

---

SUE SCHULER:                      Okay, Donna.

DONNA AUSTIN:                      Thanks, Sue. Thanks, everybody, for joining this call. This is a discussion about the RA/RAA Amendment Discussion Group. We had thought that Russ and Karla would be on this call but there's been some miscommunication about the timing of the call, so they will not be joining. Unfortunately, we also thought that Karla was sending through some documents that we would have received yesterday afternoon and we could use this time to discuss those documents but they didn't come through either, which is disappointing because we thought this would be an opportunity to go through those documents, have some discussion, and then this call would serve as preparation for the call that we hoped to have with Russ and Karla maybe earlier next week. We will need to send around another Doodle Poll to get that set up.

So, given that background, I'm not sure what we can usefully cover on this but what I can tell—and for those who don't know, I'm Donna Austin. I'm chair of the Registry Stakeholder Group. The registry members—this group—had a call yesterday just to sort out some administrative things and we have identified our negotiating team as Rick Wilhelm, JC Vignes, Jim Galvin, and myself. So, we've identified the four of us as the core. That doesn't mean that members of the Registry Stakeholder Group who are part of this group can't join the negotiating calls. That's open to anybody if they want to turn up but part of the discussion we had with ICANN staff in Montreal was what's a quorum?

---

*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.*

---

So, we have agreed with Graeme, I think, from the registrar side, you had suggested that four would be reasonable and we've agreed the same. So, our core four is Rick, JC, Jim, and myself with backup from Beth and Sam. And then sitting behind that we would have a support team. So, if folks don't join the negotiating team call, they're welcome to come to the core team call which we will have every other week.

So, what we had agreed in Montreal is that we would have ... For the first few weeks anyway, we would have a call with Russ and Karla and whoever ICANN staff sends to these meetings and then on the alternate week we would have a call of the support team so that we can prepare for the upcoming calls, so that we're all on the same page and understand how folks want to go and what positions they want to hold on different issues that come up.

So, that is generally the attempt that we hoped that this will move forward, but obviously, we've hit a first hurdle because this call we thought Russ and Karla would be on but we've had a miscommunication in that regard.

Is there any topics that anyone—and Graeme, obviously an opportunity if you want to speak on behalf of the registrars. But is there any questions that folks are having? I'm sorry this is so discombobulated.

ROB HALL: Donna, it's Rob.

DONNA AUSTIN: Yes, Rob?

ROB HALL: When you talked of quorum and you said four, does that mean all four of you have to be there for quorum?

DONNA AUSTIN: That's what we've loosely agreed, Rob. And we've got Beth and Sam as the backup. So, we see this ... Certainly, in my mind, similar setup to what they have on the EPDP, that these are our four representatives. If those four can't attend, then we need to make sure there's a backup there for us.

ROB HALL: No but if three of those four could attend, does the meeting still go forward or no?

DONNA AUSTIN: If three of the four can attend and one backup, yes.

ROB HALL: Got it, okay.

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah. So, we need to be pretty vigilant on that and make sure that we have the four in attendance.

---

ROB HALL: So, really, it's four of the six is quorum.

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah, I guess so.

ROB HALL: Okay, all right. Sorry. I just wanted to understand that.

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah. No, that's okay. And Rob, this is just what we've agreed at this point in time but I can envisage that, over time, if we have regularly, say, eight people from the Registry Stakeholder Group turning up to those negotiating calls and we feel that the other two could easily step into that quorum, then that could be the case as well. So, I do think we do have some flexibility in that regard. But for the initial setup, this is what we're going with.

ROB HALL: And I participated in the last two rounds of registrar contracts and there was never really a time we got to all of us not talking. Quorum ... There's not really formal votes and that type of thing until the end. As long as you have enough people participating in each call that know what's going on, I think you're pretty good.

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah. I think so.

---

GRAEME BUNTON: We're also not locked into this I think forever. Quorum is our own internal choice. So, if we're like, "Oh, boy, this is going off the rails," when we have less than six or something, we can adjust. So, I don't think [it would be] super rigid here.

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah.

ROB HALL: Because we certainly had times someone couldn't make a meeting and we went forward and then just met afterwards and debriefed everybody, right?

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah. But I think it's important initially that we have a core team that we know are going to participate, otherwise it gets a little bit loosie-goosey, so I think to start this process, I think it's important that we identify who our core members are.

ROB HALL: I agree.

DONNA AUSTIN: And that's what we've done.

---

GRAEME BUNTON: Just for everybody's awareness, I'm still kind of spit-balling this, but on the registrar side, I think that core ends up being myself, Jeff, Jody, and then maybe Cathrine instead of Owen because I suspect Owen is going to be conflicted with EPDP and IRT stuff reasonably frequently.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Sounds good to me.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Well, I think you're going to have to put James in there, too.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Jody should be covering from GoDaddy.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I spoke to James about it in Montreal and he was pretty adamant so you may want to just [inaudible].

GRAEME BUNTON: Yeah. James has been ... I don't need two people from GoDaddy. What I need are contractual lawyers and what I need are RDAP experts. Those are sort of the roles I think we need to fill. If Jody and James want to fight that out between them, that's fine. I don't have a strong opinion .

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Fair enough.

---

DONNA AUSTIN: Jody, I think you're on the call and you're trying to talk, so please go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Jody, you're muted.

JODY KOLKER: Yeah. Can you guys hear me now? Sorry.

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah. Sorry. We're talking about you, Jody.

JODY KOLKER: No, that's all right. I was trying to type but it's probably faster this way. I'm there from a technical perspective. So, from policy perspective, I see James as our lead on that. I guess we'll have to decide amongst ourselves if that's what we're looking for. I thought you guys were just looking for a technical person and that's what I was going to provide, just knowing what I know about RDAP and being on the RDAP pilot group. But James would be more from a policy perspective.

So, I don't know if that still breaks your rules or not Graeme, but I think that we might—

---

GRAEME BUNTON: There's not too much of this that I think is going to overlap with policy but also, again, these are our own made-up rules to try and make this work. If we find that we're running into friction or places we've got gaps, then we can adjust as well.

ROB HALL: James was on the last one as well for the registrars. I would highly recommend you have his brain at the table. There's a lot of policy history here that they're trying to undo.

GRAEME BUNTON: I'm not so concerned about that, but also, these calls aren't closed. They're going to be open to any observers. If James wants to join the calls and provide input, then I think that's also fine. It's not like I'm going to be kicking him out.

JEFF NEUMAN: Rob, this is Jeff. I've been on a bunch of the negotiations. I was on some of the registrar ones. I was on all of the registry ones. As Graeme said, James is a lot on the calls. I think we're going to be good. I think we'll be fine.

ROB HALL: You want the largest registrars' policy person there, I think. He was involved—he was key in the last round and we fought hard for some of the things that ICANN is trying to undo in this little amendment. So, I think you definitely want him involved. I'm glad ... I think you're right. As

---

long as anyone can participate, I think you'll see some of us showing up more. I suspect James will be one but I'll leave it to him to decide that.

DONNA AUSTIN:

We have, I guess, a [inaudible] is something that is very narrow. So, this isn't an open-ended amendment process. It's very specific and very narrow. In that respect, we're hoping that this is reasonably non-controversial and isn't going to create too much heartache. Obviously, if we think that ICANN is starting to creep outside what we thought we had agreed was in scope, then things might get a little bit testy but we are hopeful that this is pretty much constrained around the RDAP SLAs and anything that's associated with that.

I think sunseting WHOIS is one of the issues that's come up so far that may cause some heartburn but maybe not heartache, so that could be a little bit of a touchy situation.

Also, the SLAs that we're talking about were developed by a group that Jeff led about 12 months ago and ICANN has suggested that maybe they need to change some of those SLAs but we are holding the line on that at the moment to say that the SLAs are what they are. I think the agreement was that there might be a need, once they've been in place for 12 months to review and see if they need changing but I don't think we're open to that kind of change at the moment. So, I think that's pretty high level nuts and bolts about where we are at the moment.

---

ROB HALL: And one concern I have is I believe they're attempting to say that all registrars for every TLD must do it and we fought hard not to have to do WHOIS for where a registry offered it. That was a huge [inaudible] of contention last time. So I want to be careful that we don't backstep on that.

GRAMME BUNTON: That's definitely one of the issues we flagged already, Rob.

DONNA AUSTIN: I'm not one for taking up more time than we need to. I don't really have anything else that I wanted to discuss. Obviously I'm disappointed that we don't have the documents to go through today. There will be a Doodle Poll that will be coming out to reschedule for the call that we're going to have with ICANN staff, and then once we've sorted that one out, we're going to have to do a secondary one for this team. So, once we get the one set up with staff, then we'll do the one for this team. Unfortunately, I think it would have better if we had the opportunity to review the documents before we went into the meeting with staff but we might end up doing it the other way around because we're running into Thanksgiving which could be challenging for folks in terms of attendance. JC, go ahead.

JC VIGNES: Yeah. Briefly, Donna. And I don't know what our registrar colleagues think, but when you write to them, can you convey our frustration and, I would say, disappointment? Unless I'm mistaken, ICANN wants to

---

discuss this amendment. We don't particularly do. And I think the way they've been handling this from the start is rather poor. So, yeah. It should be more efficient than what it has been so far. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Yeah. Fair point, JC. I'm hoping that we'll get the [inaudible] problems out of the way and we'll get into a regular rhythm. Anything from anyone else? Those of you that haven't been involved, I would encourage you to review maybe the call—the discussion—that we had in Montreal. I think it might be helpful if folks who have been involved today just to catch up on what was discussed there. I don't know that it's really worthwhile going back though other conversations that we had as part of the scoping effort. I think just we need to draw a line in the sand and move forward. So, once we have the documents from Karla, I think that's the [inaudible].

All good?

GRAEME BUNTON:

Good from my end, Donna.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Okay, great.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

Good to me.

---

DONNA AUSTIN:                   Alrihty. You now have 45 minutes of your day back, folks. Thanks very much for joining.

JC VIGNES:                        Thanks, everyone. Bye-bye.

DONNA AUSTIN:                   Bye.

SUE SCHULER:                    Thanks, Donna. Michelle, we can end the recording.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**