
SUE SCHULER: Great, thanks. Okay, all set.

GRAEME BUNTON: Now what?

DONNA AUSTIN: What I was asking myself is: who's leading the call? But I wasn't on the last call with ICANN staff. I have reviewed the notes and there's a couple of things that... Well, Karla sent a message recently. So one thing we probably need to discuss is how we feel about changing the duration of the calls with ICANN staff from 60 minutes to 90 minutes. And one of the other things that I picked up when I was listening to the call is that we need to talk about updating, mechanisms for updating the RDAP profile. I know there were some thoughts about whether endorsement from the SJs is a possible way to do that. But in listening to the recording and viewing the language that was on the screen that I now can't find, I think if we rephrase what Karla had come up with, we might be able to find a way forward with that. But like I said, I can't find that language. So that's what I've got for discussion. I'm not sure what [Alice] had, Graeme.

GRAEME BUNTON: That sounds like a pretty good agenda to me. And I don't have anything in particular. So let's start with that second thing on the one hour to 90 minutes and keep going.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. So how do folks feel about... Are we going to get value if we add an additional 30 minutes to the call or are we just going to end up in the same place that we are with 60 minutes? Interested in people's thoughts.

GRAEME BUNTON: I think we're about to get into... I see your hand, Geoff, so I'll go right to you next. But I think we're about to be in a place where we're reviewing a lot of text rather than just [faffing] about. And in that context, I think the 90 minutes might be useful because then we can get through that text review faster. Geoff?

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. I think this might agree but disagree a little bit. I have not been finding these calls very useful with Karla. It almost feels like it's a working group call as opposed to a legal negotiation. So we have their text, right? Why don't we take some time, edit that text, figure out what we can live with—I think we know all the issues that they've put on the table—and then wait to have a longer call with them once we have all of our ducks in a row? I just think getting on these calls where, like I said, it's like we're trying to develop some policy here when we're all just trying to negotiate a contract. I think they've given us something to work with. Let's work with it and then not have another call until we're ready to give something back.

GRAEME BUNTON: Boy, Jeff, that sounds pretty sensible to me and what we, in theory, should be using these calls for. I see a hand from Rick too.

RICK WILHELM:

Sure. Thanks, Graeme. One of the things that I found challenging about where we are right now is that we're talking about an amendment to the agreement, but yet, we're not working with a redline of the agreement or with particular sections of the agreement. And so consequently, a lot of the, various of the topics that we're discussing are really lacking context when we're going through the text and the content in our meetings. And so I think that the sooner we got to discussing a proposed redline of, I guess, the base RA and RRA respectively, I think the better will be for us to make progress because it'll be more apparent that the progress that we're making is actually going to be impacting the proposed final documents. Thank you.

GRAEME BUNTON:

Donna, thoughts on that? Others?

DONNA AUSTIN:

So I understand where Jeff and Rick are coming from, and maybe the onus here is on us to understand what we want to get out of these calls. So obviously, Karla and Russ are driving the agenda and the calls and have identified a sequence of discussion points that they want to have. And I suspect that the ultimate goal is that once we've got through those discussion points, which I believe are probably what they consider to be the hot, the touchy subjects, then we do the redline. But I certainly understand Rick's comment that sometimes it's difficult to have those conversations when they're taken out of context. And to Jeff's point too about we're not really dealing with the agreements themselves. And I see Jeff's hand is up, so Jeff, do you want to go ahead?

JEFF NEUMAN:

They did give us two documents, one for the registry agreement, one for the registrar agreement, and in a lot of ways, they're similar, except I think the registry agreement has different sections that each thing refers to and the registry has the reporting requirement and the registrars don't. So I do think we can work off those summary of changes. I don't see a huge issue with some of that, but there are areas and Rick brought it up the last time on the call, where they say, "Okay, change every reference from RDDS to this other thing," or maybe it was the other way around. And because we didn't have the full agreement in front of us at the time, and we haven't really done a deep dive into the full agreement, we didn't know the full ramifications. So even though, and I think that's what Rick meant by "context". While it may sound okay to just change a term, until you see that term everywhere it's used in the agreement, and then only at that point can you assess what that one change will actually mean.

So I think it is on us now to kind of, we have their proposals. I think we understand what they want. It doesn't mean agree. But I think we understand what they're looking for or what their position is. I just think I'd like to take these documents, put it on our own drive instead of the Google Drive that they can, and just see if we can get people working directly in the document, put comments in, change language, whatever it is. I think that'll be more productive than next Tuesday having a call and just kind of not really having, just having a feel-good discussion.

DONNA AUSTIN:

How do others feel about that? Certainly, we've got the time booked into the call with them next week. We could co-op that and just meet

amongst ourselves, and then put Karla and Russ on hold until the following week. We could certainly do that. Owen, go ahead.

OWEN SMIGELSKI:

Yeah, I agree with Jeff. I think we should kind of start working on a document, start hammering something out. I don't think we really made significantly that much progress really in all those meetings we've had. They want to talk about what our plans are for sunseting WHOIS and how to educate the world about it and stuff like that, which I really think is outside of the scope of what we need to do. It's the RAA and RA negotiation. We need to start negotiating. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Owen. So Graeme, I think what we're hearing, and it's consistent with people supporting this in chat, is that we need to take the time. We now understand what ICANN's primary [asset] will be. So the onus now is on us to create documents and redlines and go through it ourselves and then come back to ICANN. I think that's what we're hearing.

GRAEME BUNTON:

That sounds to me what I'm hearing too. Part of that can also be we have a work product we need to produce on our own proposal for the sunseting of WHOIS as a part of this and so there is a bunch of work that we need to sit down and do and I'm not sure anybody feels tasked with that yet. And we need to make sure that we're all feeling responsible for getting this done.

So do we want to do this on... So we have a couple other things on our agenda for this call, but do we want to begin engaging on that work now

or is that a thing we need to schedule for later this week or early next week to actually get the space to prep ourselves and begin doing that work? Do we want to do it on a call or do we think we can do this just offline in Google Docs?

DONNA AUSTIN:

I think we need a project manager, people. Graeme, maybe you and I can work with Zoe and Sue and get the documents on a separate Google Drive and just scrub out what the expectations are. We put it out to this group so hopefully some work can be done, people can give some thought to it, and then we come back and use the time we've got allocated next to the meeting we're supposed to have with Russ and Karla. We can [co-opt] that meeting to go through the respective documents and see where we are. Does that make sense? And then pull Karla and Russ off the [week].

GRAEME BUNTON:

Yep. I think that's kind of sensible. Others? No one's feeling... Oh, great. Jim, go ahead.

JAMES GALVIN:

Just a quick question. Do we... Are we sure that we've gone through all of the little topics and issues that they had that they wanted? And I probably should know the [inaudible] question offhand but I just want to make sure that we've covered that before we spend our time digging into the contract to make our proposal for them. That's all.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Jim, I'm not confident that we have, but by the same token, I haven't gone back and had a look to see whether we have or not. So I guess that's another thing that we would need to do just to see where we are in their checklist and see what's outstanding. Jeff, go ahead.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Yeah, I think we have covered everything, at least, their entire summary documents and the issues. They created a checklist based on just different conversations and things but the key items are the summary of changes and I think we've gone through it at least twice of just discussing what they mean by it so we understand what they mean. I'm not... and if there is one little area where we're not sure, we can always go back to them with a question. I just think we... I think, as Rick said, we just need to start redlining or just pushing back on the changes that we're just not going to accept instead of having these calls which get a lot of dead silence, just like sort of this one.

But I do think there are a couple issues that we can just talk substance, like the mechanisms for updating the RDAP profile is one of them. I think there were a couple others as well that we said we would take back.

GRAEME BUNTON:

Right. So I think we've got a couple things that we can work on today, but I think your proposal is good for [co-aptng] that time for next week to get in there and actually do the redlining as Rick is saying in the chat. And that will make sure that this is a productive bit and that we've got work to do for next week and I think that's reasonable. All agreed? I love how assertive everyone is today. I see from Rick and Catherine and I think that's great. Okay.

You're right, Donna. I think we need someone to spearhead this because all of this responsibility is quite diffuse. Feel free to step up, anybody.

Okay. So for today, let's tackle the stuff on the agenda. And Jeff, what was the stuff Donna brought up? Oh, modification of the profile. Yeah, okay. That's item three, I think, on the agenda.

So I think on the number two then, changing the meeting time from one hour to 90 minutes, that is on the presumption that we're going through the document with ICANN and maybe it's going to be a little bit different if we've gone back and done this work ourselves. And now if we're bringing back a new version of this document, a redline, and saying, "Hey, no, we think this is our actual changes," that one hour, 90 minutes may be a different requirement. And so that hopefully we've sent that to them ahead of time and then we're discussing the substance of issues.

So maybe we can hold off on that choice at least for another week or two, to be like, "No, how much time do we need to discuss this substantive piece of work that we've put in front of them?" And so maybe that's a more effective use of time and we can answer them that way.

Yeah, sure. For, yeah, those in Europe, this is not an easy time. Okay. So let's do that that way. Let's answer Karla with that piece.

Mechanisms for updating the RDAP profile. Jeff, Donna, you want to tee this one up?

JEFF NEUMAN:

Yeah, I could step in. So the discussion here was... and I'm not sure we all agreed with the premise on the call. But ICANN's premise was that they wanted a more flexible approach to updating the RDAP profile than having to do a contractual amendment through this amendment process every single time they wanted a change. So sorry for the ringing in the background.

So it was proposed. I guess there was a discussion on potentially whether an endorsement from the stakeholder groups would be enough for those types of changes and I know Donna said that she may be comfortable with that. It's not something I'm comfortable with and neither will my clients be comfortable with that. And I can go into it, but you know, first of all, I don't even know what "endorsement by the stakeholder groups" actually means. And second of all, we've seen a lot of things lately that get approved by stakeholder groups through just meetings of the [X-COM] that get to make decisions and because this involves, it could involve material contractual or operational changes, that's, that would certainly not be sufficient for effectuating change in the profile.

Now if we come back and say, "Well, it has to be a complete vote from the stakeholder group," maybe that's a little bit better. But that's what concerns me. Plus, we're talking about contracts of a number of parties that are not in the stakeholder group. And yes, we are appointed as the negotiators. The stakeholder groups are appointed as the negotiators. But at the end of the day, there's always a fail-safe and that the other registries and registrars could just vote it down and it not pass if they don't like the way the stakeholder group is heading. So there you go. Those are my concerns.

GRAEME BUNTON: Rick, please.

RICK WILHELM: Thank you, Graeme. So generally agreeing with the stuff that Jeff said there and also his characterization of the call. One of the things that I offered in the meeting last week but basically just to remind everybody, is that I called into question whether there should be an extra contractual mechanism to modify the RDAP profile and I pointed out that there isn't currently such a mechanism to change anything related to the other technical obligations of the contract, for example, details around EBP, DNS, WHOIS, reporting, escrow services or other things like that. And so I, while there is going to be a situation here in the short-term where RDAP is going to be going through changes, most of them driven by at least EPDP Phase 1 and possibly EPDP Phase 2, over the long haul, RDAP is going to be stable like DNS and WHOIS. And so therefore, I don't think we need to build in right now, a long-term and permanent extra contractual mechanism. At least, not based on my current understanding of the situation. Thank you.

GRAEME BUNTON: So Rick, I think that's a really important point and thank you for making it. You might have just landed on a way to solve it, which is we could bake into this some temporary provision for amendment while things settle and then that timeframe, anything beyond that timeframe is not, would have to go through the regular amendment process. And I'm not exactly sure what that looks like, but that's just me spitballing. Donna?

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Graeme. So I don't... Jeff, I'm not sure that I said I agree with endorsement because I don't, because as you say, we don't have mechanisms within registry stakeholder group that would allow us to do that.

The other thing is that I think a question that Karla was asking might be off in that I don't know. So one, Rick, I'm not sure whether your group has, the RDAP Working Group, has discussed in the past what would trigger a change to the RDAP profile. So there's a question there that you continue to do the work in that working group and you may come across things over time that you think need tweaking. So I have, in the back of my mind, a thought that maybe that's part of the reason the RDAP Working Group continues to go on. I also thought that there was an understanding at some point that once we got these SLAs in the agreements, there would be a period of time to understand how valid they are and whether changes needed to be made. So I think the way that Karla has portrayed it was pretty simplistic and I think it's a much bigger discussion than that. I think Graeme and Rick are right, that perhaps what we do need to incorporate into this amendment process is including language that would allow for changes and how that would happen. But at the moment, I'm not confident that the correct question is being asked here. So I want to know what would trigger an investigation into a change to the profile. Certainly, policy could, is one way that that could happen. But Rick, I'm also conscious that your group continues to have discussions around the profile so there could be need identified there. Sorry Graeme, it's a bit long-winded.

GRAEME BUNTON: No. I feel you could talk as much as you'd like nor do I feel like I'm in charge of this call specifically. So I'm not going to censor you. I think I do see Rick's hand up again. Oh, he tricked us.

RICK WILHELM: Sorry, I'm back. I unhandled myself rather than unmuting myself. Sorry about that.

So Donna, in response to your question about the RDAP Working Group and changes to the profile, the way that we've been operating is that right now, those are, any changes we would make would be strictly in response to policy or in response to technical or operational things that absolutely require it. But otherwise, we're not meddling with the profile itself. The one that we're working with is still the version from February of last year and to date, through the implementation, we've not had a need to change the profile so far. Right now, the first opportunity that we would anticipate needing to change the profile would be as a result of the EPDP Phase 1 IRT output which is likely to cause some changes.

And then the other point that you had brought up, Donna, was the issue about SLAs. I'll just kind of remind everybody that the SLAs, along with reporting, are outside of the profile document and those only exist in the, or are going to only exist in a contract. Thank you.

GRAEME BUNTON: Jeff, go ahead.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. I mean, if we think that the only changes that are really going to be made to the profile at this point in time are changes in response to a

policy process, through an IRT for example, then that fits within the category of consensus policy, right? So we don't need a separate placeholder to revise a profile based on consensus policy, since that's already in the agreement. So if that's all we're anticipating making changes to the profile, then I think we're good. We don't need that extra mechanism. Although it was my impression, and admittedly this was a while ago, that there were still some tweaks that needed to happen with respect to searchability and how that's implemented and how a profile will be set up. But if that's all... If that all can be characterized as changes in response to an implementation of a consensus policy, then again, I think we're set with just agreeing to changes through the normal contractual mechanisms.

But yes, the SLAs are a separate mechanism. I'm not sure. We did, during the initial discussions with ICANN, say that we would have a review process at some point in time and that we would get together and see if these were the appropriate SLAs which could mean an adjustment in either direction, either that we think the SLAs could be a little bit stricter because we were way too lenient, or frankly, the other way around since it could be that the policy requires us to implement things that are much more difficult and take longer. So we could adjust the SLAs in the other direction as well. Though, from my history with SLAs, I've never seen SLAs go down. I've only seen them go up.

GRAEME BUNTON:

Rick? And then Jim.

RICK WILHELM:

I think actually Jim was first.

GRAEME BUNTON:

Hands don't rise to the top in Zoom room so it's [inaudible] I scroll down. So Jim, you haven't talked yet. Please. Wait, you have.

JAMES GALVIN:

That's all right. I have what might just be a clarifying question. But it is something that occurred to me last week in listening to the discussion from ICANN. I'm wondering if the term "profile" is a little bit overloaded here when they're talking because the WHOIS stuff, when you think about what's in the contracts, is a little bit unique as compared to the rest of the technical stuff going on. Rick's comments about we don't have any kind of mechanism for making other technical changes to documents, what makes RDAP special. And what makes it special is the output and what actually is to be published and what may or may not be included or, in the case of WHOIS, it's all about the formatting of that stuff.

And I'm wondering, as a clarifying question here, aside from this whole mechanism of whether or not to do this, if that's an interesting line to draw or not and if that's something that might be on ICANN's mind. And I didn't want to bring it up in a public forum so to speak last week when talking to them, but it is a question that occurred to me. IF that's the piece they're looking to separate out, what elements are part of responses in RDAP as opposed to all the rest of this that we're talking about here, which I agree with 100%?

So that's a clarifying question to the group here if anyone else had that impression or think that that's an opportunity worth exploring. Thanks.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thanks, Jim. I bet Rick has both his hand up and an opinion on that too.

RICK WILHELM: So thanks, Graeme. Just briefly, on the searchability question that came up earlier, that would be a policy one and... a policy question and that would cause searchability to be added to the profile. The profile documents are composed of, it's two documents. One is what's called a technical implementation guide which is more about the query side of things and the other one is the response profile which talks about the actual responses that the RDAP service is supposed to put out. And they're designed that the response profile one is the one would be most typically changed when there is a policy change and the working group's goal in constructing the technical implementation guide is that's elements of the profile which should be stable regardless of a policy shifting. So hopefully that kind of helps to clarify that. Thank you.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thanks and I think I see a hand from Jim. Is that a response?

JAMES GALVIN: Yeah, I'll offer a response and I guess just to frame my clarifying question differently, I wonder where ICANN is really coming from in this, I guess is kind of my question. The problem here is the term "profile" being overloaded. We keep talking about RDAP profile, technical profile, response profile, and I guess going back to our earlier discussion, I guess it would help if we actually had redline documents to be looking at because then it would be very clear to us what they're really looking for and what they're really talking about.

And that's why I'm asking the question. To Rick's point, sure, the response profile is what we would expect to be just very different and outside of all the technical profile stuff which we obviously want to protect. We don't want random changes to that, so to speak. And I don't know. Maybe I should have asked the question last week to be very clear about it, but I'm wondering even before asking ICANN about their confusion or not, do we think there's an opportunity here to allow that distinction or does it not matter? And we should just continue on this path of not letting them make any kind of profile change to any kind of profile at any time without a mechanism that we already have well understood. Thanks.

GRAEME BUNTON:

Thanks, Jim. Donna is asking in the... Sorry, now I'm trying to follow the chat. I think I'm hearing that all the changes to the profile doc should be in response to consensus policies or temporary policies which is in the contract. "Is RDAP profile a defined term?" asked Donna. I don't know because I haven't been involved in any of that previous RDAP work. Does anyone know? Is that actually a scoped out thing?

JAMES GALVIN:

I would say it's not a defined term, and that's part of the problem. In the working group, we talk about the response profile and the technical profile. But they keep dropping this term "RDAP" out and to me, this even brings in the question earlier about should we do a global replace of RDAP or RDDS for RDAP? And we properly responded last week about, "Well, it depends on context." And really, I think that that's the problem. We're not being clear about what we're talking about and so no, RDAP profile is not a defined term in my mind. Thanks.

GRAEME BUNTON: Right. Well, that's probably a good takeaway for us for one of the things we should be putting at the front of this process of redlining then, is to really make clear what we think these things mean, and that's probably a pretty good action item.

Okay. Where do we go from here?

JEFF NEUMAN: Can I respond to that?

GRAEME BUNTON: Oh yeah. Sorry, I didn't see your hand.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah, that's okay. So two things. Number one is there is a reference to the profiles in the temporary spec which is now a consensus policy, although I'm sure that it'll be modified through the IRT in Phase 1 or Phase 2. But for right now, there are things in there that says registry and registrar must operate a registration access protocol service. ICANN and the community will define the appropriate profiles by, and then there's a date. Obviously, we haven't met those dates and I don't know how that was incorporated into the consensus policy off the top of my head. But there is a quasi sort of definition.

But the second part is that I don't think we should let ICANN define these terms if there is something that's not adequately defined and then we define it as we see fit. I'd actually hate to have them proffer a definition because we know it's going to be way too broad, so let's put

forward a definition to the extent we need to define it that we can agree with.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thanks, Jeff. And yeah, agreed. I think this should be part of our work, not theirs. Anybody who wants to take a crack at that for the meeting next week, that would be pretty welcome.

All right. So now where are we at? We've got a couple things to do here. Sorry, now I'm trying to follow the chat. Do you guys want to have this discussion on the call so we can hear these perspectives?

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. So the temp spec is now a consensus policy and so Rick's correct that RDAP profile and RDAP is not defined in the base RA, well at least, our base RA. But it is defined because of the fact it's a consensus policy, and so therefore, the IRT is working on how to incorporate those into the agreement and they pretty much, at least in Phase 1, said that the temporary policy is adopted as-is until the next thing is adopted. So I think, again I think it's on us to come up with a definition if we don't like what they currently have.

GRAEME BUNTON: Yep. And Rick?

RICK WILHELM: Thanks, Graeme. I think that as Jeff said, the best... I'll probably tweak Jeff's words just a little bit. The best definition we have is in the temporary specification. The best definition we have of RDAP profile is in the temporary specification and I'll leave it as a separate thing as to

whether or not we're calling the temporary specification a consensus policy or not because I think that's kind of beyond the scope of this discussion. Regardless, the best definition is in the temp spec. And yeah, Jim and I can work on that definition for the group. Thanks.

GRAEME BUNTON:

Great. Good. Thank you, Rick.

Okay. Does that bring us into a landing for this RDAP profile mechanisms? We're going to figure out how to define it first and then we can sort through these mechanisms and whether it actually needs to be extracontractual or whether we need to put a timeframe on it as these things settle.

So I think we'd be belaboring that anymore unless someone has more to say on that. But so maybe we move to the newly defined terms and matrix. I don't... Rick, go ahead.

RICK WILHELM:

Yeah, one of the concerns here about having them, the profile defined in the agreement by reference rather than incorporate it as an exhibit, is the stability of the URL where it lives and the fact that it doesn't live on a URL that is independent from ICANN. I think that was one of the main issues that the group had around the situation regarding incorporating the profile via a URL or something like that, is that it's not a stable and independent reference of the same gravity and immovability as, say, an Internet, an IETF RFC. I think that's one of the things that we should really kind of track on here. Thank you.

GRAEME BUNTON: Maxim, in the chat always with crazy ideas. But interesting. Jeff, I see your hand.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah, thanks. I don't see this as a huge issue because it's done all the time in legal agreements where you could say... You could do a couple things. Number one is you can require a date stamp on it and you could tell when it's been changed. Or number two is you could say, "The RDAP profile should be kept as this link," and then you could say, "A current copy of..." and define whether there is a process or not for changing those. We're saying there's not but if, indeed, there is a separate process, that would be in there.

And then you would say, "A current copy of those policies is appended here too as Exhibit 1." I don't think it's an issue. I'm not worried about... At some point, you do have to trust the others. You have to trust ICANN and they have to trust us. So if they say it's at a website, they're not going to change the language absent whatever process is defined, then that's on the hook. They're contractually obligated to do that and if you're paranoid, you just print it out on the first day and you have a copy forever that you could always check. And if they change it, then they breach the agreement. This is causing, I think, more of an issue than it should. I think.

GRAEME BUNTON: Right, and I'm not a lawyer and not... I don't really have any sense, personally, whether that's sufficient or not. J.C. seems to be agreeing with Jeff. If a link has a PDF document that is [signed data], would that overcome some of the problem? Mutually executed paper. This feels

like more details we can figure out as we actually get into the process.
Process. You're welcome.

Do we have the newly defined terms and matrix thing? Is that a thing to look at for moving on in the agenda?

JEFF NEUMAN: So I think one of the terms... I don't know if there's something specific referred to there. But I do remember that one of the takeaways was to look at converting the term or the effect of converting the term RDDS to WHOIS services throughout the entire agreement. And I think while we didn't seem averse to at this point, it's just we didn't know because we didn't have the complete context. So I can volunteer to look elsewhere to see if that term is used and how that would, if making a change I think would change the meaning. But everyone can do that as well. But I'll certainly do that.

GRAEME BUNTON: Great. Thanks, Jeff.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. That's 1.6 on that first bullet point.

GRAEME BUNTON: Was there more then? [Inaudible] is 1.6 RDDS. Were there other pieces to the... It's just these so we just need to go back and review and probably, again, this is a definitional piece at the front of the next call then because it certainly doesn't feel like people are chomping at the bit to engage substantively on this stuff at the moment.

Right. Okay. Well, I feel like I'm pushing the envelope of getting engagement on this call. So what I think we need to do is really make clear what our homework is for a call next week, what it is we want to have as output for that call for ICANN following that call, and then make sure that we're prepared to really get into some substance in the time we're going to take next week out of the regular ICANN meeting. And so we've got a couple action items out of this one, some definitional pieces that people are going to bring, some of these terms we're going to check and then we can go through and redline and ideally, we have all done that ahead of time so that when we're on the call, we can discuss why we're making those choices. And so I think that's the way to go. So maybe Sue, if it's not an imposition, sooner rather than later on getting those documents into our own Google Doc and sharing it with the group and then making sure that we're all in there and we've gone through and redlined and added comments so that we can go through that process on our next call, and also have some of these definitional pieces in front and so that we can make sure that we're making very good use of everybody's time. And then we'll complete that work and send it over to ICANN. Hopefully, only within a week but I can see how that might take longer. I'll look at Donna via the Internet and say, does that seem like a reasonable way to try and get this moving?

DONNA AUSTIN: I think so, Jeff.

GRAEME BUNTON: I'm Graeme, not...

DONNA AUSTIN: I think so, Graeme. Sorry.

GRAEME BUNTON: Right. Anybody else have thoughts on that as a way to get this going? We're going to lean on everybody to make sure our homework is done and we're in there and ready to chat through these things. Otherwise, this whole negotiation process is going to be pretty simple. We'll just accept what ICANN says. No one likes that.

DONNA AUSTIN: It's a principle thing.

GRAEME BUNTON: Yeah. Cool. Well, okay. I feel like that's probably the way forward and some homework for people. So let's just wrap this call unless anybody has any other things that we need to think about. Does anybody have any other business?

All right. Maxim's gone to bed. All right then, so let's wrap it there. Let's see if we can get those documents in our thing. Let's get to redlining. Let's get to creating those definitions and checking out these terms and how they're defined and we'll reply back to Karla saying we're going to steal that hour back to do our own. We need to do some more work and pending the outcome of that work, we'll have some decision making on whether we need a 60 minute or 90 minute to talk through that work substantively with ICANN.

Great. Okay. I think that's it then. Donna, any last bits or pieces?

DONNA AUSTIN: Nothing for me. Thanks, Graeme.

GRAEME BUNTON: Great. Okay, then. Sue, did you have something? Did I hear you there?

SUE SCHULER: No. I just wanted to quickly verify. So I'm going to uninvite the ICANN staff from next week and then put them on to the week after that. Yes?

GRAEME BUNTON: Yeah. Yeah.

SUE SCHULER: Okay.

DONNA AUSTIN: Sue, can you just hold off on that until we've squared it away with ICANN? I can't see a problem, but let's not do it prematurely.

SUE SCHULER: Okay. Sounds good.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Sue.

GRAEME BUNTON: Great. Okay. Well, thank you everyone for joining and bearing with us as we work through that. Let's be ready to do some work next week. Please and thank you. And I think we can stop the call then.

DONNA AUSTIN: Great. Thank you. Andrea, we can end the recording.

ANDREA GLANDON: Thank you. This concludes today's conference. Please remember to disconnect all lines and have a wonderful rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]