

**Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA) DT  
Sub Team B  
TRANSCRIPTION  
Monday 03 May 2010 at 20:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA) drafting team Sub Team B meeting on Monday 03 May 2010 at 20:00 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-b-20100503.mp3>

On page:  
<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#may>

**Present for the teleconference:**

Steve Metalitz - IPC – Chair  
Kristina Rosette – IPC  
Tatyana Khramtsova – Registrar Stakeholder Group  
Cheryl Langdon-Orr - ALAC chair  
Philip Corwin – CBUC  
Holly Raiche – At-Large  
Marc Trachtenberg – IPC

**ICANN Staff**

Margie Milam  
Marika Koning  
Heidi Ullrich  
Glen de Saint Géry  
Gisella Gruber-White  
David Giza

**Absent apologies:**

Statton Hammock - Registrar Stakeholder Group  
Michele Neylon – Registrar Stakeholder Group  
Shiva Muthusamy – At-Large  
Tim Ruiz - Registrar Stakeholder Group  
Liz Gasster

Coordinator: Excuse me. I'd like to remind all participants this conference is being recorded. If you have any objections you may disconnect at this time. You may begin.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you. Good morning. Good afternoon. Good evening everyone on today's RAA Sub Team B call on Monday the 3rd of May. We have Tatiana Khramtsova, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Holly Raiche, Steve Metalitz.

From staff we have Glenn De Saint gery, David Giza, Heidi Ullrich, Margie Milam and myself, Gisella Gruber-White. We have apologies today from Michele Neylon, Shiva Muthusamy and Statton Hammock.

If I can please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes and I hope I haven't left anyone off the call. Thank you. Over to you Steve.

Steve Metalitz: Thanks very much Gisella. Welcome everyone. And I appreciate everyone making the time even in the midst of travel to join the call today.

The - our agenda is actually fairly simple because - and really thanks to the staff because Margie circulated on the weekend, the first draft of the initial report. I've been calling this a draft report but it's an in fact it's an initial report. I guess that's correct. Anyway...

Margie Milam: Call it the draft initial.

Steve Metalitz: Yes. It's the draft initial here. But it's really to give the structure for the report and make sure all of the points that need to be in there are in there in terms of what's needed from a report. And so I think it's very helpful to have that document to work from.

And I think what Margie has done is really in - just stick in there what we - the current proposals as far as task one and task three. And obviously all of that is up for further discussion as needed.

But I think this definitely moves us along farther toward our goal of having the report out the door prior to the Brussels meeting. So I want to thank Margie

and her colleagues for spending some time on a weekend to put all this together.

So I think our tasks really here are three. One is to talk about is to walk through the initial report. I know people have had a little time to look at it so there maybe some comments both on the structure and on the content of it. I have a couple of questions myself that I wanted to raise.

So then I hope of course that we will also on the list over the next few days, circulate any additional comments. Second we need to talk about the planning for the Brussels meeting and for our workshop or other event that we're hoping to have on Monday at the Brussels meeting if we get our wish.

And then the third is just to line up anything that's needed for the next meeting, our next call which will be a week from today at the same time. So let me ask first if there are any other agenda items - if there are any other agenda items that people wanted to raise.

I see that we've been joined by (Christina) and by Marc Trachtenberg. Welcome.

Marc Trachtenberg: Thanks.

Steve Metalitz: I know this is a big day of ICANN calls evidently from several of the comments. Margie has her hand up. Margie is there something else that we need to have on the agenda?

Margie Milam: No. Just I wanted to provide some background on how the initial report was drafted. So when we get to that...

Steve Metalitz: Absolutely.

Margie Milam: ...(unintelligible).

Steve Metalitz: Any other agenda items? Okay, well then why don't we turn to the draft initial report and let me just - Margie let me just ask you to give us any opening comments or anything you want to do to walk us through this document.

Margie Milam: Sure. Sure. When I first started to put it together I realized, you know, we are the Sub Team B and really it's a report that needs to come from the main drafting team. And we actually haven't formally reported on the work that was (unintelligible) on the registrar rights charter.

So the way I sort of put this together was to incorporate those tasks into one report. And what I'll - and as provided placeholders for additional content. So it - this is really meant to be a starting point. I've made suggestions for some content but certainly, you know, it's just a starting point.

And the working group can go ahead and, you know, and change it in - and add sections as you'd like. But I just wanted to, you know, give you some background on the fact that it probably needs to include both parts of our tasks.

And I've included a lot of attachments because I was trying to figure out what really would be useful to the reader in terms of understanding what the recommendations are.

And so some of the attachments that I've included in here are some of the more substantive proposals like the law enforcement proposals and the IPC proposal and the staff memos.

And I also assume that we want to include the larger matrix, you know, the spreadsheet that has the more detailed inputs from all of the contributors because even in our, you know, high level summary we make reference to the matrix. So I'm assuming that that'll be an attachment as well.

So anyway, so that's kind of the background on that. And what I've done in this particular report is included the latest version of the - of the prioritization document that we worked on last week and it also has the (Spa Man) that you sent around Steve on Friday.

So that's actually already included in there knowing that it is very draft and subject to change. But I just thought it'd be useful to - for you all to see the format and to be able to, you know, provide language changes in addition to substantive changes. Does that make sense?

Steve Metalitz: Yes, it does. Thank you very much. And I think Phil Corwin has joined us as well. Welcome Phil. Yeah, I think - I think that that's a great introduction. And let me just ask first if people have any questions or comments on what Margie has just laid out regarding the report.

Holly? Anybody else?

Holly Raiche: I have to say - yeah, this is just to say that in fact I think it really now hangs together I think that for all the people who haven't been sitting here morning after morning or night after night. It brings why we're here and what we've done so, you know, well done Margie.

Margie Milam: Thank you.

Steve Metalitz: That certainly. Well let me ask one question in terms of bringing in the Sub Team A material. My understanding is that they've completed their work, right?

And so it's just a question of kind of plugging in what they've done and - or is there something that they're still waiting still - that they still need to do before this...

Margie Milam: Yeah.

Steve Metalitz: ...support can go forward.

Margie Milam: They've essentially done their work. I think some of them want to work on an (aspirational) charter but I believe that work is being done separately through the at large committee maybe Cheryl or Heidi can comment on that. But the substantive work of Sub Team A has been concluded.

It just hasn't been formally reported to the GNSO Council.

Steve Metalitz: Okay. So this won't hold up our - the rest of this report?

Margie Milam: No. No.

Steve Metalitz: Okay. Let's look at the...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Steve sorry. Cheryl here. I was on mute.

Steve Metalitz: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And I'm not in the (unintelligible). Forgive me for jumping in. Just concerning what was just said there. And to just the gist of what we make sure we do things that reach out to the (unintelligible) of Sub Team A and Heidi I'm sure you can manage that.

Just to make sure that (unintelligible) have no particular (tickets) that they want to bring forward. I just think it's probably a good time to do a courtesy distribution of this excellent draft document. Thanks Margie.

Steve Metalitz: Yeah. Yeah. I assume that this will be delivered to Sub Team A and that they can plug in - for the next iteration you'll plug in what their material will be.

Heidi Ullrich: Yes. This is Heidi. I can confirm I can do that.

Steve Metalitz: Great. All right. Well then let's turn to this document now and just see again, I know it's been around - it's only been out for a day or two.

But I guess I would ask if people have any particular comments they want to make on the executive summary of the document or maybe just - we could just walk through this and see if people have comments. Anything on the executive summary?

Is there anything on the section on background process and next steps which I think is - I agree, this would be very helpful for people who haven't been - haven't been part of the process. Okay, it's Part 3 is about...

Holly Raiche: (Unintelligible).

Steve Metalitz: Oh, I'm sorry. Go ahead.

Holly Raiche: Holly here. Sorry I didn't raise my hand. Just a thought. After the list of names everybody's got initials.

Now if people are not familiar with ICANN people are going to say well okay, is it NCSG with - I mean I think these are - I think I understand what all they are but I'm just wondering if somebody picks this up are they going to know what all those things stand for instinctively?

That's on - I think it's page - Page 5. It's just the name of the representatives and everybody's...

((Crosstalk))

Woman: And sure Holly what I - or what I can do is I can put a key, you know, use a key so...

Holly Raiche: Just in case - just in case somebody from - with - outside the ICANN world wants to actually understand this.

Woman: Okay.

Steve Metalitz: That's a very useful suggestion. Thank you Holly. Okay. Anything else on Part 2 for the moment? Part 3 it think is just about Sub Team A - development of registrant rights charters. So we'll pass over that. And then 4 is potential topics for additional amendments for the RAA.

And I see that you had a placeholder here for responding specifically to the law enforcement related proposals. I guess - let me just throw out the question - do we think we want to do that specifically because these have been the subject of these (GAC) resolutions and so forth?

Or do we simply want to not single out that one group and just give people our priorities? Any thoughts on that Holly?

Holly Raiche: Yeah. I did have a thought. Aside from law enforcement there's also medium priority list which is on Page 11 now. It's not clear to me - I mean I think the things that we are looking at negotiating in the first round would be the high priority items.

And I think - the question in my mind is the medium priority list go with law enforcement saying down the track these are the things we're thinking about.

Steve Metalitz: So you would combine that with the discussion of...

Holly Raiche: Well I don't know. I don't know. It was just - it was really a question in my mind - is medium priority there because this is not going to be the first round but these are issues that we think at some point should be revisited?



Steve Metalitz: That's a good question. I mean I think in terms of how they got there if you'll recall these are the issues that the first time through we said these are high priority and we ended up with way too many high priority items. We said well these didn't make the cut.

Holly Raiche: Yeah.

Steve Metalitz: But so we - it makes sense to list them but I'm not sure we're necessarily saying anything about when they would be taken up.

Holly Raiche: No. And I think some of the items we identified as medium or even low was because some of the initial issues were compliance.

Steve Metalitz: Yes.

Holly Raiche: And it was clear that there was already work underway with compliance so there was general agreement let's not put them as high priority until we understand they work with the compliance and what's being done.

So I mean is that a trigger that says these are things that we sort of put on hold waiting other things - other outcomes? I don't know. I'm just - that was just possibly why they weren't medium priority and maybe it's - maybe that's worth flagging or I don't know.

Steve Metalitz: David I think you had a comment.

David Giza: I do Steve. I'd like to weigh in on Holly's comment. I do believe that the - that the group ought to recommend a second phase in this process.

And that's essentially dependent upon contractual compliance completing our work and beginning to utilize the new enforcement tools that are available in the 2009 RAA.

And so therefore, you know, a phase two which would require further - potential further amendment to the RAA I believe ought to be a recommendation of the group for that very reason.

Steve Metalitz: Okay. So let me just make sure I understand what you're suggesting is that we say something about, you know, that we mention as Holly said and I think we should say this that there are some items that are not on these priority lists because we thought that they were issues directed primarily to compliance issues.

But that at a - at some point in the near future there ought to be some type of evaluation or we should take a look at appliance activities and perhaps return to - if it seems that the existing RAA is not sufficient then turn to some of these other items. Is that what you're suggesting?

David Giza: Correct Steve.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Steve, Cheryl here.

Steve Metalitz: Yes, go ahead.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks Steve. I'd actually take what David said and build on Holly's question and be a little more definitive.

Steve Metalitz: I think you dropped out there Cheryl. You said that you would be a little more definitive than David. Cheryl are you - are you with us? Okay, hopefully we...

Coordinator: Her line just disconnected. I'll call her back.

Steve Metalitz: Okay, thank you. We'll get her back. Yeah, I - there - I will mention there are a couple of things that I put actually in my - in the cover note when we circulated - I circulated the priority list document. It probably ought to be in here somewhere.

One is to say there are some things here - is the compliance piece. Another part is to say these 12 are not listed in a priority order within the 12. I'm not sure if it says that now...

Woman: Yep.

Steve Metalitz: ...in the document. And the third was some things we didn't include in here. And this is particularly relevant to the law enforcement.

Coordinator: Cheryl has rejoined.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No, I haven't. I need to get onto my headset. Right. So I now hold the phone for the next 45 minutes. Great.

Steve Metalitz: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: What I was saying and I don't know how far I got, was - is that I would like to make a more thoughtful statement and suggest that the phase two as a result of input coming back from where compliance is on a number of issues, is quite definitely proposed.

I think the at large community would feel far better about seeing some of what they think is extremely high priority issues to either allow our different list for more than just - for very good reasons. And clearly we can't do everything they want. It just doesn't work.

But we're in this situation because people traded off on the current amendment knowing that there would be the opportunity for review. And if we only do part of that job or recommend part of that job I think there'll be significant dissatisfaction.

Now I'm going to hang up and get them to call me back so I can answer on my headset.

Steve Metalitz: Okay. Thank you. All right. Well we'll return to that topic in a minute but let me just mention the other two. One was already mentioned that it - the 12 are not necessarily in a priority order.

And the last one was about the due diligence issues which - a lot of the law enforcement recommendations really went to due diligence that would be - happen before a - someone even got accredited as a registrar. So it's a step before spelling out the obligations that they have as an accredited registrar.

And I think that we should definitely mention that. And one thing I'm not clear on is what we say should be done about that. I mean in a sense it's outside the scope of our remit which was to look at RAA amendments. And due diligence on candidates for accreditation is not really an RAA provision.

So I guess the question is what can we say about this. Can we - and really it's a question directed to staff about what - where things stand in terms of enhanced due diligence for would be accredited registrars.

What if anything should be said about that in this document? Reactions? I see Holly has her hand up. Is there anyone from staff that can respond to that as well? Holly go ahead.

Holly Raiche: Yeah. I was thinking that it is an important issue. Obviously law enforcement thought it was an important issue. I think it's fair enough to say these are not our high priority...

Coordinator: Cheryl has rejoined.

Holly Raiche: Cheryl just to say in terms of the law enforcement recommendation for that due diligence before somebody becomes a registrar - that's not really an RAA

amendment which is quite right. But because it's law enforcement and because it was a big issue for them it's worth saying it was outside our remit.

But this is an issue so that it doesn't disappear and it doesn't look as if we haven't thought about it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I think making sure it doesn't fall through the cracks and having a belt and (unintelligible) approach to some of these things specifically come from law enforcement and that they picked up quite positively by the (unintelligible) (Series Y).

Each phase is explaining it later. And I think Steve back to the (unintelligible) two that I didn't get to - I would justify picking out the law enforcement aspect because of the (GAC) communiqué out of Nairobi.

And I think when there is a bylaw mandate for the Board to take note of what (GAC) is in a communiqué and it's not by and by we'd be rather silly to not follow along the same lines.

Steve Metalitz: Okay. I see we have Margie and Dave to respond on the due diligence issue. Margie?

Margie Milam: Yeah. I mean I'll defer to Dave on that. It just - these additional comments in the content to explain some of the priority issues. So yeah, I'll go ahead and pick those up and I'll let Dave respond on the accreditation issue.

I do think we should have a separate paragraph describing, you know, the reasons behind, you know, some of the due diligence related decisions and at least it'll provide clarity to those reading a report.

Steve Metalitz: Dave?

David Giza: Thank you Steve. I do know that the registrar liaison team is working on improvements, you know, slash enhancements to the accreditation process. I don't honestly know what the status of that is but I'll volunteer to take that as an action item.

I'll reach out to (Tim Cole) and his team and then provide this group with an update, you know, via email hopefully within the next 24 to 48 hours.

Steve Metalitz: Great. Holly did you have another point you wanted to raise?

Holly Raiche: I've got a very specific comment just on the list of high priority topics. And it's perhaps being pedantic but on number three which was the point of contact on malicious conduct could we just add a few words? One is - and so it should read designation of 24/7 technically competent point of conduct.

Because that was the whole point of it. We have got further down issues about point of, you know, coming up with point of contact information. But this is a particularly special point that came from the security people. And I think we need to pick up that aspect of it. Otherwise I'm happy.

Steve Metalitz: Great. Thank you and I apologize that we didn't - because you raised this last time and we should have...

Holly Raiche: Yeah.

Steve Metalitz: ...done it then. And so let's just do that designation of 24/7 technically competent point of contact on malicious conduct issues. So that's done. Okay.

Let me just see if there are any comments on this section for - and we have a few things and I, you know, I'm glad to try my hand at some of these things because I know the staff is quite busy with a lot of other things. You know, I could circulate some language on some of these points.

I hope I - I would certainly invite Cheryl if you want to give us a paragraph or something on the phase two that would be great. So I don't want to foreclose that but I will try to come up with something that's responsive on some of these points and propose a place to put them as well.

Is everyone in agreement that we probably do want to have what's down here now as Section 4.2 - Evaluation of the Law Enforcement Related RAA Proposals? I think Cheryl has made a good point as to why that would be a good...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yep.

Steve Metalitz: ...thing to do. And...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yep.

Steve Metalitz: ...I think - I assume we would just say we did consider these - we had the whole on whatever the date was we had the meeting devoted exclusively to that with law enforcement representative that a lot of these are reflected in our priorities.

And that some of them are not on there and because they're either the compliance issue or the due diligence issue. So I think that's pretty straightforward. It doesn't need to be anything real elaborate.

But is everyone in agreement that there ought to be a paragraph singled out on that? Holly?

Holly Raiche: Yeah. I absolutely agree. I think it's a great idea and then I would also add a paragraph about compliance. I think it fits very nicely there that again we looked at some - many important issues and some of them really are compliance where we were - had advice from the compliance team.

And so those issues will be picked up. And I think that that answers Cheryl's point about many of those issues were very important to the at large community so they'd want to see the fact that they - those issues were considered and in fact have been highlighted as something that we'll go back to, that that would be useful.

Steve Metalitz: Okay. All right. Anything else on - that people want to offer our - at this point on Section 4 or Part 4 I guess? Okay. On Part 5 which is really next steps...

Holly Raiche: Yep.

Steve Metalitz: Well as you can see what's there - what Margie has plugged in is the last document that I had circulated on this. And then today I saw that Statton had circulated some edits.

And I'm - unless people want to discuss that specifically it seems as though he is not happy with the idea of having anybody else - any observers - I think he's taken out all of the references to observers. That's the main change as I see it here.

Margie Milam: Well Steve do you want me to pull up his redline? I have it on Adobe Connect if you'd like to have everyone see it.

Steve Metalitz: Yeah. That would be fine. I don't think we can really spend - I mean we can certainly spend a few minutes talking about it but it probably makes sense to defer that until Statton or others from - because I don't think anyone from the registrar community is on the call now. So...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Steve, Cheryl here. I agree. I think they have to be on the call. And I don't want to see it be a holdup to our progress. So if we can make that a topic for our next meeting that would be the best way forward as far as I'm concerned anyway.



Steve Metalitz: Okay. I'm certainly comfortable with that. I think we have two pretty - well anyway, my hope in circulating the revision was to try to meld some of the things from the two different proposals - mine and (Tim)'s but I'm not sure that I succeeded in that.

But anyway, why don't we defer discussion of that? Make that our first item on the next call. And hopefully there will be some of our colleagues from the registrar community will be on there.

And similarly I know Statton raised a question about one sentence that was Annex F which is referenced here in this Section 5 and that's the staff - the staff memorandum dated 14th of April. I certainly agree it ought to be in the report but they had a problem with one sentence in there.

And I'm not sure there's any value to getting into that now unless somebody else shares that concern that's on the call. But let's - again, let's put that on the agenda for our next meeting. Any other comments on what's down there now in Section 5?

That's the next steps part of this. Holly has her hand up. Anybody else? Holly go ahead.

Holly Raiche: Just a thought. Just to make sure that we do get the registrar community at the next meeting, is it worth when - sending out a special email saying the first time of discussion will be the inclusion or not of observers?

And it would be appreciated if people could either be present - well be present for the discussion just to flag that we really do need (Tim) and/or Statton and/or Michele there to discuss this. I mean I'd hate to keep deferring it because they're not there.

Steve Metalitz: No. We can't. We can't do that. So I'm certainly happy to do that. And I'd just encourage them. I mean the time and date are set and hopefully they will have somebody who can step up to that.

Holly Raiche: Thank you.

Steve Metalitz: Great. All right then if there's nothing else on Section 5 the rest of this is - I think is...

Margie Milam: Oh Steve it's me.

Steve Metalitz: I'm sorry.

Margie Milam: I have just a comment. Yeah, on Section 5 - on the proposed process what I did is I basically just fixed, you know, you're a straw man.

Steve Metalitz: Right.

Margie Milam: So really number one doesn't make sense. Prioritized list of topics to go to the GNSO Council, because this report is the document.

Steve Metalitz: That's true. That's true.

Margie Milam: Yes.

Steve Metalitz: Maybe we could say this report. Just put in parens this report. So just - again, just kind of putting it into context.

Margie Milam: Right. Right. So - so yeah, I didn't do any edits but yeah, I think number one needs to be clarified.

Steve Metalitz: All right. Well I'm sure there will be other edits too before we're done here. Anything else on Section 5? Yeah, I think all the rest is the annexes which is the historical material and the member, you know, the substantive proposal.

I guess my only comment on the substantive proposals - I think we really had four groups - IPC, the staff, the law enforcement people and then we had a lot of proposals from (Danny Young). So let's just make sure that all four of those groups are in there. And I think they're all in one place.

I mean each one is one document. So it shouldn't be too difficult to pull that together.

Margie Milam: I think (Danny)'s came in through the form of emails if I'm not mistaken, right? Or did he have a specific document?

Steve Metalitz: I'm trying to remember now. I know last time he had a whole series of emails but I'm trying to remember if this time he actually had one document. But...

Margie Milam: I'll go back to the list and see if he - if he has a separate document I'll include it like the others. He would - in any event his name and his comments would be in the broader matrix as we attach it as one of the exhibits.

Steve Metalitz: That's right. That's right.

Margie Milam: Yep.

Steve Metalitz: Okay. All right. Anything else on the annexes? Obviously we will discuss Annex F, you know, on our next call. And the others are just kind of plugging in historical documents. All right, well thanks everybody for walking through this.

And when I - I'll send out a note right after this meeting and that just encourages everybody to circulate their edits on the list. And I guess I'll

encourage people to do that a few days - with a deadline of a few days before our meeting so that the staff will have the chance to integrate these things.

And then - and also in that I will make the pitch that our first order of business will be talking about Section 5 and Annex F...

Margie Milam: Right.

Steve Metalitz: ...and urging the registrars to attend. Okay, our next - unless there's anything else on the report let's turn to our next issue which is the Brussels planning. And I think when we - in our last meeting we talked about Cheryl sending out something to the SO/AC list or maybe that's the AC/SO list.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you.

Steve Metalitz: But whatever - whichever. And I know that was done because I saw one response to it. But Cheryl maybe you could fill us in on any developments there.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you Steve. I'd be delighted. And just to let everyone know, there's - our particular proposal which was a short request that Steve passed on in draft form to me to pass onto the AC/SO list.

I went in at the same time as a whole gamut of agenda items and timing for agenda items is being discussed.

So Steve was copied on a single part reply which probably was a little bit unclear to him, but I felt it was important that the feedback superficially from advice to the GNSO to find we're saying that when they are - if the RAA work form - work reform goes on that we need to be very inclusive in insuring industry is involved.

And it also appears to me that there was some confusion regarding the exact intention of our (unintelligible) as opposed to a discussion of whether or not there should be observers in contract negotiations.

So leading the second part aside because I think I fixed that - just to let you all know that I am very confident looking at the current state of play in the AC/SO list that we will have at a minimum, a 60 minute session on Monday afternoon.

We are trying to get a little more time but at this stage I would suggest that staff and the work group start looking towards a planning for (unintelligible) for at least a 60 minute session on Monday afternoon.

Steve Metalitz: That's good news.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It is indeed.

Steve Metalitz: (Christina) you had a comment.

(Christina): Just to note that - following on I believe what Cheryl had sent around (unintelligible) Chair of the GNSO Council had posted a message to the council with - saying that the idea of such a session had been proposed and did anyone have an objection.

And to the best of my knowledge - well no one who responded to the council was subjected. I don't know if there may have been any private emails sent but everything on the list was supportive.

Steve Metalitz: Okay, great. Well I - 60 minutes is great.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I just want to discuss one...

Steve Metalitz: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...just one other thing Steve. I think it's really important that we get onto that planning now because I'm hearing and I think it was (Christina) informed us in another workgroup today some form of interaction. I can't remember (Christina). It's a bit of a blur to me today.

That law enforcement is not planning - no, sorry it was one of the (GAC) people. Law enforcement is not planning on being in Brussels (part) Tuesday. So it's essential that we get their involvement sooner rather than later.

Steve Metalitz: Right. Absolutely. Well that's why Monday is great. That's really great news in a number of ways. And 60 minutes is great. And if we can get a little more that would probably be better. But obviously there's a lot of crowding in for attention there.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I shall keep working on that. But you should know it's actually the Chair of the GNSO who tries to champion with a little bit more time. So it's not the push isn't even coming from what we have a vested interest with ALAC or Steve in the GNSO.

Steve Metalitz: Great. (Christina) did you have another comment or I don't know if that was your hand from before.

(Christina): Sorry. I'll lower my hand.

Steve Metalitz: It's okay. Okay, so great. We have - we think - it looks like we will have 60 minutes at least. And again I'm assuming if - I'm not hearing anything from the staff who - I don't know if you have any insights onto this process about the calendar either.

But let's assume unless we hear otherwise, that we are planning for at least a 60 minute program. And I agree we should get going on the planning here. I

guess, you know, the conventional way to do this would simply be to have a brief presentation from the sub team.

Obviously we've pretty much committed to having somebody from law enforcement. We've pretty much committed to having someone from the registrars, of course the registrars are a part of the sub team.

But I think the understanding was that they would have a slot - have a space to express their views about the law enforcement proposals.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Steve, Cheryl here.

Steve Metalitz: Yes. Go ahead.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: If you like because our - locked up with a bunch of (GAC) (people in the AT review teams for the next couple of days, I can see what contribution (GAC) would be interested in making.

And I'll be able to talk with staff in their time zone in the next 24 to 48 hours on that matter.

Steve Metalitz: Okay. I think that would be a good idea. So that in itself - oh, and then the other question is, is there any other - I mean Sub Team B has - we could have - we could have one person from GNSO, one person from ALAC as part of that since it's a joint group.

Then we have the (GAC) covered. Is there someone from CCNSO or from one of the other advisory committees that we need to have on the panel? And again, I'm saying need to have because again if you have - we now have at least four or five people and...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah. Steve, Cheryl here. We'll be pressured on time otherwise.

But I think for example, with Michele having a CC interest as well as the GTLD interest, if we have someone of that caliber and I know he would be chafing at the bit to be involved because he was a champion of this concept in the first place.

We're probably covering off on the CC input and I have spoken to both (Chuck) and (Chris) to insure that we did get the necessary support for this in the AC/SO list. And (Chris) would be quite comfortable with that (effect) as well.

Steve Metalitz: Great. So should we have a GNSO persona and an ALAC person from the sub team? Are people comfortable with that? That would mean one, two, three, four, five, assuming (Pat) does want to have a person on the panel. I'm not - I don't know if that's a given but let's assume that.

And I think that would be about it - all we could. Certainly if it's a 60 minute program that has to be the maximum.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Steve Metalitz: And if it's 90...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, that...

Steve Metalitz: ...it's probably still a good idea to keep it to that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah. That's topped out I think. And I think that's a good plan or the beginnings of a plan for us to start working with.

Steve Metalitz: Okay. (Christina) did you - or did you have your - I'm sorry.



(Christina): I did.

Steve Metalitz: Go ahead.

(Christina): And I apologize because I'm not almost into my fifth hour of ICANN phone calls in this business day. So I'm a little...

Steve Metalitz: It's getting better and better as it goes on.

(Christina): It is. It's getting so much more fun. I'm just - everything is starting to blur together to be quite honest with you. And here's my - here's what I'm forgetting. And that is what exactly have we decided is the purpose of this session?

Is it an update on the work in terms of here's where we, you know, when we last checked in on the RAA here's what was going on and here's what's happened since and these are the discussions, the proposals that have come out?

Or are we interested in doing some of that and then getting input from the community members that are present or participating remotely? And the reason I'm trying to kind of figure out to what extent it's really, you know, whoever is talking is talking at the attendees versus interacting with.

Is I think it really goes to how you divide up the time and how many panelists you have and, you know, do you end up giving people three minutes to talk and then just going from there? And I've just frankly forgotten. Sorry.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. Steve can I help you there seeing as you've actually went on the call just for a few minutes while this was (unintelligible) the discussion point so you've sort of inherited this (method)?

Steve Metalitz: Yes, go ahead.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you Steve. Cheryl here for the record. (Christina) if I can just draw your memory back it was when we were looking at ascertaining that what the (GAC) communiqué was talking about or in fact the identical step of presentations that we had not only seen but that we had been gone on to negotiate to the details with - in the time we spent with (Bobby Fray).

Industry was particularly concerned with ongoing local press and energy being put into pushing matters that in fact we had already discussed with law enforcement needed to go back to their table and to be reviewed, modified or otherwise come back to us and we'll discuss about it further.

So a part of the purpose of this exercise is to insure that all stakeholders and interest groups were at the same level of understanding of what we have done as a work group on this matter, and why we are hand in glove not going to be taking all of our (clues) that we if you just read the original law enforcement proposals.

You know, they're not just going to go yes, sir. Thank you very much. We'll do all of that. There are some significant logistical issues that we've discovered when we were talking about being (unintelligible) that has not been promulgated through the rest of law enforcement effectively.

And if it is there's a (GAC) or some of the local (unintelligible) have not been picking that up. And Michele and co. was very concerned that we've got that clear. You know, they're a public forum. That said, we should also be having it more interactive and making the opportunity to get public input during that.

And if we've got our report out then I would have the - tending to use our report as a reference point because I certainly try (unintelligible) leading out to me in PowerPoint presentations what I could (read) as a document.

(Christina): I'm with you 100% on that last point actually about - so I just want to make sure that I was clear on that.

Steve Metalitz: Yeah. This is Steve. Let me recognize myself. I'd agree with what Cheryl said but I think because we will have our report out part of the reason we're doing this is to start getting public input on...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Steve Metalitz: ...the initial report. And I guess I would ask the staff - I guess does the initial report actually go out for formal public comment or only - I guess only after the council acts on it which won't have happened but probably won't have happened by the time of the Brussels meeting.

So I'm a little fuzzy on that. But in any case I know we do want to hear what the public has to say about it.

Margie Milam: Steve it's Margie. If I could respond.

Steve Metalitz: Yes.

Margie Milam: Yeah. I was thinking the same line as long as you - that we would send this report to the GNSO Council. The GNSO Council would review it and then post it for public comment. At least that was my thought in preparing this report.

We could also, you know, pose this to public comment, you know, before - right before Brussels when we publish it. That's the other alternative. But I just figured it would be, you know, it would take place later.

Steve Metalitz: Yeah. It would make sense to have something out there so that we can - as Cheryl said, we don't have to walk through everything in the report. We could

say here are some of the key conclusions of the report, key recommendations of the report but the whole thing is available.

And give people the link and so forth and encourage them. But obviously there will be people specifically at the meeting and participating remotely.

And we want to I think leave plenty of time for them to comment and/or ask questions. Both on the report and on this back and forth if there is one, between law enforcement and the registrars.

So I think if we can hold it to the five presenters and try to hold each of them to five minutes then, you know, we've got time - a minimal amount of time even if it's a 60 minute session. And I think, you know, best or better if we could get a little more time.

But that's - that may not be on our - to us and start on time. I totally agree with (Christina) on that point. Of course we don't know exactly what time this would be but we're just saying Monday afternoon. That's pretty - that's fairly specific already so that's good.

Well I'd be glad to reach out to the law enforcement people. I mean they know that this - I've already kept them advised that this is happening, and I could ask them to try to designate who it is that they want to have presenting. And then maybe we can - well I don't know either on the next call or the one after - at some point we should get that - that group together.

The registrars - I mean I think it'd be great if Michele is available and interested to do it. I wouldn't want to make that decision for the registrar group but I'm sure they can let us know. Cheryl you were going to ask - you were going to raise this with (GAC) members...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Correct.

Steve Metalitz: ...to see if they want to have somebody and if so, to figure out who that will be. And in terms of our group I'd be glad as to - as the convener to take the GNSO slot unless someone else would like to do it.

And I would ask the ALAC people to decide who should take the ALAC slot on this, again for the five minutes of fame that we're each going to have in Brussels. So...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So it's one possibility is because I'll be on the ground in Brussels and at the time I'm going to be discussing this with Steve I said I'd be very happy to tie a facilitator role so we can have ALAC recognized and actually clear up a few more minutes that...

Steve Metalitz: There you go.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...we can make the presentation from.

Steve Metalitz: That maybe a good way to handle it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yep.

Steve Metalitz: Okay. And any other comments on this or other steps we can take now to advance the planning of this session? Do you think it's feasible for us to ask (GAC) and law enforcement and registrars to see if they can designate a person in the next week and then those people could sit in our next call?

Or should we put it off until the following call? The 10th is our next call. And then the 17th and that's just, you know, well that's even still pretty far ahead. So I guess we don't need to be quite that...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No.

Steve Metalitz: We've got plenty to do to finalize our reports. So let's just - at this point let's just ask those groups to designate somebody and then we'll figure out when we can get those folks together.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yep. Yep.

Steve Metalitz: Okay. Anything else on Brussels planning that we need to discuss? If not, then let's just briefly review for our next call we will lead off with the Section 5 Annex F issues and we'll make sure that the registrars are - have somebody to address those.

And then we will hopefully if we've gotten other comments we can - we will have another draft of the initial report to look at. And if we're on track maybe we can come close to finalizing that on that call.

And then in terms of the Brussels planning element we can have reports back on whether we've identified our other speakers there and at least know where that stands. And of course, if there are any other changes I know how the - how fluid the agenda planning can be sometimes.

So we'll just be ready to roll with it. But again I'm very pleased to hear that we're - we seem to be on track for Monday afternoon because that's definitely the time that this should happen prior to the GNSO Council meeting and with the full participation of law enforcement and so forth. So I'm pleased about that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So, so far so good and I'm hearing nothing that (unintelligible) from (GAC) that would be influencing the Chair and Vice Chair. So it's a time when Canada came in today to insure that we knew when law enforcement is going to be there I think that's very positive.

Steve Metalitz: Yes. Good. Okay. Is there any other - are there any other items that people wanted to raise for today? If not, thanks everyone. I encourage everyone to

circulate their comments on the list and we'll get a new version out before our next call.

Our next call will be next Monday at the same time. And...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Steve?

Steve Metalitz: Yes?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Just from me, I'm - Gisella will know and she'll let me know because she manages my life very effectively. I have no idea where I will be at this time next week. I think I'm still in the air. So I may be an apology but I'll get that paragraph to you in between time.

As (unintelligible) I make it tomorrow that it's on my to-do list.

Steve Metalitz: Great. Okay. In that case, thanks everybody for your time and participation today. And we'll be talking next week.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you.

Holly Raiche: Thanks Steve.

Steve Metalitz: Bye-bye.

Woman: Bye.

Woman: Bye everybody.

Man: Bye-bye.

Woman: Thank you. Cheryl, have a great flight.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you (Kelly).

Coordinator: You're welcome.

Gisella Gruber-White: Enjoy the rest of your day.

Coordinator: Thank you. You too.

Gisella Gruber-White: See you soon. Bye.

Coordinator: Goodbye.

END