

Transcription ICANN Beijing Meeting

Registrars meeting

Tuesday 9 April 2013 at 13:00 local time

Man: You know, yes I'll dive not that since we've got some folks in the room. Could we use this extra time and talk about just some housekeeping issues within the stakeholder group that has (unintelligible) for folks?

So I wanted to chat a little bit about our payment and banking arrangements that we have right now. And I think that in the past there was concerns about, you know, well I don't know like the treasurer having, you know, those funds or whatever. And so we now have that where we're operating through ICANN and they are both processing the dues payments as well as any payments to like to outside vendors or like if one of these folks buys something and then wants a reimbursement group and we have to ask ICANN to reimburse them.

The point of that is excruciatingly slow. And as business people I think we appreciate like when you ask something for payment to happen and then 60 days later you're still getting calls from people like why haven't I been paid and it's just, you know, it's a very painful thing. And so we're exploring different alternative ways to manage our finances in ways that would be more convenient and I think more familiar to a tech savvy audience like the registrars.

The problem is we want to do all those things without actually forming an entity, you know, so there's that catch. So that kind of limits our ability to setup banking or accept credit cards or have a merchant account. And so we're looking at things like PayPal and we do currently process membership payments via PayPal and then we have a separate account.

But one question would be that I'd like to put to the membership is that working, you know, do people just not care if I had to change you a check that it might take 60 to 90 days to actually, you know, it's not that bad. Sometimes it's 30 days.

But, you know, if you had to submit an invoice for membership would you put out if there was like a 3% handling charge for PayPal tacked onto that or I just want to kind of put this around to the room. Is this a problem that you guys feel as a membership, is just something that, you know, the treasurer's office and (Kristin) who's not here we just have to kind of suck it up or, you know, what are your thoughts on that?

Because it would cost us money and we don't want to - I think we're fairly confident we don't want to create a legal construct to run the finances. So we're trying to have it both ways and I'm just trying to think of the best way to do it.

(John): I'll renew the offer. I still have a separate numbered bank account, you know, that is an attorney trust account administered of the state where I'm licensed for the registrars. Actually it still has a balance of \$108.27. So, you know, I'm perfectly willing to do that. The funds in the attorney trust account are not mine. They can only be deposited and withdrawn at the direction of the client which would be the registrar constituency. And I'm still willing to do that probably, you know, for administrative reasons. Otherwise just shut the account down, you know, some time in the next couple of months because it's kicking around my accounting system. But, you know, I'm pretty willing to do that on a volunteer basis at no charge.

Man: Thanks (John). And I wasn't sure why we went away from that. I obviously haven't been on the job very long and I was wondering if it was because you guys didn't want to do that anymore. So thanks for clarifying that you were so willing to do that.

(John): Well yes. There was...

Man: Am I tipping over sacred cows here?

(John): No. Let me put it this way, you know, and I don't want to offend anybody. At one point in time back when I think (Robin) was the president constituency there was a suggestion that, you know, and perhaps (unintelligible) had about a surplus of about \$45,000 and, you know, there was a suggestion at that time. That was around the time that there were some settlements and that, you know, perhaps the registrar constituency could use those funds to engage in the council.

And I mean even in the context of the negotiating team, you know, you're negotiating with ICANN and hire an attorney to help negotiate with ICANN your bank balance is visible to you, you know, your negotiating partner and they're writing the checks to the RT Council. And so I mean they can calculate the burn rate, you know, exactly, you know, what you have in reserve.

Now there was an unusual circumstance and we kept that account going for three years from the time that I was treasurer back in golly 2002 or whatever it was, but there came a time at which the RT had a treasurer who for reasons that were really never articulated clearly was uncomfortable with that arrangement and said well let's move it all to ICANN. And about two months after that happened this RT treasurer then became an ICANN employee.

So it was kind of interesting. There was talk of using this as a reserve for the RT to get its own independent legal advice and then the person who made that decision to move our funds to ICANN's management then became a member of ICANN's management and...

Man: Right.

(John): ...that's - those are the observable facts. I honestly don't think there's anything, you know, going on there. But it looked and felt a little funny.

Man: Yes.

(John): But, you know, I was a little surprised by it because as we said it then introduced these accounting problems where there had been a progression of - there's been turnaround and (unintelligible) of ICANN staff that had made it difficult for us to get timely information whereas, you know, when the checks were coming into my office we could, you know, report and account for them immediately. We could accept PayPal, we could take (unintelligible) checks, we could take wire transfers, etcetera.

Man: Yes and one thing I forgot to point out that since they went to ICANN sometimes...

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...they commingle with your actual ICANN registrar fee payments. So they will like - the account balance will shoot up tens of thousands of dollars with, you know, weird little - and then it will go away. And, you know, I mean just imagine if, you know, you had to run your own bank account like that and, you know, by two or three arms lengths. So thanks for the history on that (John).

And I've always thought that if - I've heard in the past there were folks that were - there were some situations or some situations with previous treasurers that made folks uneasy about having certain arrangements and I'm like, you know, you shouldn't be voting for someone a treasurer. Obviously you don't feel like you could trust them with the membership.

(John): Well no. Before I had become treasurer and setup that account which is still maintained, the RT treasurer would open a personal checking account, you

know, into which money would come and money would go and it's sort of like well, you know, they were sort of treating it as not theirs and, you know...

Man: Yes.

(John): ...they could get into tax situations or something like that. But, you know, a licensed attorney in the United States has the ability to setup a bank account that is money that is not theirs, belongs to the client, is overseen by a regulatory body to ensure there's no, you know, funny business going on, and that is, you know, used solely at the direction of the client.

Man: And I also want to point out that, you know, a lot of these creative things that we're coming up with are being done to avoid establishing any formal constructs, you know, whatever you want to call it for this association. However, I don't want to completely rule out that that might be something we would want to explore in the future especially if the ranks of the membership were to grow significantly and particularly if we start looking at members who want to pay in other currencies from other areas that may or may not have tax implications for them.

I understand that the BC - the treasurer of some of the other stakeholder groups has approached me and said we need to find a better solution because we have members that can't submit a check to a US entity or something without incurring some sort of tax or legal issues or something.

So this is - it should seem like a really easy thing to do, but it's turned into a very hard thing to do and I'm asking the membership I guess the first question is I'm asking do you care. Is this impacting anybody at all or is just, you know, is it something you want to see changed, is it something you want to see fixed, is it something where you say oh, you know, it's \$500 plus I have to pay a 3%, 5% PayPal fee or whatever, you know, is it just I can live with that and, you know.

But I'm just kind of opening up the discussion of should we be working hard to fix this. Should we just close that \$108 account? Should we transfer all the money to Pennsylvania? What's up? What do we want to do?

Man: It's your money. We can also just throw the target and spend it if you guys want, so.

Man: Well we almost did.

Man: Yeah we thought about it.

Man: I just think it would be better if we don't have our funds with ICANN. That's my personal preference.

Man: Okay.

Man: They're very (unintelligible).

Man: I would also add that the attorney trust account is a non interest bearing account. There is no financial advantage to - in doing that.

The interest is actually credited to a - the - a board in Pennsylvania that oversees interest from attorney trust accounts and uses them to provide low income legal services or something like that. But the point being there's no benefit to me in maintaining the account whatsoever.

(Jeff): Thanks. So that's a good idea. Now we know John's not keeping the float. So Bob Connelly sent me a comment. Okay, Bob?

Man: It worked well using beyond attorney account with his secretary.

Man: Let's turn the question on its head. If we were to go back to the old way and strong concerns or heartburn or opposition to that?

And obviously we would have to put this to, you know, some lists for the folk who aren't here. But we're just having a discussion right now.

I mean is that...

Man: I think...

Man: Well, I...

Man: We're trying to have a discussion. I feel like in a roomful of people (unintelligible).

Man: Yeah.

Man: But I felt...

Man: I think - well I'll take the other point. I think Jeff Eckhaus had some concerns in terms of, you know, my objectivity in something like that.

And again, you know, legally I have no discretion, you know, over the funds. And in the event of my demise or something like that control would pass to my tax attorney -- his firm who would be under the same obligations relative to it.

So I think some of his concerns arose from not understanding, you know, how an attorney trust account works. And what the relevant regulations are.

But there, you know, can be any number of reasons, my goodness that people could have some sort of a personal issue or concern about me. And that's understandable.

But my - whatever I may be engaged in in my role as an attorney in other engagements, my limited engagement with BRC with respect to maintaining these funds is, you know, in my opinion invaluable. And I think, you know, his part for, you know, I'm not going to run off to Brazil with the BRC treasury or something like that.

But, you know, I would be putting my life on the table in the event that, you know, anything unusual were to occur.

(Jeff): That's good to know. And I guess the more likely thing would be - or the more pertinent question (John) would be do you intend, you know, either you or your firm intend to be a participant in a stakeholder group for the foreseeable future?

Or do you have, I mean because I know you're involved with some applicants and...

(John): No well that's a great quarter. My, you know, I for the foreseeable future will continue to represent iRegistry, uniregistry, the new TLD applicant to whom I am an advisor on intellectual property issues intends to operate its own captive registrar which will likely also become a member of the constituency.

But, you know, with respect to taking direction from the RC treasurer on receipt and disbursement of funds it's difficult for me to imagine a situation in which my function in that role would be at all, you know, affected by anything else.

Man: Thank you. Any other thoughts? Anybody want to weigh in on this - weigh in on this?

I mean ultimately it's your money. And, you know, we took it and we used it.

Becky I think for those of you who weren't familiar with her role in the RAA negotiations, she started off probably did about \$250,000 worth of work for \$30,000. And, you know, is there something - I think that would be the other side of it.

We're talking about ways to manage that money. But if you have ideas for how it should be used that's also something that we're looking at.

Because now that we have that expenditure out of the way we're looking for ways that it can be used to the benefit of the members to advance our interest, you know, within ICANN. And, you know, I think Becky was an excellent use of those funds.

And looking for feedback on that. Thanks.

Jeff Eckhaus: Thanks James. I'll put myself in the queue. You know, one of the things that we've talked about and tried to kind of move forward with in (unintelligible) for a long time is this notion, you know, we - I guess a couple years ago at this point it's been used to have what was called the registrar stakeholder group advocate which essentially was someone that, you know, kept track of the ICANN issues out for public comment, solicited feedback from members, wrote, you know, initial statements, sent it back out for feedback, made updates, things like that.

And we have not had that. And so it's really been left to the members sitting up here on the ExCom to try to manage that.

And frankly we've done a - in my personal estimation I think we've done a...

Man: Terrible job.

Jeff Eckhaus: Fine. I was going to use a worse word. But we've done a terrible job.

I'll use correct language. Sorry I shouldn't curse.

So we have tried to get some funds put together to try to bring that back into the group so that we again have that role. Because there's just so much coming at us at any given time it's frankly just near impossible for us to try to manage that.

And so I - in terms of spending money I think very clearly that's an area that we need to spend money on. But I'm also interested in hearing from members what their thoughts are, A and then B if they have any - yeah I'll put you in the queue.

If they have any ideas of who that person might be, frankly, that would be welcome too. Although you don't have to say it in an open forum.

You can pull me aside afterwards. (Unintelligible) go ahead.

Man:

Just first off just speaking to the initial thing about the finances. I think I've seen on the few people on the chaffs and Skype and elsewhere echoing the thought that moving the money away from ICANN makes a lot of sense.

And for us I mean we've had - already had issues with ICANN's accounting even for our own fees and this kind of weird thing where ICANN decides to send us three or four invoices at the same time even though they're different dates. My accounting staff got completely confused.

So we had the similar kind of issues as well around the stakeholder group fees (unintelligible). But with regards say to the public comment things about one of the issues we face as a stakeholder group is that if we miss out on making a comment on some - and even if the comment is simply we think this is an important issue which may sound a bit vacuous.

But at least it means that we've made some kind of comment. It's very hard for us as a stakeholder group to come back later and say oh my god we have a huge issue with this.

We want to do something. Because then other parties will say hey, you totally ignored this up until now.

Why are you suddenly coming along at the 11th hour? Which is a, you know, reasonable comment.

At the moment just looking at the open comment period there are about a dozen I think unless I'm miscounting. Some of them are probably ones that you probably don't give a damn about and that's fine.

But there are other ones which would be very, very relevant to your businesses and what you have to do and what you should do and what you shouldn't do. Just looking at it there there's - okay there's one going from the bottom up.

Accountability and transparency. You know, is ICANN doing a good job?

There's the one on locking. UGRP locking.

There's travel support guidelines. There's the security, stability and resiliency framework.

I don't even know what that is, but okay. Registration data services, root (unintelligible) KSK rollover and there's a bunch of other ones related to a whole range of other topics.

And ultimately at the moment, you know, between the REA negotiations, people having day jobs and all that it's been very, very hard for us to submit comments on every, single one. We've chosen one or two.

We've probably missed a few. But also you as members as well, you know, take the time and submit comments for god's sake.

You know, silence can be seen as agreement.

Jeff Eckhaus: No I'd change that. I'd say silence is agreement, not can be.

I've got (Tom) and (Tom) in the queue. Jeez.

(Tom): Hey (unintelligible) wake up. It's Mike. Come on, man, let's go.

Man: I am here to serve. And that's why I will be transferring my phone. So (unintelligible).

(Tom): Well talking about the advocate and I'm - I mean I totally understand and appreciate the work you guys do. And I totally understand that it's not in your time to make sure you go out and explain properly what you all have experienced, you know, and what a lot of issues actually about.

And I guess what I find very hard currently is to resolve the masses of email coming in saying oh there is another task for us, there's another initiative and there are other things and the PDP and GNSO and some other acronyms. You all know them.

It's only half understand them I guess. You know, it would be very, very good to have like a monthly say executive summary or something, you know, that is actually the starting point of saying to guide some kind of a just proactive discussion, you know, the ending something and somewhere.

You know, currently we see a lot of positive noise in our mailing list. That's how I would describe it.

You know, but at the end of the day you never really come to a conclusion that leaves you guys in a position where you have to make up your minds about, you know, how you want to actually represent the stakeholder group, which is fine. I don't mind that.

You know, but I guess, you know, if you would have someone be paid for it now who's in the duty to actually give us all the good information and summaries about that, you know, and can even explain single people what the whole thing is about, you know, in very, very broad and common terms, you know, that would be a big beneficial - big benefit to us, to our group.

Jeff Eckhaus: Yes, Volker, do you want to respond or do you want to get in the...?

Volker Greimann: No, I think that's a very good idea. Some executive summary to be presented to the group in the regular - at regular intervals would be a good thing.

I wanted to add though that when we see public comments -- and I appreciate them very much from our members -- on the public comment phases it's usually the same faces or email addresses that we see again and again. While this is good that we have active members it would be nice if more members would take 15 minutes or a half an hour out of their time and comment on some of the important issues that we have identified at the ExCom and put to the list as please respond here or please comment here because as we've seen for example with the (Strohman) proposal the other stakeholder groups do that.

They come out in force, they get their members active, they bring 100 or more public comments on the issues that they have - that they feel strongly about. And I can staff - we'll then go ahead and say there's an overwhelming majority of people supporting this proposal. Not in ignoring them that these all come from one area of the community only. So we must be more vocal. And it will not take a lot of time, maybe 15 to 20 minutes on one topic and you're done.

(Tom): This is (Tom) again, Jeff.

Jeff Eckhaus: Yes, go ahead.

(Tom): To give you a reply on that. I guess we all were willing to do so. The issue is whether you understand the topic before you can actually file the comment. And what I know from other stakeholders group that they are pretty much preparing, you know, what people should be sending out.

So if we would have an advocate that's actually, you know, like giving us some kind of a like an already prewritten whatever, you know, we can file it at point of time. Maybe we do our individual changes to it, would be very beneficial. But we are going through all that information that's really impossible for most of us, you know? Maybe not my company, but.

Jeff Eckhaus: Yes, no it's a good point. And I would - my response to Volker's point I think was going to be I think one of the reasons we may not see more people coming forward, providing feedback is the mechanism by which we're soliciting the feedback. You know, it - I don't think it's -- and I'll take this criticism on myself because it's been - it's directed at me -- you know, I don't think it's fair to expect, you know, members to try to sort through the hundred-some emails we're sending out to get that feedback. Sometimes that's the only way we have frankly.

But, you know, what I'm sitting here thinking through is that now that the - hopefully we're done with the real meat of the RA discussion so that'll free up a fair amount of time what I think I'd like to do is set up a monthly just policy update call, you know. We'll start doing those so that we can actually in more of a structured environment walk through the things that are going on and try to solicit that feedback in a different form. So I will take the - yes, that's right. The registries do that. I'll take the onus on to do that.

So I've got (Tom) and then I've got James.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Jeff Eckhaus: Oh yes, go ahead. Sorry.

Man: And I'm sorry I'm not trying to jump a queue. But, you know, we just had a conversation about we have this - I, you know, I don't want to say extra money but we have some now - some breathing room in the budget. What if we were to, you know, we're the technology arm of this industry.

What if we were to build some system to automate, you know, I'm not saying like a robot or a spam letter or whatever like that but if we say hey there's a comment period and we have, you know, links that you can click that summarize it and then maybe a little submission box that you can, you know, fill out and, you know, put your name to it and hit submit. So that the whole process takes like 45 seconds, about as long as it takes to brew a cup of coffee you can submit a comment.

I mean, if we were to reduce the friction to submitting opinions in ICANN the same way we do registering domain names I think we could get somewhere, you know? And we have the brains I think within this membership and the skills and the dollars to, you know, to make something like that happen. The other groups -- as Volker pointed out -- the other groups are leveraging all of these tools to do that. So there's just one idea of what we could do to ease this process.

Jeff Eckhaus: (Tom), go ahead.

(Tom): Yes, I know we have a meeting later about the by laws but I suspect we'll have far fewer people at that meeting than we do here because we're going to move back and forth. So I do want to point out that we're probably two years behind the registries when it comes to revising our by laws because

they - and once we do agree on the changes I think they probably have to get approved by ICANN and go through a public comment period, yadda, yadda, yadda.

So I would strongly suggest that we hire and advocate to help us draft the changes to the by laws because I think we all are pretty busy with what we're doing now and it's not going to get done otherwise.

Jeff Eckhaus: Yes, no I think that's right and - yes. I'll just - go ahead, John.

(John): Yes. If I can add something to that. You know, of all the ICANN stakeholder groups I think the registrar constituency has the lowest dues. I noticed that one of our registry customers pays something like \$10,000 a year for a non-voting position in the BC and that's how much it matters to them.

We did have a significant reduction in the annual dues about a year after we screwed up the bank account which was in the - sort of the - sort of a one-two punch in terms of our ability there. You know, organization and at least effectively channel information into a digestible form for the membership.

Jeff Eckhaus: Yes, and we have, you know, to go along with (Tom)'s point about the by laws we have had discussions as well about - oh, I don't want to call them classes of membership but different levels of membership. And based on a variety of different things because, you know, the - James talked about the surplus we have but it's actually, I mean, it's not a lot of money. So it doesn't get us a whole lot.

So one of the challenges we've had in that looking at some of the folks that have offered to provide that sort of policy counselor work we don't have the funds to be able to afford, you know, someone that has a fair amount of experience and knows the industry and things like that. So we are challenged in that aspect as well.

Anyone else in the queue? No one? Michele? Come on.

Michele Neylon: Okay. You're always - I just need a few moment to have something to say.
(Unintelligible)...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Michele Neylon: Okay, fine, thanks. No, the issue around get - finding somebody it's very - it's wonderful, yes let's get an advocate, let's get - do this. Let's get somebody to summarize the things. The problem we have is paying for those. Finding somebody who actually has the skills who will pay for us.

Thomas' hand up. Does that mean he's going to volunteer to pay for it? You'll do it?

Thomas: No (unintelligible).

Michele Neylon: Oh. Damn. Oh, okay. No I personally I would not have an issue paying double the membership fee we currently pay and actually - and having those fees go towards funding somebody who could actually put together positions for us or simplify précis of whatever the comment periods are and things of that - that for me personally I would happily pay double.

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: I mean, is there any - are any of you here - do any of you here have an issue with paying double the membership fee that you're currently paying which is what? Five hundred dollars? Does anybody have an issue? Okay, (Tom). Do you have lots of things to say or are you just waving your arms madly?

Jeff Eckhaus: He needs the mic though, Mr. (Barryhill).

Michele Neylon: Mr. (Barryhill) please, you're (unintelligible).

Jeff Eckhaus: He's trying to - oh. Poor guy's sitting there trying to get work done.

(Tom): Absolutely. I, you know, the thing is, you know, why don't you - I don't know if doubling it will do any good actually, you know? It might be - for here I know it's something like \$10,000 and I know that's a bit too high, you know. But why don't you guys just go ahead and say well we want to do that but then we would need that budget and then what kind of breakdown into that yearly fee?

But, you know, having a discussion about do you want to double it or triple it or quadruple it, you know, I don't think it's really beneficial, you know. We - if we want to have like a proactive approach on that, you know, why is it not the ExCom saying we need that because you guys know that's best and you make a proposal. Then the membership can actually vote upon that, you know? So I - that is something I'm very supportive of at least.

Jeff Eckhaus: Yes. Volker, go ahead.

((Crosstalk))

Man: And another - well and actually another component about that is having a coherent system by which we can receive and account for payments. Makes it easier to, you know, gain new members. We had a system previously where, you know, pretty much as soon as a registrar was accredited or if you had heard of somebody who had been registered, you know, someone who had become an accredited registrar or ran into a registrar who was not a member of the constituency somebody could just, you know, pop and note to (Kristen), (Kristen) could send them a, you know, an in-short email, take the payment account for the payment, get them on the mailing list, you know. So that they felt like something at least was happening in order to join.

And, you know, I mean, the conspiracies range the gamut from well, you know, was there some idea that, you know, perhaps there were people in the constituency that, you know, didn't want it to be, you know, a large membership. But we did have a significantly larger membership a few years ago than we do now.

Jeff Eckhaus: I've got Volker and (unintelligible) Volker?

Volker Greimann: I agree that we should first have an image of what we need. However if we find out and make a deal or preliminary talks with a candidate and we come up with a number that's - no one here is willing to pay then we have wasted a lot of time. So having a preliminary indication of what the amount could be that we would be able to spend on this would be helpful.

Jeff Eckhaus: Yes (unintelligible) go ahead.

Man: So I personally don't have an issue with doubling but I think it's not an issue of how money will - if - even if everyone here are cool with it I think we'll be talking for a long time that we want more registrars on our group. And the question is whether this will, you know, just decrease the potential of those that might join. I don't know how can we actually check that, but.

Jeff Eckhaus: Well I think it's a balance between wanting more registrars in general and wanting more registrars to participate. So I think the notion is if we're collecting more fees to be able to have more of a structure by which to get more engagement then we'll - we may have less members ultimately but I think we'll have more engaged members. And over time if we're able to show the value of membership by having more of a structure and more of a process then that could lead to more members. I mean, that's just my - I don't know if it - but that's my view of it (unintelligible).

Man: And it's a very good (unintelligible).

Jeff Eckhaus: Anyone else want to weigh in? Jim? Wait, hold on. Pause. We got some remote folks and...

(John): There's people on the phone.

Jeff Eckhaus: (John's) trying to keep up.

(John): Where am I going? (Unintelligible).

Jeff Eckhaus: Well there is another one. I'm just making you work more, (John). Makes the day go by a little faster. (Jen), make sure you state your name for the remote folks too. Thanks.

(Jennifer Gloris): Thanks, (Pat). This is (Jennifer Gloris) (unintelligible) representing web.com, registrars, network solutions and register.com. Representing web.com, sorry.

I think that we would be in favor similar to the registry stakeholder group to have the secretary or administrative support and efforts to support that would be to double, triple, whatever the appropriate budget would be to get that support from them. Thank you.

Jeff Eckhaus: Thanks (Jen). What's that?

Man: Has anybody from the NonCom actually joined us over here yes? Or no? No. Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Bill Manning: I hold a NonCom but I'm not the spokesmodel.

Man: Okay, well we'll - the thing is with the - at the rate we're going here we're going to have to - we're going to be - have to leave here to go to the board.

So if the NonCom has anything they'd like to say to us they kind of need to say it to us now.

Bill Manning: Okay. So I'm Bill Manning and I am not the NonCom spokes model but I am on the NonCom coming out of the (ARSAC) constituency which is very tiny.

The encouragement we have is that we have a bunch of slots to fill and we can guess, pick random names off of the list, or pull out our Ouija board and trying and find qualified candidates. It's best if you guys help us out by helping create a pool of candidates that are qualified to meet the requirements.

Each constituency does have - or at least most of the constituencies have people that get appointed by the NonCom. And so we need your help in finding that pool of people. If you would like to serve fill out a statement of interest. If you know somebody that you hate encourage them to go and - or if you like them particularly, you think they would be a good fit encourage them to fill out a statement of interest because we need your help basically. Is that - that's what we're really here to do is say help us out.

Man: Now which roles need filling? I mean, which are the positions?

Man: The roles that need filling are - there are some stuff from at-large. There's stuff from GNSO. There's stuff - the board needs slots filled. I'm primarily interested and have been following the board ones because that's where my constituency lies. So I was really hoping that our chair would be here to be able to fill out the rest of it.

There is the - a NonCom link on the ICANN main page. So if you are interested you can fill out the SOIs from there. If you suggest someone there's a suggestion box there and we'll follow up with them. That's pretty much the NonCom from my perspective at this point. So I really hope

somebody else comes in soon. But if not we've done our consense (sic) here, so.

Jeff Eckhaus: Yes. Okay, thanks. We've got about 15 more minutes and we're headed into the board. Are there - they are in Ballroom B I want to say. Yes, up one level. Sorry, Grand Hall A is where they are, not B. So it's...

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Eckhaus: It's a big - oh yes, it's a big room. The welcome ceremony room? Oh, okay.

Are there viewpoints, topics that we'd like to get feedback on from you guys before we go into the discussion with the board? That's a good question. We had a couple topics that we sent over to them.

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...shuffling around with us. How many of you in this room are registrars who are not members of the stakeholder group? Only one? Oh, okay. But you're joining aren't you? Which means potentially yes.

((Crosstalk))

Man: You can afford it, come on. We know you can afford it. Weren't you just claiming you were one of the largest registrars of the UK?

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Eckhaus: So the three topics that we had sent out to the board - and this was - it seemed like a lifetime ago. It was like ten days. The RA status and the board's view on its involvement in the proposed amendment process, the public interest/specification relative to the requirement for new detail the operators to use only ICANN accredited registrars on the 2013 RA, and the

board's view on closed generic detailed (unintelligible) and the potential impact on registrars.

We usually get a list back from them. We have not done that so it'll be interesting to see if they have anything that they'd like to talk to us about. Yes, that's true. We did never get to it though.

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Eckhaus: Yes.

Man: Sorry, just saying that on the microphone. They usually come up with some completely different topic that we don't really know about and end up going off. I mean, yes we did - we have those three topics. I think the amendment process one after the changes that have been made in some ways that's not really an issue anymore.

Jeff Eckhaus: All right. That's why I was saying this was, you know, it - we sort of - but I still think just trying to hear from the board what they - how they view their role, you know, if they're comfortable with even the limited role that now they'll have and how they view that process. And maybe they put some thought in, you know, to Elliot's question about, you know, are there any issues they would foresee going through that process? So I still think it's worth a discussion item. But it has a slightly different slant now since we've gotten in here and changed it.

Any other points that - (unintelligible) okay.

Man: Yes, I was actually just - rather - I'm just going to - just going off topic so I can go back on topic. For those of you who were following the Adobe chart that's actually being projected up there was piece suggestions coming from people on how one - how we could spend funds. And one I've seen several times from several quarters would be to actually put together some kind of

marketing packet so as in to market the idea of joining the stakeholder group.
So that kind of makes sense to me.

Going back to the entire thing with the board, you know, ultimately they probably have topics they want to discuss with us. Not too sure exactly what they'll be but they'll probably have some.

Jeff Eckhaus: Yes, no I'm sure they will. I was just trying to get from the group if there were perspectives or viewpoints that either on those specific topics or anything outside of those that they'd like us to (unintelligible) the board. Or, you know, it also doesn't just have to be us interacting with the board as well. If there's folks that want to say anything in that meeting they're more than happy to. Otherwise we'll break ten minutes early. You guys have ten extra minutes to walk over there.

Man: Okay (unintelligible).

Man: I'll second that motion.

Jeff Eckhaus: Yes. Well that wasn't an official motion. Okay, so we're going to get nine minutes of our lives back. What - 2:15? 3:00? What the hell time is it? Yes. 2:15 in the Grand Hall A.

Man: That's up - that's just up one...

Jeff Eckhaus: Up...

Man: ...up one level?

Jeff Eckhaus: Up one level.

Man: Okay.

Jeff Eckhaus: The big room. Thanks.

END