

**Transcription ICANN Dublin
Tuesday 20 October 2015
Registrars Stakeholder Group
Afternoon Session 2**

Michele Neylon: Ladies and gentlemen and everybody else could you please take your seats. We are about to start the very last session of your Tuesday here in Dublin's fair city. And we have with us now our guests from the NCSG. That is correct?

Man: Yes.

Man: Are you sure?

Man: I'm sure.

Man: Okay. And do you know how to use a microphone?

Man: Hey yeah. Sure.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Right. So, we're joined by the NCSG and for the record this is the last session of the day so, sorry I was going to open that back up again. So, Rafik Dammak is the gentleman over to my right. There are other NCSG people scattered around the room. I see a few, if you raise a hand or a leg or a something. Hello. I see others. I see Stephanie Perrin. I see Avri Doria and I can't pronounce your name so you're going to have to do it yourself.

Man: Okay. (Unintelligible) incoming (unintelligible), but for now I'm still just a tourist while Rafik handles all of the hard work.

Man: Ah-huh, so you are Rafik mock two? So Rafik any particular items you'd like to discuss with us or do you want me to drive this one for you?

Rafik Dammak: Okay thanks it happened that for several times we saw that we should have this kind of meeting because we do think that we have several let's say common interests in several topics. And we think that we can work much better. And I think at least for I'll say the proxy and the privacy service working group there was a lot of coordination and effort between members of NCSG and members of various stakeholder groups.

So, just we want this maybe going from the informal interaction maybe to have this in your agenda on a regular basis, hopefully, so starting from Dublin. And maybe we can talk about the review of the right protection mechanisms, maybe what we can do for the proxy and the privacy (unintelligible).

And just heard about what you made the statement in your meeting with the board. And I'm personally looking to hear more about that. I guess my colleagues they want to add some other points here, so...

Michele Neylon: Okay. Thanks Rafik. That was actually quite a lot of content. I'm going to try (unintelligible) first. I'll go back. I'll start on the left side and we'll move backwards in reverse order. Okay. So, while we were meeting with the registries this morning, it was a joint meeting between the registrars and the registries, it was brought to our attention that the IPC was planning on submitting some kind of statement to the ICANN board.

I'm not sure if they submitted a formal statement, but they definitely raised particular issues with the board in their meeting. And from what I can gather a large part of the meeting they had with the board was around this particular topic. And the topic was interpretation of the abuse reporting and appropriate response section of the 2013 contract.

So, the statement that we issued in reaction to thus, which more than happy, I can ping you an email to a link where you can grab it and download it if you want, so I'll read that for you. We are aware that earlier today the IPC asked (unintelligible) to have ICANN board to have ICANN play a greater role in content regulation.

The IPC suggested that ICANN can leverage its contractual compliance to require registrars and registries to adopt and implement so called voluntary standards. The registries and registrars groups strongly urged the board to not become involved in this debate. Our contracts are with ICANN. ICANNs exercise was contractual compliance as requested by the IPC would render such standards anything but voluntary.

A statement that there needs to be teeth behind voluntary standards, particularly when made by the part involved in the contract means they are no longer voluntary. Moreover, many of the terms requested by the IPC could in some cases remove legal protections provided to registries and registrars under relevant national safe harbor laws.

Finally, the IPC is essentially seeking rights from ICANN that they have been unable to secure from legislators globally. We understand that ICANNs board faces pressure from specific interest groups, but urge ICANNs board not to put ICANN staff or the community in the position of constant arbiters. It is outside the remission of this organization and creates a slippery slope.

We believe that ICANN compliance would like to be involved to see all registrars should respond to requests under RAA Section 3.18. Although their ICANN community may not always be satisfied with every response they receive, the vast majority of submissions are responded to in a significant portion of those requests are resolved to satisfaction.

Registrars who have not responded to (unintelligible) submissions should be pursued. While we recognize groups as the IPC have a right to bring any matter they desire to the board and staff, we would welcome a dialogue with them, and request that the board feel free to advise them to approach us directly, especially on matters that are outside the remit of ICANN. That was what we read-in today. Sorry it was a bit longer. It took longer than I expected.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thanks Michele. Can you share this later? We send you by email so we can?

Michele: It will be in your inbox momentarily.

Rafik Dammak: Oh thanks. Okay. Maybe you can ask some members of NCSG if they want to speak? Tiffany? Any comment or...

Tiffany: No.

Rafik Dammak: No? That's good. Okay, so probably we can discuss within NCSG we just heard about this today. And we will see if we can make a statement tomorrow in our own meeting with the board and so on. So we'll try to see how we can follow up about this. Okay.

Man: Okay. Thank you. Volker, go ahead.

Volker Greimman: Yes. Well a further comment that was made by me and followed up by others was that the IPC and IP interests seem to be focusing on Web sites and try to mix them up with domain names when they use these terminologies, i.e., use Web sites and domains as interchangeable terms. And I think it's important to make the distinction that domain names are not Web sites. Web sites are not domain names.

Just like domain names are not IP addresses. ICANN also has (unintelligible) addresses but nobody asks people to shut down IP addresses (unintelligible). Why not? Because we are available and the people that distribute IP addresses are not. There is no certain reason. There's no good reason to distinguish. And I think it's something we should always make clear to the board that we deal in domain names not in Web sites.

Man: Fine, Volker.

Michele: This is Michele again for the record. I mean one of the things that has come up in a couple of, over the last couple of days around this specific topic because this is not the first time it has been discussed is that, you know, the registrars feel and the registries I think share the same sentiment. We feel that, you know, abuse reporters, reporters of issues at large should report them to the appropriate place.

And that does not mean that all issues get reported to either the registrar or the registries that means that, you know, it should be reported to the registrant, the Web site operator, the hosting provider, the ISP. There are a lot of other players out there who may or may not be involved with the usage of a domain name and the availability of certain types of services. But asking us as providers purely of the domain names themselves to act as arbitrars, we think is unreasonable.

Welcome. I see more NCSG people. Hello NCSG people. Welcome. We are the registrars. We are not going to eat you. Stephanie has her hand up, go ahead Stephanie.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks very much. Stephanie Perrin for the record. I have a question that I asked Allen Grogan in the last part of our session. And I'm not sure that I really feel he answered my question. I'm concerned about the anti-competitive aspects of this business where you are basically being asked to

do all kinds of informal things amongst yourselves. It's good that ICANN has decided that it is not in the business of content regulation.

He made that affirmative statement to us. But, encouraging the registrars and the registries to set up relationships with well other great parties such as the paying people, you know, the payment processing folks to basically become judge and jury on these matters also strikes me as anti-competitive behavior. In other words, if you don't do it you strain your relationships with your clients. Am I correct or is this crazy? I know you'll be blunt with me Michele on that latter point.

Michele: Thanks Stephanie. Michele for the record. There are two questions you've asked me. You've asked me whether their proposition is crazy or whether you are personally crazy I believe?

Stephanie Perrin: Right. Yes.

Michele: Do you want me to answer both of those questions together?

Stephanie Perrin: And don't forget the bit about anti-competitive behavior. It's probably more relevant.

Michele: Right. Okay. So, apart from personal insults lying backwards and forwards between one of my favorite Canadians and myself I'll limit myself to the question that was actually asked. Okay, the anti-competitive behavior argument I'm not 100 percent sure that that's entirely accurate.

I think what they're trying to get out of it, and I don't think they are being 100 percent clear on expressing this, is that it's a matter of going to different parts of the ecosystem to see whether or not a Web site or other service is actually complying either with the law or with terms of service or with other things there. That doesn't equate with a competition issue.

What would equate as a competition issue would be if for example, registrars in the United States were beaten over the head by ICANN, but registrars in Russia weren't. Or if hosting providers in country A were beaten up and not country B or something like that. Unless I've misunderstood what you said?

Stephanie Perrin: What I'm really wondering about, and I'll try and put in a completely hypothetical case, if a hypothetical large, new GTLD was interested in shutting down elicite, I don't know, baby food sales and came to you and said we'd like an informal arrangement with you to investigate what's going on on these Web sites and shut them down in an expedited manner, if you wanted to sell registrations under that you might be coheres into having these informal arrangements.

That's what I'm talking about in terms of competitive cohesion. In other words, it's one thing to get ICANN out of this soup, it's quite another if they're encouraging you to do it yourselves. They escaped a liability for the intermediary stuff and I'm not a lawyer remember? But it's pushed down and then it becomes competitive.

Michele: I'm not a lawyer either so I leave the learned lawyers to argue about the legal points of this. Let's refer to more specific cases rather than talking of the abstract because my poor head is going to explode if I have to deal with abstract terms for much longer today.

At present there are several new TLD registries who have specific terms and restrictions in their contracts that they are giving to registrars, which prohibit us from doing certain things. So, for example, if you wish to become accredited for dot pharmacy, and by the way I'm kind of semi involved with that personally kind of in an abstract way, you need to agree so that any domain name that is associated with your company as a registrar would be subject to reports from (unintelligible).

Which means that some registrars have refused to sign the contract. There are other TLD registries who have other clauses in their contract. I think dot bank has something to do with you have to offer DN exec and dot who is who requires that you provide I think it's a Web site like builder or something like that with every registration.

There are a bunch of different contracts or clauses there. So I'm not too sure exactly what we're expected to do here. I mean unless all of the registrars are in the room who have any particular strong feelings on this. In many cases those are written into the contracts. If it's something voluntary then it's not going to be in the contract. It's a different thing entirely.

But anything that I personally have seen it's a contractual clause. It's not voluntary. Okay. Let's see what's he saying, John Berryhill is remotely? We do not collaborate on specific internal processes or outcomes, and we are subject to various national laws of our respective countries. John? Could you add a little bit more context please?

Or call in. I suppose I'll see if he updates. Any other registrars in the room want to weigh in on this? No? Okay. Here is one I think I'll call on Stephanie for this one because it's pet subject of hers and mine. The current who is versus national law debacle? Stephanie? Would you like to explain that one to us?

Stephanie Perrin: Yes. Who is conflicts with law procedure group, I can't give you the acronym off the top of my head, issued a report a couple of weeks ago and I mean basically I'm sure you've discussed this in previous sessions, possibly even today, but it was a pretty fractious working group. Some of us felt that the whois conflicts with law policy was nonsense, and therefore working on a better procedure was not helpful.

We do realize that it's in your agreement and you have to deal with it, so we released a report that had various recommendations. In my view, if

somebody that's worked in data protection area for many years, none of them work or make any sense. And so I put in a dissent, which you will see in the appendix. They are separate from the report. Chris Wilkinson former of the EU commission also put in an appendix or dissent.

And between those two dissents I think we pretty well explained why we think this is a bit of nonsense. I don't see the triggers improving this situation. You're still in a situation where the registers are being basically put in a situation where there's a law in your country, you're most likely to trigger complaints and being hauled into court and fined and court expenses and all the rest of it before you get your waiver from ICANN.

The thing that I find particularly annoying is that there was an insistence that the (unintelligible) that came from a data protection registrar had to come from one who had the power to enforce his opinion. Well in Canada they don't. They don't have binding powers. Many of the data protection laws are what we call a soft law and they have to take their decision.

If the company doesn't yield to it they have to take them to a federal court. So that means you have to have something from the federal court saying you just lost the case. I don't need to tell you what that's going to cost you, you know? So, I think this is really not in the public interest for ICANN to be proceeding in this fashion.

The fact that each registrar in a given country facing the same, I would hope it would be the same offer overall, would have to equally go through the procedure stuns me. Having come from government we would call that paper burden and regulatory over burden. I mean you just don't make every single party that is subject to the law go through the same process. It's nonsense.

Anyway, is that enough Michele? The comment period ends in November I think it's about the 18 or something like that? We already have a very nice

comment from Electronic Frontier Foundation up there. They were very prompt unlike NCSG we're usually on the last day.

Michele: Thanks Stephanie. Do any of the registrars want to weigh in on this one? I know several of people around the table have been involved. Mr. Greimann please?

Volker Greimann: Thank you Mr. Michele, the resident host and Irish gentleman.

Michele: It's getting to that point in the day where we're trying to outdo each other being nice to each other, thinking about the free beers and stuff, okay.

Volker Greimann: Anyway. It has been a great annoyance to registrars when dealing with ICANN and parties within ICANN that they seem to be insisting on us having being sued already, the child already having fallen into the well before we are able to change something in our agreements with regards to data protection, with regards to whois or other subject that we might be put into conflict with our local laws depending on what the contract tells us to do.

Therefore, we appreciate any support that you can give us there with regards to a process that allows us to pre-emptively change certain practices when for example just only a threat of legal action is present. So far ICANN has proven very resistant to such suggestions and as you can see in our contracts we have for example for the waiver process in place, which is just not satisfactory.

It's better than what we had before. But still it is a process that requires lengthy examination of the legal facts and puts a lot of costs and resource restraints on registrars that want to use that process, and therefore a lot of registrars not using the process.

Michele: So the retention process you mean?

Volker Greimann: Yes.

Michele: Yes. Thanks, Volker. Anybody else want to weigh in on this? No? Okay. With respect to the days with retention waiver process, (unintelligible) is there fresh coffee back there or just biscuits?

((Crosstalk))

Michele: Yes. I do see fresh treats arriving.

((Crosstalk))

Michele: Okay. No that was tea. It's Irish tea. It tastes like coffee. It's just very strong. Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Michele: Okay. Never mind. We'll move back to the center of discussion instead of talking about the tea and coffee. Okay there are two things here. There are two different things that Volker has spoken about. One is who is (unintelligible) to national law, which is specific to the whois (unintelligible), which, you know, you have to be sued, et cetera, et cetera, before it triggers.

There was a lot of, well (unintelligible), it was a very contentious discussion and the parties that were aligned along fairly predictable lines. The data retention waiver process is something that those of us who have gone through can quite aptly tell you how painful it is, and how incredibly broken it is. And we still have a rather large problem in that ICANN refuses to acknowledge article 29 as having any weight.

This of course hasn't been helped by the European commission, but it's nice to see some of the registrars go around the room and helping to distribute sweeties or stuff. Okay moving on because I'm conscious of the time. The

other item I wanted to mention was the proxy privacy-working group. Just out of curiosity how many people around this room are involved at some level in that? So a whole bunch of people okay.

So this I think is a fine example of something where we're all pretty much in agreement at some level or another? There is quite a large number of the registrars and quite a large number of your members would probably be fairly closely aligned. We have been working quite closely on that so I don't know does anybody have any comments or thoughts? Wendy you've been very silent and it does make me nervous so I think I'll pick on you.

Wendy: Thank you Michele, just after I've taken a bite of the lovely treats that were brought around.

Michele: And you think that was a coincidence?

Wendy: So I think I have been watching the privacy and proxy work. I'm less involved lately than some. But I think we do see it as critically important for the protection of non-commercial registrants that they be able to avail themselves of strong privacy and proxy services and that there are reasonable protections for the registrants against having their information unmasked based on unfounded or inappropriate complaints.

So, I also work with the chilling effects project where we chronicle some of the sorts of inappropriate and appropriate complaints that fly around. While there are some people who know how to use the law correctly, there are others who use it abusively and the burden shouldn't fall on the registrar to watch for what's right and what's wrong in order to protect the registrant who depends on those services.

Michele: Thank you Wendy. Mr. Greimann?

Volker Greimann: Of course a mouthful here as well, just a second. Here we go.

Wendy: Note the equivalent treatment.

Volker Greimann: As a member of the working group I have found it, and I think a lot of our registrar colleagues as well found it extremely helpful the way that our two groups engaged very early on and decided to communicate and collaborate in furthering our common interests, our stat of our customers, your stat of also our customers.

And I think that is a great model for future cooperation between the two groups going forward. There are a lot of areas where our interests are aligned. And we look at these things from different angles with the same goals. And having this exchange of resources, this exchange of opinions available during the PDP negotiations doing the work of the PDP as a back channel was extremely helpful for I think both of our groups and also will results and better results for the PDP.

And I hope that we can maybe build on this and going forward try to find aligned interests in many other future PDPs. I just look at the replacement for the whois services, which was partly co-suggested by our chair Michele and by Stephanie. Although they were of course objective against part of the results of the expert working group that's a large piece of work that's coming our way.

And I think there will great benefit of both of our groups to work together and pick this apart, try to make this work, and try to produce the result that we can live with.

Michele: Thanks, Volker, just to add to that, I mean it's great to see that, you know, with the NCSG you've managed to bring in article 19. Hi, Neils. Wendy of course, which in effect has a huge amount of experience when dealing with take down requests of various kinds. You've also effectively got EFF to engage, which was helpful, as well as the council of Europe and others.

You know, you guys have those contacts. We don't! We, of course, are the evil commercial types who how dare we try to make a living. I'm only joking half of you are lawyers. Okay apart from you (Neil) because you are better dressed than most of us. You know, we have the operational understanding. We can explain to you sometimes why your proposal while it might be well intentioned is completely unworkable.

You know, collaborating with you on some of this stuff I think is very positive. We can try to help you to understand why people do what they do. Hopefully collaborate moving forward. Also, on another note I believe it was your birthday collectively the other day? The NCSC was 16 or something, so congratulations. Oh and (Robin) as we were, oh sorry.

No. I mean congratulations. I believe you had a very nice evening over in the, what's the name of that hotel, the Dean. Yes I can see (James Gee) got about a step up to microphone. Sorry some of us tried to make it but couldn't because we got sidetracked by the new registries whiskey. Stephanie? Did you have a hand up there?

Stephanie Perrin: Yes Michele. I just wondered, while we're on the subject of the privacy proxy-working group, if you had any thoughts on the exemption of lawyers' issue that is on the table, and whether you folks had discussed that? It's a live issue going forward. We've got another meeting coming. I think it's tomorrow morning actually.

Michele: Okay. I cannot speak for the entire stakeholder group on this one. I can respond from my own personally and I'm sure other registrars can respond personally. I think, you know, this idea of their being some kind of exception for lawyers is problematic. I mean we actually did discuss that at an even earlier session amongst ourselves.

I mean if that was taken through to its logical conclusion then I will probably find myself a cheap, fresh graduated law student and put freshly graduated, qualified solicitor under our slaw and I will put them in charge of my new non-incorporated law firm that only have one client and provide one legal service because that would be awesome and so much cheaper and so much more cost effective. Did I miss anything on that one? I think that was the idea wasn't it?

Volker was actually going to give up his seat on the GNSO to run that for Key Systems. I don't have a law degree so I couldn't do it unfortunately, but never mind. Any other topics? I'm conscious of the time. Okay so I'm going to hand this over to you Jennifer.

Jennifer Stadiford: Thank you for joining us today. I was just wondering if you'd be willing to share your voting preference for the upcoming GNSO chair? Doesn't hurt to ask.

Woman[DS1]: Each of the council members, and I won't be one anymore by then thankfully, gets to select on their own, so there's been conversation among them, but there's no group decision on it. There has just been group discussion and then each one so I actually don't think there's anyone here that could tell you other than each of the counselors might be able to but I don't have a vote.

Man: Yeah just to clarify that (unintelligible) speaking, just to clarify that, we can, and theoretically possible that the NCSG can bind its counselors on things like that, but we have not even suggested it, so all of our counselors will be voting on their own individual preference.

Michele: Are you going to be one of those counselors or are you termed out?

Man: No. I will be one of those counselors. In fact, we are only changing one counselor this time around, which is Avri is leaving us to our great regret, but Stephanie will be joining us. I don't think many of the registrars know it but I'm

sure you'll get to know her. Sorry, we can't tell you at this point we have chosen not to find our counselors. We have met with both candidates in some detail. I think we're all thinking about it and hard.

Michele: Okay. Thank you.

Avri Doria: You guys have decided.

Michele: No Avri, I thought it'd be a really good idea as chair of the registrars to put forward James and then to direct him to, you know, of course we have obviously. I mean we did just to give you some background as we haven't discussed this with you, give you a very brief one and then we have to wrap. We did have a lot of discussion internally within the registrar stakeholder group around this entire topic.

It wasn't simply a question of James Bladel expressed interest in us and we decided just to back him blindly, but wasn't how things panned out. We had a lot of discussions. There was a lot of discussion around the entire structure of the GNSO, contracted versus non-contracted. And essentially the view from the registrars is that we want the best person there. It's regardless of which house they represent.

The GNSO is the main policy coordinating body within ICANN. I wouldn't say policy-making because I think that's unfair to anybody who has spent time in a PDP but, you know, in terms of policy coordination the GNSO drives, GNSO council drives a lot of those. Chairing the GNSO council is far from an easy job and you need to bring a certain kind of skill set to us, or a heavy drug addiction. I'm not too sure, which is the best one.

But anyway, you know, it's far from easy, so considering the two candidates that were available, and obviously, you know, bearing in mind that it would've looked a bit odd if we hadn't backed James but that wasn't the actual driver behind it. It was really a case of if somebody else, if a strong candidate had to

be presented from the non-contracted part it has we would in a position to back that candidate, stronger candidate, sorry. That's not saying that Heather is not a strong candidate.

I'm tired and I hope you don't misquote me to your friends later and say that I made all sorts of scurrilous male comments about anybody, especially as we're in Ireland, which means I'm subject to Irish defamation law, which is really horrible. Yes it is pretty bad. Yeah don't start the Irish contingent on this one. If there's nothing else, I think we should close this out. Go ahead, Neils.

Neils Stenover: Sorry for being late Michele. Thank you for the time. So in the light of our corporation, I would really like to hear your input because we have produced a new report with the working party on ICANNs social responsibility to respect human rights. Where we go deeper into how we can apply a human right framework within ICANN, and for that we're using the U.N. guiding principles on business and human rights, which are also specified in a specific U.N. guiding principles on business on human rights, an ICT sector guide.

So, we'll have a presentation about that tomorrow morning from 9:00 to 10:15. I also have printed versions of the report. Currently, I ran out of them but I will have fresh ones tomorrow, and I would greatly welcome you to that session if you have any questions or a response to that I would also be very open to hear them from you.

Michele: Thank Neils, just for the record, other registrars may not be aware I have been personally trying to track some of this. But I would suggest Neils that for future reports you come up with a briefer title. I'm only half joking.

Neils: Yeah but since you have been following it then you also saw that (Patrick False-rom) was quite adamant on having corporate and social responsibility in the title, so I would've preferred ICANN and human rights as well. But, you know, this seems to be working for everyone, so as long as it's working, I'm happy with it.

Michele: Go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: Hey Jeff Neuman with Valideus registrar. Can you just, I'm not familiar with the working part. Can you just explain like what is, sorry, what is a working party and how did you guys start, sorry, I'm asking a very much beginner question, but this is the first I'm hearing about it.

Neils: Thank you very much, and you just gave me a reason to talk a bit longer, that's great. No, so this work started roughly around ICANN 15 London when there was a report published by Thomas Schneider and (Monica) (Unintelligible), which was facilitated by the council of Europe on ICANN and human rights.

And we then further worked on that with organization. I then worked for article 19 and held a session about ICANN 51 in L.A. and then we published new report ICANN 52 in Singapore, which was where the cross community working party was established. Because we saw there was a lot of interest in this topic and we wanted to have an ad hoc group of people from among the community to discuss this topic, to see how we can bring this further.

And then in ICANN 53 we had sessions also to liaise with the GAC working group on human rights and international law, and then we published a report as well. And here we have a new report with very clear recommendations and guidelines. We also have a charter and I'll not go into that. But it's very interesting to see there are different processing ongoing right now that touch upon human rights in ICANN.

So, there's a GAC working group on human rights, but in the cross-community working group on accountability there is also work on human rights and a human rights commitment, which is especially fleshed out in working party four. And within the cross-community working party we're trying to inform those processes and keep track of them and ensure we have a

framework that can also be later be used in work stream two of the work of the accountability group.

Jeff Neuman: Okay so it's all, sorry, this is Jeff Neuman again. So it's all working on how to incorporate, I'm trying to think of how to say it, how to incorporate thinking about human rights in future policy development processes and things like that? So it's not an actual recommendation of a new policy, or is it? And then if it is, does it go through the GNSO or like, sorry I'm just trying to figure out how all of this, what it means and how it gets implemented and all of that.

Neils Stenover: That's a great question. And that's also one we haven't answered ourselves yet. So we're first mapping to see what is the impact of ICANN on human rights? What are the best practices in which ICANN can respect human rights, of course within its scope and mission? And since there seems to be coming a commitment to human rights in the ICANN by laws that means there will also be a commitment to implement that.

So that seems to be going to be part of work stream two, so that then probably a place where that work would happen, but let's see. It ain't over until it's over.

Michele: Thanks, Neils. Is that okay for you Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: Yeah. Yeah.

Michele: Are you happy?

Jeff Neuman: Am I happy in general, in life? I'm pretty good. Yeah. I'm in a good spot.

Michele: That's good. That's good.

Neils Stenover: I'm feeling better now as well.

Michele: I was going to come to you but he's got a Tesla so I'm just jealous. Sorry, Jeff's Tesla always gets brought up in most conversations. I have Stephanie I think and we've over run already by nearly a quarter of an hour so...

Stephanie Perrin: Stephanie Perrin for the record. I don't want to take up your time except to say that we did meet with James the other day, and it was great. I'm just wondering what your thoughts on the challenges for the GNSO as we come ahead, because quite frankly having really enjoyed the wonderful relationship we've had on the PPSAI, I'm looking forward to several other who is related PDPs, notably who two.

I hate to see him step aside and become a neutral chair because it's been really great working with him and having his strong voice on things. On the other hand, it seems really important to have a neutral chair. I'm not suggesting. I realize I'm under Irish law too. I'm not suggesting for a moment that Heather isn't. But I just know that James is really good.

So, what do you think the challenges are going to be for the next couple of years in managing the GNSO? Frankly, the first year I've been there, there hasn't been a whole huge workload, but I'm told that's not normal?

Michele: I'll have Jeff address part of those so that when he goes off the rails I'll reel him back in and remind him of his Tesla.

Jeff Neuman: Oh man thanks. I got it because it's energy efficient. All right?

Michele: So you should all appreciate this. He was thinking of human rights and respected...

Jeff Neuman: Don't hate me because I'm green. No but seriously, the, you know, it's a good question about not having James. James is an excellent counselor for the registrars and is very vocal. And yes he has to be neutral. But Jennifer over

here is coming onto the council and she is just as vocal and furious and intelligent and will do a fantastic job for the registrars.

And, of course, Volker is still there, and where is he? There he is. So I don't think the registrars are going to lose any of its advocacy. I think they'll do just fine and James is obviously still part. If he's chair he'll still be part of the registrars and will still be communicating his thoughts to Volker and Jennifer. So I don't think we're going to, you know, I don't think we're going to lose anything for that.

Michele: Thanks. I would say that I, you know, actually no just to keep it simple, I agree with what Jeff just said because he said it far better than I could. Okay then so it's a quarter to six and this was meant to finish by half past five, so it's 15 minutes past the time. We still have a couple of biscuits floating around the room if anybody wants to have one. Any other items?

Oh yes. Jennifer is leaving us. She is no longer our vice chair. She is now being, I don't know promoted, demoted, moved sideways, elevated, offending, whatever you want to put it to the GNSO council. So thank you for your service.

((Crosstalk))

Michele: And needless to say you're straight back again, so that's fine. She will now be on the GNSO council. Graham Bunton from Tucows who was wearing a tie and was sitting there has vanished. Graham is the new vice chair of the registrar stakeholder group. And he has already started his term as it will or whatever you want to call it.

Excuse me? Sentence. Thank you Chris. I'm on the third year of a three-year sentence. It looks like it. It does doesn't it? Thank you. Okay. Thank you everybody. Thanks to the registrars. Thank you all for coming. And NCSG

people thank you for coming along at the end of the day. Oh Rafik sorry, go ahead.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Michele. So, can we make sure that we have this meeting (unintelligible) for each ICANN meeting?

Michele: We can try. I'm not going to agree to you in such an open fashion. We can try to continue this.

Rafik Dammak: I would just like to in response to that remind everyone that we will have a different meeting schedule and that the second meeting next year will have a very different outlook and very different role of presentations and events. So for that one I would not like to guarantee that we have a meeting. But for the long meeting, I would like to put my hand into the fire that we can arrange something.

Michele: Yeah the thing is there are several other groups with whom we've interacted and had meetings be that during the Tuesday constituency daytime scenario or in other arenas. And, you know, the thing is that this is ultimately from our perspective, you don't need to wait until the ICANN meetings to talk to us.

Rafik Dammak: So just you can phone call or whatever to be sure that we have this in a more formal way, to ensure that to have on a regular basis.

Michele: Regular or more legal? Sorry, what?

Rafik Dammak: Come on I'm not a lawyer, legal...

Michele: Okay you want something more formal. I'm not signing a contract with you. No! Okay. Thank you Rafik. Thank you NCSG people. And thank you registrars. Thank you for attending the registrar stakeholder meeting. It is now closed. May you go forth to drink Dublin dry.

END