

**Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA) DT
Sub Team A
TRANSCRIPTION
Wednesday Thursday 11 February 2010 @ 1800 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA) drafting team Sub Team A meeting on Thursday 11 February 2010 at 1800 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but **should not be treated as an authoritative record**. The audio is also available at: <http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#feb>

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-raa-a-20100211.mp3>

Present for the teleconference:

Beau Brendler – At Large - Chair
Michele Neylon – Registrar Stakeholder Group - Co-chair
Paul Diaz – Registrar Stakeholder Group
Cheryl Langdon-Orr – ALAC
Elisa Cooper - Registrar Stakeholder Group
Evan Leibovitch – At Large
Shiva Muthusamy – At-Large

ICANN Staff

Heidi Ullrich
Liz Gasster
Margie Milam
Gisella Gruber-White
Glen de Saint Gery
Marika Konings

Absent apologies:

None
Beau Brendler: Thanks for joining and I think...

Gisella Gruber-White: Just, Beau, if I could just ask you just to wait for a couple of seconds until the recording starts. Thank you.

Coordinator: At this time, the call is being recorded. Thank you.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you.

Beau Brendler: Can we have a role call please?

Gisella Gruber-White: Absolutely. Good morning and good afternoon to everyone on today's call. We have Beau Brendler, Elisa Cooper, Siva Muthuswamy, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Michele Neylon, Paul Diaz, Evan Leibovitch. From Staff we have Margie Milam, Glen DeSaintgery, Liz Gasster, Marika Konings, Heidi Ulrich and myself Gisella Gruber-White.

If I can also please remind everyone to state their names then speak. Thank you. Over to you Beau.

Beau Brendler: Okay so I don't have the agenda up in front of me but to briefly start out, we have a limited amount of time to move now from looking at the input that the regional organization's had to completing the document. So whoever's first up on the agenda, go ahead. Who is first up on the agenda?

Margie Milam: Beau, this is Margie. I think where we left the call last time was that we were going to get input from Evan and from Cheryl Langdon-Orr on bargain busting and what kind of improvements would be appropriate for the summary of the doc- you know, the summary document that (Sam) has (talked) about and it's on the screen right now.

So maybe we want to talk to Evan or Cheryl if they want to perhaps give their comments verbally I'll take notes and then try to send out a revised version of the document.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay this is Evan. I guess I can go. I've got a couple of comments. Generally speaking, the document is pretty good in the form it's at. I have one stylistic comment and one process comment.

The stylistic comment goes to where we are starting with the enumeration on the second page where it goes into sort of bullet form - 3.2.1.1, the name of

the register, name being registered. I would suggest actually putting the section number in brackets after the text point.

So the name of the registered, name being registered and in brackets 3.2.1.1 as a reference to the - RAA. We're doing a - we're trying to do a plain language description of what's going and it's sort of like the references should go afterwards, not right at the beginning. That's just a style point.

In terms of process, what I personally would like to see happen here is that we don't have something that goes to the GNSO and then gets voted on and gets set in stone. I would like to have something where, in fact, we put this up on a Wiki or a Web site that invites continued community suggestions and enhancements to the document basically to enhance the wording of it not necessarily to change what exists. We've already made the discussions on the aspirational(sic) document which is basically being moved elsewhere.

What I'm talking about is this factual document can still have a continual process of improvement by exposing it to the community. So what I - what I'm asking this group to do is, you know - is take this document, take it as it is. We can make minor changes, but essentially take it in its current state and put it up on a Web site, make it publicly accessible so that there can continue to be improvements to it that will improve the wording of it.

That's basically my point that, you know, obviously this has to go back to GNSO council or whatever process was envisioned for it, but I would like this to actually be in a certain way a starter process where the community can continue to put clarification and better wording into it.

We're also going to find - I think that you're going to find community members adding to things like translations and other enhancements.

Beau Brendler: Okay Michele has his hand up. I think actually that we owe the GNSO a (template) document really like tomorrow, so I'm not sure that - you know, we

can certainly put this up and have people comment on in but in terms of the deadline I think we're pretty close. It seems...

Evan Leibovitch: Sorry Beau. Can I just answer that?

Beau Brendler: Yes.

Evan Leibovitch: And just say, I mean, I don't have any problem at all with having a deadline to be met to go to GNSO council. I'm just saying I don't want that to be the absolute end of a process where we have something set in stone forever.

Beau Brendler: Oh yes.

Evan Leibovitch: That's all I'm asking for.

Beau Brendler: Okay. I saw Michele's first and Margie also. So Michele's first.

Michele Neylon: I'll let - let Margie go first please.

Margie Milam: Okay sure. I mean, to a certain extent the deadline, the GNSO is not one that's set in stone. I know with the subgroup's B team, they'll be producing a report after Nairobi. The deadline was really related to if we wanted something to look at and have a discussion on in Nairobi but I don't think we're really there yet as a group.

If you feel that you need a little more time to get this right, let's - you know, just tell the GNSO that it, you know, we'll be issuing the report after Nairobi and then we can do the work that Evan suggests.

Evan Leibovitch: Margie, actually what I had in mind was the - basically putting up of a living document that wouldn't even necessarily have a specific deadline on it, but to continue to be enhanced until the RAA is changed. Why must there be any deadline, even a moving deadline on it?

This is meant to be a factual explanatory document. I don't think we ever need to put a time on which, okay, this is finalized and forever cannot be changed afterwards.

Beau Brendler: Well I think we actually - Michele would be able to speak to this to a degree because he's a registrar. I do think that there is a need to (evoke) a document in print that registrars can link to as part of the current RAA. That's correct, Michele?

Michele Neylon: Yes, that's pretty much what I was going to say but I think - the thing I think is really a case of trying to meet Evan somewhere in the middle. I don't know - Paul is also on the call so he might have something to say about this as well.

I mean, my understanding and Margie or somebody from staff might be able to correct me on this, is that the document is something that the registrars are meant to present to their registrants so from the kind of purely practical logistics, you know, how the hell do we do this and - type situation.

I'm trying to see how that would work if Evan's idea of a living document were adopted. Where is, say for example with respect to future RAA amendments, that's obviously not an issue. And Evan please (unintelligible) Paul is (unintelligible) as well.

You know, I'm just seeing it just as a kind of - I understand exactly what Evan is saying. I mean, I don't disagree with what he's saying in principle. I'm just trying to work out how that would work in practice.

Beau Brendler: Paul Diaz has got his hand up. Can we go to Paul and then to Evan?

Paul Diaz: Sure okay. Thanks Beau. And I'm just curious to see what Evan's idea. I see he started writing it up in Adobe Chat, but I just need to echo on what Michele is saying from the perspective of a registrar. We need some document at

some point in time that we can say, "Look here's a version that the community is comfortable with," and that is what registrars will link to, what will be made available.

Certainly understand, you know, the point we don't want to arbitrarily artificially cut off debate, community input, et cetera. With that said, of course, I mean we do need to have some point and time where we say, "This is pretty solid. Let's move forward on it."

I mean, registrars, the good guys, you know, the folks that are here and quite honestly most of the registrars in the registrar constituency, in particular, you know, we're all interested in support of the process but we do need to have some sense of, okay, where's the endpoint?

You know, where do we reach a point where we have something that we can work with, work towards? It can't be completely open-ended for all time because, you know, that almost becomes pointless. We'll never have anything to point to. People will wonder if we're even making any progress.

Beau Brendler: This is Beau. I have to say I actually sort of agree with that, but I mean, if there's a way to make, you know, if there's a way to make a document snapshot if you will that's current and remains, you know, the same (for) a period of time while the living document goes on in the background.

And people can make changes or observations to that with the understanding that given what the actual text is being used for it's not practical for anybody. It'll just be up there and keep changing. Evan, what's your idea? I see you say you have an idea in the...

Evan Leibovitch: Okay and it is exactly the kind of hybrid I think that is being suggested, the idea that there is something that is sent to the GNSO, agreed to, that becomes release one. That is then set in stone and pointed to - as required.

While that is happening, somebody, some group is then charged with being custodian of any further work that goes on. At a certain point where there is substantial enough changes made then that goes back to GNSO for updating as required.

Beau Brendler: Margie I think is next and then Paul.

Margie Milam: Yes sure. I just wanted to echo what Paul was saying, you know, because the contract requires a document that the registrars would link to, I think that, you know, we will need to have something set in stone but I don't disagree with the hybrid approach.

We want to have that as a useful tool to identify what additional changes might be, you know, appropriate and even the document that the registrars would need to link to, that could be updated once the RAA amendments, you know, are in.

Beau Brendler: Paul, your hand is back up.

Paul Diaz: Yes, just to follow on with Evan's idea, this hybrid approach seems perfectly reasonable. Also remember coming out of the - the long acronym but the working group that's looking to PDP process overall, one of the important recommendations or clarifications I should say is that working groups build into the process and build into the bylaws, recognition that there will be some sort of review to judge the effectiveness of the policy work, the recommendation, et cetera.

And we might leverage that move here so that it's well understood that whatever is - part (of) recommendations, there will be some period of time - I think most people are thinking over a 12, 18 month period where there is a group with staff support that's constituted to look at, is this working?

And so it'll be built into the bylaws that there will be this opportunity for an ongoing community assessment. You know, and then at the end of that period if there are things that are still glaring omissions, problems, et cetera, GNSO can constitute a new working group to address them.

So in some ways I think Evan's hybrid approach is basically what's going to be appearing in the bylaws in the relatively near future anyway. So we may all be in agreement here.

Beau Brendler: Okay well that sounds to me like we're fairly close to agreement. So what do we need then - what process needs to happen at this point in order for us to come to a version 1.0 if you will? What is the idea on that? Oh, there's three - Margie still has her hand up -- no -- I'll click it.

What is the process that we need to undertake then to finalize the version 1.0 of this?

Evan Leibovitch: Is everyone okay with my suggestion about moving the actual numbered references to the end of the text?

Beau Brendler: I have no problem with that.

Michele Neylon: (Unintelligible). I have no problem with that. It makes perfect sense to me.

Man: I have no problem with that.

Beau Brendler: Okay, Cheryl has her hand up.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Am I unmuted?

Beau Brendler: You're unmuted.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I was just (showing) that my particular points that I made with Heidi and that I was planning on speaking today were all about those text points and I think linking them to the end of the text is fine. But the other thing I would speak on to which is in the chat (space), if anyone's bothered to look at it. Yes, I'm in a bad mood. If we could, any reference to parts of the RAA could be hard linked to the relevant section of the RAA will also aid in readability.

Beau Brendler: Yes. Did you want to - Cheryl, did you want to take any additional to...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No.

Beau Brendler: No. Okay. No hyperlinks then. So we have a request to move the notations to the end and to hyperlink various terms. What is the procedure for that? Is it something that someone within this group would like to take on? I mean, I could do it. I don't know if staff can do it. Is that what we need to - do we need to establish that? Do we need to ask hands for volunteers?

Margie Milam: Beau, it's Margie. We - the staff can handle that.

Beau Brendler: Great. That's great. All right, so then let me ask one more time since everyone's here - let's ask one more time if there are any additional comments that need to be made to - any additional comments or revisions that need to be made to this document other than moving the footnotes, adding hyperlinks before we have a version 1.0.

Okay that's good. So it sounds like as soon as staff has made those two changes in this document we'll have a version 1.0. Do we need to convene on the phone to discuss that version 1.0 or can we in theory have it ready for the GNSO for Nairobi or before?

Evan Leibovitch: I think the suggestions that are being made on this call are sufficiently minor that I think the draft can be sent around in email, probably informally approved that way and I don't - we may not need another call on this.

Beau Brendler: I would be up for that as I'm sure everyone else would since it's getting close to Nairobi. What do we think? Going once, going twice. I don't see any hands up in the queue. Okay great, then the process will be staff will make these changes.

I will take responsibility appropriate to email around the version 1.0 and pending the feedback on that. Sending it to the at large list. We will have a document ready. Does that sound good to everybody?

Okay well I think that was pretty good progress. Anybody have any questions?

Evan Leibovitch: This is Evan again. I'm almost - I'm going to make a suggestion. I don't know if this is considered radical. But once this group presents its version 1.0 and then tosses maintenance off to some custodial affair like we were discussing earlier, maybe the suggestion is that sub A at that point should disband and then sub B should actually become the RAA committee because I don't know if it needs to be split from that point on after Nairobi.

Beau Brendler: I'm not sure that it does either. And I think I see that may be the intent. Plus there's also the RAA working group that's part of at large. So maybe - I'm not present for those - for the working group B meetings but has anyone expressed any sort of an idea or plan for an ongoing relationship between the RAA working groups just as it stands now and the sub team B?

Apparently not. Okay well great. Then this looks like a point at which we may be able to wrap up these calls. And the next thing that you will hear from Michele and I will be an email of the text with the changes to it that should consist of our version 1.0. Sound good?

Michele Neylon: Perfect.

Beau Brendler: Okay thanks a lot.

Margie Milam: Beau?

Beau Brendler: Yes.

Margie Milam: Can I just mention one thing. Sorry, I just got my hand up. In Nairobi there will be a discussion in an ALAC policy call on Tuesday, the 9th of March on the aspirational(sic) registrant rights charter. So anybody who is in Nairobi at that time is welcome to join that. And that's currently between 1215 and 13:00. But the agendas will be up shortly.

Beau Brendler: Okay. Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Margie, would it -- Cheryl here -- would it need to be limited to those who are in Nairobi at that time or will we be able to open up in Adobe room and allow for remote participation as well?

Woman: Absolutely.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Knowing what time it is?

Margie Milam: Thank you Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I mean, if the clock's 3 UTC, so it might be unreasonable to humans who aren't in Nairobi.

Margie Milam: Yes, remote participation will be possible. Thank you.

Beau Brendler: Okay thanks everybody.

Michele Neylon: All right, thank you.

Beau Brendler: Bye.

Paul Diaz: Thanks guys.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you.

Coordinator: All right. At this time that will conclude today's conference. You may disconnect.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you (Ed).

Coordinator: Thank you for your attendance.

END