Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA) DT
Sub Team B
TRANSCRIPTION
Monday 31 March 2010 at 19:00 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 Wednesday Monday 31 March 2010 at 19:00 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-20100331.mp3

On page:
http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#mar

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

ICANN Staff
Margie Milam
Marika Koning v bvs
David Giza
Liz Gasster
Gisella Gruber-White

Absent apologies:
Kristina Rosette – IPC
David Giza

Coordinator: Excuse me. I'd like to remind all participants this conference is being

recorded. If you have objections you may disconnect at this time.

You may begin.

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody. This is the RAA Team B call.

And on the call we have Tatyana Khramtsova, Siva Muthusamy, Michele Neylon, Steve Metalitz, Statton Hammock, Tim Ruiz, Holly Raiche, and for staff we have Liz Gasster, Marika Konings, Dave Piscitello, and Glen de Saint Géry.

And may I ask everybody to say your name before you speak for the transcription.

Thank you very much. After you Steve.

Steve Metalitz: Thank you very much Glen and thanks to everybody for taking the time to join the call. It's a beautiful spring day here. I'm sure it's not even a day in some places as...

Woman: You're saying it wrong.

Steve Metalitz: But anyway. Thanks very much for joining.

We have a rather skeletal agenda here which is focused on tasks, our Task 3 and then looking at the timetable because we seem to have already deviated from our timetable and it's clear we're not going to submit our report next week. So we should figure out what our new timetable will be and the next steps.

Before we get into that, first of all let me just ask if there are any other agenda items that people wanted to raise. Okay.

Before we get into Task 3, there were one or two loose ends from our call, our last call which was on the 18th. Margie was going - we had this discussion about the law enforcement proposals that were referenced in a GAC Communique from Nairobi and their interest that these be seriously considered.

I'm not sure whose typing but if you could mute that would be great.

The - Margie did check with (Paul Orr) and found out that this is apparently the same list that we had already seen back in I think November and that had already discussed. Had a whole meeting with Bobby Flaim and did discuss. So what the GAC is talking about we already have on our - you know in the mix here. So I don't think there's anything that we - else that we need to do on that. There aren't any new law enforcement proposals that anybody knows of.

We did have one or two other loose ends. One, Dave Giza was going to check on something with the Legal Department, but that does tie into Task 3 and I know David is not on the call, not able to be on the call today.

So I think that kind of brings us up-to-date on the loose ends from last time unless I'm forgetting some which is quite possible. Does anybody else have anything else from last time that we needed to discuss? Okay.

If not, let's start in on Task 3. Now as you know I circulated a straw man proposal for what to do on Task 3. Task 3 is simply recommend next steps, recommend...

Woman: Yeah.

Steve Metalitz: ...this Sub-team would recommend to the Council what next steps ought to be taken.

And obviously it'd be up to the Council to decide whether those are the right next steps.

So I circulated a list and we talked about that to some extent last week, excuse me, on the 18th. And there have been a few minor annotations to that. But following that call we did have some traffic on the list on this topic. And we now have as of about an hour ago a revised or an alternative proposal for Task 3, what we should recommend on Task 3.

And I think that's up on the screen now if you're on Adobe but whether you are or not maybe I could ask Tim who had circulated this if he would just walk through this with us so that everybody is clear on what he's proposing for Task 3.

Tim.

Tim Ruiz: Sure. Yeah so what - and again, you know, the concerns were expressed about - from registrars about involving anyone other than the two parties to the contract in the actual negotiations. So there was some discussion of that.

And that's, you know, an issue for registrars because we truly believe that the only two parties actually in a negotiation would be registrars and ICANN staff.

However, you know, the whole point of this exercise was to try to alleviate the concerns in the community that, you know, if they weren't included or if it wasn't open enough, there wasn't enough involvement of the community, etcetera, in the previous amendments that were agreed to with the last RAA amendments.

And so that was, you know, one of the things that we would - we'd hope to alleviate or at least to satisfy partly with this Drafting Team. And to address some of the issues that the community felt wasn't covered last time.

And so and that's the - what the steps that I outlined in my proposal again is trying to do without going beyond that threshold that I think registrars have an issue with and that's whose involved in the negotiations.

So what I'm proposing is that after - the next step would be or the next steps would be that the full list has been complied by the group and go to staff. There might be, you know, some further work or possibly not on weeding out any issues that fall under consensus policy and that would be dealt with through that channel versus amendments to the RAA.

And then the negotiations would begin with the staff and the registrars. And I didn't detail this but I think I mentioned it in some of my text above, my proposal that, you know, preference would be given to the priority - prioritization that the group did. And because there's a lot on that list. You know I'm not sure Statton will think that, you know, everything is going to get addressed in the next set of amendments so I think the prioritization was important for that purpose.

So the negotiations will begin. As some agreement is reached under various items and want to be timely in keeping the public informed about where things are at, those would be posted back for public comment and feedback.

But I think even beyond that the GNSO may even want to specifically form a Drafting Team or perhaps Assist Drafting Team that reconvenes, you know, to review the work that's been done and develop or respond to comments in regards to that as feedback and information for the staff and the registrars.

But then take that and continue to negotiations repeating step four and five until we have what is considered or proposed to be a final draft of the RAA which would then go through a similar process, public comment and the Council reviewing and considering the comments that would come in from that.

And based on those and their own discussions and deliberations decide whether to approve that version of the RAA or not.

If they do approve it, it would go to - onto the Board for approval. If not, then it would go back to staff and registrars with whatever appropriate feedback and information for reconsideration. And then again repeating those steps. Taking into consideration Council's feedback and other comments and other revised final drafts if you will, and then iterating through that process again.

And again, you know, we want to be as open and as inclusive as we can and it's just that threshold of the actual negotiations I think is all we really have an issue with and keeping that between the two parties to the agreement.

Steve Metalitz: Okay, thank you Tim. And I - why don't we open the floor for comments, questions, discussion on Tim's proposal. I see Liz has her hand up. Did anybody else want to get in the queue? Statton.

Glen de Saint Géry: Steve, excuse me. This is Glen. Just to say that Cheryl Langdon-Orr has joined the call.

Steve Metalitz: Thank you. Welcome Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I confess. I did confess to that but just in typing check. Michele has been winding me up ever since.

Steve Metalitz: Okay. We have Liz, Statton, Holly; let's start with that queue and go from there. Liz, you're on.

Liz Gasster: So I just had some very minor additions or edits to Tim's flow that I'd like to just offer. So one was, for number one, I suggest that the full list go to the GNSO Council and staff because that was the original GNSO Council resolution that created this Drafting Team, Working Group, request that so.

Tim Ruiz: Oh, right. You're right Liz.

Liz Gasster: Yeah, should endeavor to provide advice to the Council and ICANN staff so I think that's right.

                And I just wanted to let you know. I think (Tim)'s - this makes sense to me in terms of the RAA requirements. Number seven, the GNSO Council reviews and considers comments and votes on approval. You know we're interpreting that now. It's two-thirds - requires two-thirds vote of the GNSO Council which addressing the two house model that we have today would essentially,

excuse me, mean a super majority vote of approval from the contacted party house. And a simple majority approval in the non-contracted party house.

So I wanted to add just some specificity there. This is tracking the same basic model or structure for the negotiations that was used in the previous RAA amendments process. And so just adapting it to the 2/3 house model.

And then just recognizing too that this public comment process and the, you know, requirement that there be outreach and solicitation of a range of stakeholder input which is the process that we're engaged in right now.

Steve Metalitz: Okay, thank you Liz. Statton, go ahead.

Statton Hammock: Thanks Steve. I agree with Tim's proposal for next steps. I did have a question about number two just to be clear. On the further weeding out of issues that fall under consensus policies, so we give the list of staff. Is the staff weeding out issues that fall under consensus policy or is that done by somebody else?

Liz Gasster: Actually it's Liz. I meant to ask that question myself. And propose that at least some of that get done by the group.

Tim Ruiz: Yeah, I think some of that would be done by the group and then some notes have been made of that.

Statton Hammock: Right.

Tim Ruiz: And then I think, you know, any - that would be reviewed by both the Council and staff and any concerns or issues about any of that could be raised if

there's anything else that needed to be noted as or it was agreed as being a consensus policy issue.

So the main reason I put that is because I didn't know if this Working Group would be definitively making that decision or if that would go back to Council and there'd be some advice back from staff, general council or whatever, you know, to just make sure that we make the right decision on those.

Statton Hammock: Right Tim, this is Statton. That - at the beginning of the Working Group I think I asked the question or somebody did about whether we're going to be talking about whether certain issues fall, you know, under consensus policy or not.

And my understanding was that we wouldn't be doing that although if we want to do it then before we send it shouldn't that be something that we do before the list goes to staff or if we're not going to do it in the group then I'm okay with sending the list...

((Crosstalk))

Steve Metalitz: May I respond to that Statton?

Statton Hammock: Sure.

Steve Metalitz: I think if you look back at our assignment that was Task 2. And we've been doing that for the last four months. Every time we go through a section.

Woman: Yes.

Steve Metalitz: We ask if anybody thinks it raises any issues under consensus policy. So since we haven't finished really with Task 1 and two as I'm sure Holly will remind us...

Man: Yeah. No, I agree.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: And if she doesn't others will.

Man: Okay, right.

Steve Metalitz: It's certainly possible for any member of the task force that thinks that there's an issue, an unflagged issue that should be flagged to put a flag on it.

We have Holly next. And does anybody else want to be in the queue?

I'll put myself in the queue after Holly. Go ahead Holly.

Holly Raiche: I was going to ask if I can go back to bed, because you know what I'm going to say.

I really - I'm not sure I agree with it. I certainly think Tim's outline of where we're going is very sensible. I still think what we have to do, given that we had a very huge list of issues and against a number of issues that are very similar, we said high priority agreed. That's going to be very - I suppose confusing and time consuming for the registrars to go through.

I think it would be far more useful if we did do that next step and say what is it we actually agree against each topic? What is our priority? So that by the

time it goes back to staff and goes to the registrars there's a very clear understanding of our view of what's important. Our view of what can be solved or we think can be addressed through consensus policy.

And it also gives them an idea of what really are our top priorities so that I do appreciate the statement they would give preference to the things we give preference to. But we've been giving preference to about 45 things so let's actually be serious about (what) we're giving preference to just to assist them to carry out exactly what they said.

Steve Metalitz: Too many high priorities I'd say.

Holly Raiche: We've got so many high priorities there that if they gave high priority they'd be working for five years. And I don't think that's Tim's intention nor mine for that matter.

Steve Metalitz: Okay. Does anybody else want to be in the queue on this?

Well I'll recognize myself. This is Steve Metalitz. I really - I have one question and then one general observation. The question goes to point four which says that as some agreements reached on various items they're posted for public comment and feedback.

So I think Tim you're foreseeing a scenario in which a few items are agreed and put aside or can go through public comment or review by a GNSO Team while the discussion goes on on other items. I guess I really have a two part question.

First, that doesn't strike me as a very realistic scenario in a negotiation like this because ordinarily neither party would be too inclined to agree to anything until they see the whole picture. There's...

Woman: Yep.

Steve Metalitz: If there were ten issues there might be two or three that one side really wants and two or three that the other side really wants. And neither necessarily commit to either of those until they know what happened to their wish list.

So I guess my question is do you have a basis for thinking that this negotiation would not go that way that it would - that there would be actually be sequential issues, a few issues that could be dealt with and then turned to - locked down and then turned to others?

And I guess my other question on it is last time did it work that way or did it work the way I've described in which basically nothing was final until everything was final?

Tim Ruiz: Well I think - I mean I think there's - those are good questions Steve. I'm not sure that we've completely thought those out. But I think those are good points to raise when - and it may get back to, you know, Holly making a good point about trying to be more specific about the priority items so that we can address those in a set perhaps or whatever.

But I - one thing I do know and that is that not that it was the entire issue but that getting earlier feedback is going to be important because otherwise we do risk iteration or long, long drawn out iterations.

In other words, you know, we get to where we thought we had final agreement on a set of amendments but then there was significant pushback on certain items by the community and then, you know, we ended up back at the negotiation table trying to figure out how can we address those without knocking all this stuff back off the table again.

So that's what I'm hoping we can avoid by having briefer iterations and but that's going to be a challenge I think as you point out.

So I'm not sure I have kind of a speedier answer for how that's going to go but certainly if we have a better concept of what's really high priority then maybe we can take this set of things and address those. And then - and perhaps then be able to move on to another set.

Probably not the best answer you're looking for but that's, you know, about all I have right now I guess.

Yeah and Statton if you have anything to add or thoughts on that, you know, feel free.

Statton Hammock: I don't. Thanks.

Steve Metalitz: Okay. Well I thought I saw Michele's hand up but it's not up now. Michele did you want to be in the queue or should I continue with my observations here? Unless I here from Michele I'll just go ahead.

Michele Neylon: I suppose I will say something.

Steve Metalitz: Go ahead then.

Michele Neylon: I actually managed to get through an entire conference call this week without saying a word which is a miracle.

I mean just going back to Tim's list. While I can understand that some people might have an issue with the way he's presenting this, I can see where he's coming from in that there's probably some areas. I mean okay, put it this way. Would you prefer that there was movement and progress or that you ended up in a situation where it was just - there was just a complete lockdown because nobody could agree and nothing moved forward? Whereas if you were able - some things that people would like to see amended in the RAA are probably not that contentious. Other things obviously are going to be more contentious.

So, you know, the possibility of kind of moving forward on some things without, you know, it taking forever and ever and ever is probably better than sitting there trying to reach agreement on a whole range of things which might not actually happen.

Steve Metalitz: Okay. Thank you. Did anybody else want to make any comments at this point?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's Cheryl here. I stepped away from the computer. I'll put my hand up when I get back so continue your stuff. Thanks Steve.

Steve Metalitz: Okay. I guess my general observation really is I think I appreciate Tim putting this forward because I think it does give us a concrete proposal to look at. And I had intended my proposal as a straw man to get the discussion started so I think could already claim it a success in that regard.

But I have to say and I agree with Tim that one of the problems last time was that there was - it was not - there wasn't early enough feedback from the community on the negotiations.

And obviously one way to resolve that problem is to bring some of the rest of the community into the room. Last time the registrars and the staff got into a room and I suppose the staff were there to look out for the public interest and the interest of non-contracted parties. I think they failed.

And I think that's the reason why we have this team because people were unhappy both with the process and with the outcome of the last set of negotiations.

So I'm reluctant to agree. I certainly can't agree at this point to setting up that closed room again. I understand that you're suggesting that the door open periodically and people would come out and say well here's where we are. Maybe here's what we've agreed on or even perhaps to say here's where we are. Here's what we're talking about or thinking about even though we don't have an agreement. And get some feedback there.

And I think that would be an improvement. But the question is whether that's really responsive to the problem that was - that we identified last time which was the fact that no one else was in the room other than the staff and the registrars.

So that's really my hesitation about this, but I think it's definitely worth considering this, and perhaps we can discuss some way to institutionalize this early feedback that you're talking about and still maintain what seems to be from the way you put it kind of a redline for you that - or for some of the

registrars anyway, and maybe for all the registrars which is that no one else is going to be in the room other than the registrars and the staff.

So that's just my general observation on this.

Cheryl...

Tim Ruiz: Yeah.

Steve Metalitz: ...you're up. Tim did you want to...?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sorry. I think Tim wanted a round to reply.

Steve Metalitz: Go right ahead.

Tim Ruiz: Yeah, just briefly I - you know the concern I have even when we - even the previous one and it wasn't, you know, any and all registrars. It was, you know, representative group of registrars because as - if the group gets too big then there's just a whole lot of discussion and not a lot of getting things done.

I don't want to - you know I wouldn't want to see it turned into another - it's almost like a policy development process that goes on for months and months. Hopefully it doesn't go on for months and months and months.

So that'd be the one concern that I would have. But, you know, I hear what you're saying Steve and I don't know, see what we - what we might be able to come to agree with but.

Steve Metalitz: Okay, thank you; Cheryl and then Holly.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you Steve. Building on very much what you were saying at the end there Steve and so it was very good that I suggested you finished while I got back to my computer rather than me jump in and fire less eloquently say what you were going to say anyway.

But also picking up on what both Tim and Michele have said is the end game that the desire, the outcome that we all want in this process at least those of us from the demand as opposed to the supply side certainly want in this process is a mechanism where we have trust and confidence in what is happening in the necessarily closed room for contract negotiation. Therefore all the prior planning, all the preparation and some of that is clearly able to perhaps can a little bit of tweaking be done in what Tim's put up here which I would like to be labeled as draft for consideration when we revisit Task 3 of our tasks.

But to do that we need to get back to Task 1 and 2, because if we can look at those high priorities lists we've got and perhaps subset them now into other categories, those that are clearly going to be more or less contentious, those that can be bundled together, those that make sense to perhaps pick up on this methodology.

I'm not sure that we're going to get a lot further tweaking Task 3. This is a great draft. Thank you. We all got time and digest and work on it. It will need review. It will need a little negotiation but that's what the Work Group is for.

And now let's get back to the foundation work that has to happen so that the whole trust input and interaction stuff just like you're doing a development. Engage the community, bring them onboard, help them to learn and understand and then you don't get pushback or at least if you do it will be more easy to manage. Hand down.

Steve Metalitz: Thank you Cheryl very much. Holly I think you're next.

And let me just see if anybody else wants to be in the queue.

Holly Raiche: First of all thank you Cheryl. You said eloquently what I probably would have said anyway.

Just a thought Steve, and also Tim. Given that there will necessarily -- or maybe not -- be a closed room, is there any -- and I think there is -- advantage in possibly having this group so that even though there may be a closed door, there is a way to say we're running into difficulties, just to keep people informed of what's going on, so that I suppose the - what looks like a huge black thing which things happen and then we're told about later is at least a little bit enlightening in the sense that there is some kind of communication to avoid exactly the situation that Steve described so well?

Steve Metalitz: Tim any response on that or...?

Tim Ruiz: Just, you know, that I think that's a very good suggestion. You know personally I think it sounds like it makes some sense and something that I hope, you know, we can take back to registrars and see if they're onboard with that.

Again, we're trying to work something out here that's going to, you know, alleviate the concern the community had over last time and still, you know, keep the process moving forward and just the concerns that registrars have over negotiations of their agreement.

So I'm sure we can find some balance in there that's going to make sense.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Now Steve if I may, just back to Tim, we've got no shortages of legal experts on our side as the divide team. So believe me we definitely understand the nature of confidential, commercial and closed room negotiations.

And I doubt that anyone in the large community would be wanting, well anyone with significant (acting) would want to be arguing any other way. The whole concept is to get the prior planning to prevent the piss poor performance in the next time around.

Tim Ruiz: Got it, understood.

Steve Metalitz: Okay, I think Liz has her hand up.

Liz Gasster: Well I have a comment, maybe it's a suggestion for how we might be able to institutionalize if you will the process of, you know, maybe ongoing outreach and solicitation of stakeholder input without the - you know while addressing the concerns that I think Tim has about the need for the negotiations to, you know, make progress with and be conducted in a certain way.

And wondered if, you know, doing say a public consultation periodically, building in say more than one but say two public comment or three or, you know, some depending on how long the negotiations occur, you know, every four months or, you know, I'm just making it up, three months or whatever the time.

I want to respond to Cheryl in a way that like how do we put some concreteness around it without undermining Tim's process that would assure that there would be this outreach and ongoing opportunity for solicitation and consideration, you know, of those inputs but in a manageable, controlled way, just a thought.

Steve Metalitz: Okay, thank you Liz.

Tim Ruiz: Right.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Darn good thought.

Steve Metalitz: I see Holly has her hand up.

Holly Raiche: I do. And it's a very practical question. Right now I've been treating this list as pretty much confidential one. I think if we're going to proceed with three we're going to have to set some ground rules about what is confidential and what people can go back to their constituents with to get some feedback, so in fact we do have permission to discuss some things that we all agree on and we're also all agreed on what we don't discuss. It's a process.

Steve Metalitz: When you're talking about this list are you talking about our matrix with all of the issues? Are you talking about...?

Holly Raiche: Yes. Matrix issues, what people think, what is it that we as a group can go back to our constituents and say is going on and what level of detail? So that if we are going to develop some kind of process that I'm very happy to hear Tim thinks is worth talking about, we have some clarity as to the expectations of what is or isn't going to be discussed more broadly.

Steve Metalitz: Well this is Steve. If I could just respond to that, I don't think anything we've been doing has been confidential.

Holly Raiche: Okay.

Steve Metalitz: Our mailing list is publicly posted. You know all of our emails are publicly available.

Holly Raiche: Okay.

Steve Metalitz: There's been reporting. So, you know, this is a transparent process and at least up to this point so.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And as a member of the Accountability and Transparency Review Team I'm very glad to hear that and to continue to endorse such a thing.

Holly Raiche: I would say the only opaqueness is people wouldn't know what to look for.

Steve Metalitz: Well that's true, I mean there's - sometimes...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, but that's the art of it Holly.

Holly Raiche: Exactly.

Steve Metalitz: ...there's too much information.

              Okay, let me...

Holly Raiche: (There used to be very dry) transparency.

Steve Metalitz: Absolutely.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: A point I will be making I can assure you.

Steve Metalitz: Okay, let me just see if there's anybody else that has - I actually have one other question about Tim's list which really arises from something that he said about which registrars will be in the room.

If there's nobody else that wants to - has a comment, let me just ask, this parentheses in item three, negotiations be given between staff and the registrars (as a whole not individually). Could you - there were some - last time - I think you said the last time there were some registrars who were there as representatives of registrars or just can you just explain what you meant by that parentheses?

Tim Ruiz: Yeah, in other words we, you know, we - it wouldn't be - well by the parentheses what I meant was that I didn't want to imply that we thought there would be, you know, ICANN would be going individually to registrars trying to negotiate things, that what our intent would be is like last time to have - to select representative group of registrars who would actually be involved in negotiations and they would be the ones, the conduit back to registrars as a whole as far as what was going on and, you know, progress and issues or questions or whatever but having that small group that was most effective.

And so there isn't going to be - you know, that the strong intent that ICANN wouldn't individually try to negotiate with each and every registrar. Just wouldn't be productive or make any sense.

Steve Metalitz: But registrars...

Tim Ruiz: And there'd be no way to track any kind of progress that way either. That was all I was trying to.

Steve Metalitz: Okay, but last - let me just ask this, last time when those registrars who were involved in negotiations, were they empowered to speak on behalf of the other registrars or were they simply expressed - were they expressing the viewpoint the registrar constituency which then existed or were they simply representing their own companies?

Tim Ruiz: We tried to represent the views of the registrars as a whole. And so, you know, there were situations where we knew where registrars stood and we were able to speak to that. In other cases we would have to go back and, you know, determine if a particular compromise or a change whatever was going to be acceptable and, you know, just not why, that kind of thing.

                   So no, we weren't just empowered to do whatever. It was pretty much an exercise in keeping the rest of the registrars involved and communicating to them what was going on.

Steve Metalitz: Okay. Thank you. Any other comments, questions, observations on Tim's document? Okay.

                   Well I think we had the suggestion I think Cheryl's that this be marked as, you know, for draft for discussion or words to that effect and I think it's very useful as that and something that we will return to.

                   We've had a number and of course I hope people if they have other comments or questions they will surface those on the list.

                   We've been reminded a couple times that our work is not done on numbers one and two. And before we adjourn today we certainly want to talk about how we can move that forward.

But let me ask that we turn now to the question of timetable. The timetable that we adopted I think at the end of January called for this week finalizing the report. We're suppose to start the discussion of Task 3 in the preceding - two preceding meetings.

So we slipped behind a little bit to begin with and I think our discussion of three has slipped us a little further behind.

But I think - I don't want to put this all - I think the real task ahead of us is to finalize the work we've done on one and two. And I know Holly has made a good start on that. But I guess I could - all I can say is that I think we really need to turn our attention to that in the week or two ahead.

The question is what should be our goal as far as preparing our report that would address items one, two and three and submitting that to the Council.

Now we had agreed in January that our goal would be to submit the report April 7 because we were told that had to happen in order to - for it to be right for action by the Council on April 21.

Now I see in the material Marika has posted that actually the deadline is a little bit looser in that she lists 21 April deadline for submission of documents 13 April and then corresponding to the future meetings of the Council.

I guess there's only one meeting of the Council in May.

And so she's got the deadline of 12th of May and then 10th of June deadline the 2nd of June.

So I just want to - were we off base when we or when we heard or were told that we had to get something to the Council two weeks or ten business days I think prior to the Council Meeting? Is it really eight calendar days? Is that the actual advance notice that has to be given?

I guess I'm asking the staff that.

Woman: That's right.

Steve Metalitz: Okay.

Woman: Eight days.

Steve Metalitz: Okay, then we're a little bit off base there. That helps. Gives us an extra week but still I don't think it's realistic to think that we would have our report on April 13.

So I guess having seen this I wonder if we can strive to get our report done by the 12th of May which would put it in front of the Council, again no guarantee the Council will take it up of course at that first time.

But it would put it before the Council on the 20th of May. I think it's advantageous to us I think if we can get this in front of the Council before everything starts into the funnel for the next ICANN Meeting which is in end of June.

So is the 12th of May a realistic deadline for us? I guess that's the question on the floor.

And I see Cheryl has a view to express on that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Not so much a view but I think you must be becoming psychic because my question went to what will that do to the possibility should we desire to do so of having some sort of forum or otherwise. I'm not talking about a meeting of our own Work Group. But an interaction with outside of our Work Group at the Brussels meeting that I just wanted to make sure that we worked back from Brussels timelines as well as from the GNSO Meetings.

Steve Metalitz: That point is well taken. And we haven't, you know, made any decisions. It's not in our charter necessarily to - for there to be a forum. But obviously I think that would be - if we are able to clear a report it would be very useful to have something like that. And we would, you know, I'm sure members of this team would be glad to participate.

Any other comments on this timetable? Well if there's no...

Holly Raiche: Well...

Steve Metalitz: I'm sorry did someone have a comment?

Holly Raiche: I was - yeah, I just forgot to put my hand up.

Steve Metalitz: Go ahead.

Holly Raiche: I think it would work. This is Holly. I think it would work. But I think we're going to have to be disciplined in knowing that what it is we actually number one, are recommending, and then number two, what we regard as the highest priority most important.

And I think everybody is just going to have to do a little bit of homework and be able to come to the next meeting and we can just pick stuff off under each heading. And therefore reduce what is now lots of items in the matrix then do some workable things that we can realistically set some priorities around.

So there is a bit of work ahead and everybody's going to have to kind of put their hand on their heart and say, yep.

And I hope what I did helps people kind of focus on what is it we actually did agree on and rethink what kind of priorities we really do think this is - we decided to have.

Steve Metalitz: (Well) spoken. Any other comments on this?

Well okay, I'll put my hand on my heart and say that I will get a couple of things out to the list before our next meeting one of which will be the revised timetable (working) from the 12th of May. When do we have to, you know, get our draft done and so forth.

But I agree with Holly that our next meeting we should try to come - if we possibly can, we should try to come to closure on tasks one and two. And that doesn't necessarily mean unanimity. There may be some disagreements.

But if we could at least get everything - get - and we may need a three tier set of priorities or something like that.

But I agree. If we have - you've done the counting Holly. If we have 45 high priorities we're...

Holly Raiche: I lost count.

Steve Metalitz: ...in trouble. So we need to weed out from that and I don't know what the right number is. But it certainly isn't 45.

So we need to get that number down and we need to make sure we've - Statton raised, if there are issues that we haven't yet flagged that raise consensus policy issues that should be done.

So I can certainly try to circulate something on that but I think Holly has given us a good start toward doing that and it really is up to us.

And I would encourage you as to the extent it's feasible to consult with your constituencies or groups, whatever group you're working with and see (unintelligible) feedback so that we can really have a realistic list of the top priority items and then maybe, you know, a second set so things below that. So that would be my encouragement to all on the call.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: What is that noise? It is killing me through my headset? Sorry Steve, it made me jump earlier.

Steve Metalitz: I'm not sure what that is but someone may be stapling something.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay.

Steve Metalitz: Maybe not.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's actually painful through my headset. That's all, sorry.

Steve Metalitz: All right. Well let me just ask if there's any other business that we need to bring up. We will of course send a doodle poll around. And I think we're

looking at the week after next that would be early the week of the 12th. So that gives us, you know, ten days or so at least, no, 12 days, to actually make some progress here and, you know, that's what our list is for is for - I encourage people to do what we've done here with the straw man on number three. And the straw man may not survive the process. But at least - it sometimes gets the process going.

So I guess I would encourage people to do that. And I will pledge to do my bit there.

Holly did you want to make a comment?

Holly Raiche: Just a thought, I will be in Hong Kong that week. I will try to dial-in but just not sure how busy I'm going to be so may be an apology. But I think since I've done the first pit work...

Steve Metalitz: Yeah.

Holly Raiche: ...I can be apologized for one (week).

Steve Metalitz: All right, well we - obviously there will be a number of options given so hopefully we'll find a time that you will be able to join.

Holly Raiche: Okay.

Steve Metalitz: Good. Any other questions, comments or other issues that we need to address today?

If not, I want to thank everybody for their participation and I look for all of your contributions on the list and refining our set of - our list of priorities. I'll

circulate a revised version of the timetable. And you'll also - should also look for a doodle poll very soon for early in the week of the 12th.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Excellent. Thank you.

Woman: Okay, thank you.

Steve Metalitz: Thanks everybody.

Man: Bye.

END