

**Zoom Chat Transcript**  
**IRP-IOT Meeting – 28 January 2020**

12:57:58 From Bernard Turcotte : hello all

12:58:27 From David McAuley (Verisign) : Hello all

12:58:30 From Flip Petillion : Hi all - Hi Bernard

13:00:29 From David McAuley (Verisign) : coud I be heard

13:00:45 From Robin Gross : Yes, David.

13:00:49 From David McAuley (Verisign) : thanks Robin

13:03:36 From Flip Petillion : Fine for me

13:03:43 From Robin Gross : works for me

13:03:51 From Greg Shatan : Daylight Savings is currently away....

13:03:55 From Greg Shatan : But support.

13:11:40 From Kurt Pritz : Re: "Recommend training for the Standing Panel," are the rules / standards / guidelines for selecting Standing Panel members completed?

13:14:11 From bburr : @kurt, not completed.

13:15:59 From Mike Rodenbaugh : Has it even started?

13:17:00 From samantha.eisner : @Mike, yes. There will be public announcements forthcoming within a few weeks

13:18:17 From Kurt Pritz : Is there an aspirational or specific timetable for completion?

13:19:30 From samantha.eisner : Once announced, we're planning for a 6-month timetable to completion

13:19:59 From Robin Gross : Good addition, Mike.

13:20:15 From Kurt Pritz : Before suggesting topics, I'd like to see some sort of complete project plan that includes what is done, as well as what remains - to provide a full landscape. Is that possible?

13:20:30 From bburr : This came with the new bylaws, prior IRPs were not bound by precedent. Post bylaws changes are

13:20:58 From Mike Rodenbaugh : I do not agree with Becky on that

13:21:06 From samantha.eisner : An add to Becky's comment, we have not had an IRP complete through declaration under the new Bylaws

13:22:39 From David McAuley (Verisign) :  
<https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/irp-interim-supplementary-procedures-25oct18-en.pdf>

13:23:25 From bburr : <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/irp-interim-supplementary-procedures-25oct18-en.pdf>

13:31:37 From bburr : Did we lose David?

13:31:39 From Robin Gross : lost audio

13:38:16 From samantha.eisner : I'm prepared to give some higher level background now

13:38:34 From samantha.eisner : Not to discuss in depth the key areas where there was difference noted

13:39:09 From Malcolm Hutty : I think that the previous document should be presented, so that those new can see it, and not only be aware of the interim ruleset that was adopted while our work was suspended

13:40:29 From samantha.eisner : @Malcolm, I agree that we should circulate what was posted for public comment

13:40:41 From samantha.eisner : It's an important part of the history of the group

13:44:31 From Bernard Turcotte : Note: we are halfway through the meeting and have 45 minutes left

13:44:45 From David McAuley (Verisign) : Thanks Bernie

13:55:00 From Kurt Pritz : It is better than the context is done well, rather than in a week. I think the foundational docs are very important here.

14:00:19 From Flip Petillion : i share your approach, David: history first; then we can move on

14:01:50 From samantha.eisner : I don't agree with Malcolm's positioning of the status of the document

14:02:06 From samantha.eisner : That ignores the years of effort of the IRP IOT to date

14:02:21 From Robin Gross : I agree with Malcolm that we need to pick up from where we left off.

14:03:19 From mikesilber : I am fine with history - but I cannot accept that we just have to pick-up where we left off. The previous IOT did not complete its work, so I do not accept that we simply have to accept its work

14:03:53 From Malcolm Hutty : @samantha, I'm not talking about going back to the version as released for public comment, I'm talking about the version as far as it had got before we decided we were not going to conclude in a timely fashion and to adopt an interim set instead

14:04:28 From Malcolm Hutty : @mike but surely we should at least SEE it's work? don't you agree?

14:04:32 From bburr : The document that was put out for public comment is from 2017. Are you suggesting that we go back to the document that existed BEFORE public comment? I understand that there was disagreement about specific parts of the supplementary procedures adopted by the board but I don't understand the sentiment for throwing out a year's worth of work

14:04:47 From bburr : entirely

14:04:51 From Malcolm Hutty : @becky, no. see above.

14:05:00 From samantha.eisner : @Malcolm, sounds like we're closer than I thought we might be

14:05:28 From Malcolm Hutty : Great news :-)

14:05:39 From Robin Gross : Thanks, David and all. Bye!

14:05:39 From Bernard Turcotte : bye all

14:05:52 From David McAuley (Verisign) : Thanks all