

**Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA) DT
TRANSCRIPTION
Wednesday 30 September 2009 at 14:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA) drafting team meeting on Wednesday 30 September 2009 at 1400 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://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-raa-20090930.mp3>

On page:

<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/index.html#sep>

Present for the teleconference:

Avri Doria - GNSO Council chair - NCA

Tim Ruiz - Registrar c.

Tatyana Khramtsova – Registrar

Michele Neylon – Registrar

Steve Metalitz - IPC chair

Alan Greenberg - ALAC

Cheryl Langdon-Orr - ALAC chair

Beau Brendler – ALAC

Sébastien Bachollet – ALAC

Adam Peake - At large - ALAC

Evan Leibovitch - At large , Chair of NARALO (At-Large North America)

Danny Younger - At large

Andres Piazza - At Large, Chair of LACRALO (At-Large Caribbean and Latin America)

Lutz Donnerhacke - At large

Antonio Medina Gomez - At large

Vittorio Bertola - At large

Dharma Dailey - At large

ICANN Staff

Margie Milam

Marika Konings

Liz Gaster

Heidi Ullrich

Glen de Saint Géry

Gisella Gruber-White

Absent apologies:

Phil Corwin – CBUC

Marc Trachtenberg – IPC

Konstantinos Komaitis – NCUC

Mike Rodenbaugh - CBUC

Kristina Rosette – IPC

Apologies (continued)

Rudi Vansnick - At Large
NachosAmadoz – Registries
Holly Raiche - At-Large

Avri Doria: Thank you. I'm Avri Doria and I guess I'm not sure whether it's Cheryl and I that are kicking this off or whether it's Beau and I that are kicking this off. But I'll assume that it's Cheryl and I for the moment.

Alan Greenberg: beau is not on the call as far as I can tell right now.

Avri Doria: Okay. First could someone read off the list of people who are currently on the call and then others will get announced by the Operator, as it comes, so that we have a record of who all here.

And I'd like you to state what group they come from if you know.

Gisella Gruber-White: Hi Avri, it's Gisella. I can do the roll call for you. There's some that I will not know which group they come from, but perhaps Glen can fill in there.

Avri Doria: Or they can chirp in, but thank you.

Gisella Gruber-White: On today's call we have Michele Neylon, Antonio Medina. We have Tatyana Khramtsova; Registrar, Avri Doria...

Gisella Gruber-White: ...GNSO Counsel; Alan Greenberg, ALAC; Sebastian Bachollet, ALAC; Cheryl Langdon-Orr, ALAC; Steve Metalitz, IPC

((Crosstalk))

Gisella Gruber-White: Tim Ruiz.

Man: Hi everyone.

Gisella Gruber-White: Vittorio Bertolo.

Vittorio Bertolo: Hi.

Gisella Gruber-White: Danny Younger

Man: (Unintelligible).

Gisella Gruber-White: Lutz Donnerhacke

Man: Hello.

Gisella Gruber-White: Andres Piazza, ALAC.

Man: Hi.

((Crosstalk))

Gisella Gruber-White: On staff we have Heidi Ulrich, Marika Konings, Liz Gasster, Margie Milam, Glen DeSaintgery and myself Gisella Gruber-White. And we do have apologies from Marc Trachtenberg Konstantinos Komaitis, Kristina Rosette, Rudy Vansnick and Phil Corwin.

If I can also please remind everyone to please state their names when speaking this will help for the recording and transcript purposes. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thank you very much. Cheryl should you or I start with the introduction, background, etcetera?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Happy for you to go ahead with that, but I do want to record that certainly Holly Raiche from Australia indicated her probable apologies because of the timing of tonight's meeting, but hopefully not in the future.

Beau Brendler And you didn't mention my name. I'm Beau Brendler from the ALAC.

CLO: Oh, Beau you're here. That's great.

Avri Doria: Yes, I should probably also mention that (Andre Kolesnikoff), and I'm not sure I pronounced it correctly, because I knew NoCom appointee to the - I've been coming NomCom appointee to the counsel was planning on attending, but found out he had a conflict and sent apologies. So I think he plans to participate in the future.

Glen DeSaintgery:Avri? Avri this is Glen. I'm sorry. I've found out, it was not this call he was supposed to be on, it was another call.

Avri Doria: Oh, okay. Thank you. So I guess he didn't send his apologies to this call. So I apologize.

Adam Peake And this is (Adam). I'm (Adam Peake from ALAC. I'm on the call. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Oh, hi (Adam).

Okay, so I guess I'll start off with a quick introduction and then invite either Cheryl or Beau who is going to be ALAC's lead on this to augment it.

Basically though, instead of RAA amendments that went through a while back and as part of the whole effort to put that through, the GNSO had recommended the formation of two groups. One to - and I'm going to put this very briefly. Basically look into what other possible changes, if any, should be discussed in terms of future RAA.

And one to start up a recording the registrant, rights and responsibilities as they currently exist and then to perhaps look at future registrant's rights and responsibilities.

A charter was quite carefully written around the words of the charter effort largely led by Steve Metalitz. And instead of doing two groups, what came out in that discussion is that because these efforts were so interlinked, it really made a lot more sense to make one overall group so there could be separate sub-teams working on different pieces.

And in fact one sub-team has already, I think, started that was basically working on taking a staff documentation of the rights and responsibilities and then - and I think was done by Margie, if I remember correctly and if I miss-remember, someone should correct me - done by Margie.

And then I believe it was Tim and Alan who were starting as a core of a group to take those and start looking at how to make them more presentable, more presentation style or rights and responsibilities that could be posted.

I don't know how far that effort has gotten and we can get into that later.

But basically its one group. As part of that group, the notion was to have two coordinators, whether we call them leads, chairs, and we're constantly flipping, but basically two people to coordinate.

And by the way, we're trying to use that same coordinator language in another joint group we're doing with SSAC, sort of just to differentiate the rolls when it's a joint effort.

But basically two coordinators, one from the GNSO and one from ALAC. Now I was informed in an email that (Boe) was listed for ALAC as their lead in this. I asked a question before the recording started, whether lead translated into their person for the coordinator roll and I think I was told yes, but please correct me if I'm wrong.

In which case it would mean that we already have the ALAC coordinator, but Cheryl or Beau, please fill in anything I got wrong, I left out, or tell us.

Beau Brendler: No that sounds right to me. In terms of what I was asked by ALAC to do, you know, I have to apologize for a bit of a gap in my continuity with RAA matters as of about the past eight months or so, I've had a fair amount of personal things to deal with.

So prior to that, I was quite engaged in RAA stuff, but have not been so much in the past eight months. I think I can probably come up to speed fairly quickly though.

One thing I just wanted to add to or to ask about your description of how to go forward. There has been some concern in the American region that part of this process that includes, well the process that you outlined.

Does it include an aspect that would allow further suggestions for further improvements or further possible amendments to the RAA should those be considered necessary by the user community or is this circumscribed just to creating just a list of registrant's rights?

Avri Doria: No. If I can, and please anyone else can jump in, if as was stipulated in the charter, first is definitely getting the list of what exists up, published and ready to go.

Beau Brendler: Got you.

Avri Doria: And so that what exists was well known and could be told to people.

Beau Brendler: Great.

Avri Doria: The other side of the group is basically looking at what future actions that can or should be. And, you know, and can be suggested going forward. Now, one

of the reasons we didn't separate off this group, is because it's difficult to know whether future possible registrant's rights and responsibilities, where would they go?

So they would probably fit in with that effort, but they can be dealt with separate.

But no, there was no closure of what can be discussed and considered and suggested for future action, though there's no specific method of future action preset.

Beau Brendler: Thank you.

Avri Doria: Anyone want to add to that? And I know I was a little sloppy and trying to be careful.

Steven Metalitz: Avri, this is Steve. If I could get in the queue?

Avri Doria: Okay. I have Steve. Anyone else wish to be in the queue?

Alan Greenberg: Alan.

Avri Doria: Alan. Anyone else? Go ahead Steve.

Steven Metalitz: Yes, just to add that if - I'm assuming that the charter that the counsel approved on September 3 was the one that was on its agenda and that set some timetables for the work of identifying the possible changes to the RAA. It leaves a little more fluid the timetable for the registrant's rights charter reflecting the existing agreement.

Avri Doria: Yes and that is the charter that was approved.

Steven Metalitz: Yes. I sent in the chat the link to that. I'm not sure why on the Adobe we're looking at the earlier version of the charter, but in any case...

Avri Doria: Oh, okay.

Steven Metalitz: ...there were a few changes.

Avri Doria: Okay, I also thought I had put a copy of the - it's been very confusing - I did do some editing to the webpage and I think its changed since I did it and I haven't gone back. And I thought I had put the latest copy of the charter there, but perhaps I haven't.

So any other questions or comments on this sort of?

Alan Greenberg: Avri, it's Alan.

Avri Doria: Oh, yes, Alan, I'm so sorry.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. I believe the other aspect of the RAA part of the group was to try to put a structure in place or to recommend a structure for how we in fact are going to do the actual RAA amendments.

This group was coming up with a laundry list, but what the process will be in the next step, I thought but I may be wrong, this group was also responsible for recommending.

Avri Doria: Okay, any other comments? The beginning of it really should find the charter so it's in front of us.

Steven Metalitz: Yes, this is Steve. It says identify topics in which action in the form of amendments to the RAA may be desirable. From that list flag any topics that may require further analysis as to impact on consensus policy. And then third, propose next step considering such topics.

Avri Doria: Okay, so any other questions or comments on the beginning of this?

Okay. And basically the timing on those things was rather close, but anyhow.

I guess the next thing on the agenda, if I go to that is selection of the coordinators. No we already have one of them and that's (Boe) and as quickly as possible by the way, I would love to turn this meeting over to the coordinators.

And I'm wondering from the GNSO side, if there basically is one or more volunteers for that. If there's one volunteer for that, we could probably just agree to it, if there's more than one, then we would probably need some discussion on it and come up with a method of choosing. It would hopefully be good, if we could just arrive at sort of a consensus on that.

Is there anyone from the GNSO side that's interested in coordinating this effort?

Steven Metalitz: This is Steve Metalitz. I'd be happy to volunteer.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you Steve. I was hoping you'd volunteer. Does anyone else wish to also volunteer to be considered or are the GNSO members participating on this happy with accepting Steve's volunteering?

Okay, in which case, I will provisionally mark Steve down as the coordinator from the GNSO side as is the normal practice in the GNSO, once the meeting has come up with someone, it's just be put in our agenda for a review and if there are no objections that's the end of it. Okay?

Now I have a question for the two of you that are coordinators. And Cheryl, I ask you're leave, if you're okay with this too. I would like to turn the meeting

over to the two of you. Who I know Steve is much more prepared on this than I am and I understand that (Boe) is still coming up to speed.

But Steve and (Boe) would you be willing to take the rest of this meeting away from me?

Beau Brendler: Well, this is Beau. In a sense I would really, sort of, have to defer to Steve. You know, I'm not prepared to lead a whole meeting at the moment, especially in the light of needing to coordinate with some members with the at large community. I don't think we have been able to regroup on current matters related to the RAA as it stands now.

So, I mean, I'm happy to add, you know, background or whatever, but in terms of an agenda, I really don't have a reasonable one prepared to lead the meeting.

Avri Doria: Yes, well, we do have an agenda prepared, but I understand, thank you. How about Steve?

Steven Metalitz: Yes, I'd be happy to take the lead on this one and I'm sure Beau will be up to speed in no time. But just for purposes of this meeting, I could certainly do that.

Avri Doria: And Cheryl are you fine with my giving over our shared initiation to Steve and Beau at the moment, but primarily to Steve?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well, it's a fait accompli, but yes in fact I am. I'd ask Beau is it possible that he can join the Adobe so he can see if anyone is raising hands, because as Steve will probably be taking the lion's share on running the rest of this meeting. It is always handy if you've got a co-chair that is supposed to be in the same management room.

Avri Doria: Okay, in which case thank you. Steve and Beau, I step down it's your meeting.

Steven Metalitz: Thank you Avri. Well, the agenda that's posted here, we've done the first two steps and what we have remaining are the following: a discussion of whether to have a face to face meeting in Seoul; composition of drafting team; selection of sub-team coordinators; and volunteers for the registrant rights sub-team.

And then there's several, a couple of items under that about deliverables and time frame and scheduling future calls. And then there's the same for the RAA further amendments sub-team. Finally, procedural issues, mailing lists, Wikis and scheduling of futures calls.

If there's no objection, I'd like to defer the discussion of the face to face meeting in Seoul, we'll get back to that. But instead talk about the composition of the team and the selection of the sub-team coordinators.

I'm wondering whether on the later question, it might be most efficient, since we have a coordinator from GNSO and a coordinator from ALAC, could those people, rather than build further bureaucracy into this, I think most of the work of this group is going to be done in the sub-teams.

There're two separate tasks. Obviously they have some overlap and that's why we need some coordination, but people need to start talking specifically about the registrant's rights charter and people need to start talking specifically about the topics for RAA amendments.

And I wonder, I'll ask (Boe) actually, whether he thinks it would make sense, at least provisionally, to have the sub-team coordinators, be just we can parallel with the drafting team coordinators and I could coordinate the RAA amendments sub-team, convene that and (Boe) could convene the registrant rights sub-team.

Beau Brendler: Sure.

Steven Metalitz: Thank might be the simplest way to do it.

Beau Brendler: Yes, I think that would be fine. No objections here.

Steven Metalitz: Okay, what do other people think about that?

Alan Greenberg: I support that. It's Alan.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here. I've got little green tick on the Adobe. It certainly gets my support.

Steven Metalitz: Okay. So unless there's an objection, we'll proceed in that fashion, again, at least, provisionally. Now in terms of the composition of the drafting team, the agenda says open to all or limited to specific number per constituency stakeholder group ALAC. So I guess, let's open the floor to discussion on whether we want to limit this or not.

Now, I should say that there was a mailing list put together of people for the drafting team and this is the group that worked on the charter and has had the discussions up till now. And I not frankly sure how many people are on there or exactly what their distribution is. I assume that's kind of our starting point for the composition of the team.

And we certainly could take others if they can get into the process quickly, I think it would certainly make since, but perhaps the staff can kind of tell us how many people we have on the list right now and...

Margie Milam: Yes, this is Margie. Gisella do you have that information by any chance?

Gisella Gruber-White: I'll get it to the list.

Steven Metalitz: I can't remember, I mean I don't remember exactly how - we did have a fair sprinkling from the GNSO constituencies, and again, in terms of the ALAC, I know there's a number of people on this call, who I believe are ALAC participants, I'm not sure in every case. But my sense is that most of the people on this call are ALAC participants, if I'm not mistaken.

Man: Many of them are not ALAC members, but they are representing at large at this point.

Steven Metalitz: No. Except for the Adobe room, mostly at large.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Remembering of course that ALAC is the advisory committee and it is at large interests that we're definitely trying to promote here.

Steven Metalitz: Right. Okay, I stand corrected on that.

Beau Brendler: Well, it's similar the words GNSO and GNSO Counsel could be used somewhat interchangeably. In the sense of working groups, it's the same for us.

Steven Metalitz: But my sense is that we have at least a core here of people to start the work of the two sub-teams and I think that if other people want to join in, that's fine. But I think we are on fairly tight time tables here, so I would hope that that joining in could take place quickly.

But let me open the floor to others who - do others feel that we need to either have any particular structures about how many people can participate, how many from a constituency or from a stakeholder group or from the at large or are we okay with kind of starting with a group of volunteers that we have now together with whatever other that can be brought in a short time?

Alan Greenberg: Steve this is Alan.

Steven Metalitz: Yes, go ahead Alan.

Alan Greenberg: I haven't seen a problem in recent times in working groups that there are too many people. I wish there were more of a problem, but the actual number of people we've had participating is not particularly large and those who are vocal and really active is even smaller.

So I see no reason at this point to restrict the numbers. I mean, we may regret that decision at some point in the future, but that's - today I don't see a reason.

Steven Metalitz: Okay.

Danny Younger: Alan, it's (Danny).

Steven Metalitz: (Danny), go ahead.

(Danny Younger:: My only concern is that some working groups do tend to be top heavy in terms of constituency representation. I've noticed it in the expired domains working group. But again, I would tend to think that it's at the discretion of the chair as to how he wants to handle that type of a situation.

Steven Metalitz: Others wanting to speak on this question on the composition of...

Beau Brendler: (Evan) has his hand up.

Steven Metalitz: Oh, I'm sorry. I'm sorry. (Evan).

Evan Leibovitch: Well, should I be using the Adobe chat or just yell out here.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Using the Adobe chat is a very good precedent to both this and continue in Cheryl's opinion, anyway.

Steven Metalitz: And if it doesn't work, yell out.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Beau Brendler: (Evan) is the only one I see with his hand up at the moment. So (Evan).

Evan Leibovitch: And I lowered it.

Steven Metalitz: Okay, (Evan) go ahead.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. My main concern at this point, as is already been mentioned is that we don't get overpowered. I was - Beau and I were sort of the only at large, non-commercial people that were sitting in on the meeting in Sydney on registration abuse and it seemed almost like a shooting gallery when we went to talk.

And I'm concerned about that. Since, given the nature of what we're writing ourselves, it almost seems natural that we sort of limit ourselves to the participation of the contracted parties, because this is almost by definition, you know, our assertion of our side of that.

Alan Greenberg: So you're saying we should limit the number of contracted parties?

Evan Leibovitch: If at all.

Beau Brendler: I would almost be - this is Beau - I would almost be on the side of limiting maybe to one or something, whatever is appropriate for fairness, because as (Evan) points out, and I agree, this is in essence the user communities response to a document that's already been prepared with the intense participation of the contracted party. So.

Steve Metalitz: Did anybody else want to speak on this? I don't see anybody's hand.

Tim Ruiz: This is Tim.

Steven Metalitz: Okay, Tim.

Avri Doria: This is Avri.

Steven Metalitz: Tim, Avri, anybody else?

Tim Ruiz: Yes, I'm not sure what the issue is. And when we're talking about the rights document, we're not talking about setting policy or, you know, there really is going to be little argument I would imagine, over what those rights are.

I mean, there may be discussions about what they would like some of those rights to be that will spill over into the other sub-group, but within this particular group, it's a discussion of the missing rights, and I think that anyone who would like to participate should be allowed to do so.

I don't see why it would need to be restricted. What the GNSO would stand to gain from that. You know, I mean, I think I've always believed from a practical standpoint there may be someone that's limited to a number, if we end up with 1000 people in a working group, it's going to be unworkable.

But to limit it by constituency is definitely not something that I think the GNSO should or would support.

Alan Greenberg: Steve a point of order, I thought we were talking about a membership for both groups at this point, not just the registrant rights one.

Steven Metalitz: I think that's correct.

Tim Ruiz: And registrar's participation in the other group is - was a requirement by agreeing to it. So if you're going to limit the registrars to it, you may end up

with no registrars participating at all. But I just don't really want to go down that road and start that kind of discussion. I think it's unnecessary and we'll just skim this off into arguments that just really aren't going to be productive.

Beau Brendler: Other's wishing to speak on this?

Avri Doria: Avri.

Beau Brendler: Avri, oh, I'm sorry. Yes, you were in the queue, sorry. Anybody else?

(Danny Younger: (Danny).

Beau Brendler: Go ahead Avri.

Avri Doria: Okay, yes, it takes a while to get used to doing a queue. Basically, I think that we shouldn't be limiting participation by category. I think obviously if we get to a point where we feel that some particular speaker is taking all the air out of the room and dialogue can't continue, then the coordinators have an issue.

But I think to limit it, and especially in a case where what we're talking about is the RAA, you know, contractual conditions, I mean it's the registrar's contractual conditions, as it were. I think to limit their participation, but as I say to limit anyone's I find problematic, but certainly to limit there's would seem to me to be very problematic.

I very strongly advise against limiting based on category of participants.
Thanks.

Steven Metalitz: Okay. Thank you Avri. Anybody else wish to speak on this?

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Yes, this is Alan.

Steven Metalitz: (Danny).

Beau Brendler: (Danny) first I think.

Danny Younger: Okay, fine, thanks. Yes, I'll go along with Avri's opinion. I thought that the new notion for working groups in the GNSO was basically designed to allow participation from all parties. That's said, I do concur with Avri that there are times that an individual or a group may tend to monopolize discussions and there it's up to the chair to keep his house in order.

Steve Metalitz: Okay, Alan, and then I see there's two with their hands raised in the Adobe room, (CLO) and (Michele). So.

Michele Neylon: (Mikaeli).

Steve Metalitz: (Mikaeli), I'm sorry. So, Alan, I think you were next.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, certainly for this group, I see no reason to limit, because hopefully this group will not be, even the one on the RAA side, will not be doing a lot of debate, but rather trying to come up with both a process and a, what I call a laundry list, which I think is actually going to be a super set of what actually ends up getting done.

At least that's my perception. Now, once you get into the real RAA negotiations, work, whatever the working group, whatever comes out of it, we wouldn't want to be in a position where there are so many registrars that they're essentially controlling all of the discussion.

But that's a different problem and I think is going to be framed in a different way. So for these meetings I don't see any reason to limit it and leave it to the chairs to see that the meeting are run in an orderly way.

((Cross talk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: CLO here, Cheryl. I want to again speak, it sounding like a chorus of voices against (unintelligible) but also to point out to the group that when we made our call for volunteers and our senior staff will be sharing with us a full list of those who responded to that, some people may have either volunteered with an intention for a focus in one or another of what we now have as the two sub-teams.

Or indeed might have been intending to contribute to both or hadn't realized that they were going to be submitting to two sub-team activities, so we also need to consider that. So I'm against limitation and I'm wanting the group to recognize that people need to also organize themselves into better areas or best areas of interest.

Steve Metalitz: Thank you, that's a good point. Michele and then Tim has his hand up again.

Michele Neylon: Well obviously I'm going to agree with what everybody said about the separation thing, I think it's inane to even suggest it. I would be more concerned if the group was dominated by North Americans however, because.

I'm sorry, it's something that I will keep on saying. It's a lot of the ICANN policy decisions are very much biased towards a north American view of the world, North American legislation and North American business practices, where as the internet is a global resource.

So I would be very interested in seeing for example, I notice on this call, that we've people from Down Under - hi Cheryl - from various parts of Eastern Europe, and I'm not too sure if there's anybody from South America, but I do note that there's nobody from Asia.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Hey.

Michele Neylon: Sorry, Cheryl, sorry. But, you know, the point being anyway that I'd be more concerned about that kind of problem rather than anything else.

Alan Greenberg: (Mikaeli), it's Alan. I'll interject that the northern part of North America sometimes feels overwhelmed by the southern part.

Michele Neylon:: And that's a probably a good thing.

Steven Metalitz: Okay, Tim had his hand up and then I think we can wrap up on this topic.

Tim Ruiz: That's okay. This is Tim, Steve. That's okay, because we can go on.

Steven Metalitz: Okay, well, I think there was a pretty strong consensus that we shouldn't limit to a specific number per constituency, stakeholder group, at large, etcetera. I think two things that the staff could do to help us at this point. One is to generate a list of who we've got, who's stepped forward or is on the mailing list of the team.

And that could, we could indicate the geographic distribution if that's know, I'm not sure everyone has stepped forward to say that. But anyway, I think that would be useful information.

And second, perhaps we should send out a note to the list and say, you know, there are two sub-groups here, and they're going to be working, they're going to be coordinated, but they're working on slightly different, somewhat different topics and which, if you have a preference, which one would you like to be in?

Or you could be in both, I guess, if you have the time and energy. But we certainly encourage people to be in one or the other as their interest lie. Would that make sense?

As I don't know and I don't want to assume which ones most people are interested in, but it would be helpful probably to know if we've got a big imbalance there if we don't have enough people or not the right breath of people in one group or another, we might be able to tell that.

Beau Brendler: Yes, this is (Boe). Given the consensus of what people said, I mean, I think that Steve and I to some degree can be responsible for addressing issues of adversity of opinion and range and that kind of thing without limiting.

Steven Metalitz: Well, if there's no objection, we'll assume that there won't be a limit and we will ask the staff to give us, you know, to prepare the list and also we will, (Boe) and I will send out something that (unintelligible) sub-groups and encourages people to indicate a preference and maybe on sub-lists or whatever.

If there's nothing else on that topic...

Margie Milam: Yes.

Steven Metalitz: Did someone else want to be heard on that topic?

Margie Milam: Oh, yes, this is Margie, I just wanted to confirm that we'll go ahead and do that.

Steven Metalitz: Great. Okay, thanks. Then let's go on to five and six, well, five first, but five and six really are the same topic as the different sub-teams. Expected deliverables and timeframe, scheduling future calls.

So as I recall, the charter that was approved, and which is now posted I think on the Adobe board, had for Task A, which is the registrants rights sub-group, it just says immediately begin Task A, forward to counsel upon completion.

It does have some actual deadlines for Task B, but we can't meet those because the calls for the draft report on Task B to be produced at 30 days after the counsel approved the charter and that would be this coming Saturday. So we've lost a few weeks here for some reason.

So obviously that's not going to be realistic, but that does give a sense of what the counsel approved in terms of moving rapidly on this.

So I guess I would just, before we get too far into discussions of timetables, I would just start with that, and of course, this whole effort is the result of a resolution that was adopted six months ago in Mexico City. So I hope that both of these can be moved along.

And with that, let me just ask Beau if he has any comments or thoughts on what's a realistic timetable for the registrant rights group or others have thoughts on that, I see Alan has his hand up.

Beau Brendler: Sure, Alan has his hand up. I guess I would just want to say briefly, from my experience with the, limited experience at this point, with the registration abuse working group, I think that's gone on way too long for volunteers. So if we could get this back to sort of discussing the face to face meeting in Seoul.

But I think the sooner we set a timetable goal the better off we are. So 30 days after Seoul, I would say.

Steven Metalitz: Okay, so that's proposed for the registrant rights?

Beau Brendler: For the registrant rights, yes. And that's assuming we can have a robust face to face meeting in Seoul.

Steven Metalitz: Okay, Alan has his hand up, anybody else want to be in the queue? I know not everybody's in the Adobe.

Alan, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, I was really in the queue for the other half of it, but I do have a small comment on the registrant rights one. The challenge of the registrant rights one I think is going to be translating what Margie has done into simple words that apply, because there is so much variation between registrars.

Finding words that are meaningful and not simply saying go read the contract, I think is going to be a challenge. And I think coming up with a methodology of how it's done, whether it's a simply document or in fact hyperlinks, I don't know.

But I think that's going to be the challenge and it may take a little longer than we would otherwise hope because of that.

I do have a comment on the time of the other one, but I'll wait. Go ahead now?

Steven Metalitz: Yes, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Given that we are starting another round of essentially potential RAA amendments, at the very least this has to include a public call for what do people think should be addressed. And that's going to add at least 30 days plus analysis time to this process.

So whatever time we set for that has to allow abundant time to accept input, to process it, to analyze it and then the working group can try to come up with some definitive list which I don't know to what extent its going to try to narrow it down to a reasonable number of items.

But certainly we need public input into this process.

Beau Brendler: Well, this is (Boe). I mean, what if a call for something like went out like, you know, within a week?

Steven Metalitz: Excuse me, this is Steve. To get back to the charter, we did address this when we developed the charter, and that's why there's a 50 day period after the draft report goes out, there will be a 21 day public comment.

And the reason it's 50 days is people said that we need time to actually analyze what comes in, other suggestions that people have or critiques they have of the list that we've prepared.

So Alan, I want' sure whether you were suggesting that there should be some call to the public before we prepare a draft?

((Cross talk))

Alan Greenberg: I'm thinking it over again, that it what I'm suggesting and it no it was not in the charter, but I think the group needs to consider, should they be starting just based on the input of the people in this group or should there be a public comment?

I don't know the answer, but something tells me that it would be wiser to have a comment than not. But you're right it was not in the charter.

Beau Brendler: That's why I was saying maybe if we did something like by the end of the week; it's not as if this is a new issue.

Steven Metalitz: Okay. Thank you both. (Mikaeli) did you have a comment?

Michele Neylon: I'm sorry, I'm a bit confused by this. What exactly in simple one sentence is this group meant to be working on with respect to the RAA?

Beau Brendler: It's supposed to develop a list of topics for potential amendments to the RAA.

Michele Neylon: Okay, thanks. Okay, the problem is that the new RAA, the modified version, was only adopted within the last couple of months and there are in some respects it might be a bit premature to be going looking for public comments when a lot of registrars still haven't switched to the new RAA.

As into the modified version, so they're still working on the old one, which predates the first set of amendments.

Now the biggest registrars are the ones that account for the largest percentages of active registrations have switched over yes, but I don't know offhand, but I'm sure ICANN staff would have some kind of polite way of giving a figure without giving away too much information as to how many registrars have actually signed onto RAA v2 or whatever you want to call this.

But there are still a largish number of registrars who haven't signed over onto it yet. So that has just confused me a small little bit.

Beau Brendler: Alan has his hand up.

Alan Greenberg: The rationale, at least from my perspective, was the last round of RAA amendments ended with a bad taste in a lot of people's mouths, with the feeling that there were a whole bunch of things that should have been on the table but were excluded because of the process used.

And there were people eager to try to get to a second round immediately, which is why this whole thing was tied together with improvement of the last RAA.

Michele Neylon: Oh, that's fair enough. I was just trying to understand what the rationale was behind it. Because if you look at the general GNSO somewhere people where a group goes looking for feedback from the public.

And you look at the complete apathy in some respects, which (unintelligible) ranges from complete apathy, where you get like one comment, through to a reasonable level of activity through to hundreds of rabid comments, most of them actually completely off the topic that you're discussing.

So I was just wondering if going to the public immediately was such a good idea or not. I mean, that's fair enough, but thanks for the explanation.

Steven Metalitz: Does anybody else want to be heard on this? If not, I'll recognize myself.

I don't think we should have a public call before, I think it's going to be easier for people to respond to a draft, that it is for them to respond to the abstract question, what topics would you like to see addressed in the RAA?

And again, this is really the timetable that our group, the drafting team has come up with and the counsel has approved was that we would first produce a draft and then the public would react to that.

And I think it's probably more meaningful for, we're more likely to get more meaningful comments. Obviously there's no guarantee one way or the other, but we'll be more likely to get more meaningful comments if we have a list of, you know, five items.

And the public can say, no we don't want a change in that area, or you left out these other two areas. So I would propose that we stick to the timetable, at least to the framework that was approved by the counsel.

Obviously we can't meet the T-plus-30 deadline or milestone that was there, but as the charter says, those milestones will be updated as needed upon charter approval.

And I think if we can aim to get this draft report out, if we can get it out before the Seoul meeting, I think that would be ideal. If we can't, then I think we

should have done enough work on it, that perhaps very soon after the Seoul meeting we can circulate this for public comment.

Alan Greenberg: Steve, given that I was the one who made the suggestion, since many of the people who were frustrated with the previous process are in fact in this group, and will likely raise the issues that they consider necessary, I can certainly live with what you're saying.

Steven Metalitz: Thank you. (Danny) had his hand up.

Danny Younger: Thank you Steve. My concern of course is with the date at which we recognize the T at the beginning of the process and with the Seoul meeting up ahead of us, that's likely to impact people by way of travel time and other obligations.

I'm wondering whether we should in fact T actually beginning immediately upon the conclusion of the upcoming meeting.

Steven Metalitz: T in the charter says counsel approval, but obviously that's not doable. You can't do this by T-plus-30. So you're suggesting basically the end of November for the target date to issue this draft report?

(Danny Younger: Correct.

Steven Metalitz: Okay. Other thoughts on that.

Avri Doria: This is Avri.

Steven Metalitz: Avri. Anybody else want to be in the queue? Go ahead Avri.

Avri Doria: Hi, I just wanted to make a comment that I would request that whatever date you come up with, basically, then you know, send them off to both the GNSO

counsel and to the ALAC and, you know, then I'm sure that the charters can be updated.

I think that that these dates make a whole lot of since. I just sort or ask you to, you know, make sure that after you've done that update, both of the chartering organizations as it were.

Steven Metalitz: Okay, that's a good point.

Anybody else want to be heard on this topic? And I guess we're kind of mixing in both the registrant rights, Task A and Task B with the RAA and I think that what's on the table in both cases, I think one case from Alan and one case from (Danny), is that the target date for the completion of a draft would be roughly 30 days after Seoul.

Alan Greenberg: I guess they liked what you were saying Steve.

Steven Metalitz: Either that or they didn't like it, I don't know.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Steve, Cheryl here. Take is as a fanfare.

((Crosstalk))

Lutz Donnacker: A lot of money to play music on those channels.

Steven Metalitz: Okay, so I think that what we have in front of us is a proposal is for Seoul plus 30 for both of these deliverables. So what do people comment on that? Is that too ambitious? Is that too unambitious given that we've, you know, this is a process that was intended to move as quickly as possible after the approval of the most recent RAA amendments?

Michele, then Alan.

Michele Neylon: Well basically I would say that a lot of people were involved in these processes are involved in a lot of other working groups, so as long as it's setting reasonable targets it would make more sense to me than trying to do things far too quickly and then it doesn't get done properly because we've all got other commitments.

That's just my thoughts on it. What you said, was it Seoul plus 30, or whatever, is perfectly reasonable as far as I'm concerned.

Steven Metalitz: Okay. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Yes, if we say the end of Seoul plus 30, I'm afraid we're really, the week after a meeting is always pretty well lost, part some people vacationing and some people just traveling, so really we're saying three weeks and even if we hold one meeting a week, that's not a lot of time to get organized and produce something.

I'd love to say Seoul plus 30, but I don't think it's realistic at all just given the amount of time one has.

Beau Brendler: I'm assuming that we're going to get something done before Seoul, so we're now, we're now still...

Alan Greenberg: Oh, okay. If there's face to face time at Seoul, I think our chances are significantly higher.

Steven Metalitz: Well, let me see if anybody else wants to comment about Seoul plus 30 days to target, and if not, we can agree to that and then move right on to the question of face to face meeting at Seoul.

Are there any further comments on Seoul plus 30?

Okay, so that will be the target for both groups.

Now, in terms of a meeting in Seoul, I guess the first question is how many people who are participating are planning to travel to Seoul? Although I assume if we have a meeting, we can also have telephonic participation.

And another question, which I guess I would direct to the staff, is what are the, are there open slots when this meeting could be held? So let's first ask, let's open the floor for discussion about whether to have a face to face meeting in Seoul. Who would support that? Who would want to see that? Who thinks that's not a good idea?

(Evan), I see your hand up or maybe not.

Evan Leibovitch: Nope, sorry. That was an accident.

Steven Metalitz: (Danny) has his hand up.

Danny Younger: yes, if we go ahead with a face to face in Seoul, just please try to arrange for remote participation. That's it. Thanks.

Steven Metalitz: Okay. Anybody else? Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Just pointing out that of course that from the ALAC or large perspective in Seoul, our meetings, it's rare for them not to have remote participation. That's our norm, not our abnorm.

Hopefully, the local logistics will allow that remote participation to actually be effective, but with the use of things like the Adobe and telephone bridges, we should be able to sort something out. The tricky part will be fitting it into a schedule.

Steven Metalitz: Yes, that's always the challenge isn't it?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And yes, I would like to make sure we try and do so.

Beau Brendler: And other comments on face to face in Seoul?

Steven Metalitz: Well, there were a couple of comments in our earlier discussion that said, you know, that seemed to assume we would have a face to face at Seoul. I mean, I think both of these tasks are tasks that in theory could be done quite well without a face to face meeting

But perhaps we should look into whether there's a time that would work in Seoul and a place we could have it and if we could have remote participation. I mean, maybe (Boe) and I could work with the staff to see if that's feasible and come up with some possible times and you know, socialize that with the group just to see if the times are meaningful for remote participation.

Beau Brendler: Well, yes.

Danny Younger: Steve, it's (Danny). Even if it's not an ideal time, I'll still make it onto the phone.

Steven Metalitz: Okay, great. I know it's not likely to be an ideal time for your location.

Beau Brendler: Steve this is (Boe). Just to go a little further into what Cheryl said. I mean perhaps in terms of setting aside a time in a venue, I don't know how defined the ALAC's schedule is for all of us at Seoul at the moment, but, you know, maybe there could be a joint, or maybe there could be an actual ALAC session that relates to the RAA where people could be.

In other words, rather than trying to go through a lot of falderal to line up a separate meeting room at this late phase, maybe there's an ALAC meeting that could be focused around this, since there's a fair number of ALAC participants.

I can't speak for Cheryl on that, but...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I didn't think you would dear. Though I would like to think that we should be able to come up with something and of course that makes the logistics much easier if we can.

Steven Metalitz: Okay. Well, then maybe the upshot is we would work with Cheryl as well as with the staff to try to see if we could come up with a timeslot that makes sense.

But again, I would encourage people, let's try to get these sub-teams up and running before Seoul and let's try to do as much as possible by telephone and on the list.

Again, we're not - in one case we are trying to draw from the existing RAA a plain language statement about registrants' rights and the other we are really coming up with this, as Alan said a laundry list and I tend to agree with him.

I tend to agree with him. It's probably an over inclusive list of potential topics and they don't have to be extremely glandular in the way they're defined, I don't think. So, I think this is probably doable even without a face to face meeting, but we could certainly see if such a meeting is feasible.

Anybody else want to speak on this? (Evan), I see your hand is up. Did anybody else want to say anything on this question?

Margie Milam: Yes, Margie too.

Steven Metalitz: Okay, (Evan) and then Margie.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, the only point I wanted to make was, if the comment was made that we should get more North Americans and more Europeans in this, there's simply

people that communicate better face to face, who want to look somebody in the eye.

If we've got everyone together in Seoul, it makes no sense not to try and have something to put together.

And it's easy to say, well we don't need a face to face meeting, you don't know whose being shut out of this because they simply don't communicate well by email.

This happens and is being discussed at large right now and I hope you carry it into other forums, and in trying to keep in mind the people who are not participating in these things because of the stress on email communications modes that some people aren't comfortable with.

Steven Metalitz: That's a good point. Of course the other side of it is that there are people who aren't in the position to travel to all over the world to have these meetings.

Evan Leibovitch: You just, you do what can with what you have, I just saying if you have this many people here together at once, you don't lose that opportunity.

Steven Metalitz: Right. Okay, Margie I think you wanted, you had a comment.

Margie Milam: Yes, we anticipated that there were be a meeting and so the meeting staff is aware that may be asking for it. And we'll go ahead and work with the ALAC staff to make sure that its okay.

Steven Metalitz: Okay.

Margie Milam: The one thing that I wanted to point out that is that they're two different tasks and the task of writing the registrants rights charter is more of a, you know, it's a work among some people, the task of identifying the topics is something that's probably more appropriate for a, you know,...

Steven Metalitz: More appropriate for what? I'm sorry; you got cut off there Margie.

Margie Milam: Sure. My question is the RAA amendments needs that's something that might be appropriate for the ALAC audience, but to have the actual drafting of the registrants rights charter is more of a manual process that doesn't really, I don't think it necessarily involves input from people that are outside the group of this working group.

Steven Metalitz: Okay. Well, look, at this point, let's just look into the possibilities of having a face to face meeting or we can split it up between the two sub-teams or however we want to do it. But let's get some options out there and see if it's feasible.

I'm aware that we're now at the end of our 60 minute time period, so I'd like to try to wrap up, but the other - I would suggest that we that the sub-team leaders work with the staff to get doodles going on a first call of the sub-team hopefully before, I definitely hope that it would be done before the Korea meeting.

But I think we could leave, rather than, I think we could just try to do that on a doodle to find a time that's the most convenient for the most people, but we are expecting, we will also have the circular out from the staff asking people to identify with one or the other or both sub-teams.

The last agenda item we had here was mailing lists, Wikis and scheduling of future calls. I don't have a proposal on this but I'm not sure that we need to schedule of the entire group. I think at this point, the work that needs to be done in the sub-teams.

And I think we can handle the logistics of getting the face to face meeting together without having another call. So I wouldn't see a necessity for scheduling any future calls of the overall group.

And I guess in terms of mailing lists and Wikis, I think we're going to have two sub-teams so if we can get two sub-lists established I assume the staff can do that once we have people who've identified.

And you know, people are welcome to be on both lists, but again just so we don't necessarily need to be cross talking about all of these issues.

So let me just open up for brief comments on any of those points before we wrap up.

Cheryl I see. Anybody else? Go ahead Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you Steve. With the comments that Michele made earlier about using languages other than English, the Wiki spaces that we have set up were all fairly used to over in the at large and ALAC world, running things in at least English, French and Spanish.

So perhaps using subspaces as the joint work group that we set up as a commons which was open to the public input might be a useful tool as well. Perhaps we can discuss that with the GNSO and ALAC support staff and see what connections are going to be most viable and most valuable.

Steven Metalitz: Okay. Any other comments here? Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Yes, I was just going to support everything you said and with regard to Cheryl's comment of multiple languages, if we are going to want multiple language support in any form online, we should try to give staff a heads up about it. Time delays in that seem to have grown longer not shorter.

Evan Leibovitch: And we should also make sure that if we're going to have interpretations and that we should actually be aware that there's going to be people taking advantage of it.

We've already had (circumstances) where we have lots of facilities for interpretation happens and nobody shows up.

Avri Doria: Hello, this is Avri. Can I add something?

Steven Metalitz: Yes, yes. Go ahead.

Avri Doria: Okay. One of the reasons that we didn't put it on for this meeting and one of the things that needs to be considered is coming out of the GNSO there really is no budgeting set aside for that. So if it's something that this group decides that it wants to do in terms of having interpretation on calls and translations of documents, then we need to make sure that it's got a budget that it can come out of.

And since the GNSO has sort of been the sponsor of, you know, getting this effort started and the GNSO does not have any budget for that for the GNSO is specifically, you know, a English language supporting organization, we need to find budget.

Steven Metalitz: Okay, well maybe Beau and I could pursue that with the staff and see what the prospects for that are.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: As long as you involve CLO in there, that is excellent plan Steve.

Steven Metalitz: Great. Okay. Anything else that people want to add before we adjourn the meeting?

Okay, well, thanks everybody. And sorry, we ran a little bit over, but we will - please look for some emails from the staff as far as your sub-team preference and then for emails from your sub-team coordinator about scheduling those meetings.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Including for those who haven't joined tonight of course or today as well.

Steven Metalitz: That's right. That's right.

((Cross talk))

END