

Zoom Chat Transcript

IRP-IOT Call – 2 February 2021

13:33:36 From David McAuley (Verisign) to Everyone : Thanks Susan

13:38:50 From Chris Disspain to Everyone : I don't understand what you mean Malcom

13:39:41 From Chris Disspain to Everyone : yes

13:40:40 From Chris Disspain to Everyone : that's stricken me as a significantly different approach to the one pst forward by kavouss

13:45:57 From Chris Disspain to Everyone : I agree with David - manifest injustice is a good level of test IMO

13:46:59 From David McAuley (Verisign) to Everyone : yes, if not now I hope folks will weigh in on list

13:48:51 From Chris Disspain to Everyone : all that tying repose to the IRP purposes does is to allow any application at any time unless it is outside the scope of the IRP which is not the purpose of repose

13:50:17 From Chris Disspain to Everyone : if an application is outside the purpose of IRP in the bylaws then it cannot be an IRP in the first place

13:53:56 From David McAuley (Verisign) to Everyone : That too will eliminate certainty and predictability in precedents IMO I think that repose should apply as adopted

13:56:33 From David McAuley (Verisign) to Everyone : Personal disputes would constitute precedent, no?

13:58:21 From David McAuley (Verisign) to Everyone : I agree with Sam that it will help us greatly to understand when the 'action' or 'inaction' happened. Probably harder with respect to 'inaction'

14:00:08 From Bernard Turcotte to Everyone : time check - 30 minutes left in call

14:01:35 From Nigel Roberts to Everyone : have to drop now.. apologies and good evening all

14:02:26 From Susan Payne to Everyone : thanks Nigel

14:10:00 From David McAuley (Verisign) to Everyone : Good observation, Sam, IMO

14:14:06 From David McAuley (Verisign) to Everyone : I thought Chris was talking of a more timely challenge

14:14:26 From Chris Disspain to Everyone : indeed David

14:18:14 From Sam Eisner to Everyone : Concur with Chris

14:18:42 From Sam Eisner to Everyone : On the IRP being a proper place for asserting a challenge, within a reasonable time limit.

14:19:51 From Arasteh to Everyone : christ + 1

14:21:09 From Arasteh to Everyone : christ ,coulsd you pèls spweal ,more slowly<

14:23:45 From David McAuley (Verisign) to Everyone : To me the passage of time is quite important

14:27:23 From Scott R. Austin to Everyone : Agree with David

14:27:29 From Gregory Shatan to Everyone : I've been looking at the CCWG materials and I don't see any considerations or concerns based on time.

14:28:57 From Malcolm Hutton to Everyone : No. Time has since been conjured up as an excuse to undo what the CCWG intended, namely to ensure anyone affected could complain about ultra vires action.

14:30:04 From Sam Eisner to Everyone : The starting point for time is that we previously had a 60 day from the publication of Board minutes time requirement for IRPs, and as the IRP was expanded broader than the Board, the CCWG deferred

14:30:20 From Bernard Turcotte to Everyone : bye all