

**ICANN  
Transcription ICANN Hyderabad  
GNSO Registrar Stakeholder Group Meeting  
Sunday, 06 November 2016 at 14:00 IST**

Note: 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 recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page <http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Graeme Bunton: Okay, everybody. I've got 3:17. We still have quite a bit of things on the agenda. My hope is that we're going to get through a bunch of that pretty quickly and hopefully have some robust discussion, so let's get started again. I don't know we need to restart the recording or anything like that, but let's do it.

Okay, so getting going again, the first thing I would like to bring up before we dig into cross field, is participation in Registrar Stakeholder Day. We often hear too much, I think, from the usual sort of suspects, from Michele and (Tom) and myself and (Jeff) under that bus.

And so none of us bite even if we do same surly sometimes, so it would be really great if you haven't spoken before and one of these meetings, to do so. We want to hear and gather opinions from all of our members.

So don't be shy. You know, if you've got a thought and you want to share it, it can be a dumb question, simple question, a comment, clarity, anything. So join us. Get in here and participate in the discussion.

If you don't, what's going to happen at the next meeting is that I'm going to make everyone tells something like embarrassing as we go around the table, to kind of break the ice.

It's going to be silly, but we need to get everyone engaged. So you can do yourselves voluntarily or I can make you do it. So that's where we're at. So please participate.

Cross field validation, here's where we're at with this, I don't think this is going to take 15 minutes - I just wanted to make sure that this was on everybody's radar. So there's a session later this week and I should know when that is but I don't have it off the top of my head. I see, Tom, is it?

(Tom Yakabuchi): (Tom Yakabuchi) for the record. That will be in this room today at 5:00 pm.

Graeme Bunton: Really? It's today? Wow, okay. Right. So cross field validation is coming up. There's a presentation from ICANN staff. I don't have my head fully personally wrapped around the mechanics of how this works.

But I believe ICANN staff is obliged to produce a proposal for how cross field (should) work and then - and I'm not sure how the - what the mechanics are about the registrars need to agree to that or if we can - and maybe (Tom) or (Amy) can speak to the mechanics of deciding how that's going to work or not.

I can editorialize for a moment of my own self as the registrar and not as chair just to maybe get this started, which is I can get - there are certainly many people in the community who would like to see cross field validation.

They talk about it like payment processing. For myself, I don't think that makes any sense. I think you can have many contact details that are not - like, your phone number for instance, can be from Canada and your address could be in the States or vice versa.

And we have plenty of people - my own company provides a mobile phone for the service in the US. We have many Canadians that live in Canada but have a US phone number. It's not uncommon.

It doesn't make any sense to me that those think should be the same. And then, making sure that those addresses make sense, I think it's extremely difficult once you're outside of a few countries and then he gets very difficult, especially as we talk about underserved regions and trying to get people registering domain names from outside, you know, Western Europe and North America.

That cross field validation becomes increasingly difficult. So maybe (Tom) or (Amy) has some input here as well, but I would encourage registrars to show up, and if you have a strong opinion on this, to participate in that session. So I just wanted to really make sure it was on everybody's radar. I see a hand from Michele and then a hand from (Tom).

Michele Neylon: Thanks, Graeme Bunton. Michele for the record. And both surprised and quite disturbed that this is coming up again. There was a working group of registrars that worked with ICANN staff on this topic over a period of - I think about a year or thereabouts.

And we ended up having to kind of park it because there was no way to find a solution that actually met the criteria required, in other words, that it would be economically viable for us to do that.

And just, you know, from a registrar perspective, several of the country code registries have, over the last couple of years, ramped up there WHOIS

validation. I mean, if you look at some of the things that they're doing, they're literally taking the daily registrations and manually going through them one by one.

Now, if you're dealing with a TLD or a ccTLD with a handful of registrations per day, that does require a lot of manual intervention but it might be possible at the registry level to do that.

But it just doesn't scale. And in terms of the address validation systems that are out there, the databases and everything else, they don't work outside a couple of countries, as you said Graeme Bunton.

Every time I tried to order a pizza from Domino's I have to manipulate my home address until I find a version of my home address that Domino's accepts, even though my post and has absolutely no problem and delivering my electricity bill.

Graeme Bunton: Great. Thanks. I see Jen has her hand up. Jenn.

Jennifer Gore: Thanks, Graeme Bunton, ICANN (unintelligible). I look forward to having you guys - I know it's a long day but I look forward to having you guys participate in the review of the update on address - across address field validation today. Thank you. That's a mouthful - as well as public distribution to the working group on the strawman proposal.

And I believe - I'm sorry, I was out of the room - I believe, Graeme Bunton, you asked the question as far as what's next. Can you put that context and elaborate so I make sure I answer that correctly?

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, Jen. This is Graeme Bunton. Just what the process is, so Michele said he was disturbed that this has come up again. My understanding is that ICANN was essentially mandated to make this come up again.

And so in theory, I think ICANN is pitching a potential strawman or something like that for how this might work. And then I don't know if it's - the registrars approve it, the community approves it, how that happens, is what I was looking for clarity on.

Jennifer Gore: Thanks, Graeme. So by former predecessor, Mike Zupke, worked with the registrar stakeholder group and they both agreed to an extension to put the project on hold for a period of one year, and that year has come and gone. I can provide the communications on that. In the recent six months, the community has asked for an update on the process and what's happening.

Therefore, upon the one year anniversary, we took steps to set up this session as well as to present the strawman proposal which basically identifies what ICANN staff has done over the course of the period of this one year related to proposing criteria and research and due diligence on vendors, understanding local regional, national law.

So those various activities will be identified in the strawman proposal as well as a very hopefully short presentation with a long Q&A session today on that initiative.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, Jen. I've got Heath in the queue.

Heath Dixon: Hi. This is Heath Dixon. This is a question for Jenn. The transition addendum specifies - and this is partially an answer to Graeme Bunton's question - that the registrar WHOIS validation working group is the one that needs to agree to and approve any tools that are to be adopted. Can you confirm that that group is still in existence and who's on it?

Jennifer Gore: Absolutely. So your statement is correct that the working group would have to confirm, approved, accept, you know, agree to proceed with the high-level proposal and the strawman and I've included a slide during this session that has the members of the working group on it.

Graeme Bunton: Okay, I'm not sure who can remember. It's been a while, I think, since I got together. My name might be on there. I'm not sure.

Michele Neylon: Mine is.

Jennifer Gore: I recall Michele, Sara, I think I was on it at one point.

Michele Neylon: I think Jeff Eckhaus is probably on it.

Jennifer Gore: I - no, I don't think so.

Michele Neylon: I think you should be on it.

Jennifer Gore: This is (Jennifer Gore), ICANN staff. It is up to the registrars to determine who should be on it.

Graeme Bunton: Fair enough. Thank you. Did anybody else have any thoughts to share on cross field? We're all prepared that that's coming up. I'm not going to be able to attend myself but we should make sure we've got a strong showing there. (Jen).

Jennifer Gor: I understand, as I said previously, that it's been a long day and a long week thus far, and I will be more than willing and happy to provide a number - another Webinar or a series of Webinars and re-present the materials and host Q&A sessions in the coming weeks or whatever you desire. Just let me know what works best for you all.

Graeme Bunton: Great. Thanks, Jenn. I think I saw Tom raise his hand and then Michele.

Tom Keller: Thank you, Graeme Bunton. (Tom) talking. I think would be interesting for all of us to get a little rehash of where that comes from and what we have to do that and what's the intended purpose of it.

I know I had some look into that before I got installed, basically, but this was a long time ago so I think it would be a refreshment for all of us and a big help. So I think Webinars are greatly appreciated.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, Tom. Michele.

Michele Neylon: Thanks. Michele for the record. I mean, I'm also agreeing with (Tom), plus the other thing is with this kind of operational type of thing, it's more our operational developers, the people are going to actually have to do these things are tell you the lately but firmly that it's technically impossible to do.

Those are the people need to be on that kind of Webinar, so I think doing a Webinar in a few weeks' time would be ideal and also giving us enough advance warning so that we can actually make sure that it's running at a time of day that makes sense.

And I'll - since we're trying to (address best) with the Asia Pacific region, maybe if you could possibly run this on a couple of different times so that those of us in Europe don't have to get out of bed at 3:00 in the morning and those people in the States can - don't have to either, that would be helpful. Thanks.

Jennifer Gore: Graeme Bunton, will you let me - oh, thank you. Jennifer Gore, ICANN staff. I believe when I said a series of Webinars, I'm sorry, should have clarified. A series - or one or more Webinars and every - you know, most of the major time zones, absolutely. And I'm in agreement with you that I believe that having technical and operations presence (associated with) that would be very helpful.

Graeme Bunton: Heath?

Heath Dixon: This is Heath Dixon. I'm planning to attend so that anybody is here can't attend and have questions that you would like to be asked, I would be happy to ask those questions and bring you the answers.

Graeme Bunton: This is Graeme Bunton. Thank you very much for volunteering that.

Michele Neylon: And expect your inbox to explode.

Graeme Bunton: Okay, any other thoughts on that before we move on? Delightful. Okay, unified approaches to abuse document - there's a bit of a mea culpa here from myself.

We've been talking about this for far too long and so this is a - that a number of large sort of - or not necessarily large but a number of registrars agreed to sort of say, hey, let's see we can work on a process that we can all agree to, or maybe not specifically a process, but something maybe a bit broader than that around abuse reporting.

And the goal there was to set some expectations for people who are setting - submitting abuse requirements to us and to make sure that we have some sort of unity and how we approach and respond.

And it was just sort of a proactive registrar activity. It's gone through three sort of major versions. The first one was expansive and sort of unwieldy. The next one was maybe too high level.

The third one was generally kind of crappy. And now we're working on a fourth that I think is not bad. I don't have it quite in a place to share again yet.

Help to do that very shortly after this meeting. It's sort of on my list of things to do on the long plane ride home. The reason I bring it up here, though, is I want to make sure that people are still engaged on it, that we haven't let that

drop and to sort of reinvigorate a little - excitement as maybe the wrong word, but interest in that and so we can get people paying attention.

And I want you to know that the new version is coming. I would love to get lots of registrar input and then shared with the community again and see what kind of feedback we get.

And then in theory, it's something that we can all begin to sort of operate on those principles. I think it's kind of hard to have a lot of input back on that without a draft in front of you, so apologies.

And again, this is largely my own fault for just not getting it done. So I guess if you have any questions or comments on that, I'm happy to take them now, but heads up, that's coming. (Ben).

Man: Was that the one we (jumped Barry Hill)?

Graeme Bunton: Yes, that one. Okay.

Greg DiBiasi: Greg DiBiasi. So is this from a perspective of what needs to be in an abuse report or how the registrars will respond to a report?

Graeme Bunton: It's a bit of both, so the general set up is for any sort of abuse requirement, these are the things that we would need to see in order to be able to address it. And then assuming that you have met those requirements, then here are some of the responses that you could expect from the registrar. So you meet these things then you can get this sort of thing back.

Greg DiBiasi: So I guess off the top of my head it would seem like it would be easier to find agreement on what we would want from the community then try to figure out, you know, how we would respond.

Does a make sense to start with that, that we can come you know, show here's what needs to be in an abuse report before we move on to all of us deciding together how we would respond?

Graeme Bunton: Yes. So I think the actual abuse submission requirements are relatively straightforward and I think captured reasonably well in the document. The goal is not to dictate, and a micro level, how registrars are going to respond because everybody's going to be approaching these problems differently.

But I do think there are expectations that can be set. Like, you go through, you submit an abuse report with those requirements met, then you can expect to be notified that it's been received and if there's an investigation on that, like approximate timeline for that sort of investigation.

So to me, the process is sort of about setting expectations for abuse reporting. That's sort of where that's at, at the moment, but we don't want to try and dictate how individual registrars are going to respond each way. We want to make sure that there are sort of guidelines in there that gives everybody the discretion to operate how they so choose. Michele.

Michele Neylon: Thanks. Michele for the record. Just on (Greg)'s point, just the genesis of the earlier draft of this document was based on speaking to quite a large number of registrars to collect what they were actually doing and what they both - sorry, both what they were looking for and what they were doing based on what they received.

So that's where Graeme Bunton's saying this is - it's both sides. It was, you know, setting - the idea, as Graeme Bunton says, it's kind of setting an expectation so if you send in as an abuse report which doesn't contain enough information, that a reasonable expectation would be that the registrar would send it back asking for more information.

The other thing, as well, is that this project has been going on for quite some time and they're quite a few people outside this room - well, they might be in the room. I haven't seen them - for very, very interested in seeing progress on this and actually seeing this document come through because we've been speaking about it now for 18 months-plus, I think, thereabouts.

So there's a lot of interest obviously from - on the GAC side. It's the public safety working group members that are very interested in this. IPC people are also interested in it and then on the other side, there's a certain amount of interest coming from the noncommercial stakeholder's who have concerns about matters around due process, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera.

So there's a lot of interest from the community on this and we're coming under a reasonable amount of pressure to produce something. What is currently drafted is as Graeme Bunton says, not bad. It's pretty damn good. So I think really what Graeme Bunton is hoping for is to get input from people may be. I don't know. I'm not sure what his next steps are, Graeme Bunton.

Graeme Bunton: Next steps is for me to get a few more pieces into this current draft and share that with registrars. I'm planning on doing that in the next week. I think I've said it before but I'll try and for-real do it. (Heath).

Heath Dixon: And to Greg's point I - and then to Michele's point, it seems like the best way to do something quickly so that we can be responsive to the community that's looking for it, is to narrow the scope down to the thing that's the easiest for us to do.

Put that out, get comments on that. Oh, this is too much information. How - have that so we can at least start the conversation there on the easy part while we then decide on what's the right amount of information to put in the second part.

Because as far as the second part goes, it seems to me that a better deliverable would be something that we could share amongst ourselves and say, "Hey, if you get an abuse complaint, here are some things that registrars have tried that it made it easy to process them."

Or, "Here are some resources that you can use to test whether or not a claim of abuse is real." "Here are some ways that you can validate if law enforcement entity is approaching you that is, you know, the proper (resource)."

So it seems like we could really deliver two different things on that second part. One is an internal document that we could use amongst ourselves to help each other out and the second would be a very limited scope document that would address some issues of, you know, what the response is going to be.

Rather - given that we originally did poll registrars to say how are you doing this, and you're going to get a lot of different answers, putting those different answers together and the internal document would be helpful for us.

But it seems like it'll just take too long to ever get it. So I propose breaking it up. Just put the first piece out as quickly as possible and then we can decide about the second piece at some future point.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, (Heath). This is Graeme Bunton. That's certainly what I heard, was you volunteering to help work on this document and that's greatly appreciated.

Heath Dixon: As soon as you get the first draft out, or the next draft out.

Graeme Bunton: So part of that, though, that second piece, you talk about that internal document, I think, is interesting and important and brings back to something that I've been thinking quite a bit about which is that the registrar stakeholder group needs to do a better job of showing its value to the members.

And some of that value could be documents like that and we can do a much better job of sharing best practices and approaches to different problems and that's a great place to start.

Heath Dixon: It's Heath Dixon again. And I would be happy to participate in that. We, as most of you know, are relatively new to the registrar business but we've been handling a lot of abuse issues through AWS and other businesses so we've got a lot of ideas but it would be interesting to see what people are doing with respect to particular registrar domain name types of abuse complaints compared to what we're doing.

And then we can, you know, we and I think other people in the room, who have other businesses, can bring our input on what we're doing in those other areas.

Graeme Bunton: Great. Ben.

Ben Anderson: Cool. Ben Anderson. Thanks. I definitely advocate that way of doing it, having a public facing one and an inward facing one purely because I know there's a lot of expectation building around this now.

So from - with my registrar stakeholder group hat on I think that's the right approach, so I guess from my day job point of view, there's stuff that I would definitely want to see in there as you know. And so I think as the expectation grows around this document, it's probably best not to shoot ourselves in the foot.

Graeme Bunton: Great. Thanks, (Ben). So I'll take that piece on board and we'll loop some people in and we'll keep working on that. I'm pleased to hear that there is still continued interest and we can move forward with that.

I'll close that off unless there's anything else. No? Good. Okay, next up on the agenda is - what time are we at? We're about 15 minutes ahead which is excellent.

So before we get into the charter drafting team, maybe I'll grab a piece from AOB. There was a discussion on the list recently on the RSG mailing list around insurance requirements and how that's changed at the registry level but we haven't necessarily seen that filtered down to the registrar level.

I was talking with a couple registries about this and for them, selling the problem is awkward because the insurance requirements may be built into their registry agreement.

And they can change - going through that process for them is quite problematic. It opens it up to public comment, et cetera. And then they have to file an RRA through the registrars which we would then need to approve.

And so we were talking about a process where collectively registrars and registries can read a letter to ICANN and say, especially in the interest of serving - helping underserved regions, that maybe we can come up with a processor mechanism for addressing insurance requirements specifically.

And there would have to be some mechanism within ICANN to allow, especially legacy TLDs, to address those components of those components of their RA very narrowly, just the insurance requirements, without having to blow those open into try and comment periods, et cetera.

And then we would need to agree to do something like Franny RRA coming through that is addressing insurance requirements specifically, we would give it a blanket pass.

And I think that would go a long way to helping resolve some of those issues but I thought I would bring that up here to see if there was any feedback or

thoughts on working with the registries to try and make that happen. I see a hand from Michele.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, Graeme Bunton. Michele for the record. I keep on raising my hand. That's terrible. I'm actually doing a high interest topic with the GAC this afternoon on the underserved regions, so this particular discussion is timely.

Personally I, you know, I don't have any problem with is coming up with some fast, simple, light way of addressing this. But we're going to look at insurance requirements, I think it might be interesting to also look to see of some registries have a similar issue with deposits for registrars because that also causes two things.

One, that causes pain for pretty much all of us. And, two, for registrars in kind of developing underserved regions, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. It's a pain point if it's within their contract, I mean, not in the kind of (separated) outside the contract, but just in case it is. I honestly don't know if it is in many cases but thought I would raise this. Thanks.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you, Michele. This is Graeme Bunton. I don't know enough about how those are implemented. I would be cautious about trying to bundle those two issues.

If it's make or break and we try to make a change on it, then I would just keep it bracketed to something small. This doesn't seem to - so our people interested in this? Can I get, like, a show of nods?

Man; We are absolutely interested in a discussion about pre and post payments.

Graeme Bunton: Ah, okay, that other piece.

Man: (Diagram).

Man: Right. Coming from the underserved region, but of those actually are (a pain) point for us. Originally, I know that ICANN took away the requirement for registrars for the accreditation.

We're exceptionally happy with that. But then it came to, okay, now (they're starting integration) with the registry and they have the insurance requirement. Okay, that's fine. We had to go overseas and actually get the insurance policy from there because from our side, in our country, there's nobody that actually does that.

They don't understand the domain name industry that can say, all right, I'll give you insurance for this type of business. So we had to go to a whole bunch of other places for that.

Then we got back. We integrated and then we came to the second registry and had a different requirement for an amount, so we had to amend that policy. And that whole procedure was a (step) as well.

And then on the last point about the deposits, some registries have small amounts and we're happy with that but as a starting registrar, when we get to be a registry that has, for example, let's say, \$2000, \$2500 minimum deposit amount, that, to us is - well, we're starting out.

(Unintelligible) that's a huge amount and say, "Have the deposit," and we might sell five, six, maybe ten domain names (or so) in a month or something like that where that money is just being held in their account and we can do something else with it. So both of those are very, very important to us.

Graeme Bunton: Jeff.

Jeff Eckhaus: Thanks. Jeff Eckhaus here. I would very much not want to bring up that second part with ICANN because that opened the door to a business relationship between two parties that is not covered in any of the agreements.

And, one, I don't think ICANN is going to be able to do anything because it's not in the registry or in any of the agreements. And I think that's something you could negotiate specifically with the registry if you wanted to.

And I think it's not worth us bring it up. I don't the gets going to go anywhere and I don't think it's an ICANN's remit so you can look at that, at that sort of business relationship between the registry and registrar.

So me, personally, I would strongly advise against it. As far as the insurance, if it's - pertains to anything in the contract, then it's worth going after. I'm not sure that ICANN can, again, say if the registry says, "Hey, we need this insurance," and ICANN would say, "Hey, that's their business. They've decided that."

Then there's not much we could do. I don't think - I don't personally just like expanding ICANN's scope and asking them to bring things in, into business relationships that don't need to be. I like to just think of the contract and look at it as nearly as possible and not letting them into business relationships.  
Thanks.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, Jeff. I think you raise a good point and I am super cautious about bundling those two issues. And if what - and I don't pick we had clarity - if those particular pieces are outside of the registry agreements, and maybe they don't belong in that discussion.

But I certainly hear the pain that causes. But it did seem like there was sort of a rough, fuzzy general agreement that we can work on that insurance requirement issue, we should.

So I'll take that back to the registries and we'll have a conversation with them about seeing if we can move it forward. Any other thoughts on that? We're

five minutes ahead of schedule but I think we then move into charter drafting.  
(Theo) are you - you're online? Zoe?

Zoe Bonython: Okay, so because the audio isn't amazing, Lindsay is actually going to do this. But I'm just going to precede that by saying I am going to be putting up the draft document.

This is not for distribution now. This is just for the purposes if we need to refer to it during this update. Okay, so it is going to be up there but just to let you know this is not the point where we're sending it to you. Okay? Thanks.

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid: Thanks. This is Lindsay for the record. I will point out now I'm just reading Theo's email. This is not coming from me. So this is to give you a sort of overview.

The new charter was not written by the RSG members. It's a mix of the old (RRSG) charter with - blended with the BC charter. And then it had various input from - I don't know - the RSG and ex com and a variety of other people.

So currently, the charter is about 70% done and we expect to finish it before the Copenhagen meeting next year, so hopefully. But it's going quite well at the moment.

We think the charter is not easy to read but there is still room for improvement. The charter is up to par with ICANN's requirements. So a quick overview then, the mission and principles are to be expanded.

It's now clearer what the mission is and we think our principles are easy to understand. So that means that members, regardless of what your position is, within the RSG will have a better understanding of what is expected of you.

We also (listed) are eligibility and elections. We spent quite a lot of time on this. There aren't any major changes although the term of the ex com officers have been expanded to two years.

We've also cleaned up the language and how we should operate where there are vacancies within the ex com - ex com GTs. ICANN has suggested lots of new language here.

We have spent a lot of time, again, making sure the language reflects what the ex com is actually doing at a basic level. The membership section - we've had a lot of discussion on this.

There's a lot of new language and it's much more realistic now when it comes to composition of the current situation (as agreed). Decision-making, elections and policy positions - we're currently working on that.

Something that they become clear during the last few months in relation to elections is that they'll charter is very clunky around that. This has also made our work much easier as we're very aware of the limitations of they'll charter.

We're currently addressing that and it should make things much simpler. The current charter has been translated into Chinese. (Unintelligible) was kind enough to check it for us. Maybe we want to discuss how we go about making sure the translations are being done correctly. And that's it at the moment.

Graeme Bunton: Okay, thank you, Lindsay. I think we all look forward to seeing this and hopefully it's out far enough ahead of Copenhagen that we can have a pretty robust discussion on it in Copenhagen before we then get her out to voting on such a thing.

My question, having run into this a lot and I think we talked a little bit about it in Helsinki, is to try and capture how we mostly operate already which is more

or less around a consent agenda which is we can bring up an issue and talk about it and take action without having to vote but still give people the opportunity to disagree and then figure out if they disagree and away enough to trigger a vote so that we're - we - under our bylaws currently we're supposed to vote on all sorts of stuff.

And members may have noticed, we don't actually do a lot of voting. And it's typically because we just don't have enough time as issues arise to respond in that way.

So we sort of fast-track almost everything and it's an unfortunate way of doing things, but be able to pitch stuff to the registrar stakeholder groups, say, we're concerned about this issue.

Here's kind of where we're at. Does anybody disagree? And if you're in disagreement enough that you think we should trigger a vote on this issue, otherwise we can move forward as a more or less consent agenda item and, you know, take action and final comments and endorse letters, that sort of thing which is a very long-winded way to say, hey, is that in there?

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid: Hi, this is Lindsay again. What we're trying to do is get the charter to reflect what we actually do because currently there's a lot of stuff in there that I don't think we do and it just isn't practical. So in so far as we can, you know, we're trying to reflect what we currently - or maybe even look at it and say how can we do it better?

Graeme Bunton: Great. Thank you. I see Michele's hand.

Michele Neylon: Thanks. Michele for the record. This is great. I mean, this is wonderful that this is moving forward. Graeme Bunton mentioned earlier today that he's running into the frustration I used to have.

I was chair of the stakeholder group for three years. During that time my biggest struggle was trying to understand what the hell the members actually supported or didn't support, what the position was on some things and as others have pointed out, the current official way of doing it.

Clunky is a polite way of describing it. Unworkable and logistically hellish is probably a bit more realistic. So you do end up in the situation where, at times as a group, become across as being disorganized and unresponsive, whereas, that's not the case.

It's more that we are being hampered by our own stupid rules. And just a note of warning, other groups within the ICANN a lot more agile and they come across as being better organized, so we could fix this, that would be great.

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid: Lindsay again for the record. That's kind of what we're trying to do, to say that it flows better, we are more agile and not seen as completely disorganized and a nightmare. Thanks.

Graeme Bunton: Great. This sounds very positive. Anybody have questions for (Lindsay) on where this is going? No? Awesome. All right, we're flying - oh, (Lindsay), do you have a question for yourself?

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid: No, I was going to say obviously everyone is so excited about this they can't wait to read it when it's a done.

Graeme Bunton: Excellent. Thank you for the update. We're blasting through our afternoon agenda. This is good. And now we're actually into AOB about 20 minutes ahead of time.

We've got a few things in here - thick Whois, new gTLDs, (PBSA) IIRT and insurance requirements. I already talked about insurance requirements. Maybe because I'm still talking and I just can't get enough of hearing myself,

I'll briefly talk about the PP SAI IIRT just to make sure everybody is up to speed on that and see we have any questions.

As I'm sure most of you know, the privacy and proxy PDP wrapped up earlier this year. The board in August, I think, approved the final report and that's moved into implementation.

We had our first meeting on the implementation review team about a week ago. There's going to be another meeting here. I think there are some 40-odd people involved in that implementation process.

I learned a piece the other day that I was unaware of that the GAC is still expecting a letter from the board. The direction the Board is going to give the IRT to try and address some of the GAC's concerns. And the GAC had filed advice and the Public Safety Working Group had filed a comment on the initial report, so there's a couple of pieces that Public Safety essentially wanted to address.

They were sort of a mix of policy. We've pushed that into implementation as much as possible and that's sort of the recommendation from the Board is to address the Public Safety/GAC comments as much as possible in the implementation review team, and then any policy questions should go back to the GNSO.

So we haven't gotten to those pieces yet because we've really only had one meeting, and I think it'll be a little while before we get there. I think the – optimistically they're aiming the – and (Amy)'s in the room and she can maybe talk to this a little bit more.

I maybe should've asked you to present but here I am doing it for you. The – I think optimistically this is done around 2019. It might take longer. It depends on how much the IRT ends up rehashing policy discussions, and hopefully we do that very little.

It's going to have implications for quite possibly the structure of the GNSO for instance. It could generate a new Contracted Party and we don't know what that looks like yet.

I see Jen raising a hand. I'll come back to you in a sec. I've spoken with some of the Public Safety Working Group members that will be participating in the IRT, which in general I think is a pretty good idea.

It'll be nicer to have them in there rather than outside. I asked them to – when I was speaking with them to see if they can build straw men for their concerns to see how those might be resolvable sooner rather than later, and also to think pretty far forward about it – what it looks like for Public Safety and/or the GAC if they don't get everything they want inside the IRT because I think it's possible that they won't.

And I don't think they have robust processes for dealing with not succeeding and it's possible that they might not, and so they need to figure out what that looks like and how they would deal with that ahead of time.

I don't know that they super enjoyed hearing that but that was us just sort of talking about it. So I think there's lots of registrars involved in this IRT. There should be lots of registrars in this IRT.

It's going to take a long time. It's important for a lot of our businesses. Right. That's more or less it. I think I saw (Stephanie)'s hand and then Jen's hand.

Stephanie Duchesneau: I just got overly excited because I thought you were talking about the Thick Whois IRT.

Graeme Bunton: Oh sorry. I pushed that off because I don't know anything about it. Jen?

Jennifer Gore: Thanks Graeme. Jen Gore, ICANN Staff. Now we heard Goran talk about ICANN Staff being around servicing and supporting and we also heard today in the Board session.

And obviously appreciate your feedback on that one and this IRT is going to be very complicated, and it's going to take us some time and it's going to affect probably almost every registrar in this room.

And I commit and my team will commit to raising issues where we believe that there's gaps in the policy, and for that reason alone and taking it back to the IRT and the working group to determine how to fill those gaps will more than likely extend the timeline.

And I know that we've gotten feedback that it is aggressive but we also know that more than likely the timeline will be extended.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks Jen and we talked a little about the interim spec and privacy and proxy already, but for context if people haven't been paying any attention to this there will be an accreditation regime for privacy services/proxy services, many of which many of us operate those.

And it will change how that works and so we need to be participating in this pretty closely. I'm not sure I have anything more for the stakeholder group on this other than there's a meeting coming up.

If you run a service you should think about participating in that IRT and/or talking to some of us who are and there's quite a few of us in there. Michele?

Michele Neylon: Thanks Graeme. No just very, very, very, very briefly and Michele for the record. The difference between what the GAC Public Safety Working Group were looking for and what's in the final recommendations – I'm having difficulty seeing how all of those things can be addressed in the IRT because there is – it's not a question of a mild difference of opinion.

It's a substantial, substantial difference. I mean, they basically have huge issues with a few things that we had agreed on so I – your comment there about, you know, the – how they're going to deal with that, I mean, is this something that we need to be engaging with the GAC on now or, I mean.

How would we deal with this because I'm just – I have this concern that they're going to try to push very forcefully to change policies that were already decided on and I honestly don't know how on earth we can deal with that because it's – it was decided.

It was discussed. It's the consensus – it's a consensus document. I just – I'm sort of confused by that. I mean, if it was just a matter of as others said, you know, gaps sure. Fine. No problem with that but there's a few things that I got the distinct impression that we had a huge difference of opinion on.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks Michele. I saw Heath's hand but briefly for those who didn't participate in this PDP or have read the GAC advice, the GAC basically had three issues.

One was the use of privacy and proxy services for commercial Web sites. That was discussed ad nauseam in the PDP and it was decided with consensus that there should be no restriction on that.

Reopening that issue inside the IRT I think is totally a no go but it does – there's no confusion about that topic. It is extremely clear. They have an issue with jurisdiction and they have some concerns that privacy services will not have to respond to law enforcement from outside their own jurisdiction.

This is another one that I personally - and again this is me as a Registrar not as Chair or previous Co-Chair of the PDP – is I think it's totally unresolvable. There is almost no way - the – there is no way that ICANN can compel me as a Canadian company to obey law enforcement from another jurisdiction.

You may do so voluntarily and I think that's fine but, you know, we're not going to – let's pretend Canada is a totally evil country, you know...

Michele Neylon: It is. It is.

Graeme Bunton: ...that murders journalists and does all sorts of horrible things. You just can't make that work. There is no way that they can force that. And then, you know, unless they try and narrow to that like a few countries they pick that they think are okay it's – I think it's completely unresolvable.

The last issue they have was around notification. So law enforcement wanted to be able to submit a request for information and not have the registrant – the underlying registrant notified.

That one is maybe discussable in implementation. There might be a place to figure that out and maybe the framework that was built for intellectual properties – they can take some pieces from that and apply it.

But those are the sort of three core issues and only one of them do I think has a real implementation narrow possibility of really working out; again my own opinion.

I could be totally wrong. (Amy) or someone else might have more insight on that. Heath?

Heath Dixon: This is Heath Dixon and I considered actually bringing this up today in the registry/registrar meeting before we met with the Board, because I think it's exactly the same issue as we raised on some of the areas where we've run into problems in implementation reviews with changes being made at that stage that weren't discussed at the policy development stage.

And I think that the message that we gave to the Board with, you know, we are willing as a GNSO to reach out to the GAC and get GAC input on things is valid and we are going to do that.

But the Board needs to stand behind us and defend us when the GAC tries to disrupt the policy development process by interjecting policy issues too late in the process.

So I think it's incumbent upon us, all of us who are participating, to make sure that we resist those policy changes and it's incumbent upon the ICANN Staff that's actually going to be in there to back us up on that, because the ICANN Staff is the right gatekeeper in that IRT process as the party that is running the process to make sure that the process is honored and that the GAC does not make policy changes at that point. And so I was a little concerned when Jen talked about filling the gaps.

Jennifer Gore: Okay.

Heath Dixon: I want to make sure that when we talk about filling the gaps what we're talking about is implementing the policy that was agreed upon, and not making changes to the policy just because the GAC feels like there are gaps in the policy.

So it's incumbent upon us to make those points. It's incumbent upon the ICANN Staff to take that role seriously, and then we need to make sure that to the extent that the GAC does provide resistance and doesn't want to follow the process that we encourage the Board to take its role seriously to defend the policymaking process.

And it's unfortunate that the GAC has decided that they don't want to be involved in the policymaking process. They want to reserve the ability to just make a decision at the end.

But we don't need to fix that problem for them, and one learning that they will be able to take away from this is that they need to get involved early if they have concerns.

Graeme Bunton: This is Graeme. Thank you Heath. Those are good points and we're going to have to be pretty vigorous in our defense of the policy in this IRT. I see Jen.

Jennifer Gore: Thanks Heath. This is Jen Gore, ICANN Staff. So Heath I completely agree with you and I just want to clarify that ICANN Staff's position will be to identify where there may be gaps and then provide that back to the IRT...

Graeme Bunton: Thanks Jen.

Jennifer Gore: ...based upon what's in the final report of the working group and what happens after that is up – not up to ICANN Staff but we're here to facilitate and support that.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you. And I think it's (Amy) who is in the room who is running this IRT so everyone take a look. Wave your hand (Amy). And so we'll be working with her pretty closely as this moves forward.

And again if you're interested there's another session later. The – (Amy) when is the working session?

(Amy): It's on Wednesday morning. I think it's at 11 o'clock.

Graeme Bunton: Great. You'll see many of us there. So that's the PPSAI IRT issue. (Tom)'s laughing at me hilariously. I don't know why. Any other issues with that? Anybody need more context or update on that particular piece of work? Jen?

Jennifer Gore: Thanks Graeme. I just want to offer up that we will send out the presentation of a update that took place on – what day did we do that (Amy), Saturday? Friday. Thanks.

I forget what day of the week it is. On Friday we'll send that to you Graeme so you can distribute that to the Registrar Stakeholder Group for the ones that missed that session.

Graeme Bunton: Great. Thank you. Okay let's move on in the AOB list of things to do. We've got new gTLDs and Thick Whois left and we've got about 35 minutes or so.

I don't know a thing about Thick Whois and I think Theo is going to give the update, although he did send an email to the list the other day that I – my understanding – he's captured most of it.

And I think he's having audio troubles so he may not be able to join us remotely. Stephanie you care a lot about Thick Whois. Do you want to – can you give us a sense of what's going on there?

Stephanie Duchesneau: I have an update specific to the comment period. If there's someone who's better equipped to update on the status of the working group I'll defer to that first.

Then we'll just leave it to Theo's email and I'll pivot to the comment period or...

Graeme Bunton: Tom Keller?

Tom Keller: Yes we – (Toby) and I had accidentally run into Pat Kane yesterday and tried to engage him to what's happening there, because none of us is really participating in that process.

And he told us that in theory there's now all this policy made up, that we will have to start shipping over data earliest next year -- again that's 2019 or something -- but that VeriSign is going to file something, which I didn't really get.

You know, they don't want to receive data at all but they want to resolve the issue, but actually switching or waiting for RDAP so at the data space we're just – RDAP in case you don't – haven't heard of that can be – can relay requests basically and it could be used for that.

But there is no real other protocol – there's another protocol but it's not the profile and we wouldn't know how to do it and so on. So there seems to be some tendency in VeriSign to actually – to not agree with what they discussed and it would be tremendously interesting from any insight of the crew because that was completely new to us whether there's any update at – on that or not.

They're very open about it and maybe if VeriSign is in the room they can talk about that, but this could be the change – how that whole working group works and the outcome.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks (Tom). That's interesting. I don't think we have anyone in the room who can speak to more from the working group. If you know anything (Stephanie) you can share that as you talk also about the comment period please.

Stephanie Duchesneau: Maybe a little bit on the timeline. So if you'll recall maybe about six months back there was an initial public comment period where – it was either an initial public comment period or two parallel periods where RDAP and Thick Whois were put forward for public comment at the same time.

At this point there was still going to be a requirement because the VeriSign registries were going to be Thin; that registrars were going to have to implement the RDAP in addition to that.

We coordinated comments and several folks submitted comments in response that stated that the timeline for these two things should be better

synchronized such that the transition happens before implementation is required, and such that like there's this carve-out created and that's what you see in the policy now so that registrars are only – Krista's staring me down – are only required to implement RDAP for Thin registries, but that the VeriSign registries are specifically carved out of that.

Separately I know VeriSign has been very strong on the fact that they're not sure whether it's commercially reasonable at this stage to be implementing RDAP.

We come at that with a sort of different perspective but I can pivot to that. Do you have anything?

Krista Papac: Hi everybody. Krista Papac, ICANN Staff and I'm the Director of Registry Services. The Thick Whois policy implementation's being led by the Registry Services team so I'm happy to share with you if you want.

I don't – it's not really my meeting so I didn't want to interfere. I just want to make sure. I think I understood the question to be more about this – the transition from Thin to Thick rather than the consistent – there's – let me just back up.

So the policy recommendations that were sent to the Board and approved basically said two things: that all gTLD registries need to be Thick and that they should do so with consistent labeling and display, and that consistent labeling and display should be using the Whois spec that's in your 2013 RAA.

So we took the work and we've been working on it for a few years now. We separated it into two tracks, one to address the consistent labeling and display requirement and one to address the transition from Thin to Thick requirement.

The rationale or the reason behind that - and this is all in collaboration and coordination with the IRT. But the rationale is that transition of all of that Thick data is obviously a much bigger animal than the - there's pretty minor adjustments in the scheme of what adjustments could be for the consistent labeling and display track.

So just kind of to build off of what (Stephanie) was just saying, with respect to the consistent labeling and display track we did develop that policy with the IRT, published it for public comment and actually announced the implementation of it.

However there was a reconsideration request that came from the Registry Stakeholder Group that took issue with some of the language in the policy, which was requiring implementation of RDAP.

So we rescinded that policy and reissued it recently with the deletion of the RDAP requirement and have put it back out for public comment, and that was like October 21 and it closes I think December -- I don't recall -- 5th or 9th or something along those lines.

So that's the consistent labeling and display track. Everybody looks really confused so should I stop and take questions before I go to the transition track or keep going?

I'll keep going. All right. So that's going on. The consistent labeling and display track doesn't really affect registrars so much but that transition one obviously does.

So the transition track - what we've been doing there - and there are registrars participating in the IRT. You've got parties from GoDaddy. Certainly (Theo) has been taking a very active role and I'm trying to think.

Dennis who is the Project Lead – can you think of other registrars off the top of your head? Okay I think there's a few others but (Frederick) I think – I'm so sorry.

That said – so the transition – the way that that's going to work is the – so the draft consensus policy has also been published for public comment – came out a couple of days later than the other one so October 26 and it's open until December 5 or 9.

And the way that policy is set up is that there's two implement by dates. The first one applies to new registrations and the second one applies to existing registrations.

So what would happen is it goes through public comment. We'll do the summary and analysis. We have no idea what's going to come out in public comment, but assuming all of that goes smoothly by January 31 of 2017 you would get an announcement from ICANN saying, "Hey this policy is being implemented beginning – for new registrations," and this mostly affects the registry in this case.

Well no, I'm sorry. It affects both of you. For new registrations those must be Thick no later than March 1, 2018 for the three registries com, net and jobs.

The second implement by date in the policy will say, "By February 1, 2019 all of the existing registrations must be transitioned to com, net and jobs." And then the one final thing I just wanted to comment on with respect to (Tom)'s – the information he shared. I haven't had that conversation with VeriSign personally.

Maybe others in the Staff have. I'm not sure. I think one of the – but just to recap what (Tom) was saying I think if I heard you right (Tom) that VeriSign was suggesting that maybe rather than transitioning the data, they would

actually just use the RDAP protocol assuming it was being – it was activated to display the data.

So it effectively looks like you're getting Thick Whois data from those registries, but it's really just using the protocol to pull it from the registrar. That hasn't really been discussed in the IRT that I recall so I'm not sure how that would work.

And yes I don't know either. I do know that in the final recommendation report while the recommendations don't specify what constitutes Thick Whois, you know, it says, "Go be Thick," when you look at the way the IRT, I mean, excuse me, the working group discussed Thick Whois they – it – the discussion appears to be - and the way they wrote about it in the final report it sort of works under the presumption that it's duplicative data so the – it's redundant data.

The registrar has a set of data and the registry does so I – that would be a question for the IRT is ultimately what I'm saying. Sorry to be so longwinded.

I hope that was helpful to you guys and if you have questions I'm happy to answer and thanks for letting me butt in to your meeting.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you Krista. Does anyone have questions for her? Dennis?

Dennis Chang: Hello it's Dennis Chang, ICANN Staff. Just to let you know that we do have a Thick Whois IRT meeting coming up on Tuesday so please come join us.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you. (Stephanie) did you still have thoughts on the comment period?

Stephanie Duchesneau: Yes and this is brief. This is just focused – so we've gone through several different comment iterations and focused on different issues. I think this is the third and specifically this time the comment period is dealing with the issue that we raised earlier today in the Staff session -- how independent

of the community and not requested by the community Staff developed an independent set of additional operational requirements in the form of an operational profile for the RDAP.

And via the Thick Whois policy and implementation of the consistent labeling and display that all registries were going to have to undertake/endeavor to not only trigger the RDAP requirement which exists in the registry contract, but also require this additional profile which there's no basis for in our contracts and there's no basis for in the consensus policy.

The good news is that this comment period removes that text. So within the registries we've put together a comment that is strongly supportive of the change to remove the operational profile while preserving some of the criticisms that we've had about the process to date, because this is feedback that was provided pretty clearly at earlier intervals and not really taken into account and not even really reflected in the Staff analyses of the issue.

But given that – I think this is like the reverse of what you were talking about earlier Heath. Whereas this is a registry implementation problem that doesn't directly affect the registrars necessarily, I think there's similar principle arguments and principle considerations to be made.

So I'd be interested in potentially forwarding the registry comment to the Registrar Stakeholder Group and seeing if there was interest in potentially jointly signing on to the position.

Graeme Bunton: This is Graeme. Thank you (Stephanie). Please send that along and I think we have a few interested members and we'll take a look at that. Does anybody have questions for (Stephanie) or Krista or anyone else on Thick Whois?

We're getting late in the day. You guys are hanging in there. You're serious troopers. I appreciate it. Okay I think that's it on the Thick Whois. The last

thing we have on our list of AOB is new gTLDs and I have no idea who put that on the agenda.

I'm pretty sure it was not me. Does anyone know? New gTLDs. Guys so there's this thing called new gTLDs.

Stephanie Duchesneau: I can provide...

Heath Dixon: I thought it was (unintelligible).

Stephanie Duchesneau: (Unintelligible).

Graeme Bunton: Was it?

Stephanie Duchesneau: Yes.

Graeme Bunton: Do you have something (Stephanie)?

Stephanie Duchesneau: Not quite. Well I have something about new gTLDs. So I remember in our last call James had raised the fact that there was the correspondence from the New gTLD Subsequent Procedure Working Group that went out to each of the communities.

And he had some concerns that the registrars hadn't responded and that in this particular issue there was a registry response that endeavored to narrow the scope of the PDP.

And I think this is one of the points that was raised earlier where part of the issues that we cited in the Board session earlier around volunteer fatigue – they don't just have to do with Staff.

Like there are things that are being put on our plate by Staff, but then there are things like the Subsequent Procedure PDP where we as a community

have undertaken - I think Avri used the phrase yesterday that for this Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process like she said, "Every line of the Applicant Guidebook is in scope.

Everything is revisited. Everything is being reconsidered." And this is hundreds of pages long. We don't think that's necessarily practical or that it's a good use of resources.

So one of the things that we've been looking at in the registries is to like do - as an input to the policy development process do a little bit of a prioritization exercise and triage some of the different topics that we encountered during the application process as people who experienced it directly along two different parameters: one, whether we think it's a change in policy or one, an implementation; and two, whether we think the issue should be gating.

So there's all things that should be fixed but the question is whether they actually have to stand in the way of a subsequent procedure or a subsequent application process, or whether they could be addressed iteratively but not necessarily have to stand in the way of that.

We addressed some topics along four different streams and kind of triaged the issues. Everything that we said was policy and was gating we provided back in our initial correspondence to the Subsequent Procedure Working Group.

The things that weren't - we didn't believe were gating we documented them and then we like forgot about them forever. And then the things that kind of fell in the middle that we thought - or where we thought there were minor implementation changes that could've made for significant improvements but weren't necessarily reflected in the original 2007 GNSO Policy what those changes were, not that that would be the defining position but to come up with constructive straw men for easier things that the PDP could look at to I

guess like narrow the scope, while still taking into account places where there are easy wins.

We've kind of tried and failed to coordinate an ad hoc meeting during this Hyderabad session, but I will take the task of like where it's appropriate and potentially interesting providing correspondence back to the registrars on that just to see if there is parallel or there is shared interest as well indicated.

There might be and it might kind of fork on different issues in some places. There might be in some places. There might not be but that's a kind of action item to me.

I had promised to let people know when a meeting was scheduled. It wasn't. That's why I haven't let you know.

Graeme Bunton: Great. Thank you for that update (Stephanie). I see Alex has raised his hand.

Alexander Schwertner: Just one question because I – this is Alex Schwertner from Tucows – because I haven't followed that process at all right now. Is it any – like what is the – what can we expect in terms of the subsequent and will the process be entirely different? What's the sentiment in the community?

Stephanie Duchesneau: Maybe I can turn it to Sara who I know is engaged more directly in the working group itself.

Sara Bockey: Repeat the question.

Alexander Schwertner: The question was in a subsequent new gTLD round would the process to introduce a specific TLD be fundamentally different to what we had in the past round, or is the sentiment that the process actually works more or less?

That is like in the community right now what is the – what could we expect as an outcome of this?

Sara Bockey: This is Sara Bockey. I'm trying to think if we've discussed that yet. I didn't – I don't know that we have and so I don't know that it would change or not. I'm sorry I don't have a better answer for you.

Graeme Bunton: I see Frederic Guillemaut, Mailclub, with his hand up.

Frederic Guillemaut: Frederic Guillemaut, say France. Just to be brief well I also follow the – this working group on the new TLDs. We don't even know what it will look like.

I mean, every – as (Stephanie) said everything is just questions and it might be a round, might be a – not a round but an ongoing process but at – it was scheduled to be a round.

Then you have to start a round and then in order to be able to ask what was ready as an ongoing process. It's question everywhere and it really looks very complicated to me that we can manage to find a consensus within one, two or three years.

That's my feeling. Maybe I'm not in a good mood but it sounds crazy. There are people from all the constituencies of the – of ICANN. They all have something to ask for and well we just want to have predictability and something which is organized, because we will be the ones who have to implement all these new TLDs.

But no, everybody just asks for new things and question thing so – and it's – no idea.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you Frederic. Anybody else have questions or comments on this? No? Great. That I think brings us to the end of today's agenda. We've got still 15 minutes.

I don't want to keep anybody any longer than we need to. I will remind you that Bruce's reception is where and when, Zoe?

Zoe Bonython: I literally just got an email from Tanzi saying, "Can you confirm it's in the ballroom?" I feel like that was a mistake. Sorry. This is Zoe for the transcript.

It's supposed to be on the lawn at 6:30 – the Novatel lawn at 6:30. I – hang on. Let me see if Tanzi came back to me.

Graeme Bunton: While you look at that actually I – I'll raise a brief issue, which is I know Chuck is going to do – from VeriSign is going to do a bit of a talk because he's worked with Bruce for so long.

Is there anyone who wants to volunteer to say a few words on the registrars' behalf about Bruce and working with Bruce? There are many people here who have been working with him much longer than I have.

I will do it if no one else steps up but I'm looking to people who've been around like (Tom) and/or Jeff. Jeff's looking. Does someone have some good words to say about Bruce? Come on.

Tom Keller: You will do a great job. Come on.

Graeme Bunton: You people.

Tom Keller: Michele.

Graeme Bunton: I'm looking for someone to volunteer too who's worked with Bruce over the past 9 number of years and...

Michele Neylon: I think – okay...

((Crosstalk))

Graeme Bunton: I'm glad he's not in the room.

Michele Neylon: I would love to say, you know, James would do this wonderfully. Is he even on? No. Okay that's being unfair to James. Michele for the record. I'm – ultimately Graeme I think you as our Chair and as our glorious leader – it is up to you to take on that mantle and to take on that task. Just don't embarrass us.

Graeme Bunton: No I won't.

((Crosstalk))

Graeme Bunton: I mean, I'll do it. I just – I like – I think Bruce is a great guy. I've learned some interesting things from him. I – but – and his service has been exemplary. But, you know, that's kind of...

((Crosstalk))

Graeme Bunton: Thank you. Good night.

Michele Neylon: Yes wonderful. We don't want a 25-minute speech. We just want to have a...

Graeme Bunton: No but...

Michele Neylon: ...couple of drinks.

Graeme Bunton: ...maybe someone has the...

Michele Neylon: I mean, come on.

Graeme Bunton: ...hilarious anecdote that I don't have that they want to share. All right. Okay. So I'll take this on. If anybody has a tidbit that they would – they think would be great to share about Bruce please come find me and soon. Have we heard back?

Zoe Bonython: Hi this is Zoe. I'm emailing right now. I said to her, "It should be the lawn on this." If they come back and say, "it absolutely has to be the ballroom." I think – let's say the lawn.

I'm saying the lawn. I will send an email if it's not the lawn so please assume – and I already asked for there to be millions of signs up because there has been this back and forth with the venue so there is going to be signs. The signs are going to be correct. Please assume for now that it's the lawn.

Graeme Bunton: Zoe is getting wonderful insight this week into an ICANN meeting. Great. Okay does anybody have anything else they wish to raise or share with the Registrar Stakeholder Group while we're all still sitting in the room together? Michele?

Michele Neylon: I just want to say thanks to Graeme for chairing us today. Well done.

Graeme Bunton: Oh thank you. I appreciate it. It was nice of you all to vote for me. It's kind.

Michele Neylon: To you learning.

Graeme Bunton: Sure. Great. Thank you all for participating today. I know that it's a long day. Still not enough of you quiet people got up to the mic so I'm going to make everyone do something dumb in Copenhagen. Heads up. It's coming.

Stephanie Duchesneau: (Unintelligible).

Graeme Bunton: The next two...

Stephanie Duchesneau: The next two (unintelligible).

Graeme Bunton: Right. At 5 o'clock today is the cross field and the other one?

Stephanie Duchesneau: And the DNS (unintelligible).

Graeme Bunton: And a high interest topic on DNS and content regulation so those are good places to go shortly and then...

Michele Neylon: I'm speaking on the DNS and content regulation in case anybody cares.

Graeme Bunton: So am I.

Michele Neylon: Excellent.

Graeme Bunton: So those two things are happening and then Bruce's reception and then the rest of the ICANN meeting. Jen are you waving your hand too? Oh okay. So thank you everyone who joined us and participated and thank you for GDD staff today.

You were quite helpful in this session. Thank you everyone. If we don't see you for the rest of the meeting we'll see you again in Copenhagen. You are free. Be free.

Jennifer Gore: Thanks Graeme. Thanks registrars.

END