

Board with Registrar Stakeholders Group
26 June 2012
Open Session – ICANN 44 Prague

Registrars Meeting with Board
Tuesday, 26 June 2012
ICANN Meeting
Prague, Czech Republic

>>STEVE CROCKER: All right. Welcome, everybody. This is a time for the ICANN board of directors to meet with the registrar stakeholder group. We're assembled in classroom seating style here, which is not necessarily optimal in terms of sight lines but it provides a lot of capacity. Although this room's not yet filled, we've been using this with other constituencies and it has been filled.

I think we're going to try "U"-shaped, I'm told, for Toronto, which will be the tradeoff in the other direction, and we'd be interested, quite interested, on feedback on this mundane matter of the mechanics and arrangement of the room.

So if you have feelings about it, let us know. This is not an accident. I mean, you may grumble, you know, like "Why weren't we paying attention?" Yes, we're paying attention. We may be doing it wrong but we're paying attention.

This is, as we're now -- I've had experience with a few cycles of this -- this is a transition from the prior arrangements where we've had basically social interactions to frank and meaningful discussions, issues prepared in advance, and we use this time to just jump right into specific things with as little background preparation and overarching statements as possible.

So with that, let's put the agenda up and then I'll turn things over to Matt and we'll be on our way.

Questions from registrar stakeholder group followed by questions from the ICANN board of directors.

RAA negotiations, new gTLDs, perspectives on the developments at the ITU regarding governance, new CEO selection and status.

Oh, I want to take that one.

Next one. Next slide.

From us, RAA negotiations, your views on that.

Your views on the WHOIS report. Which aspects -- that is, which recommendations -- should be subject to policy work versus left to the staff to implement.

Board with Registrar Stakeholders Group
26 June 2012
Open Session – ICANN 44 Prague

Your views on the budget and operations plan cycle. The amount of time for comments and so forth.

And then one more slide.

Three questions related to batching. What are your views on having a single batch? Is there anything approaching a consensus? If there were a consensus on a single batch, what would be an acceptable time frame for doing it? And on the other hand, if there is to be batching, do you believe that there's a consensus that a method other than digital archery should be used.

That's a one-sided question. It doesn't say where we're going to. It just says where we're going away from, if there's consensus.

So with that, let's roll back to the -- two slides earlier, and I will turn things over to Matt.

>>MATT SERLIN: Yeah. Thanks, Steve.

So happy to report that I think in about 60 seconds, we can already cross off one of our agenda items.

So did just want to start by -- I don't know if Rod's in the room. I think he might have stepped out. But I just want to say that, you know, we look forward to working with Fadi in the future and we wanted to thank the board for making time for us today.

This is my first meeting as chair of the stakeholder group. I've been on the job about three weeks so far, and we've always found these interactions to be extremely positive and productive, so we look forward to that continuing.

So with that, obviously a big topic for us and a topic for the community, both in this meeting and in Costa Rica, is the RAA.

So I just want to kind of echo what hopefully you've heard during the week so far, that, you know, we've made real significant meaningful progress. You know, both staff and the negotiating team on the registrars side, have worked extremely diligently and extremely hard to get us to this point.

I think for those of you that were in the room, you heard that, you know, out of the 12 law enforcement recommendations, we've got steadfast agreement on 10 of them, so really good significant changes in those areas.

Board with Registrar Stakeholders Group

26 June 2012

Open Session – ICANN 44 Prague

There do still -- you know, we do still have a couple outstanding issues which we really want to continue to engage with the community on, but what we want to try to do is capitalize on the positive momentum and movement that we've had and really try to move forward with, you know, a negotiated registrar accreditation agreement that we can all agree to and then continue on the conversations on the -- on the remaining issues as well.

And so with that, I think Jeff Eckhaus had a couple of comments as well on this, and then we'd obviously like to take feedback from the board.

>>JEFF ECKHAUS: Great. Thanks, Matt. Jeff Eckhaus here from Demand Media.

So I'm going to reiterate a couple of the things that Matt said and read a statement which is not a statement of the registrar stakeholder group but I think some of the general feelings that we've had, to give the board an update on the RAA and, as I said, some of the thoughts of the registrars.

So it's been a long process where registrars, including myself as a member of the registrar negotiating team, have put in an incredible number of hours over the past few months, and I want to let the board know that we have made an incredible amount of progress on the RAA.

And I don't want to put a slight to ICANN staff here, but I think that the documents that have been posted do not show how much progress has really been made.

The registrars have put up some additional documents which I think -- a scorecard, if you will -- that shows some of the progress, and I think if -- we'll make sure to get that to the board but if you'll view that, you'll see how close we are on most of the topics that have been put in front of us for the new RAA.

For example, I think as Matt said, we've reached agreement on 10 of the 12 law enforcement recommendations, and of the two we have not, they're extremely involved and detailed, and I believe that we'll need a great deal more work to get those solved.

And at this time, I have to say that I don't think registrars can agree to those other two as they are currently written, but we will -- but we do want to work on those because we believe that they are important.

And in addition, we also cannot agree to the additional "asks" by ICANN staff, such as the nullification of the picket fence in the RAA, as we believe the consensus policy is critical to the ICANN process as well.

Board with Registrar Stakeholders Group

26 June 2012

Open Session – ICANN 44 Prague

So my thoughts here are I think we should accept what we've done so far, this great deal of work. Let's move ahead with what we have.

I think people are waiting to see this new RAA. I think we should get this new agreement in place, with the understanding that we will continue to work on the additional law enforcement requests and other community requests and implement them when they are complete and ready.

Thank you.

>>STEVE CROCKER: Now you're looking for our response on this?

>>JEFF ECKHAUS: I -- Sorry.

>>STEVE CROCKER: We're -- I think the board is in a position of waiting to hear the status of things and you've told us what it looks like from your side.

Rod, I'm -- Rod, I think this is yours to either answer or deal off to --

>>ROD BECKSTROM: Yes. Thank you.

>>STEVE CROCKER: -- your team.

>>ROD BECKSTROM: Yes. I think Kurt Pritz is probably -- either Kurt or J.J. who are both in the room. I'll let you guys flip a coin to provide the staff perspective on the discussions.

Thank you.

>>KURT PRITZ: So Jeff, that's a great characterization of things.

I think there is a -- there is a difference on WHOIS verification and some of the issues around that that might become the sticking point at the end of the day because it is a significant change for the registrar business model and how we operate, and that's pretty much what the RAA negotiation public session focused on, just that issue.

Some ICANN and others met with law enforcement earlier to see where there's opportunity for agreement.

So anyway, I think Jeff correctly characterized that issue.

I think that the nullification clause -- I don't know exactly what it's called -- certainly isn't to go around or avoid the picket fence or nullify the picket fence, so

Board with Registrar Stakeholders Group

26 June 2012

Open Session – ICANN 44 Prague

again, that's sort of a complicated issue and we want to continue to listen to registrars and we think there's, you know, sort of other ways to skin that cat, or there's ways to skin the cat and address our concerns there.

But thanks. Thanks for the constructive statement, Jeff.

>>STEVE CROCKER: That's an enigmatic response, I think, so --

>>KURT PRITZ: So very briefly, on WHOIS verification, we are apart, and so we'll see where the discussion goes, but we can see that the registrars have stopped at a certain point. We think we can get closer. We don't know if we'll get to agreement.

On the nullification clause, we would characterize it differently.

>>STEVE CROCKER: Do we want to pursue this further or --

If you want to push on this, we can, or if you want --

Bertrand wants to add something.

>>BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Thank you, Steve. It's Bertrand de la Chapelle.

I think what I am going to say is what I said two things I've said in previous sessions. It's not always welcome but I want to repeat it.

As a preliminary note, I do sense, from everything that has been reported, that there has been progress, and that in any case the spirit of interaction is -- has clearly grown.

The challenge that we have is that from the onset, there are labeling questions of those elements.

It's a registrar accreditation agreement, and if you look at the wording, there is an oxymoron in there. Because an accreditation is a sort of authoritative thing. An agreement means that there is a joint agreement.

And I have a tradition -- or a practice of believing that when there are tensions like this, they can either become destructive or be the dynamic tension that helps the thing move forward.

The challenge that we have is that there are two directions that can be taken. One is to consider that because it's an agreement, it is entirely the responsibility of the two parties to negotiate and each party has exactly the same right to say no or yes, but because it's an accreditation, it should be the regime that determines the rules and

Board with Registrar Stakeholders Group

26 June 2012

Open Session – ICANN 44 Prague

the accredited parties should be only applying the rules and basically signing a little bit like we all sign terms of service on any kind of (indiscernible). Of course it's somewhere in the middle.

And I just want to throw that in because sticking to absolute positions on both sides is problematic, and if in any way understanding this tension between the fact that it is an accreditation but it has to be negotiated can help move things forward, I'm sharing this.

One last point.

It's an occasion to illustrate what ICANN is. ICANN is a tool for the differentiate actors. The benefit for registrars of the existence of ICANN in such a system is that by one single accreditation, registrars get access at once to all the registries, and especially the new gTLD registries that will be coming, without having to negotiate with one after another, which would be a painful, costly, and difficult negotiation.

So there's a benefit.

And for registries, it's the same, because they can have certitude that with a good agreement, they can have their names distributed by any registrar.

I must say that for law enforcement agencies -- and we'll have the opportunity to say that in other spaces -- it is a tool as well, because if you think about it, without ICANN and without that sort of agreement, national law enforcement agencies would have very few ways to impose anything on registrars in other jurisdictions.

If things work correctly, ICANN is the tool for all those actors to find the right balance, but if we don't understand that it is not only an agreement but also an accreditation system -- i.e., an authoritative thing -- we will never get forward.

Thank you.

>>JEFF ECKHAUS: Thanks. So I just wanted to make one clarification because I think -- you know, I'm thinking about what I had said and Kurt's comments and I just wanted to make a clarification on that, that the language that ICANN had put in about the picket fence was that what it actually would do is it would pretty much remove all the picket fence protections by making the RAA itself, and pretty much every provision of this commercial agreement, subjects for a non-negotiated regulation.

So I just wanted to clarify that.

It wouldn't -- so just to be clear on that, so...

Because I think I misspoke earlier.

>>MATT SERLIN: Yeah. And just to pick up on what Jeff said, I think that the stakeholder group historically has had very strong feelings about the defense of the picket fence definitions and ensuring that items which we feel -- policy items stay out of the RAA. And so that's why, on the issues of -- you know, that remain on the law enforcement, those we feel strongly are, you know, more policy issues that should be discussed and are being discussed by the greater community, and I think, you know, we saw that in the session yesterday. You know, people have very strong feelings about this stuff, and I think it's all of our responsibilities to listen to those and to factor those in, in the policy discussions themselves.

Yeah, James. Sorry, Volker.

>>VOLKER GREIMANN: The remaining issues are also made complicated because they are the issues that affect national data protection laws. Data retention is a very critical issue for registrars in other jurisdictions than the USA, so we are not happy with the language that's been proposed because some of it might have been illegal or would be illegal in, for example, Germany or France.

So we are very carefully moving ahead. I think we have made offers on all of these positions that were met -- would have met the original law enforcement requests. The position of ICANN has moved a bit on these original requests when law enforcement issued a couple of clarifications.

So while we have moved ahead on these points, we're not there where the current law enforcement recommendations are, which has been turned into contract language by ICANN.

>>STEVE CROCKER: Good, good.

>>JUDITH VAZQUEZ: To second Volker, Dr. Crocker, I recall the IANA RFP which was made public which seeks the recognition and respect for national and local laws. And I think Volker refers to that. We should respect -- so if there is any violation of that, it should be considered. That's all.

>>STEVE CROCKER: You're referring to one of the IANA statement of work drafts?

Yeah. Thank you.

>>MATT SERLIN: So just to wrap up, from our perspective on the RAA, you know, I think the message that I'd like the board to take away from the stakeholder group is that we have made significant progress. We'd like to capture that -- that progress

Board with Registrar Stakeholders Group

26 June 2012

Open Session – ICANN 44 Prague

and that momentum, and -- and work with staff to draw to a conclusion on the RAA and then continue on with the real policy work that's ahead of us to take the other issues and get those resolved with community input as well.

>>STEVE CROCKER: Good. What's the next one?

>>MATT SERLIN: Yeah. So new gTLDs. Obviously another topic of discussion here this week, and, you know, we've talked a lot during the week about this sort of blurring of lines between the difference stakeholder groups and registries that have applied or registrars, and applicants are from all sorts of different stakeholder groups.

We'd really like to just talk about the registrar-specific perspective, and I think for us, you know, ultimately all of these new gTLDs will need to come through the ICANN accredited registrar system, and so for us as a group, I think we'd really like to hear both from -- you know, from staff about operational readiness to be able to handle that and what steps are being -- being taken to streamline systems, to make the ecosystem in a position to be able to support all of these new TLDs, and I think Jeff had some -- some points on that as well, to really just hear from us that this is going to create, you know, an explosion of TLDs that the registrars ultimately will need to support in conjunction with staff, and just to make sure that the board heard our perspective on that.

>>JEFF ECKHAUS: So just a couple of the items that I think the board should be aware of, and I know you've heard from applicants stating, you know, time lines are important, and -- for them because of their payments and their processes, but I think it's important to note for registrars where we are going to be, I guess, the pathway for these new TLDs, we have -- we need this planning as well.

We have to build out our time lines, how we're doing -- how we're doing things, what we're doing. We have staff that have to get ready, and we don't want this program to be -- you know, I don't want to use the term "dead on arrival," but we want to make sure that when, finally, everything is in the root, that you have the -- our storefronts are able to sell these products.

It's just we need that time line as well.

So that is one important piece.

The other one, I think, that Matt touched upon, I think, that is very -- very, very important is as far as contracts go, right now for each TLD that we decide -- when we make an agreement with the registry operator, we have to sign an amendment for each specific TLD, and that process takes anywhere from 3 to 6 weeks per TLD.

Board with Registrar Stakeholders Group

26 June 2012

Open Session – ICANN 44 Prague

We really -- you know, staff is aware and I just want to make sure the board is aware that this is imperative that we figure out a process to streamline this, so that we can -- we don't have to sign up -- that this process does not take 3 to 6 weeks per TLD.

If we can streamline the process to have one amendment that would cover a large batch -- I want -- I hate to use the word "batch" -- but large batch of TLDs as they come live, I think it would make this -- it would help everyone here in this room to make TLDs available a lot quicker and a lot easier, because you're going to see a lot of frustration if we have to -- in the world of a thousand-plus new TLDs where we have to wait 3 to 6 weeks per TLD to get those -- to get those live.

>>STEVE CROCKER: Let me ask a reality-check clarification question.

I understand the picture that you're painting, but there's another piece of the picture, as I understand it.

Each registrar has to go through -- have their systems be subjected to a qualification that it actually works properly with the registries, and so even if you made the paperwork problem go away, you still have a question of doing the test for --

Did you have in mind something to speed that up or to centralize that?

>>JEFF ECKHAUS: Yeah. Actually, I think because there are a lot of existing registry operators in place, we've already integrated and -- with those registry operators and they do have an OT&E environment in place. I think a lot of new registrar -- registries that are coming live are -- we've already been contacted by them and they are -- they said they already have their OT&E in place and they would like testing as soon as possible, you know, just to make sure that the handshake works between systems.

So I think we'd like to be able to get that -- I think the technical part, we can work on as the process moves forward, so that when things are ready to go live, that the contract phase is the only remaining hurdle.

>>STEVE CROCKER: Okay. You know, I'll just say with my sort of technical background hat on, that it does seem a little weird that you can do the technical testing faster you can do the paperwork.

>>MATT SERLIN: Yeah. And just to pick up on what Jeff said, I actually think that because -- you know, there's a large number of applicants, but there's a much smaller number of kind of registry infrastructure providers, and from a registrar perspective, a lot of times once you've connected to those registry operators for other TLDs -- so NeuStar for dot biz, for example, when I connect to them for

another TLD, I don't think you have to go through that same sort of testing and validation effort because you've already got those connections in place.

>>STEVE CROCKER: How would you feel about a click-through license agreement?

Just go to the Web page, there's "Agree," and you check there, and then you're legally bound to whatever they --

>>MATT SERLIN: There you go.

>>STEVE CROCKER: Whether you read it or not, you know.

>>MATT SERLIN: Yeah. That's good.

[Laughter]

>>MATT SERLIN: Would I have to read it?

[Laughter]

>>MATT SERLIN: So that was really -- I mean, you know, we're -- like I said, I'm sure you're hearing a lot from applicants about, you know, the program in much greater detail than registrars are touching on it, but we really did just want to focus on the registrar perspective.

So I don't know if any of the other registrars or board members have any other comments on the new gTLD program, but I'm sure you've each spent plenty of time already talking about it, so...

Yeah.

>>BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: One thing -- this is Bertrand. One thing that is correlated is just a marker that we've raised with the other groups. It is the issue of the impact of the new gTLD program on the structure of the GNSO in general, the structure of ICANN, and actually from what you just said, it's also, I think, to explore what are the impacts on the relationship that registrars have with registries, because there will be large numbers. Some will be easy to automate, the others not.

What kind of tension can be brought to the market and so on.

Just to say that in Toronto, we will devote, in one form or another, a session to this question of the impact with the different actors, and without preempting what Steve would probably say immediately afterwards, if you have the possibility of contributing a one-pager of short ideas of what kind of types of impact there are to

Board with Registrar Stakeholders Group

26 June 2012

Open Session – ICANN 44 Prague

Ray or Steve or me, to prepare this session in Toronto, that would be extremely helpful.

We don't need to belabor it now, but just the bullet points would be great.

>>MATT SERLIN: Yeah. No.

>>STEVE CROCKER: Stephane?

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Yeah. Thanks. This is Stephane Van Gelder.

Just to partially answer what Bertrand has just asked, just to highlight to everyone here that our groups within the GNSO -- I think most groups -- have already given this a lot of thought and are actively thinking about it now.

The difficulty being, of course, that the level of information that we have is not really that great or it's extremely new.

For example, the release of the list of applicants is, you know, only two weeks old.

So that's the only time when we actually had confirmation of the kind of situation that we'd be facing in the coming years.

So I think it's fair to say that certainly for the registrars, and I think also for the registries as far as the contracted parties house is concerned -- and I know the other house, the non-contracted parties house in the GNSO has given this a lot of thought as well -- I mean, we have discussed this with the GAC also. We've discussed it individually with a great deal of you here in this room.

And for example, one of the situations we could face is that, you know, looking forward to some time in the future -- say two or three years down the road -- we could have a constituent that could fit in all four of the GNSO stakeholder groups.

So we are thinking about this, there is a lot of background work going on, and we're just trying to, I guess, not jump the gun on information that's not yet there. Thank you.

>>STEVE CROCKER: Good. How much more do you want to do on -- on this?

>>MATT SERLIN: On new gTLDs? We're done. It's the shortest amount of time you'll probably spend on it.

>>STEVE CROCKER: All right. When I saw that on the agenda, I thought you were talking about the next round of new -- the new, new gTLDs.

Board with Registrar Stakeholders Group

26 June 2012

Open Session – ICANN 44 Prague

>>MATT SERLIN: The new, new? No, we'd like to get through this one unscathed and then we'll be ready to talk about the next one.

>>STEVE CROCKER: That's what I would have said if that's what you'd wanted to talk, so we're on the same page. That's good.

[Laughter]

>>STEVE CROCKER: All right. Does that move us into perspectives on developments at the ITU regarding governance?

>>MATT SERLIN: Yeah, it does. And I'm going to punt over to James to -- to lead us in that. James?

>>JAMES BLADEL: All right. Thanks, Matt. James Bladel from GoDaddy.

And we in the commercial world and in various countries are starting to become aware of this -- the developments within the ITU that will, I believe, focus in a meeting in December in Dubai that could have significant impacts across this industry and onto ICANN.

So the question that we wanted to pose to the board is: How aware are the individual board members and the organization of this issue? What options do you believe you have to engage in your various countries and with your various governments? And do you have any progress that you can -- that you can report or any plans that you can share with us?

>>STEVE CROCKER: Yes, we're aware. It's been mentioned a few times.

I think, Rod, I'm going to bounce this over to you.

>>ROD BECKSTROM: And I wanted to see, is -- is --

We're on the ITU issues, right?

>>STEVE CROCKER: Yes.

>>ROD BECKSTROM: Is Nigel -- Nigel Hickson -- Nigel is here.

So our lead internally is our vice president for European -- for Europe, rather, Nigel Hickson, who is the lead on ITU and WCIT.

Nigel?

>>NIGEL HICKSON: Yes. Thank you. Thank you, Rod, and good afternoon.

Well, I'm sure the board will have a perspective as well, because the board members are engaged in discussions on this issue, but I'm just -- just to say a couple of points.

I mean, first of all, we're acutely aware, I think, because as many in the community are, on the WCIT discussions it's a discussion to revise these international telecommunication regulations that were written in nineteen ninety- -- sorry, 1988 in Melbourne, so you can guess that they didn't exactly address IP addressing at that point, or IPv6 or anything.

It is a revision of these regulations, and it is true to say that a number of countries have proposed various proposals that would include the Internet into these regulations, both in terms of regulating Internet costs, but also to an extent in terms of the governance of the Internet.

Just, for example, there is a proposal to allow the ITU to be the distributor of the IPv6 addresses in some way or other. These proposals -- and there will be other proposals still to come -- are going to be discussed in Dubai in December, as has been said. It's a treaty discussion, which means that the governments, the 193 governments that make up the ITU, have to decide on whether there should be a new set of international telecommunication regulations.

They don't have to decide, but the likelihood is that the -- there will be some form of amendment to those regulations.

So the question is what -- what might happen, of course.

And there, I think, is -- is -- you know, we could, you know, if you like, throw the question back. I'm not trying to be presumptive, but, you know, we're all in this together, as they say, I think.

We're playing our part and we're involved in -- ICANN staff are involved in various regional preparations with governments. There's the five ITU regions and we're involved in all of those regional discussions, which, of course, is very useful.

We're involved with ISOC and other -- the RIRs and other community organizations in terms of coordinating positions and talking to governments. But of course we appreciate that the community, the ICANN community, is unraveled in its breadth and its reach, and therefore, I think this is -- as I said, all the players can have a role in this, because I think we share the common objective of the multi- -- well, I hope

Board with Registrar Stakeholders Group

26 June 2012

Open Session – ICANN 44 Prague

we share the common objective of the multistakeholder approach, and to ensure that the domain name system and the ICANN mission remains as it is. Thank you.

>>STEVE CROCKER: Any questions on Nigel's extended description of the process that we're in?

>> SIVASUBRAMANIAN MUTHUSAMY: I have a suggestion on handling the threat of the Internet. All registrars could allot a portion of their space pro bono to educate registrants and, in effect, educate Internet users about the threat. And if a link is provided on the front page of the registrar's Web site that would talk about the core Internet values and the threats to the Internet and the users, then the general public could come to the support of ICANN and to the good forces. Thank you.

>> For the benefit of the remote participants, could you please -- and the scribes, could you please state your name and affiliation?

>> ISOC India Chennai. You want me to start again?

Sivasubramanian Muthusamy, ISOC India Chennai

>>STEVE CROCKER: There we go.

Further comments? Questions?

>>JAMES BLADEL: Just at the end to state individually -- and I know other registrars are reaching out to work with their governments to see what they can do to support their efforts and possibly be included in any kind of a delegation that might be put together, I would ask that the individual members of the ICANN board as well as ICANN staff may be working on this issue feel that they have an ally in their domestic registrars.

So if you know of registrars in your country that would be willing to work with your government efforts on this, I think coordination can only help all parties involved as these preparations and plans are synchronized in advance of this meeting. Thanks.

>>BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: This is Bertrand de La Chapelle.

Just briefly, as was indicated in the meeting on Monday regarding Internet governance issues and the rest, there are actually two threats -- "threads," not "threats" -- threads, at the moment, although they can relate, but two threads regarding Internet governance and the role of institutions and the role of governments and Internet governance.

Board with Registrar Stakeholders Group

26 June 2012

Open Session – ICANN 44 Prague

One is the ITU, which includes not only the WCIT but also the WTSA, which is a meeting just before the WCIT. Then there is another meeting that will be the WTPF during 2013. And there is a whole list of points where further discussions will go on up to the WSIS Plus 10 discussion plenipotentiary in ITU.

Sorry. I just wanted to show that there is a dotted line without getting into details. Any questions can come afterwards.

What I meant is this is one track. There is another track which is less visible but that is followed very closely by some of the members of the board and significant number of people from the community, which is a discussion in the United Nations in general around the theme of enhanced cooperation which basically is a code word for the role of governments in Internet governance.

I don't get into details. Please come to us for further follow-up. But the messages along the line is to make sure the governmental representatives -- not the governments as a whole, but the governmental representatives or each of your countries in New York and those who will participate in the WCIT are aware of the challenges and what you think. So the purpose is not for ICANN to lead a campaign or be exclusively actively engaged.

Our role is to do our job correctly in making sure that the respective roles are respected, but to make sure the community and people in the ISTAR, people from the registrars, registries, and others do outreach to their governments as much as they can to make sure that those representatives will be aware of the challenges.

>>STEVE CROCKER: Kuo.

>>KURO-WEI WU: I would encourage all of the community and stakeholders in these meetings, don't forget there is a GAC. You know, the Government Advisory Committee is having a meeting here, too. I would encourage you all in the community and the stakeholders to tell what you think to those GAC delegates, members, so they can go back to communicate with their own country and the government and position your concerns.

I think that is a direct, and we can have a chance to face-to-face with them here.

>>STEVE CROCKER: Would it be possible to add to the terms of use for the registrars put in front of the users "allegiance to the multistakeholder model and proxy in any voting that might come up with respect to dealing with the ITU?"

[Laughter]

>>MATT SERLIN: Sure, yeah.

[Laughter]

>>STEVE CROCKER: Well, then make it so.

[Laughter]

I guess we solved that. That's good.

>>BRUCE TONKIN: I assume that's part of the RAA negotiations, is it, Steve?

[Laughter]

>> It wasn't until just now.

>>STEVE CROCKER: I was just going to skip around that and just ask them to do it.

>>MATT SERLIN: The last point for us -- And Rod wasn't in the room earlier. But we would just like to thank him for our interactions with him over the years. We've found those very productive, and we appreciate all of his work with us over the years and look forward again with working with Fadi in the future. Just a public thank you to Rod. So, Rod, thank you.

[Applause]

>>ROD BECKSTROM: Thank you very much.

>>STEVE CROCKER: I think that's a perfect segue for you to wrap up here.

>>ROD BECKSTROM: Sure. It has been a great honor for working with all of you. When you look at when ICANN was created in 1998, there was not a root set of registrars. It was pretty much concentration in one organization that was providing both services, I believe, or one and one.

And to see today the 900, I believe, accredited registrars and the richness of this community really shows the progress of the model of ICANN and the multistakeholder model delivering consumer choice and competition. Thanks to you. You are the entrepreneurs and the business people that are out there making it happen.

And it's great to see the progress we've made together with new gTLDs finally getting launched. Now we are into at least the batching discussion, past reveal.

Board with Registrar Stakeholders Group
26 June 2012
Open Session – ICANN 44 Prague

So I just -- my hat is off to you for your incredible efforts, the time you put in to make this model work. It was an honor to work with you. Thank you very much.

[Applause]

>>STEVE CROCKER: I think we're adjourned. Thank you very much. It is good to see you. We'll continue this obviously.

We'll have reserved festooned with all kinds of decorations places at the table for leaders responsible for the completed RAA next time.

>>MATT SERLIN: We're going to hold you to that.

>>STEVE CROCKER: You bring the RAA, we will have no problem. Rose petals, I don't know, we'll do it up.

[Laughter]

All right.

>>MATT SERLIN: Thank you. Thank you for making time again. We appreciate it.

>>STEVE CROCKER: Thanks.