

GNSO
Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy A PDP Jun08 Working Group teleconference
3 February 2009 at 15:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy A PDP Jun08 Working Group teleconference on 3 February 2009. 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/gns0/gns0-irtp-20090203.mp3>
<http://gns0.icann.org/calendar/#feb>

Participants present:

Paul Diaz - Working Group Chair - Networksolutions Registrar c.
Barbara Steele - Registry c.
Mike Rodenbaugh - CBUC - Council liaison
Michael Collins - Individual
Sébastien Bachollet - ALAC
James Bladel – Godaddy
Marc Trachtenberg - IPC

Absent Apologies

Mikey O'Connor - CBUC
Kevin Erdman - IPC

Staff:

Olof Nordling - Director, Services Relations and Branch Manager, Brussels office
Marika Konings - Policy Director
Glen de Saint Géry - GNSO Secretariat

Coordinator: The recording has started.

(Paul): Thank you. And, Glen, if you would, could you do the roll call?

Glen DeSaintgery: Certainly Paul, we have on the line Barbara Steele, Registry, constituency, Paul Diaz Leader of the Group, Registrar; Michael Collins, individual member; James Bladel, Registrar, Business Constituency and Mike Rodenbaugh Council Liaison. We have Marika Konings, Olof Nordling and myself, Glen.

(Paul): Very good, thank you.

Glen DeSaintgery: And we have apologies from Michael O'Connor.

(Paul): Excellent. Okay.

Glen DeSaintgery: And I don't remember seeing anybody else's apologies. Has anybody else seen apologies from anybody?

Marika Konings: No, I haven't.

(Paul): No, I have not. But hopefully Marc or Kevin might join us in a few moments.

Glen DeSaintgery: Okay.

Mike Rodenbaugh: I think as mentioned on the list that Michael Collins has dropped out of the business constituency. I assume he's dropped out of his working group as well.

Michael Collins: I'm here.

Man: Oh, you are here, Michael, excellent.

Michael Collins: Hi, (Mike).

Mike Rodenbaugh: So sorry about that.

Michael Collins: No problem.

(Paul): Michael, thank you for remaining engaged in this in an individual capacity now. But we very much appreciate your remaining a part of this group and hope you will continue...

Michael Collins: Thank you, (Paul).

(Paul): ...with the future ones.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Absolutely. Obviously, we need to catch up.

(Paul): No problem. Okay.

Glen DeSaintgery: And Sebastian has just joined the call too. Sorry, (Paul).

(Paul): Wonderful. Hello, Sebastian.

Sebastien Bachollet Hello, (Paul). Hello everybody.

(Paul): Just getting under way so perfect timing. Okay, a couple of quick administrative things for the group please. First, if you might imagine we have been discussing with staff, looking to see if there is space and time available in Mexico City for a face-to-face meeting of this group should the group feel if that's appropriate and/or necessary.

If we can just do a very quick poll of those who are on the call, how many of us do intend to be in Mexico City? And then if you would just, you know, quickly call your name, yes or no. And if you will be there, do you think that a face-to-face is necessary, a good idea?

I'll start. I will be there. And I admit that the schedule is very tight. So I personally am thinking that a face-to-face may be too much trouble. And so I would vote against doing a meeting that first week in March. Quite honestly, I'm hoping we can wrap up our report before then. So, again, I will be there and would vote against a face-to-face.

Marika Konings: (Paul), can I maybe just note that there will be a council update probably on Saturday. So the issue will be discussed and hopefully many members of the working group will be present at that time, so just to make sure.

(Paul): Thank you, Marika. Yes, very good point. Again, I'm hoping that we can present the report; that the update is actually the presentation. But let's get to that in a moment. I won't get ahead of ourselves.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Well, I think it helps, (Paul), to explain that a little bit more. So right now we've got the public comments. And your expectation is that we could wrap up a final report for council in the next three weeks basically?

(Paul): That's the hope, (Mike), yes.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Thank you. If possible, I would like - I wasn't clear. Are we waiting for constituency statements again or not?

(Paul): Okay. That's the second question on my agenda here. The deadline for statements for both public comment and constituency was the 30th.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Okay.

(Paul): So, you know, last time both business and intellectual property constituencies each had submitted comments.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yeah.

(Paul): And a question for the group will be are you all working on that? Do you need a little more time? Or were you just going to stand with your first round comments? So either/or, if you want to answer, or we can just take that up in a moment.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Well, but for the BC we have not done anything further on that, so.

(Paul): Do you think you will? Or are you comfortable with the positions that you made out the first time around?

Mike Rodenbaugh: That's the good question. Honestly, I need to send it around for comments again.

(Paul): Okay.

Mike Rodenbaugh: But I don't think it's - I mean, it hasn't changed a whole lot since the first time basically, right?

(Paul): Yeah. Yeah, that's what I was seeing with the comments that have come in so far. I mean registrars were pretty much the same. The (unintelligible) a proxy for registries is pretty much the same.

Barbara Steele: Yeah, I think it pretty much is. I didn't hear any -- I had actually sent my comments around to the registry's constituency and I didn't hear any

feedback from anyone strongly disagreeing with them. In fact, I don't believe I received any feedback at all, so.

Marika Konings: (Paul), this is Marika. Maybe just to point out to (Mike) that on the registrar position the only thing that has to change is the position on the partial bulk transfer where I think initially there was maybe some support to consider this. But in light of the discussion that the working group had and the conclusions the working group drew, the registrar position is now agreeing with that. That's the only thing that I saw has changed.

Mike Rodenbaugh: In other words, our report came around to the registrar constituency's position I think after we discussed, right?

(Paul): I think they came around to us, yeah.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Right.

(Paul): Yeah, yeah, the constituency came around to this working group's view that no additional policy work is needed at this time on partial bulk transfer terms. Yes. Okay. Hang on a second, folks because now we're addressing all the agenda issues -- one at a time.

If we could just quickly because staff needs to understand that they're spinning their wheels or if they really need to try and find a time slot. Again, anybody who plans to be in Mexico City, if you could please just, you know, say who you are and if you would like to try and do a face-to-face.

Sebastien Bachollet It's Sebastian. I will be in Mexico and I am not sure that the schedule I have or will have will allow me for a face-to-face meeting. But if you define a time, I will be very happy to do so. But with the submittals here, unless it's - it will be quite an awful week at this time.

(Paul): I appreciate it. Thank you, Sebastian. Any others?

(James Pledell): (Paul), this is (James). I will be in Mexico. I'd like to think that we wouldn't need an additional meeting, but I would be open for one.

A question for Glen and Marika. Have they finalized for the Mexico at this time, or is that still not published?

Glen DeSaintgery: Marika, can I answer that?

Marika Konings: Yeah, yeah, please go ahead.

Glen DeSaintgery: There are two slots that we have been thinking of, and one is on Tuesday from 1730 to 1830. It's just after the constituency meeting. And then there is another slot that we have held a little bit of thought to and that is on Thursday. But I think that will conflict with the (unintelligible). A sort of breakfast meeting from 7:30 to 8:30 or 9:30.

Marika Konings: I think (James)' question was rather on the broader schedule. Am I correct, (James)?

(James Pledell): Yes.

Marika Konings: Do you know when that will be published, Glen? I know internally I think, you know...

((Crosstalk))

Glen DeSaintgery: Yes, internally and it was supposed to be up yesterday, but I haven't seen it.

(James Pledell): All right. And I would...

Marika Konings: I guess it should be there shortly, hopefully.

Glen DeSaintgery: Yes, it will. Yes, sorry, it will be there shortly.

(Paul): I would say I'm against a face-to-face meeting, but I will try to attend it; that's the consensus of the group.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Mike Rodenbaugh. I'll be there. I don't think a meeting is going to be necessary.

(Paul): Okay.

Michael Collins: This is Michael Collins. I will not be able to attend Mexico City.

Barbara Steele: This is Barbara Steele. I won't be attending either.

(Paul): Okay. Then it seems pretty clear. Whatever the pace of work that we do over the coming weeks, you know, let's push. I think our positions are pretty clear based on everything that we've seen come in so far. There seems to be a pretty good consensus on two of the three issues. We can work on, on crafting language to present to council on our final report. On that first issue, if we can get it wrapped up before hand,

terrific; we're done. If not, then I think we'll probably just push that first week of March. And we would wrap up shortly thereafter when we get back.

Marika Konings: But, (Paul), if I can just say something as well.

(Paul): Yes, Marika.

Marika Konings: I think as soon as the GNSO Council calendar has been finalized, we'll send a notice as well to the groups. Barbara knows when the GNSO council will be discussing this issue. And it would be great if those that are in Mexico City could attend that part of the meeting so they can chime in if there are any questions or any discussions on the issues.

As said, I think for now it's tentatively foreseen for Saturday afternoon. Am I correct, Glen?

Glen DeSaintgery: That's completely correct, Marika.

(Paul): Saturday afternoon. Very good. Yes, to any of those - anybody who is attending and can make it, most welcome. The council really likes to hear from as many participants as possible.

Sebastien Bachollet Once again when it will be (unintelligible)?

Glen DeSaintgery: Saturday afternoon.

Sebastien Bachollet Okay.

(Paul): Right. And formal confirmation will be coming, Sebastian. As soon as they firm that up, we will get a note from Marika and Glen.

All right. Another question for the group. Avri Doria, the Chair of the GNSO Council, had shot a note out to (Mike) and I asking about the good work that we've done here and people's plans, intentions for participating in the future transfer policy related PDPs. Wants to get back to her with just a general sense, do most folks on the call now hope and intend to continue participating in the future PDPs on transfer policy issues?

(James Pledell): (James). I do.

(Paul): Okay. It might be easier -- I would hope that everybody can. I mean this has been a very, very - this has really been a very good group. I think that we've had differences of opinion. We've worked through them. We've recognized areas of consensus quickly and, you know, checked that off our list. It's kind of enjoyable to go through PDP that operates this efficiently.

I recognize that coming up in PDP-B and see there are a lot of issues that will be more controversial, probably a lot sharper views on what could or should be done. But council is interested because I think their goal ultimately if we have a core of the membership from PDP-A, especially interested in moving forward, that the council may look to initiate PDP-B in the near future.

Does that sound right to you, (Mike)? Is that what you agree with?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yes. I think there's - we were going to start the PDP-B in the very near future anyway, but certainly the core group continuing would be useful for a lot of reasons if people are willing to do it.

(Paul): There you go. All right. So for everybody, you know, obviously we need to wrap up our work here. But please, you know, keep an eye towards the announcement that it'll probably be coming in the very near term; call for volunteers and crafting a charter for PDP-B. And from our wiki site, Marika has posted early on, you can refresh your memory with the issues that will be addressed in that second PDP.

Marika Konings: And (Paul), just to point out -- it's Marika. It is likely that of course it will be PDP-B, but I think the council hasn't preset yet which one is going to be next. If there would be any strong feeling within this group that one PDP would make more sense seeing the work that has been done now. I'm sure that's a recommendation they would be willing to take into consideration.

(Paul): Good point, Marika. So, you know, I encourage everybody to look at all the issues that were laid out in that original report for the PDPs -- B, or let's just call it number two -- basically any of the others yet to be addressed. Some may feel let's just go in order as they were laid out. Others may want to address certain issues right away.

And again, as Marika just noted, council will probably be open to addressing anybody's pressing concerns. So if you really want to dive into one of the issues right away, to alert your council reps and, you know, that will be taken into consideration.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Are those on the wiki? Or could we -- I know Marika, I believe you sent them around I think...

Marika Konings: Yes.

Mike Rodenbaugh: ...several weeks ago now. Would you re-forward that what each of the next PDPs are that are queued up?

Marika Konings: Yeah, sure. I'll do so.

(Paul): I've got it up now, Marika. I'll just send it out to the group.

Marika Konings: Okay, great.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Thank you.

(Paul): You bet. All right. So, let's see. Dispense the meeting in Mexico City. Okay and then comments. Again just to - for my clarification, (Mike), your feeling is that you will probably will not have a second business constituency statement? You guys are comfortable with what you did the first time?

Mike Rodenbaugh: That's my feeling, yes. I doubt our position has changed.

(Paul): Okay. If in the event of talking to your other colleagues they - you know, feel they want to make an amendment, adjustment, if you could just email Marika or I so that we know.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Michael, do you agree with that?

Michael Collins: I'm not sure I can speak for the BC anymore, but that was my -- I didn't hear anyone expressing any concern.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Right.

Marika Konings: (Paul), just so that you know as well, like I don't know if people had a chance to look at the summary I posted, but my time would be to send that to the public comment forum later today if no one has any major objections to - in order to close the public part of the forum. And so if any other comments come in, they will need to be sent like directly either to the group or either you or me or both to avoid -- because we basically said the date was the 30th. And otherwise, we might get more comments in that might not be related to the issues, but we need to update in the summary as well, so.

(Paul): Okay.

Marika Konings: Unless the group decides that they would like to keep the public forum open for longer. But then we probably would need to send out another announcement on that.

(Paul): Okay, fair enough. There's a couple of things there. Marika has already - super efficient Marika has already provided us a summary. I don't know if everybody's had a chance to read that and sort of digest it.

Again, we had a revised - minorly revised registrar constituency statement. We had something from VeriSign which we understand can serve as a proxy for the registry constituency. And then there was pretty extensive comments from somebody, both in an individual capacity. It's important that we're - I mean we don't necessarily have to

do it today. I think everybody, please be aware it's out there, look at it and by next week we should make sure that the -- maybe not that long.

We need to make sure that the summary of the statements is accurate; that we're comfortable with it. And so that Marika can do what's she's just asked. If that's the case, we can close out the comment period, post that summary and, you know, then it's just internal, the working group, using that as a reference point for our work on the final report.

With that said, (James), please weigh in. I think that Marika's characterization of what the registrar constituency said is accurate and fine; didn't see a need for any changes.

(James Pledell): Right.

(Paul): Have you had a chance to review, Barbara?

Barbara Steele: I actually just started to review it this morning.

(Paul): Fine.

Barbara Steele: And I have not had a chance to go all the way through it.

(Paul): I don't want to put you on the spot like that because it's just not fair.

Barbara Steele: After the meeting, I will go ahead and go through it in detail and just confirm that I'm fine that our view was represented as well.

(Paul): Thank you. And then I would ask Marika if there are any changes that we get them in. If Barbara's comfortable with your characterizations

then, you know, maybe in the - we'll give it, you know, 24 hours. Does that seem reasonable? Barbara, you know, that's enough time?

Barbara Steele: That's fine, yes.

(Paul): Okay. And then maybe we can -- assuming everything is fine, the other gentleman who had posted in a capacity is not a part of the group so we can't necessarily poll him, but it seems he took a lot of time and really captured everything you said. You know, the thought is, yeah, give it 24 hours and then we can assume everything's good. We'll close it out tomorrow, post a summary and have that item checked off our list.

Barbara Steele: Okay.

Marika Konings: Maybe just to point out as well because I didn't include it in the summary that the person who indeed submitted quite detailed comments volunteered as well to join to work or participate or, you know, answer any questions that the group might have on his proposals. So just something for the group as well to take into account.

(Paul): Yeah, I really do hope this gentleman, (Patrick) -- I'm afraid I'll mispronounce his last name so I'll just say (Patrick M) -- that he does join us because he's certainly given a lot of thought and his comments were quite extensive. You know, that he will join the future efforts.

And, you know, one other thought -- oh, he's from (Dot and Co). Okay, I know the company now. One other thought, Marika, is that in - we might want to - if you could send a note to the list just reminding so that our colleagues from IPC, Kevin and Marc, will understand that this is

the, you know, the summary of comments. And basically, you know, give them a last opportunity and say, "Oops, we're really sorry, but IPC is going to submit something that we know." I'd hate for them to have misunderstood the deadline, you know. And we know how that all goes some times. Working by committee like that it takes longer than expected. But if they have something coming, I would hate to post a summary and then find out, oops, they submit something the next day. So if you would, just a reminder note...

Marika Konings: Okay.

(Paul): ...basically from the email you previously sent; here's a summary. And in particular, you can, you know, ask them if the Intellectual Property Constituency intends to submit any further comments, please let us know right away. Otherwise, that summary will be posted tomorrow.

Marika Konings: Yep, on the (unintelligible). Okay.

(Paul): All right. So then the question becomes how would the group like to proceed. I'm sorry. Just for - hopefully for the group, but certainly from my avocation the formulation of the final report, how do we move to that stage?

You know, I'm assuming it's just taking what is our initial report going through it, incorporating the comments that have been received, making sure that the - you know, we've clearly delineated when there's different points of view. But essentially what we have out there is the initial report will form the fundamental basis of the final, correct?

Sebastien Bachollet Well, all of it. Well, actually according to the Bylaws and such, it's a very short lapse between the initial report and well the receipt of the public comments to it and the production of the final report. So traditionally, that has been expanded as we have seen fit really.

So if there is a need to further elaborate at some length, well that has been done. So various circumstances before worked with one could call evolving drafts rather than the rather regimented procedure according to the Bylaws, so just as a little background.

(Paul): Okay. Thank you, that's helpful. So for all of us now, if you recall the report, if you can pull it up and see. And I was just wondering what some of us --how would people like to proceed with this? Is this too much too quickly to start going back through the report and trying to identify if there's any areas in text that needs to be redone? Is that too much to do on the call right now? Should we give ourselves the benefit of the coming week to do that and then we can address these issues next Tuesday? What would people prefer?

Marika Konings: (Paul), this is Marika. If I can maybe a suggestion because I think it's probably important for everyone to review the public comments in detail because that's - I guess that might be the only reason why certain positions of the working group might change in light of some of the ideas and suggestions that have been raised there.

So I really don't know if it's better for everyone to review that first in detail before maybe going through the report again and seeing where the group would like to see changes or make their conclusions in the preliminary final conclusions. This is just a suggestion.

Mike Rodenbaugh: I like that suggestion to study these comments and then come back next week or before next week ideally with any changes that we want to discuss with the broader group.

(Paul): Okay, that sounds great. A question for the group, how should we address or incorporate this fellow (Patrick)'s comments? Some of the things, some of the points he's making are things that we have addressed over the course of our investigations, deliberations. Some detail for instance on the (Iris) proposal.

He is highlighting things and further developing things that we discuss in our report, but don't necessarily provide as much detail on. I guess, you know, an open question for people to keep in mind as they're reading those comments and refreshing themselves with the text that we've produced, you know, the question becomes what's that balance that we want to have? Do we want to provide more background or detail, sort of taking the lead of this poster? Or do we feel that we've covered it well enough in our existing text and don't need that extra level of detail?

Mike Rodenbaugh: I would prefer to maybe highlight some of the things that he said. I mean I got to read his text still, but we might just want to highlight or emphasize a few of the things he says in our report. And maybe just attach his three comments, the three substantive comments just like we attach constituency statements so that they're part of the report.

(Paul): That's a good idea. How do people feel about that?

Michael Collins: I like that. This is Michael.

(Paul): Okay. Does anybody have a problem with doing that since it wasn't a member of the working group that we could capture this - you know, it seems a good way to capture it, put it in the back with the other statements.

Marika Konings: Would you like as well to include the summary maybe in the bulk of the report like we've done as well with the first public comments period? So we could as well receive like on the other comments received; they're just the summarized version of all comments.

(Paul): I wonder if that's enough.

Mike Rodenbaugh: I see no reason not to capture this good work that (Mike) has done. Absolutely.

Michael Collins: I would agree.

(Paul): You agree, Michael?

Michael Collins: Yes, I agree.

(Paul): Okay. The only concern I have is something to think about folks have said, we are summarizing someone else's work and whereas we were able to go back to say constituencies and say is this a fair characterization. We're going to have to make the judgment that we've accurately captured that, unless we want to engage in an email dialogue with this fellow.

Marika Konings: If I leave the disclaimer that I've put in here as well might help.

(Paul): Okay, that's another way to handle it.

Michael Collins: I think if we're attaching his comments in full and the disclaimer Marika mentioned, I think that would satisfy my concern.

(Paul): Okay.

Marika Konings: I actually had an additional question on the comments he submitted. Because not being a technical expert, I was wondering about the - what he discussed on the domain .info operation and contact info. Is that something that the group discussed and this is just more detailed, or is this another alternative the group needs to consider?

(Paul): That's a fair question, Marika. And having not really absorbed his comments, thought long and hard on them, even if -- let me rephrase that. Even if I had, I'm not sure I have the technical background as well to judge - to answer your question.

Marika Konings: Or maybe that's something that Barbara could take back to her colleague that's participated in the call to talk about EPP to see maybe what he thinks about this.

Barbara Steele: I'm happy to do that.

(Paul): Yeah, that would help, Barbara, just as a sanity check for us.

Barbara Steele: Okay.

(Paul): So that, you know, we are not attaching something to our report that is factually inaccurate and, you know, sends people off in a wrong direction.

Barbara Steele: Okay.

Michael Collins: I'm a little bit like (Paul). I think the material sounds familiar, but I'm not confident that we've discussed this in exactly the way he put it.

(Paul): Okay. All right then if you could take that action item please, Barbara. If you would just forward his comments to your colleague.

Barbara Steele: Certainly.

(Paul): And just get a sanity check.

Barbara Steele: Okay.

(Paul): And I guess a question is if you get a response and in fact your colleague finds that there were inaccuracies or mischaracterizations or anything other than being able to accept on a face value, please alert the group. And just shoot an email to the group saying that, you know, there will be - you know, there were issues or whatnot.

Barbara Steele: Okay.

(Paul): Because that's something that we'll need to decide if there were problems. How do we characterize it in the report? Do we still want to attach the comments?

Barbara Steele: And to the extent that he does have some issues, does it make sense for me to extend an invitation for him to join us again next week to walk us through those?

(Paul): That's a good idea. Does everybody think that that will probably be helpful?

Michael Collins: Very helpful.

Barbara Steele: Okay.

Marika Konings: Would the group feel it helpful as well to invite the gentleman that put forward the issues to present them as well in more detail or - because he seems to have as well the experience of actually being involved in the IETF. I think were a group that drafted the protocol so they actually might know each other I guess. Would that be of interest or that's too premature?

(Paul): Can I ask this of the group? Barbara, I'm totally blanking on your colleague's name. Who briefs the summary?

Barbara Steele: (Scott Hollenback).

(Paul): (Scott), thank you.

Barbara Steele: Yeah.

(Paul): And if you can get it out to him and maybe, you know, by late Thursday. If he can, you know, just push in - we understand that we're asking a lot. But if he can, you know, kind of skim over it. If there are

no concerns, then basically we have no problem. You know, we can do what we said, we can attach his comments; everything's great. If there are concerns, we need to understand.

My fear is that if we invite this fellow (Patrick) to join our call next week, we could wind up going over a lot of old territory and significantly extending the amount of time it's going to take to pull together a final report. It's very easy to imagine there could be all sorts of tangents that need to be touched on and we wind up, you know, kind of repeating stuff, spending a lot of time.

You know, again I've never tried to rush this, but this PDP has taken a bit longer than anticipated. We've got the next one coming up. I would kind of like to wrap this up. And so the thought is if there's, you know - if (Scott)'s all right or can look at it, feels that everything is fine, we really have no problem. Let's just move forward.

If, however, there are going to be issues, that there's things to debate, then let's discuss on the list. All right, we have this. We believe (Scott) can be with us next Tuesday as our expert, then let's invite this fellow (Patrick). And, you know, we can try and zero in on just what are the points of contention. You know, get some clarity around them. Heck, we can even invite this fellow (Patrick) if he feels he has to revise his comments, to do so. And that's what we can put into the report so that everybody's comfortable with what's been written.

But right now I'd say why don't we wait to see what at least we hear from the expert we've work with - with (Scott). And then determine do we need to invite him, the other fellow (Patrick), to next Tuesday's call or subsequent call because the other possibility is he may be busy.

And if we need to have him on the line then this is really going to start pushing out.

Barbara Steele: I'll get that out to (Scott) today. And hopefully he'll be able to get it back to us. I just recalled that I'm actually going to be out of the office next week and will not be able to participate. However, you know, we can still have (Scott) participate in the event that he needs to do some explaining or, you know, provide additional background.

(Paul): Okay, thank you, Barbara. And does that seem like a reasonable plan to everyone?

((Crosstalk))

Michael Collins: I think it's an excellent idea.

(Paul): Does anybody not share my desire to kind of wrap this up this month? Let me rephrase that. Does anybody feel that I'm unnecessarily trying to rush the process?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I don't think you're trying to rush it. My only question is here really on the proposal he makes. If this is really a different issue because he describes it as something that the group hasn't considered. And as he describes it, this seems to be a very easy way to solve the issue.

But this is in my nontechnical view. And as I said, this might be completely, you know, not appropriate or it might already be linked to what we have discussed. So I think it will be interesting to see, and based on even (Scott)'s feedback, you know, the group might decide

that some more discussion is needed on this or maybe not. And then, you know, we can maybe move forward.

(Paul): Perfect. All right. Well with that then, you know, I don't necessarily want to keep everybody on the line if, you know, (unintelligible). If every is to review these comments in detail, you know, really try to absorb it, think about how it will lead to any text changes we may need or perhaps change, you know, your thinking on certain issues. Let's all do that.

Barbara's going to reach out to (Scott) and try and get back to all of us on list with, you know, either a green light or a yellow light whether there's issues that still need to be resolved or if everything is at least technically accurate.

And then, Marika, if you would please, just resend your summary one and specifically invite the IPC to comment if they have any update on their positions or if they're going to like most of us stick with what we've either already submitted or previously stated.

Marika Konings: Yes, will do.

(Paul): Okay. Any other concerns?

Barbara Steele: (Paul)?

(Paul): Yes, please.

Barbara Steele: This is Barbara. I just wanted to get back to you all with the details. And I apologize that I was not able to do it earlier in writing. But I did pull the registry's constituency numbers to see how many of them are

required by contract to publish the registrant email address. And so just to let you all know, .biz, .cat, .coop, .info, .mobi all came back indicating that they do have a contractual requirement to publish the email address for the registrant.

The only one that came back that did respond on this I think registry is .org and they have indicated that, you know, they actually do not have to contractually publish the registrant email address. They're only required to contractually to publish the technical and admin contact email addresses. So I did want to just get back to formally on that.

(Paul): Thank you, Barbara. And with that in mind, I think, Marika, then the characterization we have in our initial report is just fine, right? We don't need to make a change? I think we worked -- I'm scrolling through it, but I can't find it to pull it up right now. But I think the way we tried to characterize it, we left ourselves - or it was worded in such a way that that's accurate.

Marika Konings: I think so, yeah. I can double-check that.

(Paul): Okay. Marc, I just got your email. Thank you for joining the group. You said about ten minutes ago, so hopefully you've heard. A question for you as a member of IPC, will the constituency have another statement to submit or are you guys going to - you're good with the first round comments, you don't have any additional things to add at this time?

Marc Trachtenberg: I think it's going to be unlikely that there's any additional comments. And I think once the new comments that have been published, it will make it more unlikely that they'll want to submit additional comments.

(Paul): Okay. Then hopefully as you've heard, what we're going to do -- so, Marika, you don't need to - your assignment's taken care of. You don't need to resend the summary and ask IPC. We know where they stand now.

Marika Konings: Okay. And Barbara sent me an email already as well saying that she's fine with it. So after this call I'll get it out and officially close it.

(Paul): Okay. Officially close it and then...

Marc Trachtenberg: I mean maybe I should confirm this with the IPC, but I mean that's my gut feeling.

(Paul): Okay. Why don't we do that because it's not fair to put you on the spot like that. Can we ask that you just do it within the next day?

Marc Trachtenberg: Yeah, can I send them that summary? Is that possible? Or do you want me to just ask them without that and sending them the summary to see if they have any additional comments?

(Paul): How do people feel? Is it better just to ask if there are additional comments, or shall we send Marika's draft summary?

Marc Trachtenberg: And I'll make it clear it's a draft.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yeah, I was going to do the same for the BCs sending around Marika's summary.

Marc Trachtenberg: Let's just make it clear to our constituency that it's a draft summary and it's not official by any means.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Right.

(Paul): And you guys know better, is a day enough time? Is that realistic or do you need a little more time?

Marc Trachtenberg: Probably a little more time would be better; maybe until the end of the week - until Friday.

(Paul): Is everybody else okay with that?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Fine.

(Paul): Can I just ask this gentleman, if you can get any sense that there will be in fact somebody, oh it sparks an idea, they definitely want to, you know, make a statement comment, if you could just post that to the list so we have some idea that there will be additional constituency statements coming in.

Conversely, if, you know, everybody should look, okay, that's pretty cool and doesn't have a problem with it, then our goal remains. Okay everybody else is reviewing this themselves and on next Tuesday's call, you know, we start figuring out text for our final report. Clearly if we're going to get additional constituency statements we would just - it would help to know that in advance so that we can plan accordingly.

Mike Rodenbaugh: I think if anything, at least from the BC, all we'd be doing is seeing if there's any other comments that we might want to work into the report. And I would just treat it like comments as to this other gentleman's comments, you know. I guess I'm saying that anything we think we

might want to change in the report we should try to get on the table by next week so we can knock them off. Whether it's from your constituency or from these other comments that were posted. Does that make sense?

(Paul): Sure.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. My only question is do we need to leave the public comment forum open for that or can we just do that as well through the list.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Through the list I think is fine, personally.

Olaf Nordling: Olaf here. I think it would be preferable if we could actually close the public comment area and then if there are comments to the comments, that's actually something else which we can encapsulate in the final report.

Marc Trachtenberg: I agree with that.

(Paul): Sure, it makes sense.

Barbara Steele: I agree as well.

(Paul): All right then. So both, Marc, (Mike), please, you know, forward that to your colleagues. And for the rest of us, you know, the idea is to use the next week go through the summary and the actual comments themselves, start thinking about issues that we need to address.

Please, as always, feel free to raise them on the list so everybody can start thinking about how we're going to want to capture this, phrase it, et cetera. But at the very least, that will form the bulk of next Tuesday's call. And I would ask that we dive right into it.

Barbara, you have already explained you won't be able to be with us, so please look forward to the MP3...

Barbara Steele: Okay.

(Paul): ...after next week's call. And, you know, I doubt we'll get through everything in one session anyway. So there will certainly be time and opportunity to continue working at this and everybody gets an opportunity to weigh in of course.

Marika Konings: So, (Paul), just to confirm, I can go ahead and close the public comment forum?

(Paul): Yes, Marika. That seems fine.

Marika Konings: Okay, thanks.

(Paul): And also we will not be having a face-to-face in Mexico City, so we don't have to worry about trying to schedule that.

Glen DeSaintgery: Thanks, (Paul).

(Paul): Certainly, Glen.

Glen DeSaintgery: But there will be the council update on Saturday then.

(Paul): Right. And we'll be looking forward to a confirmation email from you guys with the time and the room. But you're expecting it's going to be Tuesday afternoon sometime - excuse me, Saturday afternoon.

Glen DeSaintgery: Saturday afternoon sometime. Yes, as soon as we draft the scheduling (unintelligible) each working group will get a copy of it.

(Paul): Okay. All right. Any other issues that we need to address at this time? All right. With that, then I thank everybody for their time. We will send out a reminder, but please remember next Tuesday we'll have the same time - time slot to go over the comments.

And as always, as you are reviewing the stuff, if you have issues, feel free to post them to the list, get the dialogue going and we will dive into it next Tuesday at 10:00 Eastern.

Thank you everyone and we'll talk to you then.

Man: Okay.

Woman: Okay. Thanks.

END