

**ICANN
Transcription
IRTP Part D Working Group meeting
Monday 03 March 2014 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 03 March 2014 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-20140303-en.mp3>
On page: <http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#mar>

Attendees:

Graeme Bunton - RrSG
Mikey O'Connor – ISPCP
Barbara Knight – RySG
Kristina Dorrain – NAF
Volker Greimann – RrSG
James Bladel - RrSG
Angie Graves – BC
Chris Chaplow – CBUC
Kevin Erdman – IPC

Apologies:

Paul Diaz – RySG
Holly Raiche – ALAC
Avri Doria – NCSG

ICANN staff:

Amy Bivins
Lars Hoffmann
Terri Agnew

Terri Agnew: If you can start the recording please.

Woman: Recordings are in.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. This is the IRTP Part D Working Group call on 3 March 2014.

On the call today we have Volker Greimann, Mikey O'Connor, Angie Graves, Barbara Knight, James Bladel, Graeme Bunton, Kristine Dorrain.

We have apologies from Holly Raiche, Paul Diaz, and Avri Doria.

From staff we have Amy Bivins, Lars Hoffman, and myself Terri Agnew.

I'd like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you.

James Bladel: Okay thank you Terri and welcome everyone to the IRTPD Working Group call for today March 3. And we are about ready to put an exclamation point on our initial report.

And hopefully you had a chance to see one or more of the drafts that we're circulating on the mailing list last week and over the weekend.

And Mikey I think you were the last one to hold the pen so I just wanted to check and make sure that that is the - and to Lars I guess is that is the draft that we are working on today that's displayed is the one that contains (unintelligible) is that correct?

Lars Hoffman: Yes that's correct. Although Mikey's added - and I spoke to Mikey about that off list because we are working on the same draft the same time.

I've copied and pasted into this. So they're not marked as Mikey's comments but they're all in there as he corrected them.

James Bladel: Okay. So my - I'm sorry I did skip the usual pro forma request that if anyone has any updates to their statement of interest or any serious objections to the draft agenda please raise your hand now. And I didn't see one so thanks.

Sorry for that. I was so excited to jump in and get this thing rolling that I skipped that important but somewhat routine piece of business.

Okay so my recommendation then for everyone is that we just go through this latest draft focusing at this point on the changes that were submitted during the last week previous draft.

And if we can get everyone on board with these changes then I believe we are ready to wrap this one up with a ribbon and submit it to council.

That would mean it would be ready for public comment in Singapore. And, you know, basically that would start the train down the track.

Does anyone have any serious heartburn with that approach or is everyone as excited as I am to get this thing to the next checkpoint? Okay. Seeing no hands then - oh Mikey go ahead.

Mikey O'Connor: Sorry I spazzed out. I was trying to agree. Never mind.

James Bladel: Okay and Mikey agrees. And I assume silence from everyone else is roaring agreement that they also want to see this moving along.

So Lars if you could scroll us through the first substantive change I believe everyone has scroll access? Is that correct?

Lars Hoffman: That is correct.

James Bladel: Okay so can you take as to where would be the first material changes? It looks like they would be on Page 3.

Lars Hoffman: Sorry yes I think so. I - the executive summary on Page 3 what I did here is basically copy and pasted the recommendations.

So I suggest that we skip over that and if there's any changes to the recommendation in the actual text I will then change that later on up here. I think that might be the easiest.

James Bladel: That's a fair point. And I should also point out that well it said substantive changes on these are just I think just more tweaking of the language the things that I added on the 26th. Okay so...

Lars Hoffman: Yes so you are - James I just think very briefly yours - sorry it's deserting me. Yours on Page 8 I just scrolled everybody there. Those are the first changes. I'm going to synch so I don't know if...

James Bladel: Oh there was one change on Page 8 here. I just - and I think it was just for clarity. And I wanted to make sure just double check that it says the initial report will be posted for public comment for a minimum of 30 days.

And then I changed - I took out the word including a 21 days reply period because it sounded like those would be running concurrently. And those are not correct. So I just want to make sure everybody is okay with that correct?

Lars Hoffman: Yes thank you James. That's great.

James Bladel: Okay so I just wanted to make sure I had my calendars and my sequence accurate. So and then I just I don't know I - we capitalized draft just to kind of I don't know because I felt like it was a name here and then changed suggested to recommended. I think that was in keeping with the idea that these are recommendations.

So nothing is huge here on these pages. Can we go to let see going to I guess another reminder - oh go ahead.

Lars Hoffman: I think that's the next minor change now I scrolled through quickly on Page 19 the approaches of working group.

James Bladel: Okay. Okay nothing major there I believe just a note that our work plan was not static that we've revised it as necessary.

And then just as a more of an administrative note will we have the attendance figures in the initial or is that TBD for the final?

Lars Hoffman: I actually would have to check in a different report. I'm not entirely sure. But we have them on record. So I can just put them in and asterisk it. And say that's up until and includes the call for the initial report.

James Bladel: Okay fantastic. And I think maybe just making sure that the total number of meetings may also need to be updated.

Lars Hoffman: Yes.

James Bladel: And whether or not that counts workshop held during ICANN meeting.

Okay so anyone - I'm kind of keeping one eyeball on the queue to see if anyone is jumping up and down with any questions here.

If not I assume that everyone is just either so thrilled with the exchanges or so bored as not to care.

But I think the key message is is that if you do see something that you feel is a significant change to the report and not in a positive direction please raise your hand, or get my attention, or just barge in on the line anything at this point because we are going so relatively quickly. Okay Lars what's next one?

Yes so this is just again readability. Minor stuff process instead of dealt with. Next...

Lars Hoffman: Yes James...

James Bladel: Okay actually - go ahead.

Lars Hoffman: You know you I mean you made a comment here I think you added the on the authenticate related bullet point the second to the last sub bullet I believe you added to registered name holder or administer contract transfer contact.

And then you wrote a comment thinking that that might be correct. And we need to check or verify. I spoke to compliance over the weekend and they said and I looked at it up on the IOTP data as well there is actually just the registered name holder that is sent the auth-info code.

And I think where the confusion might have come in is that the registered name holder can appoint somebody else to receive the auth-info code.

That could be anybody including any sort of contact or including some person that has nothing to do otherwise with the domain name.

But the IOTP in Section 5 there's a link also in my comments states that is the registered name holder only that has to be contacted.

James Bladel: Okay. So do we need to account for that other case here the registrar sends the auth-info code to someone who is not the registered name holder comma, or authorized by the registered name holder, or do we just leave it the way you had it before?

Lars Hoffman: Well they suggested I - compliance suggested to just sort of post-up after registered name holder because that's the wording.

They will accept somebody else. But that's not actually in the policy the authorized contract person. So...

James Bladel: Okay.

Lars Hoffman: ...they suggested put it in now to end up the name holder.

But I think as far as I can tell I don't think it would hurt to put the addition in as well. I think it's up to the group.

James Bladel: I think I like Mikey's language that he posted in the chat or their designee. I think that's simple but, you know, without overburdening this poor little bullet point here we can just throw that in there and call it good because it does acknowledge that there may be some edge cases so good catch on that one Mikey.

And I saw a green check mark I thought from Barbara. And I think that was too full stop or was that for voting for the designee or something in between? Barbara did - be okay with that or...

Barbara Knight: Hi James. This is Barbara. I'm okay with either way. I was fine just leaving it as, you know, a period after the registered name holder as well.

But if we want to go further and if Lars and the compliance staff are okay with that adding or their designee I'm okay with that as well.

James Bladel: Okay thanks. Let's do that than Lars. So then I'm going to see if we can get to the next yes...

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: Oh go ahead.

Lars Hoffman: I'm sorry did I - was it corrected on Page 29 I think is the next paragraph. That's the copy and pasted paragraph.

So some of that is all text but that's where Mikey edited and so I pulled it all over. And that's why all it appears to be new. But it's not all of it that is actually new.

So there might be...

James Bladel: Okay.

Lars Hoffman: ...read through quickly.

James Bladel: Yes I was going to turn it over to Mikey and ask if he would read is through these - this language that he's added here. Mikey would you mind?

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. Although I was just making some minor changes so why don't we skip this one and come back to it then.

And I'll drag up my copy because I haven't been I haven't got that open. And that way I can highlight the things that I actually changed rather than drag us through the whole thing.

I don't think I made big changes. I think they were mostly readability. But let me get that up so if I could take a pass on this and come back. I should have it by the next one.

James Bladel: No problem. We'll just circled back then. Lars what's the next one? Are these more of the same...

Lars Hoffman: Yes there is - it's just that I just want to highlight this quickly. So first of all there's the balls or the asterisks noting that the group would like to encourage feedback on these particular issues.

And then also I added under preliminary level of consensus and expected impact or these sentences to all of each other's questions indicating that the level of consensus because the initial report is not yet determined.

And that for the impacted impact I think we can have another discussion on that maybe on the next call or maybe even in Singapore how we go forward.

(Unintelligible) Mikey in regard to the BMPM data matrix and consummating working group that kind of feeds into what kind of expectations the group might have of the recommendations of what they should achieve.

So I put again asterisk in there. And said if there's public comment on the issue what the community thinks should be achieved by the recommendations that will be welcomed by the working group.

But I think this is in line with other initial reports of no explicit expected impact of the recommendation was forwarded through the initial report but rather (driven to final) report.

James Bladel: Okay. No concerns there. I guess I just more of a question. Let me pull this I think I've got a little pop-up coming up here.

Mikey did you have - you want to either tackle this one or even circle back to the last one? Go ahead.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. I had just a minor point on this nomenclature NB I finally have learned today from Lars the meaning -- I'm not sure I can repeat the words -- but we might want to change that to note or something a little bit easier for nonacademic types to understand. I'm getting a tick mark on that from Lars.

You know, we really do want to draw people's attention to this. And I think NB just at least for me I just didn't know what that meant. So that's my only thought on those at this stage.

Do you want me to go back to the prior one? If you do...

James Bladel: Yes if you're ready.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. I finally dug it up. What I was doing is struggling Lars if you could yank us back to that prior section that I - so that people can follow along.

What I was - let's see this is on Page 26 of the word draft. Maybe I can just get us there. I'll get us there. Yes there we go.

All right that middle paragraph I just struggled with the wording. It was - and my - and the result that I wound up with I'm not terribly happy with.

It, you know, it's just a long awkward sentences that I was trying to shorten. And, you know, so I wasn't trying to change the meaning at all, you know, especially that last sentence I reworked pretty hard.

And so I think it's the second paragraph the one that starts since the statute of limitation is important read that one carefully folks and see if we can live with it. I just struggled a bit with that. And if people are okay with my revising then I think we're fine.

James Bladel: So Mikey just to clarify this is - we noted that we would have to beef up the section where we were extending or recommending the extension of any sort of window to dispute a transfer from six months to 12 months?

And we were just acknowledging as a group that that could generate a lot of questions, or criticisms, or push back from the community. So we should at least be mindful of what we were saying to justify it.

And it seems here that you're trying to point this to the fact that by extending that window to 12 months it would ensure that there was at least one Whois

data at reminder policy sent during that 12 month window which could mitigate the multi-(hub) transfer problem.

And I don't have really any heartburn about the language that you have here. I'm just clarifying that that's what we're doing right?

Mikey O'Connor: Yes that's right James. This is Mikey again. And, you know, I think that if I were if I'd had more time I might have been able to just make the language clearer.

Lars I thought did a fine job of drafting the paragraph. But it, you know, I was mostly just chopping the sentences up a bit to make them easier to read. And...

James Bladel: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: ...so if that comes through clearly enough for people then I think we're good.

James Bladel: I understood it fairly well. Kristine had pointed out that there is a typo in the first use of statutes in the first paragraph but...

Mikey O'Connor: The statue of limitation, you know, we could use a statue of limitation around our house.

James Bladel: Yes. Okay. I don't see, you know, the villagers with the torches and the pitchforks about this language. So I guess we should consider it acceptable and include it in our document and we can move on.

Mikey O'Connor: James this is Mikey again. Just roll down one page I'm going to synch you to it. You made a comment in your edits that said should we note that prohibiting transfers within 60 days of previous transfer (present for Nile) was discussed in C, or B, or something and did not have consensus report.

And I replied to that saying I think we had that conversation in D but then we added something similar to that in C.

And so I don't want to lose that question that you...

James Bladel: Well C provides the mechanism for an opt out for change of registrant. I was thinking about it must have been B than where we were talking about making that currently optional nacking of the transfer request by registrar within 60 days from previous transfer was currently optional.

We talked about making that required. And that would over like a lead balloon. So I just wanted to note because I feel like the recommendation begs the question well why don't you just prohibit this?

Why don't you just say you can't transfer during 60 days? And the answer is or at least standardize it so that registrars do this uniformly?

And the answer is well we examined that. And it was not accepted. So yes...

Mikey O'Connor: And you're right James. That was indeed in B. And...

James Bladel: It was in B okay.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

James Bladel: So I - I'm not sure where to shoehorn this in. Perhaps way leave your edits as they are. And Lars do we want to note here that there is an existing - let's highlight this Lars.

I'm going to have to probably we're going to have to wordsmith it here if we're going to capture it or we just throw it overboard and say it's a nice observation but we don't really need it or Mikey are you saying you think that we should try and capture it somewhere?

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. I think that if you read that at least the way I was reading that paragraph which is right at the top of Page 30 in the - on the screen is that in C we have a requirement that in an inner registrant transfer the registrar does indeed have a 60 day lock requirement.

But that's an artifact of C. In D we had a broader discussion that said under any transfer there's a 60 day requirement and that did not get consensus.

So my thought was...

James Bladel: Maybe we need a...

Mikey O'Connor: My thought was sorry to walk over you there. My thought was that we could just leave this as it stands because it points to the policy that's in C for a 60 day lock in an inner registrant transfer. That's where we found the consensus.

And then the way we got to the consensus was we said if a prior registrant really wants to move in a hurry, you know, this was the whole discussion about in the case of a domain name sale for example the prior registrant could opt out of this, you know, that's just to sort of refresh the discussion.

So, you know, I think that paragraph stands on its own. I don't think it needs the additional comment. But I wouldn't be adverse to putting in one that said by the way and in D we tried to do it across all registration or all transfers and that did not arrive at consensus. I think that's an accurate retelling of the tale.

James Bladel: Okay. Okay Lars why don't you and I maybe take a stab at just not modifying anything that Mikey's added here but just tacking on a sentence here noting that a broader prohibition on transfers within 60 days of the previous transfer was attempted in IRTPD but did not or was discussed or considered but we did not have consensus for support or something.

And we'll make sure that we make the distinction between the two and not change what Mikey has here. Does that work?

A green checkmark from Lars. Does that work Mikey?

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. This is Mikey. That's fine.

James Bladel: Okay. Okay awesome. All right Lars if you could take us to the next changes here we're scrolling okay.

So there were quite a few changes. We're now on page I'm not sure what page we're on. Got lots of page numbers.

Okay and I think that - so I made some changes here then I think Mikey did as well. So Lars can you reconcile those two and walk us through it please?

Lars Hoffman: I'm not sure Mikey made changes on this. I mean obviously on - the level of (unintelligible) was the same paragraph about as mentioned.

James Bladel: Okay.

Lars Hoffman: And then you made some word changes to the elaboration on why the removal of the registered LAN may be what the thought behind it was and what the advantages and disadvantages of that may be so that the community has some idea on or some guidance on the thinking of the working group.

And that might help them formulate their recommendations on - for their comment rather on the idea of removing or not removing the registry level.

James Bladel: Okay thanks Lars. I remember this now. And I think I was thrown off by the fact that this was in blue text.

So I thought I was - I thought I had made some changes and then Mikey came in and made some other changes on top of it but I remember this now.

And just in general what I was attempting to do was wordsmith this a bit - a little bit here about for context what the pluses and minuses would be to removing a registry layer in that it would flatten this process. It's a rare process, it would not - it does not necessarily warrant the training and maintenance and the operational cost associated with keeping it operational at the registry level. However moving it purely to the second level would significantly change the economics of this review process.

And that, you know, we should consider whether or not that's an unacceptable barrier to access to this seven to twelve people that actually use it on an annual basis. But regardless that was the kind of thinking here and Mikey you're up next.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks James, it's Mikey - yes I did make a couple of comments or changes but they're incorporated into Lars's and mine were all readability, there was no substantive change to what I did in there.

James Bladel: Okay thanks Mikey, I think that really all of this is readability at this point, I don't think that we've - I don't think we've really introduced anything particularly novel here.

So but there were a lot of changes and I just - it looked a little confusing and so I wanted to make sure the working group is still onboard with this concept in our discussions and that this is an accurate synopsis of the pluses and minuses of this change or this recommended change. I see Barbara with a green checkmark, that's an important voice when we talk about registries, so thank you Barbara and Volker as well - okay so I think we could move on - Lars.

Lars Hoffman: Yes thank you James, I think the - I think that was it from the changes that you provided us.

Obviously as you said the different paragraphs on the preliminary level of consensus, follow the recommendations and then - sorry it's moving slowly because I seemed to have been (answering). And then I added here on 6.1 the initial public commentary request for input where that talks about the background of the working group that, you know, it's no longer part of the accommodations sections. So this is added but it was (text taking) - I went through there with Marika with parts of it.

And then the conclusion and next steps are number seven, you know, it's again something that will be finalized with the final report (of this page).

James Bladel: Okay sounds good - can you scroll up just one moment here, I had one thought and then I'll go to Mikey. We talked about reaching out to other SOs and ACs and we list them here, have we done that recently or was that more at the beginning of the process? And if so do we need to do that again, you know, in conjunction with publishing this report? I think I'm just looking for some clarity on that.

Lars Hoffman: Yes we - if I may we sent this out at the very beginning, it's initially been - a letter has been sent out to the SOs and ACs and to the secular groups and constituencies too.

The beginning of the group's work so I think it was in - in February and March last year. And with the initial report and the opening of the public forum another letter will be sent out to the SO/ACs and the secular groups and constituencies to make them aware of the opening of the public forum and encourage them to submit comments.

James Bladel: Okay thank you - thanks Lars and then Mikey, go ahead.

Mikey O'Connor: My question was about a different section, so if we're comfortable with this I can take you to that, but if you're - if you want to keep working on 6.1 stay with that James.

James Bladel: I think I'm good with 6.1, so...

Mikey O'Connor: Okay.

James Bladel: ...whatever's next on your list.

Mikey O'Connor: Lars could you take us back to the preliminary level of consensus sections because those were new for me and I'm not sure that we need to talk about that right now. It said something like rough consensus, I guess I can just roll back myself. You know, so just - yes like on this page it says we have rough consensus and...

Lars Hoffman: Sorry James - Mikey if I may just very briefly, I think - I think I know what you're referring to.

On the -so (tele-questions) B and C the wording is slightly different because due to the fact that the group seems to be less unified let's say on the recommendations I didn't speak (the reference letter) at all there I believe. As you can see here the text -- Mikey is (pulling up) -- the text is slightly different for the questions that we're seeking specific or reporting for specific input from the community. So in those four questions that there seems to be rough consensus that's what I've mentioned.

And on those two questions where we are calling specifically for input I've worded it slightly differently and just said there has no consensus (letter) hasn't been returned yet. But I mean I'm obviously happy to change those as you see fit, I just thought that reflected best what we're saying at the moment.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes this is Mikey again, thanks Lars. I just need to contemplate that for a minute because I'm uncomfortable as a co-chair who's duty it is along with James to do the assessment of consensus.

I'm uncomfortable just breathing through those without talking about it and thinking about it and checking with the group. I'm also uncomfortable doing that on the fly on this call and I'm unaware of our deadline. So I am thinking that - I sincerely wish that Avri was on the call because she would be the person I would direct this question to.

I think what we want to do is essentially have the same language in each of these and I think that the language is the one that you've got in 5.2.3.3 - the one that I can see on my screen. We have not yet determined the consensus level but we'll do it after the public comment because we haven't - we haven't done the consensus call and I'm a little uncomfortable characterizing it differently than that - James any thoughts on that?

James Bladel: Yes - I guess maybe I'm not entirely following it Mikey. I'm trying to see what the language in blue - I don't have a problem with it. I'm trying to see where the sticky point is.

Mikey O'Connor: Well I don't have a problem with that paragraph, but Lars if you take us down to one of the rough consensus ones, I'm more reacting to that - so now it's...

James Bladel: Oh yes.

Mikey O'Connor: ...(3.2.4.3) - I'm a little uncomfortable putting that in there because James and I haven't really pulled the rest of you. And so I would prefer to just see that earlier language repeated through all of these so that we're saying look we haven't done the consensus call yet, we will do it after public comments are in and not try to characterize consensus at this stage in the process - that's where I'm at.

James Bladel: I see that now Mikey and I agree. I think we should step back from this particular characterization and just use the same language throughout.

Lars Hoffman: Can I just add something very quickly - sorry this is Lars.

James Bladel: Yes go ahead Lars, I thought Mikey still had (things set back) - go ahead.

Lars Hoffman: Just - just to I mean I'm very happy to change the (value), it's not a problem to change the (round), no problem.

And just the reason why I put that in and if you read the 5.4.3 it obviously says in the first - second half of the first paragraph that and it should be noted that no form of consensus call was ever taken. And the reason that was put in there - appears rough consensus is that it was to indicate to the community that this is where the group seems to be heading. So I'm not, you know, I just want to explain where I was coming from - this is where the community is heading (unintelligible) nothing (forward has) (unintelligible) taken.

James Bladel: Yes I don't think there's any harm necessarily with that.

Lars Hoffman: But I was talking, that's no problem - I'll take them out and use the one that we had before for all the six (firm) level of consensus paragraphs - not a problem.

James Bladel: Okay and I think it's the distinction, the difference between the two that, you know, might highlight - well I think there's the case to be made on both sides.

I mean we very clearly as a working group tackle these last two (trouble) questions very quickly because we realize that they were very non-controversial and you could dispose of them fairly readily. And I think that it is correct to try and capture that. But in the language here it's almost - it may be just getting it on the front of that a little bit and saying that these things are

already (bate). So just to be safe I think that the conservative approach is just to use the same language throughout.

Even though I think that within the confines of this working group everyone understands that these questions would take a - let's say would take a very significant bit of overlooked insight that would have to be sent our way via the public comments for us to change position about use at this stage in the game. So I think all of that is far but I think just as Mikey said to play it safe we should take a step back. So okay, what else Mikey - you had - or Lars you said that was towards the end? Mikey you said you had some other concerns or...

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey, no I'm all good - I think we've covered all the changes. I think this is the chance for the rest of you - you've all been pretty quiet and I, you know, I like James think that's fine as long as you're comfortable with where we're at.

But if you are uncomfortable do know that it's perfectly okay even at this late stage in the game to say, you know, look I am still not there on something. And some of these we've acknowledged that we're not there and we have work to do yet, but I just want to make sure that people feel comfortable and not feel like they're being sort of pressured into a group decision that they're, you know, that they're uncomfortable with. So this is sort of a very last chance but by all means an open arms offer to let people comment.

Otherwise I think we're ready to - as James said at the top of the call, put an exclamation mark on this one and send it off to be included in the work. I'll hand it back to you James to run the queue.

James Bladel: Thanks Mikey, just to act on what Mikey said this is not, you know, it's not welding the door shut for any changes or edits.

But I think, you know, also I recognize that ICANN and particularly (trends) or working groups are full of veterans and I would expect that if someone has a problem they're not shy. That's something that we are all cursed with is, you know, introversion. So but (Chris) you're up next.

(Chris): Yes thank you - I'm sort of speaking as one of the more silent members but yes thanks James, thanks Mikey for first for staging that from the last (person of course) can only speak for themselves.

But it's a question of us being onboard and in good hand is why we feel it and heading in the right direction. So if there was something that would fight the (gates), I mean I don't quite the same experience as many of us in this field with these transfers dealing with them day in and day out, so I'm sort of hanging on a little bit by my coattail. But no problem I'm happy to speak up if there's something else I'm happy about, thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks (Chris) and I would say don't discount your years of experience with these transfer working groups, you're a part of a select few, probably a couple dozen people on planet earth that know the entire (TP) policy inside and out, so thanks for this.

And I think that - is there anyone else that would like to weigh in either give us your thumbs-up - an approval to go forward. Or if you have - if there's something maybe that's just been - oh maybe just a little uncomfortable with and you feel like. You know, I'm just not going to sleep really well tonight unless I get this last bit on the record. This is an opportunity for that as well. We can go around the horn and ask for everyone in the queue to give a go - no-go, Mikey if you want to - if you think that would be useful.

Mikey O'Connor: I don't - this is Mikey, I don't feel the need to put people on the spot but, you know, the stakes here aren't terribly high because this is an initial report.

We will get public comments I'm sure, we will certainly have plenty of opportunity to revise this. You know, my main goal is to just make sure that if there's something that people have felt we missed or whatever that we get it out on the floor. But I'm fine if people are fine, thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks - Angie?

Angie Graves: Yes this is Angie Graves, I just wanted to say actually I think I'm officially just an observer at this point. But I wanted to say that I appreciate all the work that's gone into this. And I'm very much in agreement with it. It's getting - moving on to the next phase, so thank you.

James Bladel: Awesome, thank you Angie and appreciate the vote of confidence in the direction of the group so far.

And I think Mikey you're right it's not like (unintelligible) on the issue - it's just the next phase is to open this up to a broader audience and take what we've worked on this while, our recommendation to the community and see how much they love or hate our ideas and I think that - and then proceed accordingly. So I think that we're on the right track for that next step - that next milestone.

Okay well I see green checkmarks and I see some healthy discussion in the chat. I think that Lars is that the candidate language for that bit about IRTPC?

Lars Hoffman: Yes I put down a - just a sense of in front of it.

James Bladel: Yes.

Lars Hoffman: and I was wondering if okay - I mean you would be happy with that kind of wording for the time being.

James Bladel: I think that's fine - that's - and I would ask everyone to please take a look at that and it's really just the pretending of that first sentence to that paragraph that we were discussing about IRTPC.

I guess it's just a matter of personal style preference whether that should be at the beginning of that or at the end, I really don't have a strong feeling either way so I, you know, my inclination would be that we accept that and just include that then and go forward. I'm looking to see if there's any hands that are raised or red marks in the queue and there's Mikey - go ahead.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey again, having been battling the passive voice I feel like a weary warrior against the passive voice.

And so I would join James in saying let's put the positive statement first and then the negative rather than the other way around. And other than that it seems fine, thanks.

James Bladel: Okay Lars there's two votes then to move it to after the larger paragraph, both at the beginning but otherwise I think you've got the...

Lars Hoffman: (Yes, go ahead).

James Bladel: ...yes, okay. Okay - all right everyone well look it's about a quarter until this half of the hour, we're all getting ourselves busy by nodding our heads in agreement with one another.

So I think that we are ready to submit this initial work product for consideration to all of the folks in the community at the Singapore meeting and then to begin to open the public comment period. And I think that we're good here - Mikey any thoughts? Any parting comments or should we just...

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey, you know, just a hardy thanks to all of course - to James and Lars and the rest of you on the working group.

This is, you know, we're such a long-running working group that we practically complete each other's sentences. But when you look back at the policy work that's come out of the GNSO this is a big piece of the substantive policy that's come out of this organization over the last three or four years. And a heart-felt round of applause to us all I think - back to you James, great job.

James Bladel: Yes I think - I just want to echo Mikey's comments, the thanks are sometimes implied but we need to be more explicit. Thanks for everyone who stuck it out - all the IRTP die-hards that made it this far.

Certainly more work in the future of course and so I would hope that, you know, everyone is sufficiently invested so that we can continue once we get back from Singapore. But I think that we're good for this next checkpoint here - we're - we'll kind of take a little bit of a breather, let everybody get on airplanes and make their - finalize their travel plans and then we will take another look at that.

We should discuss next meeting, I don't believe that a meeting next week on the 10th of March is necessary or warranted. And then I think that that then takes us into - well let's see that would mean the 17th. So I guess we're saying now that the 10th and the 17th are probably unnecessary, so we could probably clear everyone's calendars for the next two and then we will circle back to Singapore. Are we on the calendar in Singapore correct Lars to present the initial report?

Lars Hoffman: This is Lars, yes James I believe we are on Wednesday at 10:30 until 12:00 - well 10:30 am until 12:00 pm to be precise.

I've seen a preliminary timetable that's been on there and I think the official one will be released this week I believe, but we're definitely going to be there at its humane time.

James Bladel: Excellent, excellent - there's no need for coffee and danish and so that will probable be the next time that we are all together both person - in-person face-to-face and also for those that aren't just having Singapore remote participation.

So I think as Mikey said here anybody who's going can you please put a green check into the Adobe room so that we can take a rough headcount here. We've got large (not) going to Singapore.

Woman: What?

James Bladel: Oh there we go, okay, all right.

Man: Man that's creepy.

James Bladel: So Barbara - we're going to miss Barbara again but unfortunately - but it does look like we've got a healthy turnout.

So that's all I have, I guess that would be let's get this out into the world, let's see what the reaction is. Let's deliver it to Singapore and see what the audience take is on that. And I'll turn it over to Mikey for parting words and if you want to wrap us up please do so.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay this is Mikey, just one thing we are on deck on Saturday sort of mid-morning in front of the GNSO Council. So if anybody's there for the Council work or the GNSO I guess not Council but GNSO working sessions please swing by. And then Lars you and James and I probably should put together some sort of slide deck for that session on Wednesday - go ahead Lars.

Lars Hoffman: Yes, (actually) Mikey I'm actually working that - working on that at the moment. But I'm going to send something out to you later on this week for the weekend session, a couple of slides that's no problem.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes I would tend to focus on the recommendations and the, you know, some of the rationale stuff.

Lars Hoffman: Absolutely.

Mikey O'Connor: Sounds great, okay well gee I get to wrap this up, that's pretty cool. Thanks all, we'll see you in Singapore. Have good flights for those of you who are going and we - Barbara it's only a 12-hour time zone difference, we expect to see you bright and shiny at 10:30 at night. That's it for me - see you gang.

Man: Take (care) everyone.

Man: Thanks everybody, see you in Singapore.

Man: See you later.

Woman: Bye.

Woman: (Carolyn) stop the recording.

END