

Zoom Chat Transcript
IRP-IOT Meeting – 18 August 2020

14:00:26 From Brenda Brewer : Good day all and welcome to IRP-IOT Meeting on 18 August 2020!

14:05:06 From Bernard Turcotte : will do

14:12:14 From David McAuley (Verisign) : On translations para 5, I thought Liz's idea re claimant approaching ICANN first is a good one and also good idea to revisit translation services as the case proceeds as appropriate

14:13:38 From Kurt Pritz : @ David - I interpreted approaching ICANN first as an extra process step and so might slow things down. I would leave it as an option and not a requirement

14:14:19 From David McAuley (Verisign) : point taken, Kurt, but seems to me this can be done informally in fair amount of cases

14:14:42 From Kurt Pritz : David: informally = optional to me

14:15:47 From David McAuley (Verisign) : I would prefer some encouragement rather than just a bare option, but understand your point Kurt

14:16:46 From Kurt Pritz : I don't think ICANN should be on the critical path to a claimant being able to make a filing

14:19:55 From David McAuley (Verisign) : i can hear

14:21:43 From David McAuley (Verisign) : That sounded good Susan

14:23:15 From Kurt Pritz : This is poorly worded but: For ease of use, Parties can address requests for translation directly to ICANN for a stipulation that translation services will be provided.

14:24:35 From Kurt Pritz : See, it is poorly worded

14:24:35 From David McAuley (Verisign) : I like it, Kurt, but would use 'parties are encouraged to' language

14:24:45 From Kurt Pritz : ok with me

14:25:44 From David McAuley (Verisign) : I think ongoing suggestion is a good one

14:30:30 From David McAuley (Verisign) : Keeping in mid economy if warranted

14:30:39 From Bernard Turcotte : Time check - 60 minutes left in call

14:30:39 From David McAuley (Verisign) : in mind

14:33:47 From Kurt Pritz : Susan - is this better? 6(ii) which documents or portions of the hearing relate to that need.

14:35:03 From David McAuley (Verisign) : +1 @ Kurt

14:36:18 From David McAuley (Verisign) : Bon voyage translation rule

14:39:06 From Scott Austin : Sorry I dropped off due to a signal issue out here in the wilderness.

14:43:54 From Scott Austin : is that considered an Impleader action?

14:45:51 From Scott Austin : has there been any precedent where intervention was denied as being "untimely"?

14:47:45 From Helen Lee : It might still be helpful to "encourage" timeliness

14:47:47 From Helen Lee : at the very least

14:47:47 From Scott Austin : At what point during the .web proceeding did the parties intervene?

14:48:03 From Kurt Pritz : As a starting point: Do we agree with the general principle that IRPs should prioritize prompt and timely settlement of the claimant's case as opposed to creating a global precedent or assembling all possible parties to an issue?

14:48:58 From Kurt Pritz : Similar to what Helen stated.

14:49:29 From Helen Lee : The .web IRP was noticed November 2018. Amici filed December 2018

14:49:35 From Helen Lee : But the decision to allow intervention was much later

14:49:46 From Helen Lee : partly because the procedures officer put off the decision to allow participation

14:49:56 From Malcolm Hutty : Difficult to answer that one in the abstract, Kurt. Prompt and timely is clearly desirable, but on the other hand IRP cases DO create global precedent

14:52:02 From Flip Petillion : timely is inherently related to an event that happens in a time frame

14:54:12 From Scott Austin : @Flip +1

14:55:40 From Kurt Pritz : @Malcolm - I understand - I was thinking we should be starting with a set of principles that would guide our decision making. For me, getting the claimant through in a timely manner is a priority and interventions should be the exception and require some overriding interest that supersedes the rights of a claimant to a timely result.

14:58:13 From Helen Lee : @Kurt, if I may, I think the current intervention rules don't require an "overriding interest." Correct me if I'm wrong, but they merely mention "material" interest.

15:00:06 From Bernard Turcotte : time check 30 minutes left in call

15:02:23 From Kurt Pritz : @ Helen - Thank you. Are those rules open to discussion by us? I would think it would take more than a material interest but that the test would be more specific.

15:05:06 From Susan.Payne : @malcolm, yes, I think we would need to revised the actual guidelines to fit our purposes

15:17:15 From Helen Lee : I think it's a great start

15:17:24 From Helen Lee : I can try to give some comments in advance of our next meeting as well

15:25:08 From Bernard Turcotte : time check 5 minutes left in call

15:29:32 From David McAuley (Verisign) : Thanks Susan, Bernie, Brenda, and all

15:29:41 From David McAuley (Verisign) : I prefer Sept. 8th

15:30:12 From Kurt Pritz : Shifting is fine with me, but whole team not on the call.

15:30:25 From Scott Austin : @Helen +1 It is a fine start. Ok with the shift

15:30:38 From Robin Gross : Ok with the shift.

15:30:40 From Helen Lee : shifting is fine with me too

15:30:48 From Malcolm Hutty : Shfting fine with me too

15:30:57 From Flip Petillion : ok

15:31:24 From Kurt Pritz : Thanks, Susan. Nice job.

15:31:26 From Flip Petillion : bye!

15:31:29 From Helen Lee : thanks all, Thank you susan

15:31:32 From Malcolm Hutty : Thank you again Susan