

Zoom Chat Transcript
IRP-IOT Meeting – 12 May 2020

11:55:13 From Susan Payne : hi Brenda

12:00:25 From David McAuley (Verisign) : nice test, Chris

12:01:01 From Chris Disspain : :-)

12:02:34 From David McAuley (Verisign) : nice moniker, Scott

12:05:39 From Scott Austin : Thanks David. Coming to you live from Studio A here in Burbank.

12:05:52 From Scott Austin : Thank you Brenda for changing it.

12:09:09 From Kristina Rosette : In sub(1), the first reference is to written statement of dispute, but second is to written statement of claim. think both should be written statement of dispute.

12:14:46 From Scott Austin : Exactly, form is helpful guidance.

12:16:47 From Flip Petillion : Sorry for my late arrival - just out of a meeting

12:16:53 From Scott Austin : Should we presume Standing Panel and IRP Panel are the same? Do we need to define.

12:17:37 From David McAuley (Verisign) : I don't think they are the same. The standing panel is the whole group - 7 or more and the IRP panel as I understand is the panel of three chosen for a case

12:18:25 From Helen : Agree, not the same

12:18:28 From Scott Austin : Good point then and perhaps we should distinguish with a def or an appositive distinguishing the difference.

12:19:26 From Scott Austin : OK

12:20:32 From Scott Austin : Fair enough

12:27:03 From David McAuley (Verisign) : can we scroll down to language Susan is referring to

12:27:22 From David McAuley (Verisign) : thanks Brenda

12:29:03 From David McAuley (Verisign) : I thought the balance was good

12:30:58 From Scott Austin : Love those pinpoint bylaw references - could they be made hyperlinks?

12:31:42 From David McAuley (Verisign) : sounds right - the triggers for cost-shifting is a frivolous claim or defense

12:34:52 From Kurt Pritz : Isn't that covered by the materiality req't?

12:34:54 From David McAuley (Verisign) : I took materiality to include that but I do agree with the point Mike just made

12:35:26 From David McAuley (Verisign) : but noting the distinction I agree with Mike

12:40:48 From Sam Eisner : Should we see if the ICDR has required standards for translations (i.e., certification levels, etc?)

12:41:00 From Kristina Rosette : @Sam - good idea

12:41:01 From David McAuley (Verisign) : It seems a fair point, certified translation or some way to ascertain the controlling document and record - as to documents and statements - whatever constitutes a record of the proceeding especially as these are appealable

12:43:06 From Kristina Rosette : Purely administrative-type suggestion: Can we number these paragraphs to make it easier for future reference (by us, claimaints, ICANN, etc.)?

12:44:07 From Robin Gross : good idea

12:44:09 From Kristina Rosette : YES! Number everyting.

12:44:32 From Sam Eisner : WE can take that as a drafting note as org supports the drafting of the final language of the document

12:44:56 From Kristina Rosette : thank you, Sam!

12:45:59 From Scott Austin : On a similar administrative note, I asked above if hyperlinks could be employed for the Bylaw references to assist in shifting between resources.

12:47:07 From Flip Petillion : Thanks Susan, good approach

12:49:24 From Kristina Rosette : Q: I'm aware that the .WEB Panel has issued a decision relating to the Amicus issue. Are there any other Panel statements, orders, decisions at this time? Thanks.

12:50:04 From Sam Eisner : @Kristina, not that I'm aware of, but we'll flag any others

12:51:20 From Flip Petillion : not that i know

12:59:11 From Becky Burr : there is lots of precedent for this - both in arbitration and in the courts. we don't need to re-invent the wheel here.

12:59:26 From Becky Burr : could we get an overview of the variety of approaches taken

13:00:05 From Becky Burr : yes

13:00:14 From Becky Burr : e.g., what do federal rules say, etc.

13:02:11 From Scott Austin : I have no tie to any of the parties in this case but for convenience in considering issues relative to the Amicus filing issue, here is the Claimant's reponse to the Amicus filing in the .WEB proceeding:

<https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/irp-afilias-claimant-response-to-verisign-amicus-curiae-redacted-28jan19-en.pdf>.

13:03:49 From Bernard Turcotte : without the period on the end

13:06:04 From David McAuley (Verisign) : Thank you, Susan, for the work you put in on the translation document (document de traduction) through its development.

13:06:20 From Flip Petillion : Thanks Susan. I'd be better to proceed following a preparation

13:06:38 From Scott Austin : @Flip +1

13:07:14 From Scott Austin : Thank you Susan for the translation work, well done.

13:08:40 From Robin Gross : Thanks Susan and all, bye!

13:08:47 From Kristina Rosette : Thank, Susan. Bye all.