

**Registration Accreditation Agreement Drafting Team teleconference
TRANSCRIPTION**

Tuesday 09 June at 13:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Registration Accreditation Agreement Drafting team teleconference on Tuesday 09 June at 1300 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/gns0/gns0-raa-20090609.mp3>

On page:

<http://gns0.icann.org/calendar/#june>

All recordings and transcriptions are posted on the GNSO calendar page:

<http://gns0.icann.org/calendar/>

Present for the teleconference:

Avri Doria - GNSO Council chair
Nacho Amadoz - Registry C.
Steve Metalitz - IPC
Marc Trachtenberg - IPC
Kristina Rosette - IPC
Philip Corwin - CBUC
Konstantinos Komaitis - NCUC
Stéphane van Gelder - Registrar
Alan Greenberg - ALAC liaison to GNSO Council
Carlton Samuels - At-Large
Evan Leibovitch - At-Large

ICANN Staff

Liz Gasster - Senior Policy Counselor, ICANN Policy Support
Margie Milam - Senior Policy Counselor
Marika Konings - Policy Director
Heidi Ullrich - At-Large Regional Affairs Manager
Glen de Saint G ery - GNSO Secretariat

Glen DeSaintgery: I'll do that with pleasure. Carlton Samuels?

Carlton Samuels: Yes, speaking.

Glen DeSaintgery: Nachos Amadoz, from the registry constituency, Alan Greenberg, ALAC, Evan Leibovitch, Steve Metalitz, IPC, Marc Trachtenberg, IPC,

Avri Doria, the GNSO Chair, Konstantinos Komaitis, NCUC and Philip Corwin from the business constituency.

And for staff we have Margie Milam, Marika Konings, Heidi Ullrich and Liz Gasster and Glen de Saint Gery.

Avri Doria: Okay, hello all. Okay this is I think the first meeting of this drafting team. And so I've got an agenda that I put together that I'll explain in a second. But - and by the way the agenda came out. It was one of the messages under the registrar (accreditation) agreement RAA Drafting Team (DTTDT) call on Tuesday, blah, blah.

So it was under that announcement that we all got really confused on about what call was this, what we're we to do? So let me quickly give background and I apologize a little for raspy voice.

The GNSO has the - it's recommendation, its motion to the Board awhile back. And in that motion we had suggested the creation of two different groups.

One to look at further possible improvements, changes, what-have-you - what the right word is to the RAA and the other one to look at the Registrants Bill of Rights or whatever name it is finely given. These were basically things that came out of sort of the consensus building movement at the end in the GNSO to accept that.

Now as far as I know, the Board didn't - the Board approved the RAA Amendments but didn't in any sense bless these groups. But that doesn't mean that we don't go on with them.

So now when it came to the GNSO to basically start building charters for these two groups and such to take the next step in the creation of working groups, it decided that as opposed to building two drafting teams for charters from the very beginning, because it was really difficult at times to know exactly where one topic began and the other one ended that it would put together one drafting team to work on the working group charters.

Now a further complication in this is that while working groups are GNSO sponsored things - entities, the one on registrant rights is to be a joint ALAC/GNSO working group so the procedure of putting together a working group for that will be slightly different than just GNSO passing a charter.

My assumption would be is coming up with a charter that works for both the GNSO and ALAC and both groups would have to bless it.

So that's sort of the background of why one group? Why the name of it is what the name of it is because it came out of the emotion - the motion on the RAA agreement. And so since both of these working groups are sort of produced out of that, that's where the name for this drafting team and this meeting came.

So I sent around a first agenda. Since as - since this group had no one coordinating or leading it. As GNSO Chair, either GNSO Chair or Vice Chair sort of fills that role until someone else comes forward to fill that role.

So the first thing I had on this, a very selfish point, is figuring out who's going coordinate this team. I'm starting out as interim until replaced.

But I really do believe it should be someone other than me. Partially because I'm always going around and starting off the various groups and it may be difficult for me to stay completely focused as much as the person chairing this needs to.

Then to start the work of figuring out how many working groups we're actually working on and how it's divided. Figure out how the GNSO and ALAC are going to work together on this and then get volunteers to start working on charters and motions, if we get that far.

Now one other item I should, probably, put in before I start opening on the first item. Is that (Cheryl) and I have spoken and what we have basically sort of set as the first place is we would have this meeting. We would see what develops of it.

Then I think there would already be enough people from ALAC in this one that it would sort of be a natural way forward to just say this group keeps working on it.

Or if we didn't have sufficient representation from ALAC here or the people from ALAC felt that that was still the right way to go, we would plan a separate call for people from this group and people from ALAC Central Committee or whatever the proper name is.

ALAC/ALAC to - and please correct me for not - and forgive me for not having names straight - I often don't get my own name straight - for actually having a joint call to figure out how to proceed from there.

So I don't know if there's any question clarifications or whatever on that first bit of spiel. No, okay.

Steve Metalitz: Avri, this is (Steve), I think you've laid out the task here, but it may be that the first step is to figure out if this is one group or two groups because if it's two groups then I guess we need two coordinators and...

Avri Doria: Well, okay, the first thing is I think for the moment the GNSO has certainly put together just one drafting team. I think that for certain what we - and I think it's for the GNSO its one drafting team to produce two charters. Unless we decide that one drafting team can't produce two charters.

I think once we have charters we're probably talking about two working groups. But I don't know if we actually need two drafting teams unless people think we need two drafting teams.

Does that make sense in terms of the separation of how many drafting teams do we need for charters and how many working groups do we need to charter?

Alan Greenberg: It's Alan. I suspect but I don't know that we may well find that when we go on to the trying to draft the RAA charter, the working group charter, it becomes a more complex issue and is not going to be the focus of some of the people on the group right now. So the group may well evolve.

Avri Doria: Right. One of the things that concerns me to be honest about splitting it too early in the drafting team, is that we seem to understand the first step of the RAA. We've already moved, pretty much, to the second item, which I think is not a good idea because we still need to find out if

there's another person to service the Chair, but we can move that to the end.

We seem to have determined that for the RAA - for the registrant rights the first activity is fairly, clearly defined. And that's find out what rights there are already and get them documented. Now the second set for that...

Alan Greenberg: Avri, it's Alan. I think you're jumping the gun. I think we need to make sure that we're all talking about the same document with the same content before we go on to saying how do we draft it. I suspect that is not the case at the moment.

Avri Doria: You mean there's more than one document defining what rights already exist (unintelligible).

Alan Greenberg: I think different people on this call and in previous conversations may have different perceptions of what a registrant right charter is.

Avri Doria: I see.

Alan Greenberg: I mean, I hope I'm wrong but I don't think so.

Evan Leibovitch: This is Evan. I'll add on to what Alan was saying in the sense that I think there's a little bit of confusion over whether or not the intended charter is to be simply an enumeration of current rights and responsibilities or something that we should be working towards in terms of defining what rights should be.

Avri Doria: Yes, no I acknowledge that. And if I had sort of finished the bit I was saying, I had talked about the first part of enumerating what rights have already been defined and getting them into one place.

Then the second part I thought was one looks at that and then says okay, well what (unintelligible) what rights need to be further defined and moving on from there. And that second part at some point needed to dove-tail back into a RAA type of agreement because one doesn't define rights outside of the agreement.

But anyhow I'll stop. First of all is there anyone else that wants to lead this? Please. Okay, I'll keep doing it for the moment but please I will be looking for someone to take over this responsibility. That's another thing with two drafting teams we need to find two people.

So I guess where we move to was figure out how many groups we need. And I guess we need to divide that discussion first in to how many groups do we need to draft charters? And then second how many groups do we need to do the work? And I'll take a queue on who wants to talk to it.

Alan Greenberg: Alan.

Avri Doria: Alan, anyone else? Wait and hear what Alan says, okay, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: In my mind and I may be unique. I think the drafting of the charter for the registrant right - drafting the charter to write the registrant right document. So we don't use the word charter twice.

Once we come to closure and everyone agreeing what that charter is, I think is the easy task and I would suggest we do that one first.

Writing a charter for a working group on RAA, I think is going to be a much more complex one because it's going to involve in the long-term not just writing policy but some levels of negotiation and discussion with registrars because based on the contract it's a more complex process I think.

I would have preferred to have some more registrars here to speak to that. But - so I think that's going to be the second one. And I think that, although I hope we'll have only one Chair for both parts, I think the group is going to evolve if we do it in that order which I think is the logical order to do it in.

Avri Doria: Certainly working sequentially makes sense, although possibly we could also work in parallel if we had different groups of people interested in different things. Anyone else?

Steve Metalitz: Avri, this is (Steve).

Carlton Samuels: This is Carlton.

Avri Doria: (Steve), okay, I have (Steve), let me build the list. Who after (Steve)?

Carlton Samuels: Carlton.

Avri Doria: Carlton. Anyone else wish to be on the list? Okay, go ahead (Steve).

Steve Metalitz: Yes I just sent around what was actually adopted by the Council on this, I think this is what we're basing our discussions here on and it seems to contemplate two groups sort of a parallel process.

They both have to culminate by - you're supposed to report by July 31. But it does seem to be if the Council contemplated two separate groups.

There's obviously a lot of overlap or some overlap between these tasks. But there are certainly are some things that would be covered in the RAA group that might not be covered in the registrant rights charter group and perhaps vice versa.

So I know that there's some benefit to - and efficiency benefit if we can combine them. But I'm just wondering whether that's first consistent with the Council resolution and second there's enough overlap for that to work.

Avri Doria: Yes. Okay, yes, the Council resolution - if I remember it correctly. I haven't seen what you sent around yet. It was to have basically both groups chartered by the 31st. Is that correct?

Steve Metalitz: No (unintelligible).

Avri Doria: Not to have them actually done or doing stuff yet.

Steve Metalitz: No, I think as I read it and folks can read it. It says a draft registrant rights charter. I mean just to draft a registrant rights charter and a draft charter, which I assume means registrar rights charter, shall be completed no later than July 31.

And then the second paragraph says the drafting team on RAA shall endeavor to and provide its advice to the Council and ICANN staff no later than July 31. So that - there seems to be two separate work products.

Now I recognize that this resolution was adopted when the Council thought and hoped that they Board would act on the package of RAA Amendments in March in Mexico City.

So as the Board ended up not acting until May. So that obviously makes this - it's a difficult to meet these deadlines. But I'm just kind of going back to what the (unintelligible).

Alan Greenberg: Could I get back in the queue Avri, it's Alan?

Avri Doria: Okay, I've got Carlton and then I've got Alan. Carlton.

Carlton Samuels: Yes, this is Carlton. I was pretty much the same concern I had that if you look at the Council resolution (see) that they're two separate draftings. All right? But the somehow it seems that they expect them to coincide and come together at the end which suggest to me that they were expecting parallel working teams.

But I really support Alan in this. I think it should be sequential. It makes much more operational sense to make them sequential.

(Kristina): Avri, it's (Kristina). Can I get in the queue please?

Avri Doria: Certainly, hi (Kristina). Okay I've got Alan and (Kristina). Anyone else wish to be in the queue while I'm queue building? Okay, go ahead Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, I think we need to make sure that we're not confusing this drafting team which is drafting charters and the group or groups which will use those charters and produce the actual work product.

In my mind and based on the early comments on the mailing list, everyone seems to agree that the group producing the right charter and the group working on RAA amendments will likely be two different groups.

Council in its wisdom or it's whatever decided that there be one drafting team to draft the two charters and that's the process that I'm suggesting we may want to look at sequentially but quickly because there was a target within the resolution of 30 days after the Board motion.

And whether we miss the dates or not because of the two month delay in the Board decision and whatever is not - we need to discuss that as we write the charters whether we need to flip those dates any ways.

But I think right now we are just talking about writing the charters, not doing the work and that was the only thing the Council deemed at this point to be done by the same group.

Avri Doria: Yes and though it left the question open of how many groups came after. (Kristina).

(Kristina): I would just note that from my perspective as somebody who was very involved in drafting this resolution that it was not the intention that you would have one group drafting those, at least it was not my intention as a drafter.

Avri Doria: That you would not have one group drafting both charters or you would not have one group doing both sets of work?

(Kristina): Both.

Avri Doria: I see. Okay because within the Council we did end up voting for just - approving just one drafting team.

Alan Greenberg: With some dissention.

Avri Doria: Yes.

(Kristina): Right.

Avri Doria: Okay, yes I don't remember. I guess (Kristina) must have been among the dissenting. And I think in some ways it really doesn't matter. If we have within this one group - it separates into two different groups of people working on the two different charters and we bring it back.

I mean drafting teams are not that formal and if those drafting team naturally split into two drafting teams to do the work. You know, but perhaps just using a common list. Is that a problem? I'm asking a question.

Alan Greenberg: I don't think we should spend the next month debating the structure of the drafting team.

Avri Doria: Neither do I, but people need to agree on what we're doing.

Evan Leibovitch: (Hand up).

Avri Doria: Who?

Evan Leibovitch: Evan.

Avri Doria: Evan, yes.

Evan Leibovitch: The way I've been reading it on the mailing list, the teams like the two groups have very, very different function. I mean, I see the rights charters as almost a visionary kind of document as opposed to the RAA which is much more of a contractual lets implement this in legal-ease kind of thing. The two things I see - I personally see is being actually fairly different things.

Avri Doria: Okay, I have a question. What does the rights document mean if it's not embodied in contract?

Evan Leibovitch: Well they were both required but they're both very different things. You know, think of a constitution and think of the laws that are governed by the constitution. They're very different things.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: I can, it's Alan, I can speak with some authority that what (Tim) and the registrars think we are talking about in a charter of rights is an enumeration of existing rights in clear language that's accessible to registrants, not buried in the details of contracts. But it simply documents rights and responsibilities of registrants.

It is not the visionary document that Evan is talking about and that's the substance of the difference that I mentioned earlier.

Evan Leibovitch: Yes, as a matter of fact, the documentation thing could be something that staff could do. We don't need to get involved in something that simply enumerates what exists.

Alan Greenberg: And indeed the RAA refers to it as if ICANN ever drafts the document. I suspect that Bill Drake, if he was on the call, would say what we really meant was what Evan was talking about.

And that's why I think we really need to have the discussion and get it out with the people who were part of the drafting of the motion to make sure that we are talking about the same thing and not two different things. I don't - (Kristina) was part of that. Maybe (Kristina) could tell us what she thought it meant.

(Kristina): To be perfectly candid with you, I was more focused on the other part of the resolution than the registrant's charter so I wouldn't - I can't purport to give any kind of definitive answer.

Alan Greenberg: It's unfortunate we have neither Bill nor (Tim) on the call.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Marc Trachtenberg: This is Marc Trachtenberg.

Avri Doria: Yes Marc.

Marc Trachtenberg: I mean to the extent that the charter of registrant rights is just an enumeration of existing rights seems to me that it's not - maybe not so relevant to the discussion of further amendments to the RAA.

Avri Doria: Yes, well that was just the first step. I think that the compromise that sort of came out if I was listening accurately between Bill and (Tim) as points is first to enumerate what's there and then discuss where the gaps are and where one goes from there.

Marc Trachtenberg: Based on a message that (Tim) sent to the list a few days ago, it's clear in his mind that the - where we go from here and what's missing is the RAA discussion not the registrants right's charter discussion.

Avri Doria: Exactly and that's why at this point we ended up in sort of a similar and a single drafting team to try and sort of figure out that because that is indeed, you know, the way it looks to some of the GNSO participants.

Marc Trachtenberg: But to the extent that we're going to, you know, identify things that are gaps in the, you know, existing registrant right's charter or whatever existing registrant's rights are, it would seem to me to the extent that we're going to try to incorporate those things into the RAAs and in a sense the RAA amendments would then have to be a discussion that's subsequent to figuring out all of the registrant rights issues.

Avri Doria: Except that...

Marc Trachtenberg: So instead of running parallel, it would seem that logically the Registrars Accreditation Agreement Amendments would have to run after some type of registrant rights discussion.

Avri Doria: Except...

Alan Greenberg: I don't know, we have long lists of desired rights at this point which were not implementing in this RAA.

Avri Doria: And (Kristina) can probably speak to this better than I can. I think though that there were also a list of concerns that while they may be cast as registrant rights, that there were basically a list of concrete concerns that a number of people had about the RAA that hadn't been covered in the amendments that they wanted to start working on immediately.

So one could look at it as there are two initial steps. One for the RAA amendment's group which is to figure out what the list of things are and there's a basket of items. One of which is possible registrant's rights that will come out of the other group.

And then there's another group that starts working on, you know, defining what registrant's rights there are, identifying the gaps and basically writing almost a requirements document of what rights needed to be further defined and that was an input then later to the RAA group.

But they didn't need to wait on that because there was a whole long list of issues that were already in people's mind and pending for that group to start looking into and to start figuring out were those issues that could be dealt with within the consensus policies?

Were those issues that were purely contractual that needed to find some other means, et cetera? So basically getting a list of those issues and starting to understand what the process would be for getting those issues taken care of and registrant's rights per se was just one item in that basket. And (Kristina), please tell me if I've got that wrong.

(Kristina): No you don't and in fact it's my recollection - although I would certainly defer to Bill and (Mary) and other folks in that NCUC.

It's my recollection that the primary reason the registrant right's charter was filtered out and dealt with separately was to ensure that it was dealt with quickly as opposed to just lumping it in with everything else and having it dealt with when it kind of came to the top of the list.

Avri Doria: I see, okay that was a piece that I didn't include, thank you. So does anyone else want to speak on this topic in general yet before we try to narrow down what to do?

Steve Metalitz: Yes, Avri, this is (Steve).

Avri Doria: Yes.

Steve Metalitz: I think you've summarized it quite well I think. And I suppose my - I think there's - as I said, I think there's some overlap but not - there's a lot of non-overlap too.

So I guess my suggestion would be that the people whose focus is more on the RAA Amendments which will include a number of topics, one of which is registrant's rights, should form their group. And the people who are emotionally interested in registrant's rights charter, this document of - sort of an aspirational document or, you know, not limited to just reciting what the rights are in the existing RAA should form that group.

And that they can work in parallel at least at first with the understanding that the output of the registrant rights group will have to get incorporated at some point into discussion of RAA amendments to some extent.

And I would - if - I would volunteer to circulate to those interested a draft of the charter for the RAA drafting team, if you will, if the staff can provide me with kind of a template of what needs to be in such a charter.

Avri Doria: Okay, I think that that's a good idea. Would you have any objection though to working within the same list so that - and just carefully subject our notes so people knew which one we were playing with.

Steve Metalitz: That's fine with me.

Avri Doria: Just so we can keep it (confused) and people that are interested in both can follow both.

Alan Greenberg: Avri, do you envision one of the outputs of the charter working group to be the document of existing rights which will then get posted on the ICANN Web site and registrars are required to point to?

Avri Doria: In so far as I have any vision at all other than trying to make sure that these groups get started reasonably. Yes, if that's seen as - basically at the moment I'm calling it the RAA Amendments and the Registrant's Rights. So on the registrant's rights side I would see that as being a first outcome.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, but that group would then continue and also work on aspired rights?

Avri Doria: Yes, with one caveat. This group - that group, the registrant's rights group needs to coordinate with ALAC more than just this meeting coordinating with ALAC but, you know, my agreement with (Cheryl) is that for the registrant rights part of this, ALAC, it's a peerage.

Alan Greenberg: Understand, but in your mind it's a two-step process. One is the tabulation in clear simple language of existing rights and the other is then go on with it and say what should they be?

Avri Doria: That would be my, you know, engineers take on a way to do it, yes. As I say, it's - I'm just one person, you know, who happens to look at things in that sort of progression.

You know, I mean, I could certainly imagine that there would be others. And it's really up to that group to figure out what it's going to do that would say now first we have to discuss the normative of what should

be, and then once we have the normative, let's check off the ones that are met and deal with the ones that aren't.

Now that's not the approach that I would take but I could certainly imagine the group of people working on that, you know, coming to a consensus decision - well, I'm not sure because I would assume there would be registrars in that group.

But that that would be one possible way that people would approach it. As I say, that's not the one I would personally recommend but I can certainly see the rhyme or reason to it.

So if that - do people object to sort of working in these two separate groups within this team and sort of tracking what each other's doing by reading on the list but really even having separate conversations while we're doing this and (Steve), do I understand that circulating a first draft means that you're also sort of willing to take responsibility for sort of ushering it through?

Steve Metalitz: Sure.

Avri Doria: Great.

Steve Metalitz: I'll be glad to take that on.

Avri Doria: Okay and...

Steve Metalitz: Again, I'm hoping the staff can provide me a template of...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Yes, I think Marika or Margie may already have one. Marika or Margie, I mean you guys already have kind of like a template that you've used for other new working groups, correct?

Margie Milam: Yes, we can easily put something together and help (Steve).

Avri Doria: Okay great because I knew you had helped already several other working groups so I was pretty sure that you had those in your arsenal.

Now in terms of the other group, the registrant's - what I'm calling the registrant's rights group for now, leaving the word charter out of its name, how do we want to approach that?

Evan Leibovitch: Well, you - Avri, this is Evan - you said that you need - there was a need for more ALAC engagement on that part of it.

Avri Doria: Unless you guys aren't the official representatives of ALAC and what, you know, you guys are actually representing them, I believe that since this is a GNSO meeting that we need to have that bit of coordination.

Alan Greenberg: We can come to closure on that ourselves moderately quickly. I'm more concerned with insuring that we have NCUC participation which is where the, you know, this motion originated.

Avri Doria: Right.

Alan Greenberg: And without having (Mary) or Bill here who were involved in that process I don't think we want, I don't think we're in a position to make decisions.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: And similarly with (Tim).

Avri Doria: Right. So basically we need to get a dialogue going between (Tim), (Mary), Bill, Alan and Evan to bring that together. So another - is there anyone else from ALAC that we need to pull in? Like do we need to pull in (Cheryl) or is that - are you guys are really?

Evan Leibovitch: That can be posted back to ALAC to find out who else is interested. I think if we end up asking if there's volunteers who are interested specifically on - I'll call it a visionary document on registrant rights, we're probably going to get more people involved than there were for purely the RAA.

Carlton Samuels: Well, this is Carlton. Can I say that that's one of the reasons why I kept on trying to be a part of this group because from the discussions (unintelligible) the issue has always been that we should have an (unintelligible) visionary document that sets out certain objectives.

And that is what I thought I was signing up to be a part of and if we could go back to ALAC and to the (at-large) we would probably get some more people now that we (unintelligible).

Alan Greenberg: Avri, to answer your question, for this drafting team I do not believe we need anyone else. If we decide to add one more person we'll say so quickly. As far as the actual working group...

Avri Doria: Okay. So we need to have a joint meeting in other words?

Alan Greenberg: ...joint working group, the answer may be quite different.

Avri Doria: Okay. But we don't need to have...

Alan Greenberg: First we need the charter.

Avri Doria: But okay.

Evan Leibovitch: Do I hear you right that this is not really a GNSO/ALAC thing. This is really an NCUC/ALAC thing.

Avri Doria: NC - no, it's a GNSO/ALAC thing. However NCUC has been the motivating force within the GNSO for this particular activity. Okay. So now we have one group that's already working on putting together the shell of the charter for this one.

Do I - it sounds like with Carlton, Evan, Alan, volunteering Bill who's not here and volunteering (Tim) who's not here, we have a group of people who could begin working on the other charter.

Alan Greenberg: Yes.

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Evan Leibovitch: Yes. I'm going to suggest inviting in Garth Bruin as well. He - in a small conversation of this on the North American regional region that we had yesterday he sounded like he was quite interested in this and it's what he's been doing in his day job for quite a while. I see one or two other people I'd want to...

Alan Greenberg: Evan, I thought he was - we were talking in that conversation about the actual working group, not the drafting team.

Avri Doria: Okay. The moment we have to build the charter for this work that can be blessed by both ALAC and GNSO.

Evan Leibovitch: Yes.

Avri Doria: Before we actually start on the work we need some document that basically defines the parameters of the work, says what it's outcomes are, you know, it gives a couple of milestones and, you know, that sort of administrative bookkeeping at the beginning of projects to make sure we have something that we can track.

Evan Leibovitch: So this isn't the making the charter, this for defining it.

Avri Doria: This is for defining the group that does that work.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: With the work product due in a few weeks...

Man: Yes.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: ...or less.

Avri Doria: Okay. So, Alan, are you willing to sort of take the lead on trying to get that charter together?

Alan Greenberg: No. But I'd like to Bill - I would like to try to get Bill in that position.

Avri Doria: Like to try and get Bill in that position, okay.

Alan Greenberg: I'm already overcommitted and I...

Avri Doria: Okay. Yes you are.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: ...for a bunch of reasons I believe he should be leading this not me.

Avri Doria: Okay. So I guess I'll try and get Bill to do that. Now I guess I come back to a question. I earlier was indicating that I thought maybe keeping this on two lists - on one list was the best. But as I listened to people I start to wonder whether that makes sense.

Stéphane: Avri, this is Stéphane.

Avri Doria: Hi, Stéphane.

Stéphane: Hi. I've been listening to you guys. I would like to - I seem to be the only registrar representative on the call.

Avri Doria: Yes.

Stéphane: I would like to be able to follow both conversations if there's an email list that's out there.

Avri Doria: Okay, great. Then we'll (save us) one.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Do you have anything to add to the conversation?

Stéphane: I'm sorry. What was that?

Avri Doria: Stéphane.

Alan Greenberg: This is short enough lived that it shouldn't be a problem.

Avri Doria: Okay, great. I just wanted to make sure that I wasn't dictating something that everyone else thought was painful. Stéphane, we've been talking about registrars what they want and how they want to see things go and I know you intentionally kept yourself quiet, but now that you've betrayed your presence.

Stéphane: I wasn't trying to be stealthy or anything, but no, I just wanted, you know, just want to...

Avri Doria: Okay.

Stéphane: ...listen to what was being said. I was - I'm sure that on the second part of the motion, the part about whether there are further amendments that need to be drafted or not.

I think we need to start - from our registrar point of view the crucial issues obviously are with the possible further changes to the RAA and if they are - if there is a need for further changes.

But so, you know, that's one answer - one question that we need to answer from a registrar perspective is are further amendments needed and if so what are they? So obviously there will need to be some kind of registrar presence on that drafting team or working group or whatever it will be.

On the other one I think I'd love to be an observer at least and just listen to what people feel should go in registrant rights charter. I'm sure some registrar input is needed there as well and I would hope it would be welcomed.

Avri Doria: Okay, thanks. I'm sure it would be. Okay. I have a question for staff - I don't know if anyone here is prepared to answer it.

Several times people have sort of said oh, well the enumeration of what rights and responsibilities are already defined in the RAA is something that the staff could easily - I don't know if the word easily was added - but could do. Now is that something that the staff is willing to take on during that initial enumeration?

Margie Milam: Yes, this is Margie. Yes, I had thought that that would be very useful if the rest of the group thought that would be okay. It'd obviously be a starting point and more could be added to it or taken out. But that would be a fairly easy (expedite) on our part to come up with, you know, the types of things, section references, that sort of thing.

Avri Doria: Is there any objection to asking staff to do that as we're developing these charters which gives us a jump start on certainly what the registrant's rights group would be built upon?

Man: No, quicker the better.

Avri Doria: Hearing no objection, Margie, if you could fit that into your list of things to do it would be very much appreciated. And, you know, if you could let us know at some point, and obviously not immediately, you know, how long that would take you that would be useful.

Margie Milam: Yes. And I could - if it was okay with the group, I could work on that this week. It's something that I've already kind of been giving thought to. So it wouldn't take more than this week to put something together for you guys.

Avri Doria: It seems like it's okay with this group. I don't think anybody's saying no.

Margie Milam: Okay.

Avri Doria: So thank you.

Margie Milam: I'll take that as an action item.

Avri Doria: Okay, thanks. Okay. So - okay. So I guess coming out of this I don't know how much more there is to be done today other than I want to list what's happening and then we can see.

We basically on - we've sort of understood that there will two separate efforts within this team, one to produce a charter for RAA amendment

and that (Steve) will sort of develop a first credit that would help from - I guess it was either Margie or Marika, I wasn't sure - who is the (staff lead) for this particular group.

Marika Konings: It's Margie.

Avri Doria: And then...

Marika Konings: Margie.

Avri Doria: Margie, okay. I think that was Marika saying that.

Marika Konings: Yes.

Avri Doria: Okay. And, okay, on registrant rights that basically we have a first action item is that Margie is going to pull together a list of the existing ones. In the meantime we'll start thinking about a charter for the effort and we will try to get someone from (NUCUC), namely Bill, to sort of take the lead on this. Alan, can I list your help in trying to get me to talk Bill into doing that?

Alan Greenberg: You bet.

Avri Doria: Okay. So you and I have an action item to try and convince Bill that having gotten this into the motion, he is invited to step up and sort of take a lead on that effort. Is there anything else we need to cover?

I don't think we can go that much further down either of the paths at this point productively and it would give me great joy to end at least

one meeting in my life before time. Is there anything else that we should cover now?

Should we plan for another meeting before Sydney or should we try and gather ourselves at some point at least informally - at least the two separate, you know, efforts in Sydney? How should we approach taking the next step other than continuing on the list?

Alan Greenberg: I'd certainly like to see a draft charter, not necessarily agreed on by all parties, posted well before we leave for Sydney. It sounds like (Steve) is well on the way to doing that on the second half. If we can try to orchestrate that on the first half I think that will make for a much more productive quick meeting in Sydney.

Avri Doria: Okay. Do we need - we don't need another meeting do we before Sydney?

Alan Greenberg: Probably impossible to...

Evan Leibovitch: (No, it doesn't).

Avri Doria: Probably impossible. I know. I'm travelling to Sydney starting on Wednesday next week.

Alan Greenberg: Me too.

Evan Leibovitch: Yes, I mean - this is Evan. I mean in my sort of wish list what would be great is to start to assemble the people who would actually be working on the rights document to start that ball rolling (in to me).

Avri Doria: I think that's a great idea in the background for people to start, you know, pulling together the teams and stuff because as soon as we've got, you know, the charters agreed to, they can just start cooking.

Anything else we should cover today? I thank you for putting up with all my confusion and I wish us good luck in getting the work started.

Stéphane: Thanks very much, Avri.

Alan Greenberg: (Have a) safe travel...

Avri Doria: Thank you.

Alan Greenberg: ...(unintelligible) everyone if we don't talk again.

Avri Doria: Okay, yes. Thank you. Bye-bye.

Man: Bye.

Woman: Bye.

END