I put myself in the queue because I had a thought here. And I don't know if it's necessarily applicable to this PDP. But in the past few PDPs that I've worked through we've - the groups have finished their work and buttoned up their final report and sent it to Council where it was approved and then it was sent to the Board and it was approved.

And then there was this weird sort of follow up period - I want to call implementation questions or things where it was dropped onto the last of the policy staff. And they had a number of implementation questions, so how do we do this, what's a suitable timeframe to implement this policy? What, you know, which contract, what language, what, you know, we had some vague or conflicting recommendations from the report or different ways to interpret it, etcetera.

And so they would - and this is to staff's credit I think - they would go back and reconvene some or all of the members of the working group to discuss how to actually implement the recommendations as they were adopted by the Council and the Board.

And so my thinking here would be perhaps if we could anticipate that that would also be one of the challenges resulting from our report, whatever our recommendations ended up being, and we should start to anticipate that that will be a need and account for that in our work so that we can minimize that implementation follow up work or build that into the report as much as possible.

I think the way that's done with - would be with very specific instructions to staff. So that's just one of my thoughts of what we can also do to still beat this deadline, still over achieve on this schedule but produce a more complete and comprehensive final product.

Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. In relation to your comments on implementation it might be worth pointing out that as part of the revised GNSO policy development process there is a provision in there that talks about implementation and has a suggestion there if indeed there are concern or where working groups and the GNSO Council feel that there might be further discussions needed as part

of the implementation there is the possibility for the GNSO Council, you know, possibly on the recommendation of the working group to form an implementation review team.

And the idea behind that is that review teams consist of preferably members that have been involved in the working group and are very familiar with the recommendations that can serve as a kind of consultation body with ICANN staff when they work through the implementation of these recommendations.

And that's a way for staff to go back to a certain group that's representative of the working group that developed those recommendations to answer clarifying questions. And we get closer and have, you know, for example, the first draft of an implementation plan that we have a group to share that with before we share it with the Board or community to just make sure that we've got it right and that, you know, we've implemented a - or the proposed implementation follows the intent of the recommendation.

So that's something you might want to consider including as part of your report if you feel indeed that will be helpful in order to ensure that, you know, the recommendations again implement it as you intended and also to be able to, you know, provide input if there are specific questions on how or when to implement certain things.

James Bladel: Okay thank you, Marika. Simonetta and you'll be the last speaker on this so we can move into the review. Go ahead, Simonetta.

Simonetta Batteiger: I just have an observation. And I don't even know what to do about this. But when I'm thinking about to IRTP Part B and the reactions to that at the very end I think they were a result of that people gave input along the way but then they have, you know, when they saw the final product they didn't really have a chance to say anything to that.

And I guess you could turn an endless loop if you always needed to allow for further input with the final recommendations. The question is always like how do you judge basically how much different the final version of this - from whatever people have had a chance to last look at and review and comment on.

And so I'm just wondering how can we judge this final round and maybe do a better job judging on how much we changed our recommendations and our final product from what we presented in Prague which resulted in the comments that we are not getting.

But maybe once we're done and we have discussed the final open (pools) that basically knows what our recommendation will be about these how can we then make sure that this is not creating the same kind of reaction. And if so is this something that we would need to plan for adjusting and reacting to again. I don't know.

James Bladel: No that's a good point, Simonetta. And I think it's something that we should always keep in the back of our mind as an area of concern. I think that, you know, already I think that this group has done a better job of outreach and the building awareness and reaching out to the stakeholders that would have had a significant interest in responding to our reports. I think that how, you know, the differences or the blanks that need to be filled in are material and so we need to allow folks to comment on that.

But at a certain point that - it is a fuzzy logic problem or a judgment call where you eventually have to say that, you know, we have given opportunities - while we may - we can never say that, you know, there's someone out there that doesn't have an idea or something that we've missed that we haven't communicated with or hasn't offered their feedback but I don't know that we can ever say that we're completely done. But we just have to make our best determination that we are done enough. If that made any sense.

But I think that we can always continue to build awareness within our different stakeholders and within the community - capital C - that this work is ongoing and that we're approaching certain - approaching certain recommendations that might or might not be material to various folks.

Okay so I'm sorry was that a new hand, Simonetta or just a follow up from...

Simonetta Batteiger: Oh sorry, I just forgot to take it down.

James Bladel: Oh okay. Okay so thanks, everyone, for your feedback on the work plan. I think that, you know, we want to keep pushing. As Avri noted, you know, we certainly don't want to pat ourselves on the back for saying that we were able to finish three questions in one year; that's certainly, you know, may be faster relatively by the (ISAC) community but I think stepping outside those external to this process would still find that somewhat laughable.

Although I think that when you consider that this is an effort that is completely driven by volunteers sacrificing time, an hour or a slice of time here or there I think that, you know, it still is something to be noted. And I think to be fair, you know, we didn't really get this effort started in earnest I think until early November.

So I think we officially kicked off in October the real meat and potatoes took place in November so we still have a little bit of time before we hit our first birthday. And I would say the PDP that hits its first birthday is probably not something to be a fan of. So, Avri, go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yeah, funny about differences in perspective. I wrote that down there as a good thing; not as a thing to feel bad about. I think we're getting at the point - first of all we started a PDP and I think we had a change of PDP process somewhere in the middle and we worked with two, then one.

I think what we've got is a situation where we are trying to pair down trying to understand how things can be done more quickly. We have certain people pushing for faster PDPs and of course that's a good idea. I think afterwards it'll be a good thing.

Another thing the new PDP proposal calls for is sort of a, you know, a postpartum on a PDP, okay you've reproduced your output now look back at your process, look back at this, what can be improved? What was good? What was innovative? And get that sort of understood.

But I put this down as a good thing that, you know, it's down to a year. And of course if we want to be specific about it there's all the months it took to actually start up the PDP and get to October, November. But that's beside the point.

I was just saying let's continue shooting for our target. I think we've got a good thing. And, yeah, I'm sure GNSO can improve it still further but I think this is a good benchmark. Thanks.

James Bladel: And I appreciate that and I think - I don't want to - didn't want to come off as being too cynical but it is something that - I think sometimes about the internal conversations I have where I would tell someone yeah I've been working on this for a year and they kind of look at me and they roll their eyes and they say ICANN.

So - but, yeah, we are working at a feverish pace I think. And I think that the quality of our work has not been affected at all. I think that's just a - thus far the output has been solid.

Avri Doria: When I say perspective I'm about to get an RFP out that I've been slogging on for six and a half years.

James Bladel: Oh.

Avri Doria: And that's IETF process. So when those people roll their eyes at you, you know, getting a draft standard out in a couple years is really a good thing.

James Bladel: That's a I think a good contrast of the different time scales that we're all working in.

Avri Doria: Right.

James Bladel: So I think when we - on a number of commercial context when we look out more than one quarter we start to call that long term or wishful thinking. So...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: ...wrong with industry these days.

James Bladel: Okay all right so Marika, if you would, can we swap the document that we currently have in the window for the beginnings of the public comment review tool? There we are. Thank you.

And should mention that while the public comment period has officially - well I'm going to struggle with my terminology here so the initial comment period is closed however the reply period remains open until July 25. And for those that aren't familiar with this new process I think which was adopted, I don't know, earlier this year - and Marika or staff I'm sure can correct me.

The - one of the recommendations coming out of the community engagement session of the accountability and transparency review team would be that the comments be - comment period be managed in two phases. One would be for the submission of initial comments and ideas and then the second period would be open for individuals and organizations to respond to comments that had already been - already been submitted by others.

So I think that the goal there - and we can, you know, I can refer you back to the ATRT report if you're passionately interested in these sort of things. But the objective would be to allow commenters to interact with one another, not just to ICANN or to the working group or to staff as well as eliminating that phenomenon that I think we started to see which is form spam or whatever we want to call it where there's just a number of, you know, comments saying the same thing or sort of me too responses and documents where we can at least organize those by topic.

And I don't know if that's actually a - an overly optimistic objective of having this two-phased process but we'll see if that is one of the results. So with that said we can say that the initial response created two comments and that was from this gentlemen, (Michael Showhad), may not be pronouncing that correctly - and from I believe Chuck Gomes representing the Registry Stakeholder Group.

So there are responses that are still open for those two comments. But, Marika, perhaps we can at least look at Mr. (Showhad)'s response - comments here and see where are on time when we get through those. Go ahead, Marika.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. Just to note that, you know, the way I've organized this document is, you know, the first comment is just more a general statement and then I've tried to group the comments in relation to the different recommendations. So I haven't grouped them by person as such but more on, you know, which comments related to which of the recommendations and put those together.

So, you know, although even the - I think the first three or four are from (Michael Showhad) you see that they go into the - some comments that were made during the public workshop, the Registry Stakeholder Group then there's some others from the public workshop and then they go into

recommendation and Number 2. So just to clarify how that document is organized.

James Bladel: Okay thank you. And then, yeah, it looks like the form stuff is at the end. So could you start us off with the response - general comments from (Michael)?

Marika Konings: Yes, so this is Marika again. So the first general comment he basically made is that the process should be kept as (live) and simple as possible and registrant confirmation for domain name procedures should only be required if absolutely necessary. And I think that last part partly relates as well to Recommendation 1 where he has more specific comments to that end in the further comments.

James Bladel: Okay thank you. And I think that we are definitely looking for him to expand on what the definition of absolutely necessary is. But I think that that is - I would even warrant to call that that is a unanimous position of the working group is that whatever process we have it should be a lightweight process because we certainly don't want to create friction in what is currently a healthy and functioning commercial marketplace.

Okay so any comments on that or should we just dive into Recommendation Number 1? Pretty tame. Okay so if we could proceed.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. So then we go into the specific comments that were made in relation to our Recommendation Number 1 which relates to the proposed process for a change of registrant. So the first comment also from (Michael Showhad) reads, "A normal registrant, non-domainers, non-technical end users usually don't understand registry policies and verification procedures and often ignore communications from registries and registrars. Ask (urit, nic.es and nic.at) to name just a few which portion of their emails regarding trades are bounced or simply ignored.

(Urit) is currently removing their confirmation requirements for trades for exactly that reason and will shortly regard change of registrant as a simple update while ICANN is considering going in the opposite direction for gTLDs."

James Bladel: Okay and I think that we could probably take a queue to discuss this. But this is questioning whether - I guess I'm confused as to whether or not this is an expansion of his original comment or if this is almost a contradiction. So I think that ask (urit, nic.es and nic.at) to name a few about their - specifically about their email bounce experiences - I think we asked country codes a lot of open ended questions and received a lot of feedback - their experiences - positive and negative as well as some of the operational challenges necessary for having something like this.

So what does the group think here as far as this comment - that Comment Number 2 from (Michael)? Is he cautioning us to not adopt anything at all or is he cautioning us to keep it lightweight? I'm looking for what everyone's take is on these comments. Simonetta, go ahead.

Simonetta Batteiger: What I heard him say at the - in the workshop and the way I understood his comments is basically that from his point of view any kind of like additional confirmation, as he said, in his first comment or any kind of other thing that you're asking a non-domainer, non-technical end user to do to get something like a transfer done is not an easy process for the user.

And, I mean, I'm thinking back to our original experiment of actually getting a domain name transferred and how much we struggled with this although we kind of know a little bit about this process. So I think what he's saying here is that the ignorance, uneducated to the policy end user has a hard time understanding why they should do something with an email that maybe comes from the registry and not the entity that they just had some interaction with.

So if I'm thinking about - I'm about to transfer a domain name and maybe I had interaction with Go Daddy and I had interaction with Network Solutions because those are the two entities that are involved in this transaction. So I get some kind of a confirmation email from one of these two entities that make sense to me because I just did something in their interface or I know that this domain name is coming from that registrar.

But if I would get a random email out of the blue now from this company called VeriSign that I have no idea that they happen to be the registry for dot Com and it asks me to do something then chances are that I don't do anything with that email I just ignore it because I don't think it's relevant or related to what I just did so I don't even trust it. So I think that's what the intent of this comment here is. And he's saying make it simple and make it such that it makes sense to a user.

James Bladel: Okay thank you for that. Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. And just to clarify looking ahead because if you see in the next comment because there he actually states that they do support the adoption of a policy, you know, for a change of registrant. But, you know, as Simonetta has said I think that their main point is that, you know, should have as little difficult processes or confusing elements around it. That's how I understood, you know, the different comments that he submitted as part of his submission.

James Bladel: Okay thank you. Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, James. It's Mikey. This is kind of directed to Simonetta but I don't think we're proposing that a registry get involved in this, are we? We're proposing, at least right now, notifications by registrars. And in the case of change of control if we kind of leave the structure the way we've got it right now it would be from the current registrar of record.

So to the extent that a registry is sending an email I would completely agree that, you know, I don't think we want that to happen. Isn't that right?

James Bladel: I think that's - that is correct, Mikey. And I think, you know, it's possible that he's thinking with a broad stroke here meaning registry or registrar. But I think to Simonetta's point the folks that should own the relationship with the customer would also own this process.

To (Michael)'s point - or to his concern - I would submit that any challenges, customer awareness, understanding, education or actions - or operational challenges associated with email would equally be affected by the FOA and auth code exchanges that are currently part of the existing transfer process.

So I don't - while I don't think that his concerns are trivial, I think they exist and they are real. I think that they are potentially already occurring. And I don't know that proposals coming out of this group would necessarily make them better or worse; they would just kind of be more of the same issues.

Simonetta, go ahead.

Simonetta Batteiger: I agree with you. But I think where his comment is coming from is it's exactly that, that even the existing process is really confusing for users. And I think we all agree that it is. So I believe he's writing this because he has experience with users being confused with the process; not really understanding it and he wants us to make sure that we don't make it even more complicated than what we currently have and that his desire would be that it's easier than what we currently have.

But maybe we should just post this question back to him, is that what you meant? That's how we understood your comment. Is that - are we reading you right?

James Bladel: Okay well maybe we can capture that as part of the recommended action that we want to make sure that we're capturing that correctly and then that will help us formulate our working group response.

Okay it looks like we have...

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: Oh we have two more folks. We'll go to Avri and then Mikey. And then we'll probably saw it off there for today so Avri, go ahead.

Avri Doria: I have what is actually a process question for you. When you say get back is this something for - especially something that's in the official comment, although I think it would even be okay in the non-official comment that people were reviewing.

Is this something where you're recommending we actually send something to the response with a question that we approach him directly and ask the question? Is there a process recommendation from you on how this should be done?

James Bladel: Marika...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: I could take no answer as no suggestion.

James Bladel: Or maybe we lost her.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I mean, there's no official process. I mean, I think the idea behind the reply period is people can respond to comments. But, you know, to be honest I don't think there's an official notification that would go to (Michael) saying hey, someone posted something in response to your

comment. So I think he did post his details and I think people, you know, he was part as well of the workshop.

If there's a specific clarifying question the easiest way might be to directly reach out to him and ay well what do you exactly mean with your comment? But again I think, as said, I think he also participated in the workshop so maybe it's worth as well looking back at the...

Avri Doria: Right.

Marika Konings: ...the transcript to see if there's anything in there that, you know, further clarifies his points.

Avri Doria: Okay. The reason - this is Avri jumping in again with a follow up - is the reason for that - and perhaps it's putting it in the reply. Because also very often people hear one person say something or see one person say something and they don't bother to say anything because oh yeah, yeah, it's been said.

So by - if we really do want a clarification and the reply period is still on and we've gone through the search as you recommend perhaps it's worth sending in something as a reply from the group, see how process develops and copy him on it specifically to deal with the fact that there's no automated mechanism. But - because then other people might see it and say yeah, I thought about that too and here's what I thought. Thanks.

James Bladel: Okay thanks, Avri. Simonetta.

Simonetta Batteiger: Well I kind of had the same thought that maybe it would be nice that we - we actually respond as a workgroup to his comments so it's publicly visible and then (from) and reach out to him personally and say to him hey can you just place one more comment in there as well to say yes we captured this right or no and then X, Y and Z and this is really what I wanted to say.

Because then everyone else who might be reading those also has a chance to weigh in. And also it shows very transparently how we dealt with his comments.

James Bladel: Okay thank you. I think that's a good idea as well. I just - my only concern would be the timing - if we wanted to do that with this comment and with the registry comment. I think, you know, we have to hustle to get it in there by that cutoff date.

Go ahead, Marika and then Mikey and then we'll probably cut it off there for today.

Marika Konings: Yeah this is Marika. I think that's exactly the point I wanted to make. And indeed if the working group resumed down the road of, you know, posting a reply it might make sense to encourage everyone to look at (Michael)'s submission as well as the one of the Registry Stakeholder Group so that at the next meeting the working group can focus on any elements that are unclear or people think they want to go back to.

Because indeed if, you know, we want to put it in - the working group wants to put in something as part of the reply but also allow then those people that we have comments for to come back to us again as part of the public comment forum, you know, it would make sense to leave them ample time so we'd have to be done basically shortly following next week's meeting basically.

James Bladel: Okay thank you, Marika. And I had another hand up I think from Mikey but it's gone now so. Okay well, folks, thank. That was - I think - encouraged that we were able to get so much done today as well as dive into the beginning of the review here.

So let's call that a wrap for today. I appreciate everyone who was able to participate. Let's make sure that we're keeping an eye on the mailing list and using that to - in the interval between calls. And I would encourage everyone to take a look at the comments that were submitted. There were only two so I think, you know, it would be a good bit of homework before our next session if everyone had some familiarity with those comments that would be great.

Thank you, everyone, and we will meet again next Tuesday, same time.
Thank you.

Simonetta Batteiger: Thanks.

Man: Thanks, James.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, James.

((Crosstalk))

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you, (Veronica), you may stop the recordings.

Coordinator: Thank you.

END