

**ICANN
Transcription
IRTP Part D Working Group meeting
Monday 4 March 2013 at 16:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of IRTP Part D Working Group call on the Monday 4 March 2013 at 16:00 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-d-20130304-en.mp3>

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

Attendees:

James Bladel - RrSG
Kristine Dorrain - NAF
Kevin Erdman - IPC
Rob Golding - RrSG
Olivier Hope - RrSG
Barbara Knight - RySG
Bartlett Morgan - NCUC
Bob Mountain - RySG
Michele Neylon - RrSG
Mikey O'Connor - ISPCP
Holly Raiche - ALAC
Jill Titzer - RrSG

Apologies:

Chris Chaplow - CBUC
Paul Diaz - RySG
Alan Greenberg - ALAC

ICANN staff:

Marika Konings
Lars Hoffman
Julia Charvolen

Coordinator: Excuse me. I'd like to remind all participants this conference is being recorded. If you have any objections, you may disconnect at this time. You may begin.

Julia Charvolen: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Welcome to the IRTPD Working Group call on - hello. Oh, sorry. On Monday 4th March, sorry about that.

On the call today we have Holly Raiche, James Bladel, Kristine Dorrain, Kevin Erdman, Oliver Hope, Barbara Knight, Bob Mountain, Mikey O'Connor, Bartlett Morgan, Jill Titzer, Michele Neylon. We have apologies from Paul Diaz, Chris Chaplow and Alan Greenberg. And from staff we have Marika Konings, Lars Hoffman and myself Julia Charvolen.

May I remind all participants to please state their names before speaking for transcription purposes? Thank you very much and over to you.

James Bladel: Thank you Julia. And this is James speaking. And somebody - someone still has a line open. So if you're not speaking, could we ask that - could we ask that you put your phone on mute? Thank you.

So just looking over Item Number 1 on our agenda if we could first please - I just got that little pop up now. If we could indicate whether or not you have any updates you'd like to declare for your statement of interest. If not, we'll move on.

Okay. I don't see any hands in the room. The second item of business, and we should probably add this to our agenda going forward, does everyone accept the agenda that was posted here on the left hand side of the Adobe chat room?

And I keep getting these pop ups saying that private chats have been started. So whoever's doing that maybe we can shut that off because it's taking up my

whole screen. So any updates or additions or edits or comments of our agenda? Okay. Don't see anything there. Thank you.

The next item on our agenda is Item Number 2 where we've established essentially that Mikey and I are interested in serving as co-Chairs for this working group. So far all of the feedback that we have received has been positive and supportive of that. I do not believe we have received interest or expressions of interest from any other candidates nor have we received any objections to Mikey and I serving in that - in those capacities.

So if anyone has any objections on this call or we can consider this issue closed and just go forward. Okay. I don't see any objections but I'll leave it to ICANN staff. I see a couple of green check marks but Michele go ahead. Easier to object now.

Michele Neylon: Michele speaking. James I think whilst we're all very respectful of protocol and everything else, I think this was asked and answered two or three times on the mailing list and there were multiple members of the working group who expressed their support for both of you as co-Chairs and I did not see a single email to even suggest that anybody in their wildest imaginings was in the least bit upset by this. So I think we can just consider that to be done unless you want to have this on the agenda again for next week.

James Bladel: Thank you Michele, no. As we established during last week's call that we would put this out on the mailing list and we would confirm it as the first order of business for this call and then it would be done. So I think that - I think that's where we were going with this. Marika.

Marika Konings: Yeah. This is Marika. This is just a note that the Chair selection will have to be confirmed by the GNSO Council, which is only just a formality. And the only issue that we still haven't been able to find a volunteer to serve as the GNSO Liaison who usually then performs the role of telling the Council who the working group has selected their Chair.

So in the meantime I think staff will probably just go ahead and let the Council know so they can, you know, make a confirmation at the next meeting and then just as well ask if anyone has any suggestions for who may be a good Council Liaison to actually encourage them and apply for the post. Thanks.

James Bladel: Okay. Well thank you. So it seems like we do have this issue wrapped up and Michele you - is that an old hand or you'd like to weigh in again?

Michele Neylon: It's a new hand. Just with respect to this thing about the GNSO Liaison. I thought that that was automatically have to be a GNSO Councilor. Is it actually open to non-GNSO Councilors because I mean as far as I'm aware they've always been GNSO Councilors?

Marika Konings: Michele, you're correct. It's a GNSO Councilor. I think the only one at least having looked at my list - I think we have Volker as a Council member. Then we need to check if there are any other ones that are actually members of this working group. So it's either indeed someone who has already volunteered for the working group or another Council member that (applied) becoming a liaison would - can become a member of the working group as well.

Michele Neylon: Okay. But it has to be a Council member.

Marika Konings: Yes.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Thank you.

James Bladel: And Alan is also on this group. I'm not sure if he's a liaison or a Council member but maybe he would also be interested. Okay. So can we consider that item per Michele's request and his frustration that we're still talking about Chair and co-Chair type orders of business?

Can we consider Item Number 2 closed and report that to the GNSO Council for their approval and remind them that we still need a liaison? Okay. Thanks everyone. And Michele is that an old hand or a new hand? And there it goes. Thank you Michele.

Okay. On to Item Number 3 where we will discuss the work plan that was circulated by Lars on the mailing list. And I thought that he did an excellent job here and I wanted to thank him for bringing this together and I'm sure he was borrowing heavily from some of Marika's materials from previous working groups. So thank you for that Marika.

A couple of items here to discuss as a team. And obviously leaving open the door to adjusting this work plan as we go along and as conditions and circumstances warrant adjustment.

But kind with notes, first off we have left ourselves as with previous working groups some checkpoints which would be the yellow lines if I'm not mistaken Lars.

And the checkpoints are just a - we've dedicated a little bit of time in that particular call or meeting to review the work plan and see if we're on track, off track, whether we need to make adjustments, speed up and in some cases towards the end if we want to hold to our targeted date, we will add extra calls or extend our calls to 90 minutes if we see those coming.

The other item that's highlighted in orange I believe are key milestones, which could also be document cut off dates. And, you know, Lars maybe you can walk us through exactly what the difference is between the various forms highlights.

Lars Hoffman: Hi everybody. Yeah, it's Lars. Yeah. James you got it right. So the yellow just review points so we can maybe have an additional meeting or, you know, look back at what we've done and where we're going to go from there. And in

the orange the first one - milestones are like soft deadlines. Obviously nothing is cast in stone, as we'll see as we go along.

But the first one is the sending out the templates that we'll also send around in two weeks time. I think that might possibly be due depending where we go today.

And then the next one is in July. The publication of the IRTP - the initial report. And I tinkered a little bit with this. In the beginning I had it moved to a little bit earlier which would then overlap with the Durban meeting in the summer. But it would give us very little time pre-Durban and a lot of time post-Durban. So I moved it to later into July, which then means that the public comment period will fall after the Durban meeting.

And then the next (unintelligible) that comes up in August and the closing of the public comment period. And then the 6th of November is the final deadline that we wanted to submit the final report for the GNSO Council consideration in Buenos Aires. And I think...

James Bladel: Okay. Thank you Lars. And just a - I have a couple of observations here and then I'll open the queue. I think that first off is that this is like our previous IRTP schedule. This is a fairly aggressive calendar. But I also think it is achievable. If we stay on task and stay organized I think that while we all have our day jobs and we have lots of things competing for our time, I think this is something that we can deliver towards.

Secondly I noticed that if we have our initial report for public comment during the month of August, that leaves a lull I think during the August meetings while that's out for public comment. And certainly there's some things that we can do and can work on in the interim. But, you know, we're going to be waiting for some of those comments and feedback to be able to review those and incorporate them into our final report.

But this is not necessarily a bad thing because the folks that have done this before probably are - just a second. I'm being pinged here. The folks who have done this before notice that there's an attendance and an activity drop off during August as well. So this is probably a good thing that this coincides with a down cycle, if you will, in our schedule.

After that it looks like the only other comment I would have is that from the incorporation of public comments through to the final report and submission of that in Buenos Aires, looks like we have quite a bit of time from August to November.

You know, folks who have done these IRTP meetings before will probably attest to the fact that we take anywhere from three to four - maybe three to four calls or weeks to get our comments incorporated into our final report. I'm not sure that we're not maybe - we don't have too much slack at the end of the calendar year. I'm certain we will use it up. But it's just an observation I have at this point. So I'll go to the queue now. Michele you're up first.

Michele Neylon: Thanks James. Sorry, brain not working very well. Did a bounce from like three - from one call to another all day. Now just in terms of the kind of overall timelines and everything else, I think that this is fine. I mean the last workgroup, which you chaired, we managed to do it in quite a tight timeline.

I think aiming for something similar is a good idea and I fully support that while I may not be able to contribute as much as you can due to my - to other obligations that I have. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks Michele. Bob, you're up next.

Bob Mountain: Yeah, thanks James. This is Bob. I guess my - not to disagree with Michele but is a realistic schedule? I mean we're in March now and we're looking at a November wrap up. We've got, you know, summer holidays where a lot of the productivity and progress kind of grinds to a halt or slows down significantly.

So I just am voicing a concern and I want to make sure we're being realistic and not aggressive to the point of, you know, being unrealistic on the schedule.

James Bladel: Thanks Bob. And, you know, I think that's a good point. If I had to bet, I mean I think this is a good aspirational schedule. But if I had to bet, I would bet that our initial report slips into August and possibly September and that we're reviewing closer to the Buenos Aires meeting. But that's just me taking a swing at this.

But I tend to agree with you is that it's compressed or frontloaded between now and Durban and then the summer holidays where I think that would end up. And I agree. But I think, you know, it's a good jumping off point but I tend to agree that it may be - it may be a little too frontloaded for some of this. Mikey, you're up next.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah. This is Mikey. That's why I kind of like that slack at the end. I think that the thing that will help us with this is these milestones, the yellow and orange dates because we'll get pretty good early warnings that maybe we're running into some trouble.

And I like having those pretty frequent so that we, you know, get lots of feedback on how we're doing. And so I agree it's pretty aggressive but at the same time as many of us said on the last call, it would be nice to able to demonstrate a predictable way to get through a PDP this fast because the other choices are pretty unpalatable.

And one of those other choices is going on right now in a parallel call with the Registry Stakeholder Group where the PDP process was pretty much bypassed and I think partly it was because it's perceived to be so slow. So I think that there's a lot of merit in really trying to do this well and effectively.

James Bladel: Okay. Thanks Mikey. So I think the consensus is that while we recognize the dangerous kind of - the challenges that Bob has raised, I think it's something to shoot for. We've got some points here where we can check in and we've got some slack towards the end actually like most of October I would say and the first couple weeks of November are slack where it's going to be very compressed between here and July.

So but I think that - I think that your concerns are noted Bob and I think that we'll just have to adjust as we go. And, you know, I think I guess I'm not ready to say let's shoot for Singapore. It's early enough in the game I think we should try with the schedule and see how far we can get.

And I think that we may surprise us and, you know, something slips into, you know, into the - beyond Buenos Aires and we start to target it for the end of the year as opposed to a fourth ICANN meeting. But I think three ICANN meetings I think a cycle. But we, as Mikey said, we've left ourselves enough checkpoints here that we can frequently ingest and adapt as we go.

I think that the real push here between now and Beijing will be developing that statement or the constituency statements and the SO and AC inputs templates and getting those out so that we have something to push off on in Beijing and something to kick off our deliberations and our team efforts so that we can start driving toward that initial report.

Michele, you're up next.

Michele Neylon: Yeah. I'll just keep it brief. I mean I think - I appreciate where a couple of people are coming from in terms of the timeline. But I mean the way I look at it is, you know, the timeline is something which you can adjust.

It's just if we set - start off with a very kind of relaxed schedule in terms of timelines and there are delays then it's going to be much, much longer where if you start off with a slightly more aggressive timeline and need to expand

things out a little bit, it's not going to be as long. So that's I'm not concerns.
That's, you know, that works better overall. Thanks.

James Bladel: I agree Michele and I'm of the firm belief that ICANN activities will fill whatever calendar you put in front of it and then some. So (I think) giving it as little as possible at the outset is probably not a bad idea.

Okay. It looks like the queue is clear. We're on Item Number 3 of our agenda. We're discussing the work plan. Were there any other thoughts on this before we consider this work plan to be tentatively adopted?

Does anyone spot any omissions or errors? Are there any national or regional holidays that we're failing to account for? Anything big like that? Certainly don't have to raise it now. We can raise it on the mailing list so we can adjust this. We have - if not, in a couple weeks here we have another checkpoint so we can take that into account. So are there any other thoughts on this calendar before we move onto Number 4?

Okay. Thanks everyone and really appreciate everyone who contributed to this work plan to get us off and running. And I think it'll be an excellent tool and a guidebook - I hate using that word - let's say a map - road map to get us to - get us to our final report.

So looking at our freshly adopted work plan. It's clear that we have a very urgent task in front of us, which is to develop the SO and AC outreach plan, which includes the template for their input on our charter and on our charter questions and to get that finalized and get that published and get that sent out to these groups so we can start getting feedback in advance of the meeting in Berlin - Beijing.

So let's take a look first at the template here. And I may ask the staff to walk us through this. It looks like we borrowed heavily from IRTPC template

because I can see it filled up there in the title. It says IRTPC even though the file name is IRTPB.

So Lars, would you mind walking us through what we have here and we can take a look at how this might apply to our current PDP?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I'll take a...

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: You're asking how we'll work with the input template? That was your question, right?

James Bladel: Yes. So this would be input template I see it...

Marika Konings: Yeah.

James Bladel: ...as kind of a mixture of IRTPD and IRTPC. So is this the one that we used for IRTPC?

Marika Konings: I think the only thing that's remaining is actually in the title. I think we probably forgot to update it there. What you see in the rest of the document should all have been updated to IRTP Part D. So it's one of the required (stats) in the PDP is to actually request input from GNSO stakeholder groups and constituencies.

And an additional move to that next is reaching out to the different ICANN support organizations and advisory committees to see if they have any input they would like to contribute in an effort to get all the information on the table at an early stage of the policy development process so it helps the working group to (unintelligible) the operations of the issue.

So what we typically do is indeed this is a template that just describes, you know, what this group is all about like when they need to send their responses and to whom they should send it. We can usually also ask if they can identify how, you know, who from their groups are represented on the working group and how they've actually developed their statements.

And then basically it's up into the working group to either define further questions or specific information you would - they would like to ask. And just basically what we've done is just put in there the charter questions.

But for example, some working groups have identified specific questions they want to ask to certain groups and have added those. Or have defined more detailed questions on some of the charter questions that they would like to add there.

Of course nothing prevents a stakeholder group or constituency to just, you know, ignore the template and just send a statement on what they believe are important issues that are related to the topic we're discussing. Or as well again there's no requirement for stakeholder groups or constituencies to make a submission.

So they'll see as well at the end of the day some may provide input if they have any input they want to provide. Others may wait until there's actually an initial report to have something concrete to comment on. And maybe just to note as well I think under the PDP manual the minimum time that needs to be given to stakeholder groups and constituency to prepare input is 35 days.

So that's a minimum timeline you're looking at and I think in the past we've seen as well instances where actually groups will ask for more time, you know, depending on workload issues or other things going on that they may need more time to prepare it.

So I think that's in a nutshell what you see on the screen and apologies for the mention of C in there but we did use the older template to build on and go on. We'll fix that for the next version.

James Bladel: No problem Marika. Thank you for the update. And it's good to know that we have to give them 35-day minimum. I wasn't sure what that was. And it's starting to think like if we're going to have anything in advance of Beijing it seems like we're right up against that through no fault of our on really. This working group got started so close to that time period.

So just a couple of thoughts here and then we'll open the queue. I think that this is - it's good. It just kind of in a basic way lays out, you know, lays out our charter questions in terms of soliciting input and feedback.

I noticed that in some cases we had converted this either in - instead of this formal template we used a survey tool or we used a survey tool in addition to this template. And I can speak from the perspective of the SO and AC members that the survey is probably a less burdensome mechanism to respond to calls for the input and feedback on charter questions for PDP.

It also in some ways I think simplifies the review of that input by the working group, kind of organizes it for us. It's just a thought here. Do we want to include something like that alongside of this or is this - is it something that we want to discuss as a team or consider? Marika?

Marika Konings: Yeah. This is Marika. I think this is just, you know, that nothing prevents you from using the survey as long as you allow stakeholder groups and constituencies as well to, you know, either have a open section in the survey where they can, you know, share any other information or submit statements separately I think as long as there are no limitation on them doing it in other ways if, you know, they prefer.

I don't think there's any limitation to you using whatever tool you think may be most useful or easier for stakeholder groups and constituencies to provide input or for the working group to actually, you know, review the information received.

I think as you said for some of the other working groups, for example, in the locking of a domain and subject to UDRP proceedings. What we did there indeed we developed a specific survey for registrars and UDRP providers because we - the working group felt they were very specific and targeted questions they wanted to receive input on.

And in addition to that they also used a template to reach out to all the other groups and as well, you know, registrar stakeholder group in that case to get input. So it can be, you know, either or and - and so it's really up to the working group to determine, you know, what questions you have and how to, you know, define those and what will get you the most useful input and feedback.

James Bladel: Yeah. Thank you Marika. And I think just in my experience more people are likely to respond to a survey and it's easier to incorporate the feedback. The only downside would be any sort of conflict that we might have with certain constituencies or stakeholder groups like for example the registries. I'll pick on them for a minute here Barbara.

I think have a more formal mechanism for submitting comments and feedback and that they have to take attendance and votes and things like that. So, I, you know, as long as they have some alternative mechanism to indicate the level of support for that feedback, then I think that maybe we could examine a survey or consider that as an alternative. Barbara, go ahead.

Barbara Knight: Thank you James. This is Barbara. So yeah, I think you hit the nail on the head. We do tend to have a fairly formal process by which to submit our

comments on various items and our inputs. So I think that, you know, given where we're going in the industry with a lot more registries coming into the fold, that's, you know, obviously we're figuring out the logistics of how that's all going to work as well.

But I can definitely run by the idea of the survey approach and see what feedback from the others in the stakeholder group.

James Bladel: Okay. Thanks Barbara. I appreciate it if you could take that back. And then the other just recommendation would be what if the survey were the primary means to solicit feedback but then we allowed other groups that have more formal processes like the registries submit a document, you know, as an attachment that can - that meets their bylaws requirement that indicates their level of support or something like that either as a separate document or as a - as Marika said, as a field - and open field that they can reply to.

Mikey, you had your hand up.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah but you beat me to it.

James Bladel: Oh, sorry Mikey. Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yeah. This is Marika. Just to note that of course you develop a survey, we may already be looking at a, you know, first slip of timeline because I think there you may want to give a little bit more thought to make sure that you ask the right questions so you really get valuable information. Because I think on some of the questions it's, you know, kind of yes or no questions.

So I think to tease out some of the information you want to receive, you may - or even may need to specify questions for certain target groups. Because for example if you talk about the TDRP I think, you know, registries and registrars may have specific information that you'll be looking for to help inform the deliberations.

In addition as like with the previous working group I described, you may want to do specific - if you're doing a survey anyway, also reach out for example to some of the district resolution providers that are currently also the second tier service providers handling the TDRP.

So again, if you're doing a survey anyway, you may as well want to look at if there are other groups that you may want to target at the same time so you include that in the effort.

James Bladel: Okay. Thank you Marika. Mikey you're up.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah. As Marika was talking about that, I started to cool on the survey idea because developing a good survey is actually kind of a little project in and of itself. And, you know, I think especially given the timeline that we're on, we could wind up spending a lot of time just developing the document that used to collect people's input and delay the input.

So I'm drifting backward from the enthusiasm for that for the very reason that Marika stated.

James Bladel: Okay. So Mikey to kind of put the question out there, would you prefer then something that we have on the screen here where it's just a posted document with a list of our charter questions and more of a free form or...

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah.

James Bladel: ...more of an open-ended question like that?

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah. I mean those of us who've been in constituencies for a while and responded to a lot of these, this is not a difficult document to respond to. We know how to do this. And so I just, you know, I - one of the things that I've discovered is that it's hard to get that first round of input in in a timely way.

And I don't want to add any time in front of that building a structure for them to input this stuff. I think they can all handle it.

James Bladel: Okay. Good thoughts. Thanks Marika and Mikey. Kristine, your up next.

Kristine Dorrain: Hi James. This is Kristine from NAF. Hey, I had just - I wanted to comment on Marika's comment about a survey for the providers. And I'm participating of course with one of the providers. And I know that the other provider is the Asian Domain Name Dispute Resolution Center.

And I was just going to echo the fact that preparing a survey, you know, may be more work than just maybe calling someone from the ADNDRC and asking if they've ever had any of these cases. And certainly I'm already here and I'm willing to just share whatever, you know, answers to questions we have. So I wouldn't put a lot of work into a survey for providers at this point. That would just be my vote.

James Bladel: Okay. Thanks Kristine. So it sounds like the general consensus at least of those speaking based on Marika's input is that converting something into a survey would - while it might ease the burden for respondents, it will slow us down and possibly cause us to miss some of our early first checkpoints as well as might - I think - and if I'm paraphrasing might diminish or discount the overall quality of the feedback.

You know, maybe I'm over - reading too much into something - some of the stuff that folks have said. So let's take a different approach then. How do folks feel about this document as it stands? I mean obviously we have to change the title from IRTPC to IRTPD.

But otherwise, does this start to look like it's a good framework of a request or a solicitation for input? What would you like to see added to this document? Maybe we could spend about another five to ten minutes on that and then look for something that we can circulate to the mailing list for this week with

the idea that we would have that sent out as quickly as possible. So what are folk's thoughts on this document as it stands? Anyone? Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. I like it. I mean if this was the first working group ever and the constituencies had just been formed, I'd be saying gee, I think we need to put some stuff in there to hold people's hands. But, you know, we have a great issue report. Constituencies know how to handle these sorts of things. They've got a process already.

They just need the list of questions, which we've given them on Page 2 and the issue report to let them figure out what their issues and responses are. So I'm quite comfortable going on with the document as it stands.

James Bladel: Okay. Thanks Mikey. Any - anyone have any more view or opposing views? See that the queue is clear. So I have a question for staff, which is we have - I do see the first line we would submit a response by some date - some deadline that we would determine. When would we - so working backwards from Beijing, have we already missed Beijing even if we sent this out today? I guess that's a question for staff. Are we 35 days...

Man: Well so this - as this will be official document submission deadline that's I think in a week or two. So that's definitely missing Beijing itself and before it - so maybe just (unintelligible) I think 35 days which is - it's five weeks from now right. I'm just thinking out loud.

James Bladel: Yeah.

Man: So it's a no.

James Bladel: So we would set the deadline basically at the time that everybody was...

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: Okay. Okay. Bob, you're up.

Bob Mountain: Yeah. Thanks James. I'm sorry. I just had to step out a couple minutes ago so I may have missed this. But in terms of the questionnaire or the survey, will part of that be, you know, getting some quantified or some data from the audience on the scope or size of the problem?

I know that's one thing we did in the prior group, which was to try and get some feedback from the audience - from the registrars specifically around, you know, how many incidents they were running into so we'd at least see the magnitude and what we are trying to fix. Is that part of the scope of this. And apologies if that was already discussed and I missed it.

James Bladel: No, it wasn't discussed Bob and it's an excellent point because I think that when we were looking at this deadline for considering just taking this document as it currently stands with our charter questions as the theme questions, if you will, and then, you know, turning that around as quickly as possible.

But I think that now that we are kind of coming to terms with the idea that we've already missed a major document cutoff. Maybe that is something that we should look at incorporating into this request for feedback is some understanding of their idea of the scope of the problem and any other questions that we can add to help put some boundaries around these issues that aren't specifically or explicitly called out in our charter questions.

So I'm going to go - Bob is that a new hand or it's down, okay. Going to go to Mikey and then I have a proposal but I would make to the group and see if they - see if they like that idea. So go ahead Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Mostly I was going to say that, you know, the document deadline for Beijing I don't think is - affects is because that's a deadline for documents that we might want to present at Beijing. You know, it's more likely that we're going to

be just having a - and as I think of that document deadline for mostly for (the count). But, you know, we're just going to be having a meeting in Beijing.

And so I don't think we have to worry about that deadline much at all. And, you know, hopefully by putting our deadline basically during Beijing, people will get the stuff done before they go.

So that then the proposal I would have is to expand this document with a paragraph somewhere that says or maybe expand the questions with requests for the kind of information that Bob's describing, you know, actual detailed quantitative probably guesses rather than statistics. But just do it in the narrative.

I'm still not keen on a survey and I'm not terribly keen on slipping the date that we've published this nor am I very keen on slipping the date to get replies back.

James Bladel: Okay. Thanks Mikey. Bob.

Bob Mountain: I guess my feeling is I would prefer to have some degree of confidence that the things we're working on, the solutions we're coming up with are, you know, are justified. They are solving a problem that does exist and that we have, you know, some, you know, some commitment from the audience that these are real problems, you know, that the frequency is such that it merits, you know, merits effort and time on everyone's hands.

So again, you know, I - if we've set this - we all agree the deadline we've set is very aggressive. Personally I'd much rather get some information back from the audience around, you know, how - what is the nature of the problem, what is the size of the problem than, you know, than rush this for, you know, the sake of hitting a deadline that's in November rather than something we can more naturally hit with a higher degree of confidence on the work product, you know, potentially at the next meeting.

James Bladel: Thanks Bob. Holly.

Holly Raiche: Yeah. I actually agree with what's being said. Is there any information from either compliance or the TIO. Now I know it's outside the TIO's jurisdiction; in fact 80% of what he's done is outside his jurisdiction. But he does have some information.

So then maybe some feedback within ICANN compliance with TIO that we would entertain as to whether there are problems that have been identified and the extent of those problems probably would help our deliberations.
Thank you.

James Bladel: Thank you Holly. I put myself in the queue just to kind - as a marker here to kind of see if we can bring this in for a landing. So my thinking is that - and see if we can get some green check marks or some red Xes. My thinking is that we've already missed the Beijing cutoff.

You know, if we wanted to have any of this - these feedback documents or responses to discuss in Beijing, I think we've already kind of - we're already right up against that deadline. If not, it's already passed.

And then just in practical terms, people don't like having document dropped on them at the end while they're just getting on airplanes or having two days right, you know, occur during or immediately after ICANN meetings. I mean that's just more of a cultural thing I think.

I mean ICANN experience and I think that a lot of folks will tend to agree with. So here's my thinking. Nothing that the data that Bob has pointed out and that Holly has raised also from ICANN internal statistics is important and should better inform our deliberations on our recommendations on these charter questions. And I think that we definitely need to take the time to get something like that.

So my thought here is - and I'm kind of blending Number 4 and Number 5 on our agenda a little bit is that we acknowledge that we're going to get this out, we're going to do this correctly. We're not going to necessarily rush for any kind of Beijing deadline because we've already missed it.

We rework this particular template to incorporate calls for data including calls to ICANN compliance and any providers as far as any statistics or anything they can help us understand the exposure of the depth of these issues.

And then we look to Beijing to be more of a working session - working group session as opposed to a formal review of any feedback we've received. Obviously if we have received any feedback that could definitely be on the table and one of the agenda items for our work in Beijing. But otherwise the primary focus of that meeting will be just a standard working meeting.

If we wanted to, you know, have an open section on our agenda for anyone in attendance to weigh in on these items, we could certainly take that into account as well. I think we did that in Prague and that worked fairly well for the previous working group.

So that's my proposal to the group is that we take our time on this particular template. We take another week to add those components that have been identified by some of the speakers. We get that published with the understanding that we may not have a whole lot to talk about in terms of responses by the time we get to Beijing but whatever we have will definitely be on the table for discussion.

So I see Michele's hand is up and would welcome anyone else's thoughts on that as well. Michele, you mind if I go to Marika first?

Michele Neylon: No, (work can) wait but I think she's going to ask the same question I was going to ask.

James Bladel: All right. Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yeah. This is Marika. I just have a couple of other things I wanted to say. Just on one note I think if we would be sending out this document either today or tomorrow we basically would have a deadline just before the ICANN meeting in Beijing.

But of course there is the question will groups have time to actually prepare their responses as many will start traveling already earlier in the week to get there. So of course from a deadline perspective, it may not be ideal to set that as a date.

Secondly on the question on getting information from compliance, I don't think that's something we need to work into the template. We've taken note of the question now. We can take that back to the compliance team as we've done in previous working groups to see if there are any specific data they can provide us. And I think we'll be looking at, you know, any complaints they have received in relation to the TDRP.

And noting of course that I think at this stage there's no, you know, official ICANN role in that process. So may need to see how much valuable data we get there as it's probably more of our interest indeed to ask registries and registrars as well as the providers on the statistics they have. But we definitely take that already as an action item to reach out to our compliance team to see what they have that they can share with us.

And then I just wanted to ask - I think Holly mentioned the compliance department but she also mentioned something else, (PO) or (TO) but I'm not really sure what she's referring to. So if Holly could maybe clarify that.

James Bladel: She said TRO and I think I know what that might be.

Holly Raiche: It's TIO, sorry, the industry ombudsman. The ICANN ombudsman is what I was referring to.

Marika Konings: Okay.

Holly Raiche: And I...

Marika Konings: I don't think he usually intervenes in those kind of situations but we can definitely check.

James Bladel: Yeah, it doesn't hurt to ask.

Holly Raiche: Yeah. Can I just add to that? I have talked to him. He deals with a lot of - he handles - well he does not handle but he receives a lot of complaints. Only about 20% of the complaints actually are within his jurisdiction. But he does have statistics for the complaints that come to him that are outside his jurisdiction that he has to send somewhere.

So there may be - and I - it's just a guess but there may be some information there that would assist this group. Thank you.

James Bladel: Yeah. I certainly don't think it hurts to include the ombudsman in our data gathering efforts.

Marika Konings: Yeah. This is Marika. We'll take this as well as an action item to reach out to him to see if he has anything that we can make use of.

James Bladel: Okay. Thank you. Michele, you're up next.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Just following up on this. Just so we're clear, Holly, you're not suggesting that the ICANN ombudsman has any -- what's the word -- any power in this area. It's just more a case of he might have some information.

Holly Raiche: Absolutely right. It would be outside his...

Michele Neylon: That's all - that's right. I'm just making sure we're clear on that because...

Holly Raiche: Yeah.

Michele Neylon: ...the idea of the ombudsman getting involved with things he shouldn't be involved with would give me a massive headache.

Holly Raiche: No.

James Bladel: Thanks Michele and thanks Marika. So I think the proposal is still on the table here folks and just wondering if we can get anyone to sort of weigh in on that is that we would take another week to flesh out this particular template and that we would publish this at some point next week with the understanding that the deadline then would be a week or even two beyond Beijing and the - any submissions we would have at that meeting would just be courtesies at that point that we would still be - still have an open comment period in front of us.

So any other thoughts on that and we can essentially take that as our action item and move on. I see a few green check marks here. I don't know if that's a red check mark or a do not disturb. I think that's a do not disturb.

Man: Yeah. He's out.

James Bladel: Bartlett, okay, fantastic. Okay. So let's take that as an action item. Lars and Marika, if you wouldn't mind circulating this to the list with a cutoff date of our next meeting - we'll - at our next call. Next Monday we will finalize this input statement and then begin to target publication following our next call - I want to say Tuesday or something of next week.

If that works for everybody, we can go that route and then we can flush this out a little bit. And Beijing then becomes more of a working session. Mikey, go ahead.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah. I was just looking through our charter questions to identify places where some of this data might be useful. And it seems to me the really interesting one is probably Question B, which is the multiple transfers thing and, you know, that's going to be one that James you and the register community, you're probably going to be the ones that are going to be in the best place to be able to come up with any kind of data.

Do you think that's going to be data that we can even get? Or is that going to be in the secret stuff pile and thus we're sort of delaying just so we can get data that we can't get.

James Bladel: I think we can get some aggregate - I'm going to weigh in her just - I think we can get some aggregate data Mikey. I don't think we can get data on the specific cases. But if we're alluding to say, you know, during a certain year or quarter we see X or some percentages or something like that, I think that we don't want to give away anything that can be reverse engineered into a world transfer statistic. I think that's the danger. But...

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah.

James Bladel: ...if we're sanitizing them, you know, I think that that's - you know, I think that would be okay. And hopefully that'll be sufficient to inform the debate without give anything away.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah. I think that's the key is, you know, I'd hate to wait and wait and then find out that well, the data wasn't terribly useful anyway or wasn't available. But if it's available, that's great.

James Bladel: Yes, in some form it might be. Okay. So then our action item on this is staff is going to circulate this around with a call for additional questions. And in addition to the charter questions, we would want to ask questions, you know, over and above those like questions request for data and Bob's laid it out.

And also not just the questions themselves but also if you have any thoughts on parties or organizations or individuals that should be weighing in on these things that are not part of our typical SO/AC outreach efforts. So, you know, what like the ombudsman might be included in that.

I think that all of those things can - are what we're looking for as feedback between now and the end of this week so that we can incorporate them into a draft final input template and that we can publish that this time next year. So - no, this time next week. See I've already...

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: ...calendars on the brain. But yeah, let's - so let's target that this time next week. And so everyone watch your inbox please for a request from Lars. Okay. So I think that knocks down Item Number 4 and Number 5 on our agenda, which is good. We're seven minutes from the end of the meeting.

I wanted to confirm that next meeting will be at the same time and place although I - and I'm springing this on him a little bit. I may ask Mikey to take a lead on that because I will be traveling next week. And also wanted to ask staff if we could include an agenda update as part of Item Number 1 for all of our housekeeping items. I think that's an easy fix.

And that's really all I had. Mikey, what did you want to cover today? Anything in addition or...

Mikey O'Connor: The one thing that I'll just give people a heads up on is that I've prepared a little status report. A lot of you have seen these on other working groups with

me. And I've been checking it with James and Marika and have got a couple of changes to drive in before I publish it.

But I'll push it out a little late this week. But generally I try to get them out Saturday or Sunday. So look for that. That's all. And James I can cover the call for you tomorrow or - see I like tomorrow better than next year.

James Bladel: Than next year.

Mikey O'Connor: I can do it next week.

Man: Next year's good.

James Bladel: Yeah. Okay. All right. Thanks Mikey. I appreciate that. And then I think the status report's an excellent idea. And I think the comments on the list that, you know, one of the things that we have to do as part of our PDP is - I'm sure Marika's favorite thing in the world and Lars it will be your favorite thing in the world is take everything that we've done to date and summarize it in a report for Council.

I think that building that report as we go along is always nice to see with the status reports. And I think that that will help us do that. So I'm out of - we're at the end of our agenda and out of things to talk about today. If there are no other orders of business...

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. I've got one last one and maybe Lars has two. But Marika, are you and Lars taking out the action item to go wrestle Alan or Volker into being our liaison or should James and I do that?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I've already tried to reach out the Volker but I think he's ignoring my emails on this topic. I mean we need to check whether, you know, according to rules Alan qualifies. Because I think according to rules he's actually a liaison and not counted as a Council member as such.

But I mean I guess, you know, the Council can waive that and say well, Alan is willing to do it. You know, we're happy to accept him as a liaison but I would just need to double check the rules on that.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah. That's true. I was thinking he was a non-com member but that's right he's a liaison this time around.

James Bladel: Right. ALAC...

Mikey O'Connor: So can - you're a - James, you're pretty close to Volker and probably talk to him a lot. Can you...

James Bladel: Yeah. I'll ping Volker and if you want to take Alan Mikey and we'll...

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah. Marika, can you get the news on whether he even qualifies. I don't want to bug him if it turns out he can't do it.

Marika Konings: Yeah. I'll look at it now and I can send you the information Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: That's great. Thanks.

Lars Hoffman: Can I just - sorry guys, it's Lars. And just one quick thing before we wrap it up completely. There's still the letter that I also sent around. I can send around again to the (OC), to the SO/ACs. And they would come (unintelligible) on the agenda before. And then the - just quickly the timing and perhaps of the Beijing meeting, which is Item 5 that we can skip those.

And by the looking at the number of people might not actually going to Beijing. Now I've pasted the doodle link at the (unintelligible) on the right if you want to have a quick look. Or we can just defer that to next week as well. It's really just a (unintelligible).

James Bladel: Yeah. I think that - and this is James speaking. I think that we can definitely discuss that next week on our agenda. The results of the doodle call, figure out how many folks are going to be in Beijing and what time works. I think if it's a working group meeting, then that opens up a lot more possibilities and also we have remote access. I just...

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah. What time is...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: ...if we did a breakfast meeting in Beijing, what time would that translate into in terms of (ETC) or East Coast time or something? Does anybody have that just right...

James Bladel: I think we're 12 hours ahead of East Coast time Mikey normally.

Mikey O'Connor: Twelve hours ahead. So if it were 7:30 in the evening...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: ...well it'd be tough on people in Europe I guess. But it'd be okay for people in the U.S.

Marika Konings: Because Mikey, a question because you actually pulled in a little bullet. You're not going to Beijing. Is that right or is it just pushing the wrong button?

Mikey O'Connor: Oh, yeah. I didn't mean to say that. I meant to say that I have some conflicts on certain days but...

Marika Konings: Yeah. Because we're not really sure and maybe some people misunderstood because we actually added one option in saying traveling to Beijing and I just sent an email that was intended to determine whether people were

participating remotely or not. So we're not really sure whether we have an accurate count.

But I think for scheduling purposes we probably do need to go ahead shortly to actually confirm or change the initial request at time to one of the morning spots.

Mikey O'Connor: You know, Marika, I misinterpreted that to mean because of the day that that was over was...

Marika Konings: Right.

Mikey O'Connor: ...Friday. And so I misinterpreted that column of the doodle poll to mean can you meet on Friday.

Marika Konings: Right. And I suspect that others may have interpreted the same way. But you're looking at it it looks like promotions rule the mornings. Mornings that we offered are an option. So we'll probably even be able to review James and Mikey to make sure that we take one of those three that are, you know, work for both of you as well. And we should probably go ahead and quickly at least confirm it on the schedule.

And then again if there's any need then to cancel it, we can still do that. But I think it's - we need to make sure that we communicate to the meetings team if there's any changes to our initial original request.

James Bladel: Okay. Thanks Marika. Can we - Lars, can we just resend that doodle poll link and give everyone another 24 hours maximum to respond and then we'll essentially tally that up and make the call.

Lars Hoffman: Yeah. No problem. I'll do that.

James Bladel: Okay. And I don't have visibility to the Adobe remaining more folks. My connection dropped. So if everything - if there are no other...

Mikey O'Connor: There's a forest of red check marks after I...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah. After I posted that James is a rat in the chat. Then there's always red check marks. So I guess you're not a rat.

James Bladel: Okay. All right.

Mikey O'Connor: (Unintelligible).

James Bladel: Well if there's no other - if there's no other real business and everybody just wants to get personal and take this outside, then we can adjourn the call and enter this into a, you know, a spirited discussion in the hallway, so.

Mikey O'Connor: Food fight.

James Bladel: Thanks everybody. And Mikey, I'll coordinate with you for next week and some of the action items that we have.

Mikey O'Connor: Sounds great. Thanks James.

Woman: Thanks everyone.

Man: Thanks James.

((Crosstalk))

END