

**Zoom Chat Transcript**  
**IRP-IOT Call – 16 February 2021**

10:57:55 From Kristina Rosette to Everyone : Hi!

11:00:37 From Kristina Rosette to Everyone : Yes

11:00:51 From Liz Le to Everyone : Hello everyone

11:01:00 From Liz Le to Everyone : Sam is an apology

11:05:15 From David McAuley (Verisign) to Everyone : Congrats Chris

11:05:28 From Kristina Rosette to Everyone : Congrats, Chris.

11:05:55 From Chris Disspain to Everyone : thanks David and Kristina

11:07:18 From Bernard Turcotte to Everyone : Becky should join a little late

11:10:05 From Kristina Rosette to Everyone : Nothing to add. Excellent summary (as always)

11:11:00 From David McAuley (Verisign) to Everyone : I hear Susan well

11:11:34 From Chris Disspain to Everyone : hearing well

11:12:19 From Kristina Rosette to Everyone : I can hear Susan well. But headphones does sound better.

11:12:37 From David McAuley (Verisign) to Everyone : I agree with Kristina

11:13:19 From Malcolm Hutty to Everyone : Agreed. The treble was a bit muted before. I could hear fine, but it's more natural now.

11:14:25 From Chris Disspain to Everyone : I think we MAY have reached consensus that Susan sounds better now 🗣️

11:18:10 From Flip Petillion to Everyone : sorry for the late arrival

11:19:28 From Scott R. Austin to Everyone : Sorry for late arrival. Firm partner calls on 3rd Tuesday.

11:19:28 From David McAuley (Verisign) to Everyone : I think it is a fair summary

11:23:00 From David McAuley (Verisign) to Everyone : I recall that comment by Sam and think this would be a useful topic to explore

11:25:47 From Chris Disspain to Everyone : that is indeed the crux from my POV Susan

11:37:53 From David McAuley (Verisign) to Everyone : My understanding is that Rule 4.3(n) allows the IOT to develop rules and then once the standing panel is in place the IOT can develop rules in consultation with standing panel - the standing panel can recommend amendments to rules but no such amendment is effective until approved by Board

11:39:04 From Arasteh to Everyone : I tend to agree with David

11:39:31 From Sam Eisner to Everyone : That's correct, David

11:41:04 From Arasteh to Everyone : which timing Malculm

11:45:43 From Chris Disspain to Everyone : and I acknowledge that Susan

11:48:41 From Flip Petillion to Everyone : I am called away. I'll listen to the recording. Apologies.

11:52:42 From Sam Eisner to Everyone : I have to step away for 15. Apologies

11:58:20 From David McAuley (Verisign) to Everyone : The problem I have with 'personal' decisions is that they too would create precedent IMO - can't that precedent affect policy?

11:59:44 From Bernard Turcotte to Everyone : Time check - 30 minutes left in call

12:01:29 From Chris Disspain to Everyone : good points Greg...

12:02:45 From David McAuley (Verisign) to Everyone : Exactly - the gravamen of an IRP dispute is that the bylaws or articles were violated

12:03:01 From Malcolm Huty to Everyone : I agree

12:04:38 From David McAuley (Verisign) to Everyone : Kavouss's comment makes me think that all sides of the issue have been and continue to be expressed in good faith but still differences remain. I am wondering how we can draw this to a decision at some time. It might help to focus on the definition of 'action' or 'inaction' as Sam seemed to suggest to see if that helps us narrow differences

12:05:33 From David McAuley (Verisign) to Everyone : I am referring to 'action' or 'inaction' in definition of 'dispute'

12:06:21 From David McAuley (Verisign) to Everyone : No need for apology Susan - this is not simple at all

12:07:58 From Sam Eisner to Everyone : I'm back

12:09:13 From Chris Disspain to Everyone : recommend coming back to this next time

12:09:29 From Sam Eisner to Everyone : To Susan's question, I don't think that we could say that there's "inaction" in not taking action to change a previously adopted policy, for example.

12:11:01 From David McAuley (Verisign) to Everyone : maybe the nature of an 'action' has come up in another context than timing?

12:17:07 From Greg Shatan to Everyone : I think I agree with Kavouss — inaction should really be called "failure to act"

12:21:07 From Sam Eisner to Everyone : However it's interpreted Inaction has to be alleged to be against the Bylaws and cause harm in order to serve as the basis for an IRP

12:22:42 From Greg Shatan to Everyone : This is too much like work... :-(

12:23:24 From Bernard Turcotte to Everyone : bye all

12:23:30 From David McAuley (Verisign) to Everyone : Thank you Susan, Bernie, and Brenda and all