

**Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA) DT  
Sub Team A  
TRANSCRIPTION  
Thursday 13 May 2010 @ 1800 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA) drafting team Sub Team A meeting on Thursday 13 May 2010 at 1800 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but **should not be treated as an authoritative record**. The audio is also available at: <http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#may>

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-raa-a-20100513.mp3>

**Present for the teleconference:**

Beau Brendler – At Large - Chair  
Michele Neylon – Registrar Stakeholder Group - Co-chair  
Paul Diaz – Registrar Stakeholder Group  
Cheryl Langdon-Orr – ALAC  
Phil Corwin - CBUC  
Avri Doria - NCSG

**ICANN Staff**

Heidi Ullrich  
Margie Milam  
Gisella Gruber-White

**Absent apologies:**

Liz Gasster

Coordinator: Excuse me. This is the operator. Just need to inform all participants today's call is being recorded. If you have any objections, you may disconnect at this time. I would like to introduce your host, Ms. Gisella Gruber-White. Ma'am you may begin.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you (Lori). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone on today's RAA Sub Team A call on Thursday the 13th of May. We have Michele Neylon, Beau Brendler, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Paul Diaz, Avri Doria, Phil Corwin. From staff we have Margie Milam, Heidi Ullrich, myself Gisella Gruber-White. I have not noted any apologies. And if I can please

remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes.  
Thank you. Over to you Michele and Beau.

Michele Neylon: Thank you.

Beau Brendler: Oh, it looks like (Steve) is trying to connect or is on hold. At least that's what my...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Steve), we haven't got hold of him yet so I'll let you know as soon as he's joined.

Beau Brendler: Okay. My apologies about the confusion as far as joining the call. I had sent an email earlier saying I was not terrifically prepared for it. But I'm happy to join and happy if Michele wants to take it away, you know, here as far as the agenda goes. Go ahead.

Michele Neylon: Well, it's up to you Beau. I don't want to step on your toes.

Beau Brendler: No. You're not stepping on my toes. I mean I think the purpose of the meeting is to look at the plain language summary and have, you know, whatever comments - I mean I have not kept up on what's been posted to the workspace for the aspirational document.

So I know that comes later on on the call. But I had actually thought that the work of the workgroup was primarily done expect for the aspirational registrant rights charter. So I'm coming into this call confused in the first place. So it's probably better if you go ahead.

Michele Neylon: Okay. I'll try and sound less confused. I believe Margie or Heidi wanted to have a look at the initial report. Is that correct?

Margie Milam: Yeah. Yeah. If you want, I can provide some background on where we are since it's been some time since we've met. We - our last meeting I think was in the end of January, maybe early February.

What happened was in the RAA's Sub Team B, which relates to the RAA additional amendments, we started to put together the report and I realized that we never formally reported to the GNSO Council what we've done on our group even though we had, you know, concluded our work.

So what I did about two weeks ago was circulate a draft report that addressed primarily the Sub Team B issues related to the additional amendments. And then last week I circulated the part that summarizes what we did on the registrant rights charter.

And so that's, you know, the purpose of the call today is to hopefully reach closure on what we - what we'd like to say in the report and if there's any changes that might (be) appropriate to let me go ahead and we could talk about it now or we can, you know, circulate them on the list. But to give the group the opportunity to comment on the report that would be sent to the GNSO Council.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Thank you. Yeah, just check the dates. The last time was the 11th of February. I'm a bit - I (could say) that I'm a bit confused because I'm on the other group as well.

Beau Brendler: Well I guess - has anyone here read those two documents that have been sent out? I will confess that I have not.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well yes some of us have.

Beau Brendler: Including the operational rights document. So is there a reasonable show of hand? Should we proceed with those who have comments to make comments or what do we think we need to do at this point?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I think we need to look at the draft initial report because it will be going on behalf of both Sub Teams. And I would be particularly discomfoted if only the active participants in Sub Team B had had any opportunity to look at the initial report that will be presented in Brussels.

Michele Neylon: Okay Cheryl. Sorry. Have you all had a chance to look over the draft document that was circulated? One which is up on the Adobe Connect at the moment.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well we know about (Heather) but (Pat)'s not - Margie can you take - can you take us through a high level?

((Crosstalk))

Margie Milam: Yeah. It's - sure (unintelligible) you through a high level because there isn't a lot that...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Margie Milam: ...deals with how the registrant charter works. So I can ahead and do that if that would be helpful to the group.

Michele Neylon: Please do.

Margie Milam: Okay. We set up the Adobe Connect so you can scroll through the pages as I speak. We start the report with the Executive Summary where we kind of provide a background on how we got to this stage of the work.

And before I kind of go into detail, the one thing I wanted to point out was that I drafted this primarily from the GNSO's perspective because that's my background and that's primarily who I, you know, I provide support for.

So things like at large, motions or resolutions or activities going on in the at large community I haven't really incorporated in this. And to that you have additional background information that you'd like to share as to how we got to this point from the at large perspective, please, you know, speak now or provide it, you know, over the list.

So essentially the Executive Summary talks about how we got to this point, where we came up with the 2009 amendments and then the additional work that was requested of the drafting team, specifically the proposed form of a registrant rights charter and then the additional amendments.

Michele, you have a question?

Michele Neylon: It's just with respect to the registrants' rights. I mean Paul has put it on the Adobe chat there as well. It's just something that's come up in the other work - in the other workgroup. Shouldn't we be referring it to as registrants' rights and responsibilities throughout the document?

Paul Diaz: Yeah thank Michele. This is Paul. I just want to underscore that. It's not semantics and ICANN has enough bloody acronyms already. So if they're looking for a short one or what not, the end responsibilities is very, very important and needs to be included throughout. It's there some cases. It's not in others. Please be consistent and please have the full title as it appears in Annex D.

Margin Milam: Okay so - in other words you're saying do not refer to it in shorthand the registrant rights. You want to say registrant rights and responsibilities charter. Is that correct?

Paul Diaz: Absolutely because that's what it is.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Right from section - Cheryl speaking. Right from Section 1.1 in the Executive Summary where it says, you know, this draft team included blah,

blah, blah. That when A, drafting a charter comprised of registrants rights and responsibilities and B, a specific bar. Just wherever those words registrants rights are gathered together, also add and responsibilities. Just a global search and replace.

Margie Milam: Okay.

Michele Neylon: (Unintelligible). I mean just - the - parts of the thing with this is (wilders) because in other workgroups for example post-expiree or - post-expiree is a prime example. You know, we as registrars are being asked to, you know, I don't know to kind of give people the ability to do certain things. But they need to - it needs to be underlined that they have a responsibility as well. It's a two way street. Cheryl, go ahead.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. Well I got my hand up there because it goes back to the theme that Michele and other registrars are probably tired of hearing me singing at them. And that is education outreach information need to actually have informed people who you're interacting with.

So the matching, the coupling of rights and responsibilities goes to the core of having informed consent and knowledge and understanding about what you're signing up for and what happens if things go wrong.

Michele Neylon: Sorry Margie. Want to continue.

Margie Milam: Yeah. I agree. So that will be incorporated in the next version. Then in Section 1.2 we talk about the preliminary conclusions and I threw in the word consensus. I just want to confirm that there is consensus in the group regarding the form of the registrant rights charter.

So if there's - as we go through this if there's some disagreement, you know, on the form of the charter, then we have to revisit this and accurately describe what the level of consensus is.

So we've said that there's consensus in the drafting team that I can't just get adoption but registrant rights charter substantially similar to the form and Annex D and we can go into Annex D later.

And then I have clarification on what the purpose of the registrant rights and responsibilities charter is. I site back to the section of the RAA that was included in the last version of amendments, Section 3.15 talks about that if ICANN publishes a Web site that identifies the registrant rights and responsibilities, the content and the list delivered in consultation with registrars then the registrars would have to provide a link to it.

And so that - as we go through the reports, the next steps in the process is to conduct a registrar consultation because that's an important part that's referenced in the RAA agreement. And so that's what the recommendation is is that the drafting team recommends to ICANN that it commences the consultation process of registrars to finalize and publish that Web page.

And then the other part of the recommendation, and this is something that perhaps we can discuss now is that early on we talked about the difference between the registrant rights and responsibilities charter as it reflects, you know, the current obligations under the agreement versus perhaps an aspirational charter.

And I think what I tried to point out here was that there may be additional work regarding the aspirational charter conducted through the at large community and I wanted to reference that in the paragraph.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah. Thank you. It's just again recognizing Margie that you've written this in the style of a traditional report to the GNSO. From an ALAC

perspective we tend to have as many type of links and drill down opportunities for the reader as possible.

So if this was a purely ALAC report we were doing here, this is where we would have our first hyperlink to the community available space which is the Wiki space for the aspirational document. So if everyone else agrees that is where I would be putting that hyperlink in.

Beau Brendler: This is Beau. I think that's fine. I guess I would just say, you know, this has been agreed on and talked about again months ago. So I'm not necessarily sure that - I don't think the ALAC - the ALAC has had an opportunity to look at this. So I'm not sure what - I'm not sure anybody knew it was still open for review or comment. So does that mean that we need to...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's not a matter of review or comment. This is a report and we're talking about space where aspirational charters can be perhaps discussed and looked at. We need a link to that space.

Beau Brendler: Oh, you're just talking about (unintelligible) space. Right. Right.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Beau Brendler: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Now the fact that that space itself might need to be vamped up a bit is another matter. But the link itself needs to be in the report in my less than humble view.

Beau Brendler: Oh, I agree.

Michele Neylon: This is Michele just recognizing myself. I think in some previous calls one of the concerns raised by some of the ALAC members was that they wanted something which would be a living document or words to that effect...



Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Michele Neylon: ...I think was where this workspace concept came from. Cheryl probably can correct me on this.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Only if you need correcting Michele.

Beau Brendler: Yeah, that's right.

Michele Neylon: I wouldn't assume otherwise. It's an ALAC thing so I wasn't making any assumptions. But that's what I recall.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And that way the link is - the link is essential.

Margie Milam: Okay. I have that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay.

Margie Milam: Okay. And then the other thing that I pointed out in this paragraph, just want to confirm that everybody is in agreement on this. It relates to the issue that we discussed when we first got the working group together that if it turned out through that aspirational charter work that it identified principles that weren't reflected in the RAA, you know, in the current version of the RAA then we would encourage the submission of those principles to be submitted as additional topics for consideration in future RAA...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: In future - yeah.

Beau Brendler: Right.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Margie Milam: Okay. Good. So that's Section 1.2. Any other questions on Section 1.2 before I move on? Okay.

Then we move now to Page 4, a background process and next steps. And this just provides more information on how we go to the work required of the working group. Gives background on the register (fly) situation and the process that went - was undertaken in 2009.

And then in Section 2.2 on Page 5, this is approach taken by the drafting - RAA drafting team. I had discussed the process that we went through. And in Section 2.3 I've identified the members of the drafting team.

And one of the suggestions that came back last week from the other group was to break it out into the various groups as opposed to having it one large RAA group. I'm going to break it out to have the RAA Sub Team A group spelled out and then the RAA Sub Team B spelled out.

Okay. Proposed next steps. And if you go to Section 2.4, Page 8, I talk about the next steps for this document. And so we recommend that the GNSO Council and the ALAC review the recommendations contained in the initial report.

And then with regard to the registrant rights charter, we recommend that ICANN proceed to the next phase of implementing the registrant rights and responsibilities charter which includes commencement of the consultation process to finalize the registrant rights charter and working on the Web page that the registrars would like to.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Margie Milam: Okay. And then on Page 9, Section 3, I provide more information on how we got the registrant rights charter. And here I discuss in the first paragraph the difference of opinion on what was originally anticipated for the registrant

rights work. And so we clarified that - the scope of the document to include just the rights that are currently...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Currently in...

Margie Milam: ...in the RAA (unintelligible) future. And then I also provide the background that there's additional work regarding the aspirational charter being conducted in a - to the at large community. I'll provide a hyperlink here as well. And then that meets recommendation. But if additional, you know, topics are, you know, appropriate for future amendment discussions, you know, let's go ahead and forward it to the other process.

And in Section 4.2 I discuss that little consensus for the registrant rights charter and provide a little background on how we got - how it got - was developed. As you guys recall we used the plain language guide to the RAA as the basis for the document. And I provided some information on what that, you know, what was involved with that.

And then again refer back to Section 3.15 of the RAA that talks about the registrar rights charter and - rights and responsibilities and it is the same recommendation that ICANN should go ahead and proceed to (unintelligible) process. Any questions on Section 3?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Four.

Margie Milam: Okay. I have my numbering wrong. Four. Yeah four.

((Crosstalk))

Margie Milam: Go ahead Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Hey it's early for me. What's your excuse? Not a question. I was just concerned about the numbering. That's all.

Margie Milam: Yeah. I'll fix the numbering. Is there any other content anyone wants to included related to this discussion? You know, I was trying to think back the - sort of the issues that we had in our process and these are the issues that came to mind.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'd like to know that Beau in particular is happy that this is a true and accurate record of where we got to where we are particularly since we've got to drag our memory banks back a bit and because both Michele and I are immersed in the world of B as well as A. It could be that we'll get our mindsets a little bit more muddled. But Beau are you happy that what we've got here is a - to use the minute's term true and accurate record of the proceedings?

Beau Brendler: Yes, I think so. I've - yeah. I think it is.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Good.

Beau Brendler: I was looking - focusing specifically on the areas where, you know, the at large was concerned about the aspirational documents even though it hasn't grown or enlarged since Nairobi. But yeah, yes I think it's an accurate representation.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Good. Okay.

Margie Milam: So that's the - that's typically in the report except for Annex D which is the registrant rights charter. So if you flipped over to Page 25...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Whoop, whoop, whoop. All right. I went to 40 something. Sorry. Here we go. Got it. Okay.

Margie Milam: Yeah. The rest of the document relates to the Part D stuff plus a lot of attachments. And do you guys want to walk through the charter now or do you want to look at it in your - over the weekend and put in any comments. In

the versions or that last version that we sent out -- it must have been in February -- there were a few changes and I can point them out if you guys are interested, typos and let me...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Margie, as much as some of us would probably like to get on to other things, I think walking us through while you've got us together is a wise move.

Beau Brendler: Yeah I would agree. I'm not - I would agree. I'm not so concerned about typos but I am concerned if any, you know, changes were made that...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Beau Brendler: ...I would see as being extra judicial if you will.

Margie Milam: Sure. Let me close this document and pull up a red line of the charter so you can see the changes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Becoming the queen of the Adobe room. She's going to be on the speaker circuit to tell people how they can best operate these tools because she's very, very good at this.

Margie Milam: Okay. So I've just pulled up the - this is a red line of the last version that was shared with the group. And I'll walk through - I mean very little changed. But we have an introduction that gives background. We have a preamble. This was all there before. We have terms of interest.

We provided the links to the different sections of the RAA that refer to the language. On Page 3, a typo solicitations. That light green color is the red line. The rest of - the darker blue colors just has a link.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. Right.

Margie Milam: Okay. So that's - so none of that changed. It's just that link part. There's a section on registrar business dealings with the registrants. That didn't change. The registrar...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Unintelligible).

Margie Milam: Yeah. EDRP is the one other than a typo where we spelled out what that meant. And then one substantive change and let me see if I can find it. It's on Page 8, verification of contact information.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Unintelligible).

Margie Milam: Yeah. That would be the one substantive change. What happened was we went back to how - the final version of the plain language guide to the RAA and we made the language consistent.

And the reason it was clarified, the legal department pointed out to us that it sounded like there were verification requirements in the RAA when in fact the RAA says that there can be verification requirements that can be created through, you know, specifications or policies. So that was the reason for the change on Page 8. And it's consistent with the language that's being used right now in the plain language RAA. Any questions about that?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No.

Margie Milam: And then the last thing is - to the document where it's a little different from the plain language RAA is that it also talks about obligations under specific policies. So we - at the very end - this was in there before but just reminding you that there - you know, we make reference to some of the policies that are currently in place such as the EDRP and the...

((Crosstalk))

Margie Milam: ...(small gen) transfers.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Margie Milam: And that's it. So those are the only changes from the version that you guys saw back in February. Any questions on the registrant rights and responsibilities charter? Okay. So that's the document.

What I'll do is I'll send a red line clarifying the things that we talked about today. Does it sound like you guys need any further analysis from the at large community? If you want me to reference for example a motion or a resolution, we can set a time to request responses by so that we can get this thing published by the end of the month.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We have a - if Beau is comfortable with this, we have a principle that says providing these things predictive, sufficient community input time and deliberations by (it's in) the community on anything. And in this case I believe that is the case. That the Executive Committee can sign on or off on the things in between end of month to end of month meeting.

Heidi, correct me if I'm wrong with an executive meeting running what, 16th, something like that.

Heidi Ullrich: Next week, yes, the 17th.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Seventeenth. So from a formalities and process point of view because our Executive Committee meetings are also open to anyone who wants to come and be involved, we'll put that on our agenda and have that as a formal (unintelligible) comments acceptance of this report for publication.

And Beau if you can make sure that the list and the ALAC members involved in this process are aware of that and have opportunity to put any comments or points of view onto the Executive Committee meeting Wiki page, which I

believe is already up. If not, it will be in the next 24 hours. Then I think we can tie that up fairly neatly. Your opinion Beau.

Beau Brendler: Yeah. I think that that would be fine. I think the at large community has had ample opportunity to look at this at pretty much every phase. So I think that's fine.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah. I still want to give them an opportunity to interact with us at - in preparation for that resolution that we'll put forward on the - from the (ex comment).

Beau Brendler: Oh sure. Yeah. That's good - yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah. But I - (unintelligible) I specifically want that push to come from you.

Beau Brendler: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. Okay Margie. I'm still leaving my green teacup there.

Heidi Ullrich: If I could ask a follow up question. Do you want me to refer to that process in this document or do you want I mean just the end of it and then you guys just do that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Heidi, that's a very good question because what happens in the world - in the wonderful world of ALAC, we have a very particular pro forma cover that goes on anything that becomes a statement. And to become a statement it's voted on by the ALAC. So that's a 15-person electorate that makes it be known.

What I might do Margie is ask Heidi to share some of the words and intricacies of the wonderful world of ALAC with you and see whether we can come up with a specific set of words that indicates this is endorsed as a



report as opposed to becoming a statement of the ALAC because a statement from an advisory committee is a rather different beast than a report from a working group.

Margie Milam: Okay. I'll work with Heidi to...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Margie Milam: ...come up with some...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It sounds a bit arcane but because we want to push for a particular weight and recognition depending on how much community consultation endorse and transparencies associated with any particular process. If we just follow some language not dissimilar to how we describe a statement being born to say this is a report being endorsed as opposed to a statement of the ALAC being created, we should be okay.

Margie Milam: Okay. Okay. I'll take that as an action item to follow up with Heidi and include that in the red line to the group.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Fantastic. Heidi's probably going to throw a virtual brick at me of course. She...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: She really needs more work right now, don't you dear?

Heidi Ullrich: Taking notes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm ducking. I'm ducking. I'm virtually ducking while you're virtually going gee thanks Cheryl, just what I need. More work.

Beau Brendler: No actually that's been educational for me. I mean it's difficult to figure out what, you know, what the statement from the ALAC versus what the report endorsement versus the - it's good. Good exercise for me.

Cheryl Langdon Orr: If nothing else Beau, I am a (parent).

Margie Milam: All right Michele. That's all I have on the report.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Thank you. The next item on the agenda was discussion of the aspirational charter.

Beau Brendler: Well I can say - this is Beau, I can say that we rented the - presented the proceedings basically to the at large in Nairobi, when I say proceedings we basically just went through what we just talked about in the report, the process that was undertaken.

And people had a chance to review the aspirational material that was there, it was largely put together by Evan Leibovitch with some help from some other people and it's my belief at the moment that the at large gives it what's been stated there so far is pretty much all anyone has had to say yet.

So I'm not sure that we're going to see much more added to the aspirational registrant rights workspace until another deadline arises, in other words something that focuses specifically on trying to build this up, the next iteration of the RAA.

So if there were anything that I would say would be helpful at this point it might be some indication of process, in other words there's an aspirational registrant rights statement and workspace and whatever.

But to what end and at what time would addition to that be useful to anyone? Ten years from now? I mean - do you understand the question I'm asking?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I understand the question you're asking but I'd like to hear from Avri, hopefully she's got an answer.

Avri Doria: No, Avri only has questions.

Woman: Now I know that's not true.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: In this case it's true. Now first of all I need to confess up front that I only happened to have been listed on these groups because that was a residual from when I played chair and I was listed as an observer in every group.

However on finding out that no one from my stakeholder group had really been paying attention as we should I decided to start paying attention just so I could figure out what we needed to do catch up if catching up was still possible without delaying anything.

So that's where I'm at so in looking at - you know so I've looked through the documents that are about to go to the GNSO and we'll be talking about them in the NCSG.

In the - in terms of this aspirational document I don't quite have a grip on what is supposed to happen to it? Is it at a state where I should go into the NCSG, ring a lot of alarm bells and say hey guys, you know we really should comment on this, we really should X, Y or Z.

Or is this something that's now going as part of a package somewhere and you know we'll comment on it on the next pass in a working group, whatever. So for this I confess to ignorance because I've only been light following and I've only been trying to catch up for the last week.

Beau Brendler: I was just going to say I can answer to that a little bit to say that you and I are basically asking the same question. The aspirational language got put there

because when we initially embarked on this sub team exercise we weren't entirely clear to what it was we were supposed to do.

It sort of seemed like we were just cutting and pasting a certain amount of information from one place to another without any chance to sort of say hey, these sorts of things should be in the RAA you know.

But as it turned out there were some real deadline issues involved and we agreed to make the aspirational process ongoing and a place of discussion where people who were interested could say this is what we think should be in the RAA that's not there now.

But I don't think anybody knows when the next - or the question I was asking earlier is when is this going to be of any use? Is the RAA going to be renegotiated in any time soon?

Avri Doria: Okay, I know what I thought at the beginning when I was playing chair and the scope was being put together. I thought that that aspirational list was going to be fed in to part B and considered as part of their list of what needed to be done.

That would then go to the council with the analysis of oh, okay this needs a new contract, oh this falls within you know this method of doing something, oh this falls within that.

In other words because there's all different ways in which things and so it really depends on what the content was as to what part of improving RAA it could best be part of.

And that was supposedly a post B exercise as I understood it, though as I read and understand B now and I know this is not the place to talk to B, it looks like it's turned into a private registrar's party which I don't quite understand but that's beside the point.

Beau Brendler: B has? Or - because I'm not in B, I don't know anything (unintelligible).

Avri Doria: But as I said this isn't the point to talk about this.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...to avoid that of course.

Avri Doria: But anyway that's why I now having had the vantage of thinking I understood this when it was put together and now popping my head back in many months later and just being curious as to what's going on.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Can I catch some of those issues Beau and Michele?

Beau Brendler: Yeah, I was just going to say I mean I remember that being discussed at the early phases but yeah, go ahead.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay thanks. Avri, to some of the points you raised are exactly what caused some consternation, confusion and some issues in the very beginning of group A discussions where there was a belief certainly from some of the at large perspectives that an exercise of putting together an aspirational document would have a greater ability to feed into the group B processes at this point in time.

Battle scars and discussions later we are where we are and what we are looking at is a number of points coming out of group B where it would appear that there will be a proposal recommendation going to the GNSO council that says a revisit to the RAA is in fact a good thing.

And these matters brought forward by group B and prioritized and to meet the needs of various inputs, not the least of which is law enforcement need to be looked at and negotiated.

So to answer one of those questions and indeed yours Avri, yes there is a point in time in the not too distant future where the RAA will be revisited and in group B we've made quite a number of times to remind people that the whole signing off on the current RAA had this expectation wrapped in it that said and we will be reviewing soon.

So there is a opportunity in the near future, not distant future Beau, so if it's a ten year plan I'll certainly be dead and it's a shame to waste my few days of life now doing it.

We are looking at near future even in the terms of ICANN and contractual parties negotiations.

Where there will be an opportunity to relook at aspects of RAA and unless we have some aspirational high level and specific issues raised and repositioned somewhere, there won't be - we'll be in a catch up phase which is what we are currently in.

We have a number of points that have been raised by community historically again and again and again. They need to be captured. Some of those fit into the discussions in the group B and some of those actually end up being issues for compliance.

So we need a system sort space that says what is something that community and there I use the word end user and consumer is concerned or confused about needs to be analyzed and worked out.

In the aspirational charter space however we don't have a - other than a high level list, let's read them to the record, at the moment the aspirational rights registrants right states the following.

Have accurate current and complete contact and located information regarding the registrar, to be the sole entity capable of asserting and changing ownership information for their domain.

Have ample opportunity to renew their existing domains at the same rate as new domains.

To protect their trade name against unauthorized use. To refuse the transfer of their personal information to unauthorized bodies and to expect ICANN to enforce its agreements with registrars.

They're all laudable, they're very high level. Some of them are compliance and some of them go across the work of a whole lot of workgroups in GNSO space.

So whilst that fixed set is nice, we also need to capture and have discussion with non-commercial stakeholders group in the GNSO with perhaps an aggregation of consumer interests within the wonderful world of ICANN as to end what else and specifically what needs to be done looking forward.

She says stepping down off her soapbox.

Michele Neylon: Let's go to Paul, he's had his hand up for a while.

Paul Diaz: Thanks Michele and thank you Cheryl, you've actually kind of gotten to a lot of the questions that I had, you've answered them.

As a registrar rep in this group and certainly the folks in team B that are looking to this as well just help me understand this aspiration document.

We want to keep it up as a living document, correct?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Correct.

Paul Diaz: And then if so how does this - when we get to what seems to be an inevitable next round to negotiate the items that have been prioritized, the RAA, when we get to that is there an expectation that we'll continue to look to see what is in this aspirational document?

Or will it be - I'm just kind of at a loss between all right, at what point do you then go into the room, do your negotiation? Or do you have to keep you know opening the door to look to see what's on this list?

Because this might be a mechanism for members of the community to express the things that are really bothering them.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Future trigger point, yeah, I would hope that if the six golden rules are getting violated we're all in deep trouble. But if there are - if there is a - within a living document a suddenly number seven comes up.

Because let's face it, this is an industry that's near its maturity. Things will change, teenagers will grow into different sorts of adults.

And we now find that there is another need for rights and responsibilities to be specifically teased out and identified. And that may indeed need to be a trigger point for future.

But that would - that goes back to the chartering organizations to see how they want to deal with it I would have thought.

Paul Diaz: And that falls on because then I was going to ask, it's not necessarily something as you've identified yourself that is specific to an RAA negotiation, it might be a PDP that's needed because this is something that - okay.



Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Exactly. So I'd actually see two bands, if one looks at the - can I jump to the next - to the lower down on the agenda Michele without you trying to throw a virtual brick at me?

Michele Neylon: That's okay, go ahead.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, if you look at the RAA workspace for aspiration registrant rights, sad and pathetic little space that it is and boy does that need revamping but it's not my job to do that.

You saw that top band you know all motherhood and apple pie and yeah, hard to argue with any of them.

We also need a place for people dig deep, get up on their soapbox and a little bit like we've done in accountability and transparency and say (unintelligible) and for some form of authority to be able to look at that and it can be ALAC or it can be the GNSO or it can be just part three (unintelligible), the parts of the community.

And go ah, simply that's the compliance issue and if you do this then this complaint to compliance, your problem will be solved. In other words to have an interactive iterative open and welcoming space she says clearly eyebrow raised and you can imagine my face.

Where we don't get combative next steps but collusive and collaborative next steps. So there's no surprise to industry when they discover that demand is saying we're not happy about this, this and this happening.

This is a space which anyone who cares to take the optics and have a look at it, can go oh, gee, I could have a market differentiator by meeting that need.

Michele Neylon: Margie, then Avri.

Margie Milam: Sure, it sounds like and this is a suggestion to the group, there's been a fair amount of work on the aspirational charter and it's on this web page.

Is there a suggestion perhaps that we attach that list as it currently stands as an addendum or additional exhibit to this document?

And it also sounds like if we were to do that, if we want to think and talk about the next steps for the aspirational step we should probably think about including that in this report as well.

Beau Brendler: I'd be delighted by that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I can suggest there would be a whole lot of people putting up their hand and clapping and smiling from the end user part of the world, but Avri's got her hand up so let's hear from an end user and non-commercial interest perspective.

Avri Doria: I'll say yes to that and then I'll go back to my questions. So yeah. Now have these aspirational been considered at all by being in the middle of their what those law enforcement needs from us negotiations?

Or is this something that they've never looked at yet? And I know I should know the answer to that already but I don't.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Michele you've hear enough from me.

Michele Neylon: Yeah Avri, I think some of the items on that list come with the similar if not identical to the issues that came up in the other working group.

The other working group we were I think trying to split out some things that were to be dealt with by compliance, in other words that were either covered by existing consensus policy or the 2009 RAA because some people may confuse the difference between the two versions of the RAA which is

understandable considering there's one that's been around for nearly 10 years, and the other one has only been adopted within the last 12 months.

So some things that people had put down on various lists would be covered by the 2009 RAA and because it's still registrars of the 2001 RAA you know they wouldn't be bound by them.

I think most of those once they are now- Cheryl can correct me, I think most of those seem to have ended up being mentioned in some shape or form in the other working group.

Beau Brendler: Yeah, and I don't think - this is Beau, that's not by accident. I mean we tried to introduce some of the stuff that's the law enforcement community was saying earlier in this discussion and I think the response was pretty resoundingly against that.

So it wound up in group B. So to answer Avri's question.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And by that - that's okay because of the historic way that the work definitions the group A and B were firstly put together and seemed not half as well understood by all of us who signed up for it in the first place.

So I don't think we've lost anything by going down this particular process, as I say we are where we are, so Avri there are a whole bunch of themes that fit in those six high level statements that are absolutely chapter and verse in the very specific issues that are being discussed in prioritizing group B.

But what we couldn't do to have both groups doing the same work.

Avri Doria: Okay, I was really just - so it looks like sort of almost maybe the right thing happened in that the considerations of A for things that were aspirational beyond the simplification and English and turning the rights and responsibilities into English did make it to the other side of the fence.

And have to some extent being considered and so on so I think that yeah, and I'm sorry for bordering on opening issues that had already been covered, I apologize for my stakeholder group not having paid enough attention to what was going on until the last couple weeks.

But thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: But Avri, the time is absolutely perfect as we move now into next steps on an aspirational document platform to get meaningfully and effectively involved and have shall I suggest supply and demand sitting around the virtual title instead of across the battlefield?

I stepped away from my computer Michele so I'm not in the room as such now.

Michele Neylon: Oh I'm sorry what was the question?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm just saying to you I stepped away from the computer now, I've to get to a city meeting which means I've got to be out the door shortly so I'm away from my computer now.

Michele Neylon: Okay, so (unintelligible). So where does this leave things? Margie?

Margie Milam: That's my question as well, so sounds like I'll take the work from the workspace, I'll make it an addendum, but what does our report say with respect to the next steps on the aspirational charter, that's the part I'm not quite clear on.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Meeting in Nairobi, there's a couple of - I'm sorry, meeting in Nairobi a couple of things happened but meeting in Brussels there's a couple of opportunities, not the least of which is some exciting stuff that Avri can probably speak to.

Avri Doria: Yeah, the only thing that we're talking about is talking about a - you know trying to put together, trying to understand what a consumer agenda for - and Beau could have spoken to this as easily - what a consumer agenda would be for ICANN and certainly you know some of the consideration of registrants, rights and responsibilities but especially rights vis-à-vis the registrars is probably a real fine sub theme for any such workshop.

Beau Brendler: Yeah, I would agree, I mean I think we should send out the - this doesn't help Margie's question necessarily but I think we should send out the draft to the cross consumer group list that is going on now.

But I think we could put it - I mean I think if the next step is to make the aspirational work as far as it has proceeded an addendum to this report, I mean that would be a great next step for a number of people concerned I think.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And open up, clearly open up in almost a commons way which is why we'd need to (re G) that Wiki space, but why not meet with the community in Brussels and find out what the community wants as enablers and tools and mechanisms to work.

Michele Neylon: That's one thing though, if you want those slow down be the adoption of the registrant's rights and responsibilities charter?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No, because the six high levels, other six high levels that they are at this point in time.

Michele Neylon: Okay.

Beau Brendler: Yeah, that's why we broke it out in the first place was so we wouldn't hold up your deadline so you could publish this.

Avri Doria: Avri again and you know certainly what could happen is as that other work goes there could be a reviewing of its charter some down the road if there were specific things to try and add in to its list or a separate work object could be started, though that wouldn't make sense.

But you know once a charter is started it does not mean, especially something that's going to involve a negotiation process that hopefully won't be as black box and secret as the write up I read in B makes me think it's going to be.

And there should be ways to see new considerations in if the community comes up with new considerations.

Beau Brendler: Man, sounds like I should have joined B too.

Avri Doria: I was just reading it, I didn't join it, I was just reading it. Yeah, I mean we haven't gotten to the point yesterday of understanding whether we want to vote for the way B looks at the moment but that's beside the point.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Avri, sorry again kind of the closure to the jumping in with his hand up just you know slap me down. That's probably why the status of aspirational document next step is so important.

Because it's the sort of thing that from putting on my consumer advocacy hat in other parts of the world in the telco industry that could be a deal breaker.

If we don't have an opportunity to make sure our voices are heard and our concerns are considered then we can get really difficult to deal with.

If we feel there's iteration going on it can make a slightly different basis.

Michele Neylon: (Audrey)?

(Audrey): Yeah, I just wanted to clarify the recommendations of working group B. That's not the consensus at the moment, what's reflected in the report is the request that came from I think it was (Staton) network solutions and in Steve Metalitz's email when he forwarded it out he just noted that that was still open to discussion.

And I think where Steve reported on our last call was that there was consensus to have the process be open and there would be a minority position of the registrars indicating that the process should not be open.

But that's still in flux Avri, so...

Avri Doria: Okay fantastic. I had (unintelligible) before Monday. I had read going into Monday I couldn't make the Monday meeting so thank you.

(Audrey): Sure, and it sounds like it's more in stone than - and in fact it's the opposite as the current consensus level is but it's still being hashed out by back room.

Avri Doria: Well I'll be joining them next week.

Michele Neylon: Okay so is there anything else that we need to look at this evening? Margie is that hand from before?

Margie Milam: No, that's - I'll do my best in trying to capture the concepts here related to aspirational work. I think if you guys and when you get focused specifically on the next sort of the operational (unintelligible) but...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Michele?

Michele Neylon: Go ahead.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Just this before Avri talked about linking, enshrining or replacement of the six points, the six golden rules which are the current aspirational registrant rights charter.

I was wondering from a perspective as Margie and some - yeah, obviously Margie and Heidi but Margie put these reports together in the past, is there precedent for us to have say those six points as a sort of like a shaded box so we have them you know, highlighted in the document but simply they are what they are?

At this stage this is what the aspirational rights charter says? They're not sort of hidden in the text so much as Heidi help me here, you know what I'm trying to say, that they stand out but they don't stand out to be any more than this is the statement that is the current aspirational registrant rights document.

Michele Neylon: Would somebody cover (unintelligible) themselves?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No, I didn't want it as an addendum.

Michele Neylon: Okay, I was just trying to understand what...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I want it right up front in the executive summary, it needs - you know it's six lines, you know it's less than 200 words, in fact it's less than 100 words.

You know a little shaded box somewhere up front so that people don't have to get past Page 42 to find out what it is, this scary thing that we're talking about.

Margie Milam: Yeah this is Margie, that's fine, I can include it in the body, I didn't realize it was so short. It would make sense to include it in the body of the text.



Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, I'd pull it out, not as part of the report per se but a reference to a set of requirements for want of a better word. A little shaded box just makes it you know like an example or you know image.

Michele Neylon: That probably might be a good idea to it says but at the particular date and time that you have...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, as that this is the date of.

Michele Neylon: Yeah.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Good.

Woman: I have a question Michele, should we fill another call to follow the next person of the draft so we can say okay good, it's final?

Michele Neylon: It might not be a bad idea just to see - you know if you're going to send around a revised draft via email and then I mean if this - if everybody gives some input on whether they're happy or unhappy with this, I personally can't see anything to (unintelligible).

I mean if Beau or Cheryl or somebody feels that we should have another call you know so be it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well remember I want this signed off on by ALAC next week. It would have to be (unintelligible).

Michele Neylon: You're breaking up on me Cheryl, I can't - I couldn't catch that, sorry.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: This has to be an enormous (unintelligible) to be motivated to make another call.

Michele Neylon: So you'd agree with me that another call wouldn't be a good idea.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Very unlikely to have another call.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Margie can we work on the basis that we do not intend to have any other calls...

Man: They're finally coming for you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: They've come to get you Avri, they've tracked you down, they've come to get you.

Michele Neylon: Okay is there anything else anybody wants to address? Margie?

Margie Milam: No, that's fine. We'll assume no other meeting and we'll do everything by the list. I'll send out a new draft by tomorrow.

Michele Neylon: Okay then can we call this a wrap then?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Fine by me.

Beau Brendler: I thought we had done that in February. Sorry.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Beau, never let a report go out without going over it with a fine toothed comb, trust me. Thanks Michele, thanks Beau, thanks everyone.

Heidi, I'm out of office until mid afternoon now.

Heidi Ullrich: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So you'll have to Skype at me and I may be able to switch on my phone.

Heidi Ullrich: Okay. As of right now.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: As of - join me in the bathroom, I'm dressed, I'm going now, good bye.

Woman:           Bye everybody.

END