

GNSO
Inter-Registrar Transfer PDP teleconference
4 June , 2008 at 17:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Inter-Registrar Transfer PDP teleconference on 4 June 2008. 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-irt-pdp-20080604.mp3>
<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#june>

Present:

Mike O'Connor (CBUC) chair, Tim Ruiz, Paul Diaz, (Registrars) Barbara Steele, (Registry constituency) Christian Curtis (NCUC) Michael Collins (CBUC)

Staff:

Olof Nordling, Glen de Saint Géry
Absent apologies: Robert Hoggarth,

Coordinator: This is the conference coordinator. I would like to advise all parties this call is now being recorded. Should you have any objections, please disconnect at this time. Thank you. You may begin.

(Mike O'Connor): Thanks very much. I think we're on. I think this is what I'll call a quorum.

Glen DeSaintgery: Can I do a roll call for you (Mike)?

(Mike O'Connor): That would be wonderful.

Glen DeSaintgery: We've got (Mike O'Connor) who is the Chair, (Michael Collins) from the Business Constituency, (Paul Diaz) from the Registrar, (Christian Curtis) from the non-Commercial Constituency, (Barbara Steele) from the Registry, (Tim Ruiz from the Registrar and oh yes, (Mike Collins) you've rejoined again.

(Mike Collins): I'm back.

(Mike O'Connor): Oh good. Oh that's much better (Michael).

Coordinator: And we've got Olof Nordling from (Staff & Myself).

(Olof Nodling): And (RobHoggarth) is regrets the staff side. He couldn't - he was - he had to be on another call.

(Mike O'Connor): Oh that's too bad. Well okay, let's - I'm hoping for a short call but I have an hour blocked out.

Let me sort of bring folks up to speed on what I did. I took (Tim)'s terrific email and (Barbara)'s comments and I smashed them together and updated the proposed final draft on the wiki.

And the way I did it, I put the new stuff or the changed stuff in italics. And my thought was that we could spin through those italicized sections and un-italicized the parts we like and edit the parts. We can try to get to a final draft today.

I thought the conversation on email was fantastic. And I'm thinking that we're awfully close to final draft here.

The one change that I made to (Tim)'s suggested language is in Denial Reason 5. I shortened your second to the last recommendation (Tim). I sort of stripped out when - after the conversation with (Barbara)...

(Tim): Right.

(Mike O'Connor): ...I sort of simplified the language to just say include clarification of Denial Reason Number 5 in PDPC rather than a couple of sentences of explanation because those all pointed at PDP and I couldn't...

(Tim): Right. No that's fine. That makes sense. I'm perfectly okay with that (unintelligible) point so...

(Mike O'Connor): Yes, I thought that that conversation was terrific. So let's just do Denial 5 first and see if there's anything in there. If you look under concerns, that's really where (Tim)'s new language starts. And first paragraphs are italicized. And there's one italicized bullet in the bullet list. And then the recommendation is really all (Tim)'s language with my little tweaking.

Do you want to go through this paragraph by paragraph? Do you want to just take it by acclimation? How do people want to proceed here?

(Michael): This is (Michael). I agree with you (Mike) that the conversations by email seem to be very well thought out.

And the last recommendations including (Barbara)'s (unintelligible)

right on target.

(Mike O'Connor): Great. Anybody else? Should we just accept the language as it stands on italicized stuff? I'll go through. If that's the case I'll go through and clean that up after the call. I won't try and edit anything.

Man: I perhaps run little (edit). And that is the final report from 19 March 2008. Maybe we should spell it out. But that's editorial if anything.

(Mike O'Connor): Just strip that off the end of there?

Man: Oh no, actually spell out the title of the report because there are many kind of reports here and there. But the final report from 19 March 2008 identifies which file report it's referring to.

But I think that we should use the report of the - well whatever it was called. But okay, that's minor editorial thing just to make it abundantly clear which report we're talking about.

(Mike O'Connor): Okay I just...

Man: See what I mean, they include a clarification of Denial Reason Number 5 in PDPC of the final report from 19 March 2008.

So I think that the words final report is this - it's called something else if I remember right. I can look it up in the meantime so...

(Mike O'Connor): I just heard of the phrase spell out which final report in our draft. So if you refresh your screen. And (Olaf), if you could take the action to insert those words, that would be...

(Olof Nodling): Will do so.

(Mike O'Connor): Terrific. That would be fantastic. Any other edits like that?

(Barbara Steel): I think we probably will want to make a recommendation that the PDP, the people who are participating in this particular group would participate in the PDPs because we've had, you know, a fair amount of conversation about it and may be able to help bring it to fruition and I guess a little bit quicker.

(Mike O'Connor): Yes, that's a good idea. I mean can we stick that in before the recommendations that are a choice so that we make that not a choice but just...

Barbara Steele: Maybe a consideration?

(Mike O'Connor): Yes.

Barbara Steele: I don't know.

(Mike O'Connor): Yes. So let's do that. Let's say something like encourage the current drafting group participant. Carry on as members of whatever subsequent working group is formed recommended by that.

Okay, that should be on your screens now if you refresh them. Any other suggestions for us?

Barbara Steele: This one relates to the second option there on the recommendations where (they) talk about expanding the charter and the scope.

And I don't know if we can - if there's a way that we can come up with what we would expect if they were to choose that option, how much time we would need in order to adequately address it.

(Mike O'Connor): We could insert something in there that says let the team determine how much time they need. Maybe that's the way to do it, you know, as the team is formed they could lay out a work plan. And, you know, rather than impose a deadline from outside the group, let the group determine what that deadline is internally.

Barbara Steele: Well I'm wondering if we could figure out, you know, based on what we know -- and (Tim) you may be, you know, probably the best person to give us some feedback on how long you think it might take, how many, you know, more additional meetings or what the timeframe would be needed with a larger group that would be able to represent I guess all of the thoughts, processes and so on and feedback relative to this issue.

(Mike O'Connor): (Tim), you got any ideas?

(Tim): I mean my initial thought would be, you know, like 90 days, about three months. Could be less than that, but I know about probably close to six weeks would just probably be making sure we get good feedback from the constituencies and give them, you know, the time to consider any issues or express the positions.

(Mike O'Connor): If we were to sort of sketch out the big tasks, it's - that might give us a way to arrive at that.

One part of that is what you're describing, sort of a feedback cycle. Is this sort of a drafting cycle, a feedback cycle and then a final drafting?

Man: I mean doesn't the PDP, the bylaws, do they kind of dictate a certain timeline?

Olof Nordling: Yes they do. But as (Avri) has recently interpreted, it is - when deliberations start, the clock effectively stops meaning that well the council deliberations or the kind of deliberations in some kind of working group can be actually adapted before.

So - well that's her reading of it. And I think that's useful. Because they're very, very optimistic the overall timeline of PDP.

(Mike O'Connor): Yes, yes.

Olof Nordling: We have never, ever met them.

(Mike O'Connor): You know, as an old project guy, I had the idea of imposing an arbitrary deadline especially through bylaws. That seems crazy to me. Because some of these are going to be really long and some are going to be really short.

Olof Nordling: If we compare it with what we cc and the (Solo hats) for their PDP, we've got minimum timelines.

(Mike O'Connor): Yes. You know, (Barbara), as I think about this and as I sort of return to the era when I actually worked for a living as opposed to now when I don't, I'm tempted to either not raise this issue at all, or if we do raise it, I think what we ought to do is hand the job of figuring out that

timeline to the team that's formed rather than trying to determine it now.

Barbara Steele: Well I guess I'm just saying that if it's - that if they want to expand the charter of this particular drafting team...

(Mike O'Connor): Yes.

Barbara Steele: ...to become a working group, then I think that we would need to provide some sort of a timeframe that we would want to ask them to extend, you know, the work to be done within just because I think it would help them to be able to make a better decision on which recommendation they would choose.

And it could very well be that they would go ahead and choose to pull it out and put it into another PDP in the interest of getting this one done more quickly.

(Mike O'Connor): That's a good point. What do other people think?

(Tim): I guess, you know, my thinking was just to clarify was the timeframe was that we were kind of considering that we could end up with both fees.

I mean if we only end up with one, you know, that'll certainly make a difference. I guess that's the other question is...

(Mike O'Connor): Yes. See that...

(Tim): If we end up with one but not the other or we could end up with both.

(Mike O'Connor): Now see that's where, you know, you set a timeline and then it turns out that there are extenuating circumstances.

And it's the same group of people is working on two different PDPs (unintelligible). And they're locked into a timeframe that we've determined makes me cranky. So I'd kind of like to ease away from this idea.

Olof Nordling: A little comment from (Olaf) here. I think - well the big question is are we - well could we assess sort of off the cuff right now what kind of time this would take?

(Mike O'Connor): Well I'd be willing to go with...

Olof Nordling: Who better to do it than anybody else? But then again there would be an opportunity to raise that. Because currently we're a drafting group. We have no specific charter really.

For a working group there would probably be some kind of terms of reference and there will be discussions about such if they choose for that option when the council meets in Paris.

And if so, there would be some kind of reporting timeline.

Well I don't agree with you (Mike) that well it's promising much to say that we would have it ready by any particular time in the expanded group. We don't know the composition of that group either. And to what extent the council would like to enlarge the scope of the - or rather the charter in terms of reference work.

So well if we can get some kind of soft advice, well that's good. But I don't know if - I'm not able to do it.

Barbara Steele: Yes, I don't think that (my camp) was that we would lock anybody into it, but just, you know, provide a best guess of what we think it may take.

Man: I wonder if we - well what if we said something like - you know, we're not going to get much more done between now and Paris because, you know, they're not going to make a decision probably till then.

Man: Right.

Man: And then that puts us into July. So, you know, if we were to allow something like (15 months). And it may not take that long but, you know, that puts us into early October.

But the end of October is the next ICANN meeting. So if we said something like, you know, that with both of these PDPs we could, you know, have recommendations for the council to act on - you know, either act in the Cairo meeting or sometime before (unintelligible).

Man: I could go with that. You know, as long as we don't word it so strongly I think that...

Olof Nordling: I should remind you also that the PDCP has not been launched really. We haven't even produced an (unintelligible) of that one.

(Mike O'Connor): Right.

Olof Nordling: So and - well the - I think the basic assumption is that these PDPs would run consecutively.

(Mike O'Connor): I was going...

Man: And I guess what I'm considering is that we would - if we end up with both of them, you know...

Olof Nordling: Yes.

Man: ...kind of what we would comment on. They give us one and put together one in PDCP, well that's going to change their timeline for that one, have our PDCP starts or whatever...

(Mike O'Connor): Right. See that's the thing that, you know, suddenly we've switched from being a drafting group to being a project planning group.

And I think it might be better to leave the parts on the table and let some group of people who is trying to plan the schedule figure out which sequence they want.

You know, we worked on that other one quite a while on the sequence. But I was sort of lobbying for the same thing in that that I think it'd be a lot better if the group formed and then figured out the work themselves rather than having a schedule imposed on.

I think one of the reasons that we're in this fix where we've got two of them done and two of them not is because somebody else imposed the schedule on us. I'm not sure we'd do anybody any favors by doing

the same thing to them.

So (Barbara), if it's okay with you, I think what I'd like to do is just be mute on that one.

Barbara Steele: I mean I guess I can go either way on it. I just thought it would be more helpful for the council when they're evaluating this to be able to make a better decision on, you know, whether or not we could maybe get these done a little bit earlier or if it looks like, you know, regardless of whether or not we pull them out, you know, the timing of completing I guess clarifications for those two would probably end up being in the same time frame if they have to be pulled out and put into another PDP.

(Mike O'Connor): Yes. I mean I agree with all that. I just hate to make that choice for someone else. I'd rather leave that flexible so that they can...

Barbara Steele: Well I guess I was also under the impression with that particular option that it would be this group plus whoever else we needed to engage in order to be able to craft the clarifications.

(Mike O'Connor): Yes. And the trick would be if - or if there's another PDP running in parallel with this - now let's say PDPC kicks off at the same time and we have the same group of people largely represented in there, you know, we run into we don't know how many hours of which people's time we have available to us.

You know, if we had us and no other work in front of us, then it would be easy to predict the lapsed time or at least easier. But we don't know those things.

And that's why I think it's better to let those decisions fall once we know what the work's going to be and who's going to be doing it.

Barbara Steele: Okay, so if the council were to I guess, choose the second one where we expand the scope of the existing team, then I guess the question I would have there is would they at that point reset a schedule for us to work to?

(Mike O'Connor): I would hope not.

Man: That's what I was going to comment on (Barbara). You know, to be practical, probably what will happen is they'll either do that or they're going to come back and ask us anyway.

(Mike O'Connor): Right. But I think that once that's done then we know the field of fire in terms of the other work that needs to be done. Because I think the answer varies.

Let's - one answer is sure we can do it in 90 days if this is all we're doing. And the other answer is, well if you want to kick off one of the other PDPs, and our guess is that a lot of us will be represented on that as well, then let us huddle and figure out how long it's going to take.

But I think it's really useful to know what the work is and the people before we guess on how long it's going to take.

Man: And there's some of us on the council so we can...

(Mike O'Connor): Yes. Well and a lot of us will be there. I'll be there....

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Mike O'Connor): So again, I don't want to push this if there isn't consensus
(Barbara). So...

Barbara Steele: And if you all are planning to be there and - (Tim) was it you that said
you were on the council?

(Tim): Yes.

(Mike O'Connor): Yes, (Tim)'s on the council.

Barbara Steele: So I mean, you will know better I guess what they were looking for. I
guess I was just, you know, hoping to try to preemptively be able to
answer some of the questions that they may come back with so that
they as I said, could make a good decision on which way to go as far
as the recommendations are concerned.

Man: I mean honestly I don't think it'll go over well if we don't - I think we're
going to have to consider that we - if we have both of these that there's
going to be some expectation that we're, you know, pretty much
completed it by the next ICANN meeting.

But that's my feeling so we should kind of be prepared for that. I don't
think it would go over too well to expand it beyond that. And I don't
think it would really require it anyway.

(Mike O'Connor): I don't either. I think the thing is that if they just left us to do that,

that would be a pretty good target to shoot at.

But if they said well in addition that, we'd also like you to start working on something else, then I think we want the ability to negotiate that.

Man: Right. We want to be - we want to follow the advice of (Scotty). I don't know if you ever watch Star Trek or not.

Olof Nordling: I've updated the little reference too. And it's actually appeared a little bit later in the text in the same way as I rendered it. I think it's consistent also.

(Mike O'Connor): Terrific, okay.

Olof Nordling: But updating the drafting group's history and adding the (unintelligible).

(Mike O'Connor): Okay. So going once, going twice on staying mute. (Barbara) I want to - still want to check in with you and make sure this is okay.

Barbara Steele: I'm fine with that. I expect that there will be discussions surrounding it at the parents meeting...

(Mike O'Connor): Oh yes, I think you're absolutely right. And I would quite cheerfully take the wrap for - you know, I as a project manager like to under promise and over deliver. Having been in the situation where deadlines have been imposed by outsiders, I'm very sensitive to making sure that the group is comfortable that they can get the work done. So I'm happy to be the fall guy on that discussion.

Olof Nordling: I'll fall with you (Mike).

(Mike O'Connor): Okay, thanks (Olaf). We'll link arms and jump off the cliff together. Anything else on Number 5? I'm thinking that is an okay, we're fine on Number 5 Consensus.

Man: Under the recommendations, I'd kind of like to reverse the order of the first two bullets.

(Mike O'Connor): The proposed text goes below the registration period one?

Man: They encourage the current drafting group for (areas) members. That underneath B includes clarification of denial reason in 5. I think that just - it flows more logically that way.

(Mike O'Connor): The reason I put it there was because that one we just recommend whereas the second one and the third one are a choice. And I took the "or" out. I should probably put that back in. Hang on.

Well if you look at include clarification, the one that ends 19 March 2008, there really should be a comma there saying or. And that's the reason that I stuck that one in the front because I didn't want to put it between the "or" choices.

Now I could put it at the end.

Man: Yes.

(Mike O'Connor): How about that?

(Tim): Yes, maybe encourage that. It could be kind of like subpoint of the

include.

(Mike O'Connor): Let me do that.

Oh just put in the - shall we just put it in the include ratification one?

((Crosstalk))

Man: And possibly encourage or whatever.

(Mike O'Connor): But within include rather than as a separate recommendation?

Man: Yes, yes.

(Mike O'Connor): Okay, I could do that. If I can get my hands to not spas out on me I can do it. Bullets don't go in edit anything.

Olof Nordling: I know.

(Mike O'Connor): You and I were fighting over versions of the draft there for a while. I realize that I had the thing open and you were editing it too.

Olof Nordling: Yes.

(Mike O'Connor): So...

Olof Nordling: Now I'm out.

(Mike O'Connor): ...I'm claiming it. Okay let's see how this reads. Okay, I've saved the draft. Whoops, somebody else made changes while I was editing it.

(Dang nabit). Who's in there? Rascal, I bet it's (Olaf).

Olof Nordling: I didn't.

(Mike O'Connor): Keep your dang hands off this thing. Hold on a minute. Okay I've got to go in again. Hold on.

That's the only trouble with (wikis) is they're kind of dumb about version control.

Okay. Now it's up. I just moved the sentence down. I didn't get real cute with that.

This stuff on 5, I'm calling that done. How about 7?

Now 7, I had a harder time (Tim) with your stuff because I wasn't sure how much of that was commentary to us and how much of it was what you wanted in the draft.

So I took everything you wrote, sort of chopped it up and stuffed it in there. But if there's language in there now that you didn't really want to have in there, feel free to sing out and I'll remove it.

(Tim): I wrote it in - (made me) write it in a way that would be included.

(Mike O'Connor): Yes, okay.

(Tim): That was my intent so...

(Mike O'Connor): Yes, all right. So then the only change I made to your language on

that was I broke it up just a little bit.

(Tim): Yes.

(Mike O'Connor): And so if we're comfortable with that.

Man: I don't quite understand the distinction between the first two recommendations.

(Mike O'Connor): Moving it into PDPC or having it as its own PDP?

Olof Nordling: I think it could be (moved) to its own PDP. Well that's the third option really.

(Mike O'Connor): Yes. I'm sorry, I'm off a notch. So we're really talking about the first two.

Olof Nordling: Right.

(Mike O'Connor): The result as opposed to it could then. Let's see, actually probably the first one probably isn't a recommendation, it's really...

Olof Nordling: It's a introduction to the first (simulation).

(Mike O'Connor): So what if I just unbulleted it?

Olof Nordling: And then I think we should write something more similar on the second - well the not so recommended recommendation...

(Mike O'Connor): I think...

Olof Nordling: I think rather similar to what we wrote in for Issue 5. Well our Issue 5. Now we get into other issues or Denial Reason 5 (though).

Man: Okay. That was really intended to - that was only at least myself, I was (wanting) to make two recommendations, either that given the close relationship that we just included in PDPC 4 - we make it its own PDP in the sense that - but I meant in regard to extending the scope and...

Olof Nordling: Yes.

Man: ...(unintelligible) of this group deal with it.

(Mike O'Connor): Yes. So I changed it. And it should be on your screen now so that that first bullet is no longer a bullet. It's just text, sort of introductory text.

Does that solve the problem that you were raising (Ralph) or (Paul), sorry?

Barbara Steele: I almost think that the introduction there that you now have taken the bullets from...

(Mike O'Connor): Yes.

Barbara Steele: ...and the - it could then be left as Issue of PDPC, I almost think those should just be pulled together in one bullet.

Man: Yes, that's kind of true.

(Mike O'Connor): So maybe should we just - could we just strike the second bullet?

Olof Nordling: And combine it with the first which is not bulleted now and bullet that one, bullet the whole thing.

Barbara Steele: Yes. That's what I would go for.

Man: Okay...

Man: And then maybe the - and then those last two, you know - or it could be moved - now why don't we just say or the council could decide to extend the charter of this group and become a work - you know, those two intermediate bullets we could just remove and then make the other two basically the two recommendations.

Man: Okay.

Man: Yes.

Man: I'm taking those two intermediate ones out.

Man: But they're so (cheap). They're recommended.

(Mike O'Connor): And then I'll put the recommended behind the first paragraph right?

Man: Yes.

Olof Nordling: And then we need to take...

(Mike O'Connor): That'll be coming a bullet again.

Olof Nordling: ...change the introduction of what is now the - well third bullet or fourth paragraph if you like, if the latter - well we can't say that anymore.

Man: Yes I think you just move that first sentence and then...

(Mike O'Connor): Tell you what, I'm going to (prevail) on you for some assistance, going to do a hack job here then we can - now that comes out. I don't think this is right but I'm saving what I've got. Okay so it's up there now.

Olof Nordling: Yes, that's where we need to delete. And the second bullet is the latter. Now we should start with the council could also decide to immediately extent the chart and scope of the (unintelligible) working group. So just delete it's the latter comma.

(Mike O'Connor): Yes.

Olof Nordling: You want me to do it?

(Mike O'Connor): No I don't. That's where I got in trouble before. Hang on a minute. I'll get out of here.

Olof Nordling: (Unintelligible) I know since I introduced registrars again.

(Mike O'Connor): Okay, so I've taken off (if) the latter saving. Should be up there now.

Man: You know, it occurs to me that under the recommendations in 5, without an or we don't have language establishing that that's an

alternative or that the two bullets are alternated.

(Mike O'Connor): Yes.

Olof Nordling: And we should have or here and or there.

(Mike O'Connor): I'm going to just put an or right in-between the two bullets because otherwise that looks silly. And I'll do the same thing up there. And I'll save it.

Okay, that's up on your screens now. How does that look? And I'm going to go in one more time. We don't really need to say the counsel also decides. We could just say the counsel decides.

Oh actually I'm going to make it into active voice. New version, fresh. That looks...

Barbara Steele: Could we be consistent? I mean it looks as though that's, you know, fairly similar to what we have up above. And now Region 7 as the second alternative.

(Mike O'Connor): Yes. So maybe I should just pick up the language from above?

Barbara Steele: Yes we should decide which one we like better and then just...

(Mike O'Connor): Yes, take whichever one we like. Which one do we like better? Immediately extend - I like the first one better just because it's more active voice.

What if we just copied the one out of PDP - or out of Region 5 and

stapled it in down here? Is that okay with folks?

Man: Yes, I just think you need that second sentence though...

(Mike O'Connor): Yes.

Man: ...in Number 7.

Barbara Steele: Yes.

Man: Don't lose that.

Barbara Steele: Yes, that's true.

Olof Nordling: But that's the difference really. These - they need to be (unintelligible).

(Mike O'Connor): Which second sentence?

Olof Nordling: Second sentence in the recommendation for 7.

(Mike O'Connor): Yes, the (council) may first need to decide if the new issues report would be necessary.

Barbara Steele: Right. And I think this one is very clear cut that those two need to be dealt with together. So from my perspective I think that recommendation one would be what they would take on that. But...

(Mike O'Connor): Yes.

Barbara Steele: ...they definitely need to keep a notation there relative to it.

Man: If they do them separately it's just going to be an issue essentially.

(Mike O'Connor): Okay so I'm going to take the sentence 5 and I'm going to staple it in as the substitute for the first sentence of this one and leave the second sentence right? Yes.

Barbara Steele: Yes.

Man: Except in the first - except for the part where it says PDPC right (unintelligible). Is that - oh yes, I guess it is apply actually.

(Mike O'Connor): Do we want to have the prior to initiation of PDPC in this one as well?

Man: I don't think so because we're - because if they combine them it doesn't really - it's not really an issue.

(Mike O'Connor): Okay, so I'll stop at the comma more thoroughly.

Man: I don't think this can be resolved by doing one before the other. I think either way it's going to cause a problem.

(Mike O'Connor): Okay, it's updated on your screen.

Barbara Steele: I think definitely you do need to have that prior to PDPC because we want to make sure that they - this is resolved if they choose to allow us to continue on and resolve this one as part of this drafting group, that I think we want to have it resolved before PDPC mentions though that that team, whoever is on that -- it may be some of us, maybe not --

would be able to take what we have done and move forward versus, you know, again, having perhaps a conflict.

(Mike O'Connor): (Tim)? You were the one that had me whack that out. What do you think?

(Tim): Yes, I guess that would work. I was just thinking that the ideal would be to, one way or the other to do those two together.

(Mike O'Connor): I'm becoming edit man so I'm not guiding the conversation.

(Tim): We can - but we can make that point too when we discuss it. I mean that - I think it's pretty clear. So if they're not going to do them together then should certainly resolve it before they start.

(Mike O'Connor): So I'm going to put it back in?

Man: Yes.

(Mike O'Connor): That's going to work? Okay it's back in.

Barbara Steele: That's the point I was trying to make albeit not quite as concisely as you were able to do it (Tim). Thanks.

(Mike O'Connor): Well take a look at what I just did and see if that's the right thing.

Barbara Steele: I think that works for me.

(Mike O'Connor): Okay.

(Tim): Yes, that looks good.

(Mike O'Connor): All right, anything else in 5 that we want to work on aside from me taking out all the italics?

Olof Nordling: In - you mean it's 7?

(Mike O'Connor): I'm sorry, yes.

Olof Nordling: (Unintelligible).

(Mike O'Connor): Listen to what I'm thinking not what I'm saying.

Olof Nordling: Yes I'll do that. I use my telepathic skills, lots of times.

Barbara Steele: It's very helpful

(Mike O'Connor): All right.

(Tim): I can't help but wonder if the first two italicized concerns could be combined. It sounds a little redundant as it is.

(Mike O'Connor): (Tim) is that a friendly amendment for you? I'm the one that broke them apart. But it may be that you intended them to be.

(Tim): Well yes because well the first one just is kind of a - makes an introductory comment that these two things are very closely related. And then the next two bullets explains - goes into a little more detail about what each one is. Issue 5 of PDPC is quoted there. And then the - those are - reasons for denial report tell this issue that we're

addressing, you know, is quoted there.

So it's kind of - it's trying to show how the - like quoting them separately how they're closely related. Maybe it isn't real clear but...

(Mike O'Connor): Should I just combine them all into one long bullet?

(Tim): Could we make the last two sub bullets of the first...

((Crosstalk))

Barbara Steele: That I think would work.

Man: Yes.

Man: Have a colon after related then make them sub bullets.

Okay, let's see if I can do that. No idea how to do that in this editor.
Hold on.

Okay. I'm going to hold my nose and click save. I have no idea what I'm going to do here. Okay, it's there. Hey, it worked.

Oh no. Looking at the right spot. Okay it did indent them. Do we need to change the language? It's a little bit redundant. Oh no, not in sub bullets. I guess it worked - it reads okay now. How does that look to people?

Barbara Steele: Looks fine to me.

Man: Looks good to me.

(Mike O'Connor): I'll clean up the formatting some time, not on this call.

Other thoughts about - so what will happen is that the three italicized bullets will turn into normal bullets and they'll align with the bullets that are already there. And then those last two will be indented from the last one.

Let me see if I can fix that. That's more confusing to describe it than to just - okay, up there. A little funky but at least the alignment's right.

What do people think of that?

Olof Nordling: It makes the (unintelligible).

(Mike O'Connor): Here's the point at which I've exhausted you so much that I'll just say fine.

Anything else in 7? Anything else at all? Are we at the final draft aside from formatting.

Man: One minor wordsmithing. In 5, the first recommendation bullet we say encourage the current drafting group participants to carry as members of the whatever. Did we lose something there when we cut and paste it?

(Mike O'Connor): In a minute. Let me find where you are. The editor in this is pretty rugged to read.

Olof Nordling: Yes, a lot of...

(Mike O'Connor): Got lots of extra characters and so it's hard to (unintelligible) sometimes. Okay, so I've got - so say that again?

Man: It just looks like we might have lost something. I can't remember what the original text was. It just doesn't read properly.

Barbara Steele: Maybe if you add encourage - well read it as encourage the current drafting group participants to carry forward as members of whatever.

Man: Yes, I think that's what we might have had.

Barbara Steele: Yes, and then delete the...

Man: Get rid of the and add forward.

(Mike O'Connor): Hold on. Encourage the current drafting group participants to carry...

Man: Forward.

(Mike O'Connor): Ah, forward.

Man: As members of...

(Mike O'Connor): As members of. And then get rid of the.

Man: The.

Barbara Steele: Right.

(Mike O'Connor): So encourage the current drafting group participants to carry forward as members of whatever subsequent working group is formed. Yes okay. So let's see, I probably carried that same bad language. Did I carry that down into 7?

Man: No.

(Mike O'Connor): Oh good, okay.

Man: No, we didn't copy that one down.

(Mike O'Connor): All right, so I'll save that. That should be up there now.

Barbara Steele: Should we - I mean should we even say even subsequent working group or PDP for these forms?

(Mike O'Connor): Oh that's a good idea.

Barbara Steele: Sorry about that. Now you're going to have to republish.

(Mike O'Connor): Oh that's all right. Publishing's cheap, you know. It's finding the place that's hard. It's not publishing that's hard.

Okay, subsequent working group or (unintelligible). Okay, it's up there now.

Okay, it's open season on the whole draft at this point. Anything that people see that they're going to change it's fair game. I'm going

through and taking out italics like crazy.

Just save the non-italicized draft. That may be easier to read. Oh boy, except for Number 7. That's kind of.

A pretty good long pause. Anybody see anything or should we call this done?

Man: Pretty good to me.

Man: Yes, I don't see anything else.

(Mike O'Connor): Okay. Well wonderful. I think that is it. (Olaf), I have one action item for you.

Olof Nordling: Listening.

(Mike O'Connor): The editor has stumped me as far as getting bullets indented. So if you look at Reason Number 7 you see how there are two bullets underneath Issue 5...

Olof Nordling: All right.

(Mike O'Connor): ...there in the concern. If you can figure out how to make those bullets instead of asterisk, that would be completely neat. But the editor has me buffaloed on that one. I don't know how to do it.

Olof Nordling: Would hyphens do?

(Mike O'Connor): Any old thing. Yes, hyphens might look better wouldn't they? Yes,

let's do that. I can do that. I can handle that. Hang on a minute. Let me put hyphens in there.

Olof Nordling: And while you're at it, on the main and last bullet point, maybe you should put a colon or something after or very closely related to make clear that these are - well it's clear, but...

(Mike O'Connor): Ah, yes. Somebody said that and I forgot to do it. Okay, I've just saved that one. Yes that reads better. Good catch.

Okay, I'm calling this done. And this is last call. And if we're all agreed than I think we'll draw this call to a close.

(Olaf), I'll hand this draft back to your able hands to bring forward to the council.

Olof Nordling: I extract it and forward it to the council and of course to the drafting group as well.

(Mike O'Connor): Yes.

Olof Nordling: Okay, with your regards and regards from the group and so on.

(Mike O'Connor): Yes, yes, yes. Et cetera, Et cetera. Thanks gang. It was...

Man: Thank you (Mike).

Man: Thanks (Mike).

Man: One quick thing. We could use some colons after the subheading,

Current Tax Concern Recommendations. We're a little inconsistent about that.

(Mike O'Connor): Concerns and - oh, you mean the...

Man: Under 8 we have a semi-colon after current tax and proposed tax. But then we drop that under the most of the rest of them.

(Mike O'Connor): Oh, I see what you mean. Yes actually we've only got two of them. I'm going to get those right now.

Man: Then under 7 there's a colon after current tax which is different from the semicolon that we have under 8.

Olof Nordling: Shouldn't we get rid of the colons and semicolons since they are headings actually or subheadings or whatever?

Man: Yes.

Man: As long as we're consistent.

Olof Nordling: Yes.

(Mike O'Connor): You know, maybe consistency is the (unintelligible) and the (small) (unintelligible). All right, I think I've got them all and I've just saved it. How does that look? It looks better, a lot easier to read when you're not in the editor.

Barbara Steele: Looks good to me.

Olof Nordling: Well I think we should because now it's not any more proposed final draft. It is the final draft. So we need to change the overall heading. The final draft.

(Mike O'Connor): Yes, and that is something I don't know how to do in this particular software. Wait a minute, rename the page.

Olof Nordling: Anyway, since I will extract it to make a Word file out of it, maybe I can do that.

(Mike O'Connor): I just renamed it final draft. Question becomes can you get to it?

Olof Nordling: That is complicated. I missed out completely on that and...

(Mike O'Connor): Oh what a minute, I can fix this.

Man: Yes, there's a link that says page renamed to final draft when you refresh.

(Mike O'Connor): Yes.

Man: And that takes you to it.

(Mike O'Connor): And I think that if I just change this on the front page, yes. So now the front page, the home page, if you hit home, the final draft now shows up as where proposed used to show up. And it gets to the right page.

Barbara Steele: Okay.

Olof Nordling: Wonderful.

(Mike O'Connor): That's how you do that. First you rename it and then you relink to it.

Olof Nordling: Thank you. See I tried to do it the other way around on...

(Mike O'Connor): That gets - yes, that gets nasty.

Olof Nordling: Really. Then it's lost in cyberspace for a while.

(Mike O'Connor): Yes. Okay gang, well I have to scoot off to another meeting.

Glen DeSaintgery: Sorry, this is Glen. Just one thing before you leave. Who will be in Paris? Because there will be a working session of the GSNO on Saturday the 21st of June. And the intra-registrar transfer policy PDP on denial definitions is up for deliberation.

And the (inter-rich) transfer policy PDP and new IRPP issues is up for deliberation.

(Mike O'Connor): I'll be there.

Glen DeSaintgery: You'll be there. That'll be Saturday the 21st. Will anybody else be there, (Michael), (Christian)?

(Tim): This is (Tim). I will be there.

Glen DeSaintgery: (Tim), you will be there. Yes (Barbara)?

Barbara Steele: I was originally planning to be there but I may not be now. So can I let

you know?

Glen DeSaintgery: Yes of course. And (Paul), I just want to make sure that you all do know that this is going on.

(Paul): Yes, I will not be there (Glen).

Glen DeSaintgery: Okay, thanks (Paul).

(Mike O'Connor): Okay.

Glen DeSaintgery: Okay.

(Mike O'Connor): Any other business?

Glen DeSaintgery: Thank you.

(Mike O'Connor): I think that's it. We'll call it a wrap for today.

Man: Thank you again (Michael).

Glen DeSaintgery: Thank you (Mike). Thanks. Bye.

Man: Good job (Mike).

Olof Nordling: Thanks a million (Mike) and thank you all.

(Mike O'Connor): Okay.

Olof Nordling: I'll see many of you in Paris.

(Mike O'Connor): Yes.

Olof Nordling: All right.

(Mike O'Connor): All right.

Man: Bye all.

(Mike O'Connor): See you guys.

END