ICANN
Transcription
IRTP Part C Review Team meeting
Wednesday 3 July 2013 at 16:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of IRTP Part C Review Team call on the Wednesday 3 July 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-c-20130703-en.mp3

On page: http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#jul

<u>Attendees:</u>
Chris Chaplow – BC
Mikey O'Connor – ISPCP
Jill Titzer – RrSG
Bob Mountain – RrSG
Michele Neylon – RrSG
James Bladel – RrSG
Barbara Knight – RySG

<u>Apologies:</u>
Philip Corwin – BC

<u>ICANN staff:</u>
Mike Zupke
Caitlin Tubergen
Marika Konings
Berry Cobb
Lars Hoffman
Julia Charvolen

Coordinator: And pardon me everyone. It's the operator. Just need to inform all participants that today's conference call is being recorded. If you have any objections you may disconnect your line at this time. And you may begin.

Julia Charvolen: Thank you (Lori). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. Welcome to the IRPTC Review Team meeting on Wednesday 3rd of July 2013.

On the call today with Chris Chaplow, Mikey O'Connor, Bob Mountain, James Bladel and Barbara Knight. We have apologies from Philip Corwin.

And from staff we have Mike Zupke, Caitlin Tubergen, Marika Konings, Berry Cobb myself Julia Charvolen.

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

Mike Zupke: Great, thank you Julia. This is Mike Zupke for transcript purposes. I, you know, I want to thank you all for joining.

And I was hoping that we could just have sort of an organizational call here to get started and I could share with you kind of what we were thinking about in terms of a project plan and get your feedback on that.

So I've got sort of the proposed agenda here and I hope that this is okay with everybody, you've had a chance to take a look at it.

So we've already had our roll call and introductions. You got me and you've got (Kaitlin Tibigen) who is going to be taking over this project after the trimester ends. So after Durban she will be running the show and I will be answering to (Kaitlin).

So from what everybody says they prefer her over me anyway. So I think you're in good hands. So anyway that's sort of the formalities here.

I just want to give you just a little bit of background and also an update on where we are with one of the recommendations.

There were I believe four recommendations in total but one of them was to form an IRT so there were three kind of substantive recommendations related to the IRTP Working Group C.

And number three we've already begun working on because it seems pretty straightforward. And that was the recommendation that registries publish registrars IANA ID's also known as the (Gired) in their Whois output. So that's already underway and I can just sort of give you the background now on that.

We've got another policy that was in implementation process called the Whois Information Status Policy.

And this was about registries and registrars using APP status codes in their Whois output instead of sort of, you know, made up terminology and then also requiring them when they use these status codes to link to a page run by ICANN that would define what the status code means. And so that was from IRTP Working Group B.

And since we've got two recommendations from two different working groups that essentially...

Woman: ((Foreign Language Spoken))

Mike Zupke: Okay that wasn't me. I don't speak that.

But anyways so we had two policy recommendations that were going to require registries and/or registrars to publish something new in Whois output. So we've combined the two.

So we'll have the Whois Information Status Policy will just become the Whois Information Policy. And that will relate to that EPP status codes and also to IANA IDs of registrars.

So that's pretty well underway. We had a comment period on the Whois information policy that closed. We just need to post the summary of the comments.

And I think we're generally ready to go. James Bladel has raised the issue on this list. And I know I've talked to him off-line about this about just the amount of stuff that's being implemented at one time.

So we're sort of holding off on officially implementing that one until we plan to come up with a more comprehensive strategy on everything that's coming to the pipeline right now that's going to place new operational burns on registrars and registries and potentially also create complication or confusion for registrants.

So it's kind of in a holding pattern right know and we can talk a little bit later about sort of how we should deal with that question too.

And, you know, I mentioned on our list that I think it's kind of a bigger issue than just we can decide. But I think we could probably come up with some ideas in particular for this project but also maybe more big picture that we can sort of go forward us.

So anyway that's where we are on recommendation three.

And then just as a really terse background I think you probably all know recommendation one was about establishing some sorts of rules or protocol or system for when a registrant is changed and how a registrar should handle that, what sort of security mechanisms should be in place, also how it should interact with inter-registrar transfers.

And then the second recommendation was about what I'm calling the expiration of forms of authorization and also sort of the exceptions or the opt in mechanisms that would allow those to auto renew or - and also then the exception to that which would prevent somebody from opting into auto renewal of the FOA in certain circumstances.

So those two are the ones that we got to deal with in this working group and I've already got some questions about that that I think, you know, we'll be able to work through in the future that will be helpful.

And I've got sort of a proposed timeline. So I think unless there any questions, are there any questions about the background so far?

It looks like not. Oh yes James?

James Bladel: So thanks Mike. Not just a - not really a question, just a comment thanks and thanks for including on there the idea that, you know, we need to really take more of a holistic approach in all of these changes.

And I think it's not really a question of, you know, what do we do and what do we hold off. It's more of a question of sequencing and what order do they come in and, you know, how can we minimize the confusion so that from a registrant perspective it doesn't follow all these policy changes, doesn't feel like this whole industry is flying on, you know, flying away.

And I just wanted to offer that for the change of registrant procedure that I think some registrars have existing procedures that are internal only that maybe could be - we could map those out and bring them back to this group so sort of a show and tell to see if any of those are compatible with the policy recommendations and would be easily adopted.

Mike Zupke: Thanks James that - I mean that makes good sense to me and, you know, maybe you'll have some share and maybe we can encourage people who were not necessarily part of this review team if they've got, you know, other registrars if they're willing to share what their processes are. I think, you know, I think the more information we've got the better.

Bob?

Bob Mountain: Yes. Thanks Mike this is Bob, just a question. I may up misheard or I may be misremembering. Did you say that the registry ID or the registrar ID was IRTPD or was that IRTPC?

Mike Zupke: That was B. And I forget whether it was Number 8 or Number 9. Those two both have had some implementation work for us. And I believe that was recommendation Number 8 but anyway it was B, one or two of those.

Marika Konings: But...

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: ...Mike this is Marika. I don't think so. I think the registrar ID is C because that's the...

Mike Zupke: Oh right, sorry.

Marika Konings: Because for the remaining ones from B relate to Whois status updates and the provisions are unlocked.

Mike Zupke: Sorry that's what we're combining with. It was Recommendation 3 of this IRTP working group C so thank you Marika.

Bob Mountain: Okay good. That's what I thought. I was a little confused when you said B because I thought it was more recent. But I just wanted to confirm that.

                  But we are - I guess to your point we're rolling up certain other items from prior working groups into this group which is implementation for C. But it will be other things that where outstanding from prior working groups is that correct?

Mike Zupke: Right, exactly.

Bob Mountain: Okay.

Mike Zupke: Or maybe we're pushing this one back in time or forward in time for the other one. I'm not sure which it is.

Bob Mountain: Yes, yes we've got just got to get the flux capacitor working, got it.

Mike Zupke: Yes, exactly. All right anybody else?

So here's what I've done. Oh yes, Chris go ahead.

Chris Chaplow: Hello sorry. Chris Chaplow here, just a quick question. I'm just wondering is this concept of a work group for implementation, is this a new beast for ICANN or have there been others following PDPs? I'm just curious to know whether we're - this is a new thing. Thanks.

Mike Zupke: No it's a fairly new thing but we did it before for the PEDNRP policy. That was the Post Expiration Domain Name Recovery Policy that came to the GNSO. And that eventually resulted in the ERRP, the Expired Registration Recovery Policy -- just cutting some letters out there.

But that worked pretty well. I think, you know, we've learned a little bit and I'm trying to be a little bit more organized because I think that one of the challenges in that go round was that people really weren't sure where we were in the process.

So that's why I've got this time a project plan to share with you that, you know, that I would like some feedback on but also said we can all kind of refer to it and see are we, you know, are we still on schedule? Are we slipping or, you know, that sort of thing.

But, you know, it is a pretty new thing and so I think that as we kind of learn as we go through this, you know, kind of maybe jot down in your notes you've

got or if you want to send them to me or share them with the group, you know, or within the GNSO I think there's always opportunity to try and tweak this to make it better.

Chris Chaplow: Yes thanks. No thanks for taking the context there, Chris yes.

Marika Konings: Mike could I get in the queue? I'm sorry I'm on Adobe Connect.

Mike Zupke: Of course and go ahead.

Marika Konings: Thanks. No maybe just to Chris's point as well just to add because this was basically the concept of implementation review teams as something that was added as part of the revised GNSO PDP which was adopted a little while back. So that's why it's relatively new.

And as Mike said where it needs - so experimenting is just sort of an extent of how these run. But it also closely links to the discussions we're currently having on policy and implementation and how that links.

And one of the questions that working group is probably going to look at is, you know, whether there should be more formal structures or structures around how implementation is done, whether these kind of groups need to have more formal rules to think as well the experience that you're having here will benefit that discussion.

And I'm hoping as well at least from a staff perspective we'll be able to as well share our views and how we believe this is working or not working or what could be done better or differently so just to place maybe in the bigger scale picture.

Mike Zupke: Thank you Marika. You said that much better than I was fluttering there.

So the next thing then is I would like to share my screen with you and show you, you know, look into our project planning software.

And so I've got, you know, of course we have the ability to do this in Adobe Connect but I don't know how well it would appear.

So we have right now, you know, on the screen there's the center box just sort of square that I'm going to try to put my screen in there. But unfortunately when I do it I can't see what you're seeing.

So if it's not real clear I have another screen layout that would more or less take up the entire screen. So if you don't like this somebody please speak up and I'll try to, you know, move to a different layout so it's a little bit bigger and a little bit clearer.

And you might also have a full screen button on that window. I don't know because it seems to sort of come and go as it pleases. But let me just try this.

Okay so I'm sharing my browser screen. Are you able to see this fairly okay or would you prefer if I made the screen bigger or the layout bigger?

The drawback is if I make it bigger than you can't see the chat window or the attendance list for people raising their hands.

Chris Chaplow: Chris here just to chip in. If I click the Full Screen button it becomes clear for me. It isn't going to effect it. Full screen it's fine now thanks.

Mike Zupke: Okay.

So hopefully nobody's raising their hand and I can't see it. But, you know, if there's no other objections that I'll just go ahead and you can use the Full Screen button.

So this is, we have this project planning software which is also the, I don't know what you call it, the company management dashboard, call that task.

So this replaces, you know, your typical project planning software in this regard like, you know, Microsoft Project whatever.

So what I did was I tried to take our work that we're doing here and break it into the task. And essentially I pull up the questions of things that I felt like were not clear to me or that were too, you know, there's too much area for different interpretation or it was clear that the GNSO working group's asking us to fill in the details.

So I've identified those as little tasks on this list. And so you'll see those from basically two to number nine are those - well I'll take that back. Starting from Number 5 to 9 those are the questions that I've got for essentially for this working group or for this Review Team.

And, you know, we may find that, you know, you may advise these things seem to be sort of out of scope of what the Review Team should be doing. So these could also result in questions back to the GNSO or whether it goes back to the Working Group or whether the GNSO council decides that part is sort of outside my scope of knowledge. And, you know, we're kind of in new territory here.

So in any event I kind of kill two birds with one stone here. I can sort of show you the schedule and show you the things that I think are kind of the open issues.

And then like I said just feel free to speak of if you have comments, questions or just things that I'm leaving out or things that I, you know, maybe should be including or whatever. So...

Mikey O'Connor: So Mike this is Mikey. Let me but in. Is it safe to say that you can't see the queue in Adobe Connect and nor that you can see the chat? You're sharing your full screen and that's all you got right?

Mike Zupke: That's all I can see. So maybe I don't know if (Kaitlin) or if Julia maybe if you'd like to just sort monitor the queue and you can butt in here.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes that's what I was going to suggest is that you, you know or one of us could do it. We've all done that before. I mean it may be easier if you become a participant rather than the leader of the call for this part of the conversation.

Mike Zupke: Yes. That would be fine with me. So I don't know Julia is that something you'd like to do for me? Whoops I've just lost my screen.

                  Okay maybe she's dropped off. (Kaitlin) how about you? Could you take that on? Hopefully you're on the phone.

                  All right moving down the list...

Julia Charvolen: Hi Mike.

Mike Zupke: ...It sounds like you had - oh wait.

Julia Charvolen: Julia, sorry to interrupt. This is Julia. What do you wish me to do?

Mike Zupke: Would you mind just kind of monitoring the queue because I can't see it and just interrupt me if there are people who got their hand up?

Julia Charvolen: Sure. I'll do that for you.

Mike Zupke: Okay. So having said that does it - does anybody have their hand up now before I go any farther?

Julia Charvolen: Chris Chaplow has just has his hand up now, Chris Chappell.

Mike Zupke: Okay go ahead Chris.

Chris Chaplow: If I - yes just put my hand up and before we get started I heard that magic word a task. So this is the screen from a task is it?

Mike Zupke: Yes so this is a screen.

Chris Chaplow: Yes.

Mike Zupke: This - and this layer of visibility I don't think will ever actually be on our public interface. This is more of a staff level of project planning. So I think that...

Chris Chaplow: Right.

Mike Zupke: ...what you would normally see when the dashboard is finally completed for public viewing is you'll see what you see at the top is IRTP Working Group C Policy Implementation. That's the name of the project. And you'll see the percent complete and the condition and the status and that sort of thing.

And don't be too alarmed by the condition. It's at risk. I have no idea how to change that and I think it just sort of looked at all these things that say zero and decided it was going to call it that.

Chris Chaplow: So at the moment - yes Chris here. So at the moment this is at a task level, T-A-S-K level...

Mike Zupke: Yes.

Chris Chaplow: ...which is lower down than - so which program does this come under because program is the lowest level that we've seen from the budgeting point of view?

Mike Zupke: Right. So I think - well here, let me just pull it up and tell you.

So we've got the portfolio is detailed e-services and the program is registrar contract management.

Mikey O'Connor: So Mike this is Mikey. Your screen isn't being shared anymore. Is there any way that you can get that back up in Adobe?

Mike Zupke: Is it there?

Mikey O'Connor: No.

((Crosstalk))

Mike Zupke: Okay let me try this here. I think what happened was when Michele entered the room it flipped me off of Chrome and put me on - back on Adobe. All right...

Mikey O'Connor: Michele broke it. God Michele who's - what - we haven't talked to Michele in ages. He's too busy.

Mike Zupke: All right, is it back up for you?

Mikey O'Connor: OH now you've got it.

Mike Zupke: All right excellent now. As long as...

((Crosstalk))

Mike Zupke: ...Michele doesn't do anything here.

Mikey O'Connor: No his on the phone. He's not going to do anything soon.

Mike Zupke: Welcome Michele.

Mikey O'Connor: He's not (unintelligible).

Mike Zupke: It's just background. I'm just kind of going through the project plan here that I've drafted up for feedback for this group for the implementation of Recommendations 1 and 2 from IRTP Working Group C.

So does anybody else have their hand up right now or should we go ahead?

Julia Charvolen: You can go ahead.

Mike Zupke: Great. Thanks Julia.

So as, you know, as I was saying the points here five through eight are really what I saw as the questions that I felt like we really needed to spend some time trying to define what the policy meant or what was intended.

So just kind of working through the list here, you know, the first thing that we had to do was convened this team. That's of course done.

The next thing is creating a framework for this policy and sharing it with you.

And so by that what I was thinking was, you know, the recommendations say we think there should be kind of an overarching transfer policy.

And so I started to kind of trying to craft up what I think that should look like in terms of how the two policies might fit side by side or how there might be interplay. And so when that's in a more state of doneness I'll share that with you.

And so the deadline you can see here, the due date for these is on the second to the - the second column from the right. And so that is basically due the day after the end of the Durban meeting. So I'll have some work to do on that 25 hour flight I guess.

Then we've got after that - and this isn't really necessarily contingent on that but I figure since really there's probably not a lot that's going to happen between now and the end of the Durban meeting by this group it's just as well that we start on the 22 July.

And this is defining the methods of authorizing transfers by both registrants and so this is referring to recommendation one. You may recall that it talks about different ways whether it's a PIN code or passcode or an off code that this might happen.

And so the idea was, you know, and I think this sort of relates to what James was saying. We need to sort of come up with what are the universe of possibilities and things that are already being done in test that I think, you know, maybe kind of spend the most time thinking about and then, you know, defining do we want to spell out what all of the available options are or should we maybe put prescriptions and say these are things the registrar should not do or do we want to say guidelines and say if you fit within these guidelines than this is acceptable within the policy.

And so, you know, that's sort of like the first question is how exactly do we want to attack this? And then, you know, let's say we want to define all the different possibilities of things that registrars could do and be in compliance then we need to start coming up at that list.

So you'll see in the duration column I've given that 21 days which is 21 working days. So basically that's a month for us to have discussions. And this sort of assumes, you know, that we've got maybe a weekly call and that we're having good discussion on list.

And, you know, and this is something I would really appreciate feedback on is, you know, are these times realistic or, you know, do you think I'm sort of overshooting or undershooting?

So I don't know if there's any thoughts on that? So I saw Mikey popped up on my...

Julia Charvolen: Mikey...

((Crosstalk))

Mike Zupke: You want to go ahead Mikey?

Mikey O'Connor: Yes this is Mikey. One of the project management tricks that you might want to think about is when you have a great big complicated hard to figure out task you might want to break it into smaller chunks. So you've got a little bit easier to understand stages.

Some of these seem pretty big and complicated to me. And so I guess if I were in your shoes I would be thinking about breaking them into smaller pieces.

Mike Zupke: You know, that's good advice. And if you've got some suggestions of where to do that I'm open to that.

You know, one of the things, one of the let's say features of that task is that it has a habit of annoying you when you're either behind on a task or when you haven't logged in a while to check off that you've done it.

So, you know, what kind of learning as staff I think to be sort of judicious about how low level we want to get in our work.

But, you know, I mean I take that point and I think, you know, maybe in some of these things it's kind of obvious to me because in my mind I know what's involved. And maybe it's not really spelled out as clearly.

So for example this Line 4, you know, to me I'm not just going to create this thing but there's going to be a process of getting feedback from other people on staff before I share with the review team.

And really sharing it with the reviewed team is a whole second step. So, you know, I hear what you're saying.

Mikey O'Connor: Well yes, this is Mikey again. I think you've just got at least three chunks in there that might help. You know, one is create a draft and another is review with staff, you know, and keep chunking at, incorporate staff comments, review with us, incorporate our comments.

You know, I mean that's what I made by chunking us chunking this into smaller pieces is it gives you a little bit easier series of steps to get through.

And it may also make it easier to estimate. Because now you can say well how long do I think it's going to take me to write a first draft as opposed to how long is it going to take to get through to the staff, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera?

So, you know, that's just sort of a basic project management trick that I pass along. And it doesn't have to be real complicated.

Mike Zupke: Sure, thanks. Bob?

Bob Mountain: Yes thanks Mike. This is Bob. Yes I think my gut reaction total knee jerk, you know, halfway through our first call is that your time frames sound aggressive.

And, you know, my experience with two previous working groups was that, you know, everything takes longer than you think it should. So based on very preliminary I think you - this looks aggressive to me.

I think the, you know, depending on - and I think most of these working groups, you know, really depend on the volunteers to do, you know, a lot of the work and the staff participation is, you know, kind of coordinating communication and stuff.

So if you, you know, Mike or your team have bandwidth to drive this then I think, you know, maybe that's more realistic.

If the dynamic is more or less the same where, you know, we're kind of looking at the group staffing and volunteers to pick pieces up and run with it, it seems to me you might be being a little unrealistic on time frames. So that's just my two cents.

You know this - I haven't been on an implementation team before, just working groups. So I may be off but just wanted to throw that out there.

Mike Zupke: Thanks Bob. And I think that's good feedback. You know whether we're driving it or not, you know, you make a good point. And that's, you know, we've got volunteers here who were being pulled in a million different directions.

So, you know, I know this isn't your one priority even if, you know, even if this was the only thing you were doing in ICANN. You've got all sorts of things outside of ICANN. So, you know, it's a point well taken.

So, you know, I think maybe, you know, maybe we kind of head down this path and evaluate and say yes we were way off and then we can readjust the thing.

I, you know, I don't think this has to be a commitment right now to the due date at the very final day.

I think, you know, we can still adjust this as we go. And maybe, you know, if we get to the first step and we say wow this took, you know, six weeks instead of four then we just, you know, add 30% to everything else or 50% to everything else.

Bob Mountain: Yes this is Bob. Yes if I can reply I think that's true. I think one of the comments are meant to say was what the endpoint is and what the, you know, the risk of failure in terms of hitting the endpoint is.

If there's a low risk of failure then, you know, it's okay to be a little more aggressive. You know, if we miss it doesn't hurt.

On the other hand if you use the Mikey philosophy and, you know, we're trying to, you know, use the project plan and hit it then, you know, I think that, you know, that may be the ultimate approach is to just be more realistic on the date and so I'm fine either way. It's just I just wanted to volunteer my opinion.

Mike Zupke: Okay well thanks.

So, you know, I think, just - I mean just hearing you two talk now has got me kind of thinking I would like to start tweaking some of these days again.

So, you know, I mean we can maybe consider this sort of like the 0.1 Version and then, you know, maybe we can talk again at the next one where we kind of get more into substance. I can sort of give you an update and what this looks like and get more feedback on it then just so we're all sort of marching along the same path.

Mikey O'Connor: So Mike this is Mikey again. Michele raises a good point in the chat which is there sort of a list of things to be done.

I think could be useful to see the rest of this plan. And I think that when you do the next iteration of it it would be nice to sort of call out the pieces of the plan and identify who's participating in which piece and in what way.

Because, you know, my presumption is that, you know, there are a few checkpoints along the way where you come back to us so that, you know, there's a review with staff step and maybe there's a review with us step and stuff like that. And it would be nice to have the distinction between everything that needs to be done which is your punch list.

Mike Zupke: Right.

Mikey O'Connor: And then a way to highlight well here at the things that I need you to do. And part of the reason I think that's important gets to the point that Marika made which is as we're doing this we may want to pay attention to the role that we're assigning the review team to and also figure out a step in there that says something along the lines of identify any issues that require policy guidance and kind of leave the language up to Marika on that.

But there are several audiences to this document. You need a very detailed punch list. We need a punch list that says, you know, where do you need us to show up and what are you expecting us to do?

Mike Zupke: So...

Mikey O'Connor: And there may be others.

Mike Zupke: Yes. So, you know, there's this assignments column. And one of the let's say features to ask is I can only assigned to other staff people. I can't, you know, I

can't put parenthetically I want to go to the IRT. And I tried that. I tried writing in things there and it rejected it.

So, you know, I think we're on the same page with this and maybe I just need to put it in the task and say. So, you know, in my mind Numbers 5 through 8 or 5 through 9 are all basically in close consultation basically in collaboration with this IRT.

And then we have you'll see step 11, 12 are review layers and Number 12 was going back to the IRT. This is sort of like the final, you know, everybody gets to look at it and poke at it and say what do we think before we post it for public comments.

So I think, you know, I think that's a good suggestion that I can, you know, try to at least maybe in the descriptions of these tasks try to make clear.

And, you know, I think, you know, another good point is, you know, for the audience is this. And ordinarily, you know, this would be a staff only document.

You know, there's nothing particularly confidential about this. It's not, you know, it's not a problem sharing with you. It's just that, you know, it's just it's a level of detail that we, you know, we just haven't, you know, we haven't decided yet, you know, if this is going to be published or anything.

So and part of it is, you know, for these things you're identifying everybody kind of has a different way of interpreting what a project plan should look like and what level of detail it should be it I think.

You know, I think it's probably subject to potential misinterpretation if we, you know, just put it out there didn't, you know, have lots of explanations around it and caveats.

So anyway I hear you and I'll work on that.

Michele did you have your hand up?

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. I wrote Michele had a point in the chat which I agree with which is one of the steps that you may want to add to this - I bet Michele's on another call so as a result he's just on Adobe.

But he's suggesting that we might want to add an impact assessment step to some of these.

And I would agree you may want to, you know, in addition to writing things, checking with staff, checking with us blah, blah, blah, you may want to have some sort of impact assessment layer to this.

And you may want to come to us for the dimensions of the impact but then figure out some process to go out probably mostly to the registrars but depends on the policy and check with folks because, you know, we're in an implementation phase now. Unless there's more it's going to scroll up on the screen here.

Mike Zupke: Well I can scroll down a little bit here and show you what else we've got.

Mikey O'Connor: Michele I can't hear you. You may be muted. You want to - are you coming in through Adobe or are you coming in on the phone?

Michele's typing Adobe. Well that's weird. He may be suffering the problem I did with my Mac which was that in order to get its work right Michele, I had plugged my headphone in first before I logged into Adobe. Nobody could hear me until I did that. So that may be the trouble.

I could work with you on that off-line if you wanted.

Back to you Mike.

Mike Zupke: Okay. So, you know, if you're able to break in Michele by all means. If you want to just type in your question or your thought that's fine too.

So, you know, just scroll down a little bit so you can see a little bit more. And you've got the last section here is kind of the outreach and education part of it.

And, you know, as you were talking Mikey one of the things you said sort of remind me of the last IRT that we had with PEDNRP. And, you know, one of the reasons why I think you're seeing an aggressive timeline here - and that wasn't yours. That was Bob's words.

And, you know, and the last one I heard from (Alan), you know, fairly regularly, you know, sort of a concern like he felt there was no progress happening.

And I know sometimes that's a matter of just us, you know, staff not communicating well what's going on.

Sometimes it's a matter of there's just a bunch of competing priorities and, you know, PEDNRP couldn't always win.

But, you know, this was - so this may have been my defensive approach saying all right here's, here's a timeline that we're going to aim for.

And if it's not realistic that doesn't really help us. It only makes us really look worst if we don't achieve it.

So, you know, it's giving me something to think about here in terms of, you know, the dates. And, you know, this impact assessment stuff, you know, that makes good sense to me.

So I think, you know, this could use some more refining. And, you know, this chunking that you're talking about this might be the way to do that.

So I'm getting lots of...

Mikey O'Connor: Yes Mike.

Mike Zupke: Yes go ahead.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. I think the chunks help in a bunch of ways. One is that it does give you a much better visibility of how progress is going.

But I think another thing is that with what you're seeing in the chat is, well Mountain is asking for a PDF of this plan before the next meeting and I would subscribe to that as well.

And - oh and Michele's on the phone so I'll hand off to him in a second.

But I think the other thing is that this series of tasks seems to miss the whole actual implementation part.

You know, where is the actual turning of the knobs and dials by the effective parties like the registrars? Is that out of scope of this? Is this...

Mike Zupke: So really where implementation officially ends is at Line 14 where we say the language gets posted and announced to the registries and the registrars. And that's when the contractual obligation becomes effective where they've got to have some reasonable notice and they have to start taking action.

Now we really don't end there. That's why we've also got this outreach and education part where we say okay, that's not enough that we told you to do it.

We want to make sure you understand what it is we're asking of you and making sure that, you know, people who are maybe not primarily English speakers are understanding what it says. And so we're, you know, we don't want to just stop at that point.

But that's really officially when implementation is kind of - that's the moment of implementation is when we send the announcement out to the affected contracted parties.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay Mike, Michele do you want to jump in? I've sort of unilaterally taken over the queue here because Zupke can't see the...

Michele Neylon: Okay I'll...

Mikey O'Connor: There you go Michele.

Michele Neylon: ...mutter a few words. And because things that concern me I suppose is I mean first off we - obviously we need to get this implemented.

I mean I'm very conscious of the fact that there's policy coming out of the GNSO and it's kind of getting lost somewhere.

I know there's reasons for that. I'm not trying to blame anybody or anything in particular but it - we need to make sure stuff gets done.

But I think thing from our perspective as registrars it would be helpful to - for whatever happens for it to be kind of broken out into simple bullet points in terms of what the actual material effect in terms of our operations are on any changes in policy.

I mean this is - I would say this about any policy change, not this one specifically. So if the comments I'm making a kind of general as opposed to specific.

And the other thing as well is the impact assessment it's just because if there's a change say for example with transfer policy it could have an impact potentially -- I'm not saying it does -- but that say potentially could have an impact on say UGRP policy or it could have an impact on I don't know, some registry policy or something else. It's just making sure that people are aware of that.

Because what's happened a few times over the last 12 to 18 months is that the policies have changed. And then when you're sitting in a meeting about something completely unrelated somebody will spend 20 minutes postulating about something and the information's out of date.

And it's because people aren't aware of the fact that these (changes) have moved. I'll shut up now. I'll hand over to Mikey again I suppose.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes Mikey is a universal queue usurper. Mike you want to come back on that?

Mike Zupke: Yes, no I mean I think Michele makes a good point. And, you know, one example of that where it wasn't a failure but where, you know, it's evident that there's interplay was in this one, one of the notes that we're aware that there is policy work going on I believe it was referring to IRTP part or working group B.

And you know, and refer to that I'd say well we understand that registrars, the losing registrar will be required to send out these FOAs. And so this is how we recommend, you know, the treatment of those.

So, you know, that's definitely a point to be thinking about and, you know, sort of mapping out how this stuff all goes I think will be part of that.

And I think, you know, I mean to a certain extent some of that might just be unavoidable. You can't, you know, you can't educate the whole world about, you know, everything that's going on. But I think we can, you know, trying to do a little bit better.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay Mike that's - your queue is clear. You're on to whatever next point is.

Mike Zupke: Thanks Mikey. So, you know, maybe we won't - we don't need to spend so much time looking at the duration of these tasks but maybe kind of look at just the ones that have identified things that I think I would like us to work on in terms of interpreting it and drafting what the, you know, this new part of the transfer policy would look like.

And so I mentioned the first one is defining the methods of authorizing transfers between registrants.

The next one that I've got would be defining mechanisms for registrants to opt out of the 60 day post-transfer lock.

And this is, you know, referring to that the recommendation was that if there's a change of registrant a change of registrar -- am I saying the this backwards? No. If there's a change of registrar there should not be a change of registrant for 60 days. No I said that wrong again.

If there's a change of registrant there shouldn't be a change of registrar, sorry so that the...

Michele Neylon: It's all going to slowing it down Mike.

Mike Zupke: Sorry what?

Michele Neylon: No I'm just saying if you actually look at what if - rather than getting yourself - getting our tongues twisted around the - what the actual recommendation is,

if you actually look at what the reasoning behind the rationale behind it was, I mean the idea is - it's just slow the entire thing down. That's where it came from.

Mike Zupke: Oh got you. So I thought you were asking me to slow down. But right. So the idea was that basically the gaining registrar should know, you know, who the real registrant is. And, you know, domain name was hijacked it doesn't know who the registrant should be.

So there is idea that there should be a 60 day lock on certain transfers and also that registrants should be able to opt out of that lock.

And so this is something that is kind of, I mean frankly it's kind of perplexed me a little bit about how do you do it in a meaningful way?

You know, I think that if you say yes you can, you know, transfer's blocked but click here to undo it that, you know, that really works the purpose of that.

So, you know, I'd like to spend some time thinking about what's a meaningful way for registrants to opt out of that that won't just enable hijacking and basically thwart the purposes of the policy. So that's on my list.

Mikey O'Connor: Mike this is Mikey. You may want at a task somewhere early in each of these tasks where you get a briefing on what the working group was thinking.

Because we actually spent a fair amount of time thinking about that and drew cutsey pictures and argued about all that stuff. And so...

Mike Zupke: Yes so, you know, I think that's...

((Crosstalk))

Mike Zupke: ...a good point but it's really I'm not the one who needs to be educated so much as the policy need to be informed.

Because I think that there's a lot that didn't get into the language of recommendations. And so I just want to make sure that we're capturing that in what becomes the rule of the land, you know?

And so, you know, I totally agree with what you're saying but it's really not just for my benefit but it's really for the benefit of the policy that comes out.

Mikey O'Connor: No but I'm thinking that you need that briefing before you start writing your drafts. I guess that's where I'm headed.

Mike Zupke: Yes I agree. That...

Mikey O'Connor: Because otherwise you're going to write a draft that's been missed by mile.

Mike Zupke: So when I say here define the mechanisms for registrants to opt out that's not me doing that. That's this working group doing it. And I'll be sort of described saying okay here's what you said. This is what we're going to put in the policy. This is what the IRT is telling me was meant here.

So, you know...

Mikey O'Connor: Then I think we're back to Mountain's question because, you know, before when Mountain was asking the question about your dates and the aggressiveness if in fact we're a working group and not a review working group but we're actually doing the hitting then multiply all these by ten because there's no way that we have the bandwidth or the facilities to actually develop that.

I think we could brief you on what we came up with and give you good ideas but if you want us actually writing the processes and writing the policy that's a whole different ballgame.

Mike Zupke: Yes I don't need that but I do need you to tell me what it's supposed to be. So this briefing that you're talking about that really is the step. That's what step...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: Yes...

Mike Zupke: ...60 is...

Mikey O'Connor: ...and that's what I'm proposing is...

Mike Zupke: Yes, but you know...

Mikey O'Connor: ...getting a step like that into your work (plan).

Mike Zupke: So that is what step six is. And, you know, what I'm trying to say is it's really, you know, it's not just that I need to understand it but that we need to have a shared understanding that goes into the policy.

And so that's when I say we define it. You know, it's not - it's not just like okay Mike gets it now. But, you know, we define it and we all agree to it. And so you tell me what you thought it meant. I'll write it down and then if I get it wrong you can give me some feedback on that.

But, you know, I don't mean that I want you to tell me word for word what you want the policy to say. But I need you to say at least, you know, what it means.

Mikey O'Connor: Marika are you still the call or are you a way or driving?

Marika Konings: I'm still here. I'm driving but I'm still here.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh good. Well, you know, we might want to take this offline so we don't tie everybody up. But I think we've got to figure out some sort of roles and responsibilities here as to how much of that you can do with Mike, how much we need to do with him as a backgrounder -- blah, blah, blah. I mean...

Marika Konings: Just for maybe to clarify because we did spend quite some time and I know you did Mike but also others within ICANN staff when the recommendations were adopted going through there one by one and already having an opportunity there to, you know, ask clarified questions where we need, you know, explaining as well what the thinking was.

But I think on some of that it may just require some refreshing or maybe some of the materials or briefings that I already provided were just not sufficient to actually come to the answer or have the information that was needed to actually write the policy.

So I think we can definitely take offline and then, you know, talk to Mike and you can see what is needed as a next step.

But some of that we definitely did at that early stage of this process.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Mike Zupke: And really these are the questions that are still open that we talked about. And I still have questions.

But part - I mean part of the challenge is -- and maybe this is my legal background getting in the way -- but, you know, I look at the record here. And

the record is the GNSO gave us these recommendations. And some of them I think are vague, I think are ambiguous.

And I don't feel like staff can just come in and say we unilaterally interpret this. Here it is based on Marika's memory.

I think, you know, it's this IRT's job to sort of help inform that so that I'm not saying the wrong thing or we're writing the wrong thing.

But, you know, maybe I'm making it sound like I'm asking for more work than I am. But, you know, I feel like some of these may have been punts. You know, the working group said hey, you know, we have these kind of general ideas. We think it's too hard to get into the weeds here so we're going to kick in IRT.

And in fact there's some language in there that says that.

So, you know, part of this is I think you've got, you know, some language that leaves more work to be done. And I don't think it's for Marika or I to do. I think, you know, it's really - and it might even be this goes back to the policy making body and we say all right, this is still not clear. We need, you know, policy recommendations on this point or whatever.

So, you know, I'm not trying to offload the work on to you and I'm not trying to, you know, refuse the education.

You know, and like Marika said there's been this but, you know, I think that it needs to be the community here filling in the gaps. It shouldn't be, you know, me or Marika trying to define what - how the gap be filled. I feel like they were sort of deliberately left there.

Mikey O'Connor: Well I think a more granular work plan with, you know, I think maybe a first step in the work plan is revisit the briefing that you already got from Marika

then identify those questions that you feel uncomfortably or are uncomfortably vague, sharpen up a list of those questions, forward that list us.

I mean I think that we're perfectly willing as members of the working group to help clarify that. But the implication that...

Mike Zupke: This is - what you see here these are my list of questions that weren't answered. So believe it, you know, work actually went into this. It wasn't just that I woke up one day and somebody said you have to implement this.

You know, I've tried to immerse myself in it and these are still the things that I feel like I don't know the answers to and I can't answer and I don't feel like it's my job to answer. That would be, you know, usurping the GNSO's rule here.

So, you know, I think we're talking about doing the same thing but maybe you're sort of not liking the way that I've posited it here.

Man: No if you - if I may Mike...

Mike Zupke: No go ahead.

Man: Because I think we're going round and round in circles here and I don't think it's helpful for anybody.

I think - I mean I - what Mike is saying makes a lot of sense to me. And I think it's, you know, Mikey this is what, you know, what you've always asked for, what we've always asked for is that, you know, we as we in the working group with Marika's support because Marika does all the heavy lifting through the super-duper Marika, you know, we come up with a policy and then staff turn our recommendations into something that gets, you know, applied to contracts and written out and policy ease or whatever language it is.

And this - it is important but it's not a question of staff unilaterally interpreting stuff. It should be something that's done in collaboration with us.

I think, you know, Mike what might help, the fact is Mike and Michele Mikey is really confusing. I'm going to have to start calling you all John or something.

It might be helpful, you know, if you break it - if you break it out a little bit more in terms of various little bits that need to be dealt with and then maybe the bits that you're not 100% sure where they came from, what the idea behind was it.

I mean I know there probably was a certain degree of let's leave this to interpret to implementation.

But I think the reason that was done and has been done in the past isn't because the working group was particularly lazy or anything.

It was more a case of the working group would still be, you know, talking about it rather than actually - nothing would ever come out the far end. It would still be in there in the bowels of a working group.

So I mean maybe just breaking some of this stuff out of it more in terms of what needs to be clarified which we'll have little bits within that.

And just as a kind of - from a purely operational standpoint, you know, the kind of bits that actually need to be done on - from the registrars side or whoever else so that impact thing I think is - would be very, very helpful.

I'll shut up now. I'll - back to you Mikey. You can go off to dominating any (unintelligible).

Mikey O'Connor: Well, you know, I think we're agreeing. I think the key is this work plan needs to be a little bit more granular.

And Mike, to the extent that you're doing stuff outside this work plan, in other words I must assume this is your whole work plan.

But if in fact this is just a list of questions for us then what you might want to do is write a work plan for yourself that's got us slotted in in the places you need us and then make this a list of questions.

You know, this could be the list of policy clarification questions for that matter.

You know, I think the next step is why don't you take another run at the work plan? I don't think we're disagreeing that much. But I think this one needs a bit of touching up and then we'll do it again.

Mike Zupke: Okay thanks.

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: And I'll also point out that we're two minutes from the top of the hour. So if there's anything else you really need from us this is the time to get it.

Mike Zupke: Right thanks. I was just going to suggest that. You know, I put James's comment on the agenda. So I thought maybe, you know, James if you sort of want to introduce you thoughts here on this and, you know, sort of think about it now and continue discussion on the next call would that be all right?

Mikey O'Connor: Unfortunately James had to drop off. He has a conflict so he dropped off about midway through the call.

Mike Zupke: All right well in that case sorry that (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: You can swap James for me.

Mike Zupke: What's that?

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

Man: You swapped James for me.

Mike Zupke: Oh, okay.

Man: But it wasn't intentional or coordinated.

Mike Zupke: Okay well why don't we save that then for another day? We can wrap up here so people can actually get to their next calls on time.

                  You know, I got some good feedback from you all and I think this gives me some good direction.

                  You know, in the meantime I do want us to keep working on the parts that are really, you know, staff work, you know, so like this coming up with our framework of what we can think is going to be the holder of this policy and we can continue working on that in the meantime.

                  But, you know, I work on trying to give something to you that'll be a little more helpful.

                  And, you know, I also sort of want to say, you know, this, we don't normally share any of this, you know, I don't think outside of - what I was trying to do is avoid the situation like I had where somebody was saying, you know, I think staff isn't doing anything.

So I want you to see, you know, we've got some milestones here. I want, you know, I want there to be some expectations that we can, you know, sort of benchmark against.

You know, for me, you know, too much granularity is, you know, potentially extra effort in this that's time I could be spending on something else.

And, you know, I've got a team that's already 40% short right now due to medical illness. So it's, you know, there's only so much of me to go around.

But, you know, I'll see if I can make this more useful to you and maybe kind of come up with a sort of compromise that doesn't involve spending a ton of time on it.

But, you know, I think some of this it sounds like from what you said it's almost required to give you a little more detail.

So I'm happy to do that and I want to say thank you all for your time on this and for your feedback.

And I think I won't send the PDF of this one but maybe the next iteration as I, you know, put some more detail into it. That might be more useful to send around.

So with that unless anybody's got any closing thoughts I'll just say thank you. Were - are there any - here I can get on this now and look at the room.

Okay I see no hands up so I'll just leave it at that. Thank you. Enjoy the rest of your day.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Mike.

Man: Thanks Mike.

Woman: Bye everyone.

Man: Thanks.

Man: Thank you.

END