Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA) DT
Sub Team B
TRANSCRIPTION
Monday 26 April 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 26 April 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-20100426.mp3
On page:
http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#apr

Present for the teleconference:
Steve Metalitz - IPC – Chair
Kristina Rosette – IPC
Tatyana Khramtsova – Registrar Stakeholder Group
Statton Hammock - Registrar Stakeholder Group
Cheryl Langdon-Orr - ALAC chair
Shiva Muthusamy – At-Large
Philip Corwin – CBUC
Tim Ruiz **-** Registrar Stakeholder Group
Holly Raiche – At-Large

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

Absent apologies:
Michele Neylon – Registrar Stakeholder Group

Coordinator: I'd like to remind all participants today's 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 and good evening to

                    everyone. Today is our RAA Self Team B call on this Monday, the 26th of

April, we have Steve Metalitz, Holly Raiche, Cheryl Landgon-Orr, Tatiana Khramtsova, Tim Ruiz, Shiva Muthusamy, Statton Hammock.

From staff we have Margie Milam, David Giza, myself Gisella Gruber-White. We have apologies from Michele Neylon and if I could also please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you. Over to you Steve

Steve Metalitz: Thank you very much and thanks to all for participating. I don't think we have a formal agenda circulated but I had circulated two documents for discussion today.

One is a revised document on high priority topics as part of our Task 1 to - or to compile the topics for RAA amendments, possible RAA amendments. And then the task we set ourselves to try to express the priority. So that's one item.

I also circulated a revised timetable for our activities aimed at getting us across the finish line of the work of this drafting team in this space before the Brussels meeting and in fact if possible, to get the material up to the council at their meeting before Brussels, June 10 I think.

So those are the two items that I had circulated. And if we have additional time I'm sure we could also turn to discussion of Task 3 next steps. So let me ask if there are any other items that people wanted to bring up today. Okay. If not, then we'll go ahead, we'll take that as approval of the agenda.

And if we could turn first to this document that I think is up on the Adobe screen. It's the one that I circulated Friday. Actually the version I'm looking at has Friday's date on it and I see the one that I sent around actually has an earlier date on it but the text is exactly the same.

So I can only attribute this to my ineptitude at some point along the way. But in fact I think I finished it and then forgot to change the date. So anyway it's the same document. So - and I hope people have had a chance to look at it. Let me just briefly say what I was trying to do here.

I was really trying to boil down, you know, we had too many high priority topics. I think everybody agrees that we had 30 or 40 high priorities. It wasn't very meaningful. I tried to boil this down into really 12 subjects.

That's an arbitrary number but it seemed as though that might be a manageable number. And so I've put in the third column there which items in the matrix this - these refer to. And of course I left out the items that were really compliance topics.

You know, maybe there are some on here that are compliance topics too. But the ones that I think we had identified as compliance topic because those might not be - those are areas where the staff says they already have the tools to do what was being suggested.

So if that's the case then there wouldn't be a need for an RAA amendment on it. And I also left out - there were several including a lot from the law enforcement list that we're really going to due diligence about entities that were applying for accreditation.

So those are all very - I mean I'm not saying those - those are very legitimate issues but if they were adopted they would come in at the due diligence phase and someone would have to meet those tests in order to become accredited.

And so that's prior to the point at which the person signed the registrar accreditation agreement or the entity signs it. So I kept those out too as not really within our scope. So that left us to - that leaves these 12 and these basically follow the order with a few little exceptions.

But basically they follow the order of our matrix. So they're not in priority order, you know, I'm not saying Number 1 is the top priority and Number 12 is marginally high priority. It could be the other way around.

But I don't think we're really required to be that granular and tell the council, you know, here's our list in priority order.

I think if we give them a list of a manageable number of topics and say of all the topics we considered we think these are the ones that are most worthy of short term consideration for inclusion in the RAA. And again, we're not proposing language or any specific provision but just a topic.

That's really what this list attempts to do. So let me ask if anyone would like to - has any questions about the list or - and/or any comments or reactions to the list. And feel free to just speak up if you want to get in the queue.

Okay. I see Holly's hand is up. Anybody else want to be recognized? Holly go ahead.

Holly Raiche: Yes, first of all thank you for doing this. This is just so much easier and less to deal with. Just a question - and I'm missing - now it is early - and I did read these through - there was something - there was some - one of the particular requirements from the law enforcement end, you know, it was said in many ways.

It could probably be boiled down to simply making sure that the - that there is plenty of information about the registrant that is collected. Am I missing it?

Steve Metalitz: Yeah. Some of those - yeah, they had a number of proposals to expand the - I think this was in Item 6.4.

Holly Raiche: It was something.

Steve Metalitz: I think it was in Item 6.4.

Holly Raiche: Yeah.

Steve Metalitz: There is a long list. And I see in the right hand column that's listed as low priority. So...

Holly Raiche: Oh okay.

Steve Metalitz: ...while I don't recall exactly the discussion there I think we - we reached the conclusion that it was not the highest priority to change the data elements that were being collected.

Holly Raiche: Okay.

Steve Metalitz: But there are provisions obviously...

Holly Raiche: Sure, yeah.

Steve Metalitz: ...about escrow and everything else.

(Cheryl):   Yeah. (Cheryl) here. I also think that because we hadn't gone over those because we were really going through it as a prioritization not a (unintelligible) and stick it out exercise we hadn't really gone through those to the extent of saying are these RAA issues or are they issues that fit elsewhere.

Steve Metalitz: Right. Yeah, I don't...

((Crosstalk))

(Cheryl):   It would really be (unintelligible) in an RAA I would have thought.

Steve Metalitz: Well the current RAA does...

(Cheryl):   There was the level of, you know, if you use these tools the (collection) of this data is not that difficult to (our) discussions. But that's a long way off. It needs to be an RAA issue.

Steve Metalitz: Well yeah. The current RAA does list in some detail what elements need to be collected. But you're right, I don't think we really had much detailed discussion. And again, I was just basically drawing this from the matrix. Other questions or comments?

Okay. I'm turning back and forth here from my phone to the screen so I apologize if I missed anybody's hand there.

But if there aren't any further comments maybe we could take this as our working draft and ask people to circulate on the list any comments or anything you think should be removed from the list, anything you think that should be added from the list.

And if not, then I think we'll just proceed with this on this basis in terms of drafting the report. And we'll figure out exactly the best way to present it. Maybe it's in a chart like this or maybe it's in prose. But let's take this as our working draft on Task 1 if you will.

And obviously we'll attach - we could attach our full matrix. You can attach lots of things to the report of...

Gisella Gruber-White: Yes.

Steve Metalitz: ...kind of trying to convey what...

(Cheryl):   Hey. It's (Cheryl) again.

Steve Metalitz: Yes (Cheryl). Go ahead.

(Cheryl):   What I was saying is we hadn't discussed the gory details on the wish list of additional information on registrants Holly (unintelligible) on the 6.4. I'm not suggesting that we shouldn't perhaps look at having it in some way associated with this list.

It's, you know, if we're looking at what might be ditched and what might be prioritized within here or, excuse me, (unintelligible) I do apologize for the noise. It's a, you know, it's the end of this conversation looking at this matrix is okay now we now build a report around it.

I don't think we've spoken quite long enough about it. Because there probably is some tweaking that we might want to do. But essentially you're hitting fine but I wouldn't ignore the issues of 6.4...

Steve Metalitz: Yeah.

(Cheryl):   ...out of it.

Steve Metalitz: Okay.

(Cheryl):   Yeah, certainly from the large point of view accuracy of information that was listed as being very useful is something many people are very interested about.

Steve Metalitz: Absolutely.

(Cheryl):   But it goes hand in glove with access to that information. Notice I avoid using certain words.

Steve Metalitz::   Okay. Okay, other - any other comments? And again, I would encourage people to - on the list if there are, you know, if there's a way we ought to bring 6.4 into this we welcome a comment on that and anything else that is missing here or should be mentioned here or something here that doesn't look like it ought to be a priority.

Now I will just say once again that in terms of our Task 2 of identifying things that ought to go on - through the policy development process rather than being part of - or rather I should say more accurately things that we flag because of they could be candidates for policy development process rather than an RAA amendment.

You know, the invitation - the - it's still open for people to raise those concerns about anything on this list. And I would encourage people to look at this list with that in mind.

And if you think there's something that shouldn't be on here for that reason then speak up either in our meeting or on the list because I think we've - I think we've - that's the approach we're taking is we're just asking people to - looking at the priorities anyone where you want to raise a flag.

And I tried to avoid including on here any that had already been flagged for that in that regard. So there weren't too many of those. But if I missed - if I have anything on here that was already flagged I'm sure someone will let me know.

(Cheryl):   Yeah. I'm - I've got my hand up.

Steve Metalitz: Okay. Go ahead.

(Cheryl):   Just one thing on Item 3 which is the malicious point of conduct. I think there's probably just a couple of details needed on this one point that when Dave Piscitello was on he said define it as a 24/7 contact for somebody who

actually knows enough so that they will be able to take down something very quickly.

Steve Metalitz: Yes.

(Cheryl):   It's just a definitional thing but malicious point of conduct really does quite different from other points of conduct. I'm sorry, contact.

Steve Metalitz: Contact. Yeah.

(Cheryl):   So a range of contact details. This is something specific.

Steve Metalitz: That's a good point. And we could certainly amend the description of Item 3 to reflect that.

(Cheryl):   Yeah.

Steve Metalitz: It's a 24/7 point of contact with the authority (unintelligible) the ability to take action. That's good. Other comments? Okay. So this will be the target for the next week. And I look forward to your comments on the list. Otherwise this will be the basis anyway for our draft.

The other item I circulated was a revised timetable and if we could turn to that now this went out Friday afternoon eastern time in the US. And I don't know if the staff can get that on the screen for the Adobe room or not.

But - okay, that's in process. So what I've done there is really just update our previous timetable to reflect what we had already done and to reflect that we would be meeting weekly starting this week for the next four weeks.

And hopefully this is our time to try to finish as much as possible of our work. So today it - we discussed the Task 1 compilation. Obviously we didn't give it

final approval. But we I think are using it as the way forward. And hopefully we can come to finality on that next week.

And then the plan had been to circulate the revised proposal on Task 3 because I thought we might have more discussion on the Task 1. And I will - I've already made the call for views about topics to be flagged under Task 2. So I'll make that again on the list for those who aren't here.

But anyway you can see what we've got down there for this week. And then next week, as you can see, we moved through the process. We would look to have a draft of the report circulated after our next call so sometime next week.

I've already been in touch with the staff about preparing the outline to make sure that, you know, all of the different items that need to be in a report of a group like this are included. And I know they're working on that. We've been working really sort of on the content of the report here.

And that obviously needs to be put into some type of prose. But I think that hopefully we can pull all that together and with a discussion next week we can circulate if we're lucky, a full draft of a report. If not, at least a draft of most of it.

And then we can - we have two meetings to discuss that, make any amendments, have people if they wanted to prepare any separate views or dissenting views or anything like that that they could do that. So - and the goal would be to submit the report if we can, by June 2.

(Unintelligibly) the deadline in order for it to be ripe for action on June 10 not that I'm assuming that there will be action on it on June 10. I think the other date we were given in order for it to be ripe for action or discussion in Brussels at the Brussels meeting of the PSO Council was June 8.

So we don't really - it's not - it doesn't make too much difference. You know, we don't get much additional time there because of the way the different notice requirements work.

So we are looking at early - we need to wrap - get our work in there in and done by early June if we are to have it on the table if you will in Brussels. So that's the timetable and I'll open the floor now to any questions or comments about that.

And I see it is up on the Adobe screen. So are there any...

Margie Milam: Margie.

Margie Milam: Yes, I have...

(Cheryl):   You have Margie waving at you Shiva.

Margie Milam: Yeah. What I wanted to say - this is Margie - that I am putting together a draft. It'll have a draft report, it'll have background and it'll include I guess a draft version of the high priorities we just discussed.

And I'll get that to you guys this week so we can start, you know, figuring out what needs to change and what, you know, minority positions or whatever, need to go in it.

Steve Metalitz: Great. And I know there's just a lot of paraphernalia that goes with this in the ICANN report so I'm sure you guys have all that covered. I'm sorry I didn't see your hand. I guess there are enough people on this call that I can't see everybody at once.

Any other comments or people that would want it to have questions - ask questions or react to this timetable? Okay. Then we'll work from the basis of

this timetable. And that would call for, you know, the further circulation on tasks three and two this week. And that will occur.

And again, any comments on the Task 1 compilation to be circulated this week. With regard to the other item, planning for Brussels, I think - I guess after I had to exit the call last week things really got very constructive and there was a very focused discussion about how...

(Cheryl): There's no correlation there Shiva that's for sure.

Steve Metalitz: Well I don't know. I don't know what to say but, you know, if it works that's great. There was some discussion about how any - I've been saying workshop and that may not be the right label.

But whatever event it's, you know, educational event or discussion forum there would be about this work in Brussels, how it would work and the breadth of views we would want. I think there was general agreement on the list.

I don't think anybody dissented. That it shouldn't just be a typical GNSO presentation - internal GNSO presentation. It should draw in from at large, the law enforcement should definitely be there as well as the registrars should have concerns about some of the law enforcement issues.

And I don't know if it was any more specific than that in terms of who the presenters would be. But I think that general framework was what everybody seemed to want. Did I get that right or do people have other comments on that? Holly if you have something for that.

Holly Raiche: Just a question. I'm reasonably comfortable with some of the compliance issues being taken off the matrix. But I think given that we actually did spend a bit of time if you're going to do a final report or if people are going to be there it would be useful to flag that we discussed it best.

It seemed to be in hand and maybe have compliance people there to talk to the fact that one of the issues raised by this group was compliant with both existing and proposed RAA amendments.

Steve Metalitz: Okay. Thank you Holly. (Cheryl) go ahead.

(Cheryl): Yeah. Thanks Shiva. As Holly was raising is (integral) to the reporting process. But I think we need to have it on the record where we were heading. And I hope what we got back from the list feedback was also based on this question.

Not the group was particularly keen to discuss/debate at some sort of show and tell exercise in Brussels. It was not as limited as a "Hi guys, here we all are. We're a drafting team and we've done this on the record."

It was in fact if anything, that the little more than reference material for (unintelligible) exercise that those that were on the call had envisaged.

It was to be looked at very deliberately as a mechanism to ensure the government advisory committee, the pillars of ICANN -- in other words, all of the (ICNSO) people -- had an opportunity to Ensure themselves that the incredibly important issues raised by law enforcement, and which we have of course indirectly modified and have taken to various levels, are all on the same understanding and established playing field.

In other words, we would have a forum where we could ensure that all parts of those with interest, all stakeholders -- and very particularly the diversity of law enforcement view which we discussed -- was not all in (step) with where we were with the primary representative of law enforcement will be done in Brussels.

And Michele - and I really speak on behalf of Michele, because it's quite a job to try and do so with one of those who's quite concerned that we're the voice of some path but the less important parts likely and regionally of law enforcement laws.

It's taking us backwards not forwards. And so I think it's pretty important of what we were designing was slightly different than a traditional workshop - GNSO workshop.

And certainly a long way away from here we all are, look at our report and this is what we've done and (GE) should talk to us about this.

It was far more at the level of a debate/hypothetical discussion to ensure everyone in the room and looking remotely and looking at the archives obviously, could ensure themselves that our subgroup had interacted with established clearly what needs and limitations are with the desires of the big guns holding stakeholders i.e., law enforcement and those who seem to be jumping to the (creaks) of their springs, government advisory people.

We're all having a clear understanding. To that end we were looking at - assuming that the list agreed, that we would be asking for a prime spot at the very beginning of the week.

So not so much the Wednesday, Thursday workshop slot but a Monday afternoon with the blessing of the ACSO chair's top slot for this activity.

Steve Metalitz: Thank you. That's a very helpful summary. And I guess just on the scheduling question I don't know if the staff has any insights at this point. I agree with you completely that it just really shouldn't be a Wednesday, Thursday type event.

But let me ask the staff if they have any information on the schedule and how do we go about making our pitch to have a Monday slot for this as (Cheryl) said perhaps where the ACSO or is that SOAC, normally has its...

(Cheryl):   No. We won't do it alphabetically. It is ACSO. The limitations of whoever put the list together is no longer with our (unintelligible) staff. It's the fault of it being the SOAC list.

Steve Metalitz: Okay. Do the staff have any information on that?

Margie Milam: Sure. It's Margie. I did share that that we were looking to take that position, you know, the SOAC meeting on Monday to talk about this.

I just raised it internally and it looked like it - it got - I mean it got the (unintelligible) they saw that that would be a good, useful topic to have on Monday. So it's certainly on our radar. I don't really know what the process is to get that...

(Cheryl):   Well if you want to know a next step Margie it needs to come to the ACSO list. Now assuming that this group and we're all satisfied that's sufficient of the group has responded and it certainly was in the list on (unintelligible) I was going, not virtually but certainly metaphorically.

No. Actually I felt like I was dying last week. That there was nothing but support for that (unintelligible) option that we need to take it formally to the ACSO list. And if that's the case then I'm happy to do that. Shiva if you want to pin something formally I can slide it straight across to the list.

But it would have to be on fairly soon which is why I specifically asked for the email list to give us feedback on that concept.

Steve Metalitz: Okay, well what do people think about that? Should I - should we draft something that would go - that (Cheryl) would get to the ACSO list and that

would certainly be one step towards doing this, toward having the type of session that we are talking about.

(Cheryl): I'm very confident that we'd get (Jack)'s support on that of course.

Steve Metalitz: Yeah. Yeah.

(Cheryl): And I'm with (Jonathan) and a whole bunch of other people next week in India and then later in San Francisco so we should be able to sort of sort some of this out in real reasonable timing as well at least not the (unintelligible) specific lobbying to get the support we need.

Steve Metalitz: Okay. Well I'd certainly be glad to start that process in motion. Holly did you have a comment?

(Cheryl): I would just like it to become - I'd just like it to come formally from the drafting - from the sub (unintelligible). And I'm talking with (Chuck) in a couple of hours.

So Shiva if you want to just, you know, give a very quick blessing talk set of words and throw them at me I can get it through the ACSO and GNSO chairman, you know, in a couple of hours later today and make sure we integrate (unintelligible), etc. through next week.

And through next week we'll go through the formal jumping through hoops with the ACSO listing to see that we get it some sort of prioritized.

Steve Metalitz: Okay. I'm glad to give it a try. And I'm sure you'll let me know if I'm...

(Cheryl): We can but try. We can but try.

Steve Metalitz: Holly did you have a comment?

Holly Raiche: Yeah, I did just to say I agree with (Cheryl). I think that this is not just an ordinary agenda item.

I think that because we've all spent the amount of time which was actually represented various groups coming together with some very serious proposals that it would be nice to have it really right up front with a certain amount of, you know, gravitas and support.

Just because it's been so many of us spending a lot of time coming up with some very sensible proposals.

Steve Metalitz: Okay. Other comments? You know, it strikes me that - I'm hearing what people are saying and I think this is going to take a bit of planning to make this come off right in terms of figuring out who should be the presenters and who should be on the panel and so forth.

And, you know, we could start talking about that now in terms...

(Cheryl):   I think if you put together a very small organizing committee obviously (unintelligible) would be the staff organizers of each (unintelligible) self evident when you look at who's on these calls. And, you know, they work directly with region planning.

And we should be able to identify, you know, the groups that (unintelligible) we are meeting weekly after all. We should be able to identify the key stakeholders. The trick is doing it fast enough now...

Steve Metalitz: Yeah.

(Cheryl):   ...that we can approach the stakeholders, the key stakeholders to...

Steve Metalitz: Right.

(Cheryl): ...keep challenged and be on the panel. But right so their experiences with even remote presentations, you know, if they can't be on a plane and getting into Brussels they should be (unintelligible) and presenting from wherever they are.

Steve Metalitz: Right. Right. Okay. That's a good suggestion. Would - do we have any volunteers to serve on the organize - the small organizing committee to develop the agenda and personnel if you will, for this session? We don't know exactly how long it will be but I'm sure...

(Cheryl): Well it - everyone...

Steve Metalitz: ...(unintelligible).

(Cheryl): ...who's got yellow next to their name in the Adobe room.

Steve Metalitz: Wait a minute.

(Cheryl): And I would think...

Woman: That was...

(Cheryl): ...that if it comes in with the full support I hope it does get from signatures of VICs and the (unintelligible) that they will probably put forward a name or two themselves. So, you know, at least...

((Crosstalk))

(Cheryl): ...the logistical issues and it will (unintelligible) try to put our thinking hats on one.

Steve Metalitz: Holly has her hand up. Holly, go ahead.

Holly Raiche: Just a question. What about having someone from I suppose the (ALAC) on the team just - I know that (Cheryl) will be there so I can put my hand up.

(Cheryl):   The concept of us doing something which is basically (entrenched) that the (ALAC) will be involved with it at the sub team level not having some form of voice on the panel or whatever it is, you know, a full hypothetical or just a panel discussion.

     I cannot imagine them doing anything about this without us. But I would have thought that was pretty much a given Holly. But, you know?

Holly Raiche: Some things look given aren't necessarily given.

((Crosstalk))

(Cheryl):   Yeah, right. Whatever.

Steve Metalitz: Yeah. Well...

Holly Raiche: I'm assuming (ALAC) will be there.

Steve Metalitz: Yes. I'm assuming so too. But I think our question now is who should be on the organizing committee to...

(Cheryl):   Right.

Steve Metalitz: ...make this happen and ensure that (ALAC) is there along with everybody else that needs to be there. So...

(Cheryl):   Well if you look at - if you look you've got - if you've got Holly and Margie and Marika and yourself you'll be - you're that makes it an even five with all of us, right? And we're not going to shut up about it are we, let's face it Shiva.

Can you imagine us not, you know, interacting and, you know, trying to...

Steve Metalitz: Right.

(Cheryl): ...make one lovely suggestion? You know, I've hired this director at large. Well if she can't interact with the (ALAC) then boy have we got problems. And, you know, you've got plenty of (feeding) to the GNSO spectrum of interest with Margie and Marika.

And of course the other thing is if it's going to be something that is going to be, you know, encouraging the voices of concern that we heard from (GAC) and from law enforcement then, you know, you've got them there and you've already got seven people on the title.

The problem will be making it, you know, limiting it to...

Steve Metalitz: I agree. Yes.

(Cheryl): ...(unintelligible).

Steve Metalitz: You may be - that maybe the challenge.

(Cheryl): (Unintelligible) the voices that want to be heard.

Steve Metalitz: That maybe the challenge is to keep it to a manageable number. Well is there anybody else from the - on - from the sub team that would like to participate on the organizing committee for the as yet untitled event to take place in Brussels we hope on Monday?

Is there any other volunteers - are there any volunteers? Okay. I don't hear any volunteers. This will not be a final group. Holly has raised her hand though. Holly are you volunteering?

Holly Raiche: Well I'm asking what's involved. That's all I'm saying. Because I just - I'm beginning to think what you're talking about is a bit of an administrative task that (unintelligible) are already good at.

That I would, you know, I'm happy to be a contact point but I think you're the ones who really have I suppose the knowledge and the insight running to set up something that you can report back to this group.

I'm just - I don't see it as something that we necessarily have to be involved in, in terms of organizing so much as contributing to what should be on the agenda and so forth. So I'm a little puzzled as to...

Steve Metalitz: Well I see this...

Holly Raiche: ...(unintelligible) to do.

Steve Metalitz::   ...organizing committee - I would think this organizing committee would also draw up the agenda or a proposed...

Holly Raiche: Okay.

Steve Metalitz: ...agenda for the event.

Holly Raiche: Okay.

Steve Metalitz: as well as proposed speakers or panelists.

(Cheryl):   Shiva, we're not talking show and tell here. We're not saying, you know, here you are guys - sorry (Christina), I jumped in. My apologies. You know, you know, the (unintelligible) we want you to talk about these three items. Here are the government people - we only want you to limit yourself to that.

You know, we wanted a full (unintelligible) discussion. And, you know, sort of a clear the decks exercise. And that doesn't get micromanaged. That needs to be facilitated. Sorry (Christina). I'll jump back now.

Steve Metalitz: (Christina), go ahead.

(Christina): Well first off, apologies for being so very late. I had a lot of other calls that ran long. In any event, I am happy to kind of do what I can. I think given how overextended I am with things in ICANN land right now discreet projects would probably be better for me. But I'm happy to pitch in wherever I can.

Steve Metalitz: Thank you.

(Cheryl): Yeah. Shiva I think you've got the commitment of the regulars on this group call anyway.

Steve Metalitz:: Okay.

(Cheryl): And, you know, to be honest I spend on average no less than three hours six days a week in real tiny direction with (Heidi). And she sure as hell can let us know what the plans are, you know, in sort of the wider outreach from our part of the community.

You know, Margie, Marika, you know, I'm sure you've got the same sort of interaction level with GNSO and all the constituency parts there. And if the, you know, I think it's more of a just making sure nothing gets dropped type job as opposed to a terribly detailed creative task.

So, you know, if everything sort of - we're meeting weekly. If, you know, where we are and what we're doing gets reported back, you know...

Steve Metalitz: Yeah.

(Cheryl): ...and discussed in five or four minutes in each of our meetings then I think the whole of this group will be involved at that level.

Steve Metalitz: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

(Cheryl): At the culling down does who would like to speak to try and pick, you know, the best presenters because it's got to be dynamic and it's got to be interactive and it's got to take us all away.

Steve Metalitz: Okay. Holly did you have a comment also?

Holly Raiche: Yeah. Again, just to say I think leading up to our final meeting just a report every week where we're up to with scheduling and so forth so that all of us have a chance to say well this is the way we think.

Steve Metalitz: Right.

Holly Raiche: This is the sort of structure and again it's - I think it's - (Cheryl)'s absolutely right. To (unintelligible) free flowing discussion that encourages everybody to have a lot of discussion. And it's just going to be who's there on the day and who are the best people to participate I think.

Yeah, I just expect every week to be talking about progress on this.

Steve Metalitz: Okay. So we can make this an agenda item for all of our following meetings and...

Holly Raiche: Yes.

Steve Metalitz: ...progress reports on, you know, both when and where it is, the logistics, the agenda, the speakers and so forth.

Holly Raiche: Yes, please.

Steve Metalitz: Okay. All right. Are people comfortable with that approach and is that - does
                   that make sense from the staff's perspective? Because I see you've been - I
                   hear you've been volunteered for some things. So any - does that make
                   sense from your perspective? Okay, good.

(Cheryl):   If they're not used to that by now...

Steve Metalitz: Well, right. Right. I was just giving them a chance to express themselves on
                   it. Okay.

(Cheryl):   Oh Shiva you are so much more fair than I am.

Steve Metalitz: Okay. All right. So we - all right, that - unless there's anything else that people
                   want to raise about Brussels we'll move - that will be on our agenda for the
                   next meeting obviously. I will say on Task 3 I haven't circulated anything.

                   I think, you know, we saw the original proposals, one from me and one from
                   Tim and then we had some discussion on (Tim') proposal. And I think we're in
                   a position to circulate a version that might advance things.

                   I did just today circulate a notice I got from ICANN staff about a working
                   group, I think they're calling it, that is being formed to - or maybe formed to
                   draft contract provisions for the registries, the new registries on, you know, be
                   on the new GTLD process.

                   And I think that's a relevant precedent for us. I know we've had this
                   discussion. It's not an exact precedent because some of the - we already
                   have a lot of accredited registrars and the issue is what will change in the
                   agreement.

But we also I suppose, have a lot of potential accredited registrars. And they're not going to be at the table so I think it's a useful marker that ICANN is thinking about taking this approach to at least some aspects of the registry agreement that they would propose to sign with the new GTLD registries.

So that suggests to me that maybe there is a role for nonparties to the contract to be directly involved in drafting provisions of the contract. So I just put that out for what it's worth. And as I said, we will circulate something on Task 3 this week.

Okay, are there any other comments on Task 3 or on any other business that we need to undertake on this call?

(Cheryl): Tim's got his hand up.

Steve Metalitz: Okay. I think - and let me remind everyone that our next call will be the same time next week on Monday. And by that time you will be seeing some additional documents on Task 3 and others. So I'll just make - once again ask you to respond on the list to the proposed compilation on Task 1.

Flag any issues you think need to be flagged under Task 2. And participate...

Tim Ruiz: Shiva this is - this is Tim. I had my hand up. I just...

Steve Metalitz: I'm sorry Tim. Go ahead.

Tim Ruiz: Okay, sorry. Yeah, I just wanted to comment very quickly on Task 3 that yeah, I saw your note about the registry. I don't really know what the registry agreement allows or doesn't allow or how that plays into this whole process, the fact that a new registry agreement is begin created for, you know, these registries.

And you might have a situation where some registries are operating under one agreement, other registries are operating under a different agreement. I don't think that's the goal with the RAA. I think the goal is that everyone would adopt or eventually would be required to adopt a new RAA.

So I think that's the fundamental difference. And there's a fundamental issue right now in regards to the interpretation of the RAA and how it can be amended. I think the staff has presented one idea. Registrars have another and we're trying to work to resolve that.

But until that's resolved as far as registrars are concerned it's a little hard to move forward at least from our perspective. So I just wanted to make sure that was understood.

Steve Metalitz: Okay. Thank you Tim. And is that - you said as to how the RAA could be amended - because basically what I heard you describe is sort of how the registry agreement could be amended.

That's the issue that they're convening this working group on would be how could the registry agreement be amended or, you know, unilaterally...

Tim Ruiz: Yeah, right. You know, and I don't know what the conditions are. I wouldn't pretend to comment on that. I'm just saying that I do know that ultimately what we may end up with is we'll have new registries under a new agreement, old registries under another agreement.

Steve Metalitz: Yes.

Tim Ruiz: With the RAA I don't believe that's the working group's goal that the goal would be that eventually the registrars would all be required to go under the new agreement.

Steve Metalitz: Yeah.

Tim Ruiz: Now I don't know if that's going to be true with the registry process so even with the precedent I'm not sure that would work. But my other...

Steve Metalitz: Okay.

Tim Ruiz: My bigger concern about it is just this difference of opinion about how the RAA can be amended, will have an effect on - there's been a - I don't know which interpretation is correct will have an effect on how that process would move forward in any regard.

Steve Metalitz: Okay. And I'm just asking - I'm not sure I know what you're talking about there in terms of the difference of opinion about how the RAA can be amended. Is that a difference of opinion between some registrars and the staff?

Is that over this question of whether it can only come in - the new version can only come into effect if the old one expires unless the registrar agrees?

Tim Ruiz: No. It's over the staff's comments that we - I responded to that the negotiation with registrars isn't required. And that was the comment that they made the week before last I believe.

Steve Metalitz: In that memo or...

Tim Ruiz: Right. Right.

Steve Metalitz: Okay. Okay. Well okay. You know...

((Crosstalk))

(Cheryl):   ...an issue though in the chat that is a question that (unintelligible) that would be good to have the answer to that on the record.

Steve Metalitz: Pardon me? Could you repeat that (Cheryl)?

(Cheryl):   (Christina) writes a question in chat to Tim on this topic and it would be interesting to have the answer to that on the record.

Steve Metalitz: Okay. So it says Tim is what you've stated the position of the registrar stakeholder group or Go Daddy? So that was (Christina)'s question.

Tim Ruiz: I wasn't stating any position. I'm just saying that the, you know, there's this issue out there. I can say for Go Daddy it's difficult for us to participate or to move forward until we have a resolution to that question.

                    I do believe it will be an issue for other registrars. I'm not saying it's a stakeholder group position as of yet or that it will be. But I find it hard to believe other registrars wouldn't have a problem with that.

Steve Metalitz: Okay. Well this group - our goal in this group is to try to recommend next steps. Now there maybe not everybody will be prepared to join in that recommendation or we may not agree on what the next steps should be and we just provide the different - several different inconsistent options.

                    I mean that's possible. Let's see...

Tim Ruiz: Right. Right.

Steve Metalitz: ...if we can move it forward and try to come to an agreement if we can. But obviously if there's outstanding issues that would prevent some members from coming to that agreement that's part of the landscape. So I think - I apologize.

                    I would have sensed - put something together on Task 3 but I actually thought we would be spending more time on Task 1 today. So I didn't. But I

will get something out on that this coming week and let's see if it provides any basis for agreement or not. Other comments on this?

(Cheryl): Shiva it's just you did such a good job on Task 1 that everybody's just so silenced.

Steve Metalitz: That must be it. I guess so. And, you know...

(Cheryl): Margie's got her hand up.

Steve Metalitz:: Yeah. Okay. All right. If there's no further business then I look forward to talking with you the same time next week. And please do participate on the list. You'll be seeing a number of documents that we've discussed already today.

Woman: Thank you.
Steve Metalitz:

: Thanks everybody.

Woman: Bye Steve

Tim Ruiz: Thank you.

Woman: Thanks.

Woman: Bye.

Woman: Thank you.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you (Tanya).

END