

**ICANN**

**Moderator: Chantelle Doerksen  
December 1, 2016  
10:00 am CT**

Chantelle Doerksen: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the BC members call on Thursday, December 1, 2016. On today's call we have Steve DelBianco, Jimson Olufuye, Chris Wilson, Kevin Audritt, Barbara Warner, John Berard, Philip Corwin, Tim Smith, Isabel Rutherford, Andy Abrams, Susan Kawaguchi, Cecilia Smith, Jay Sudowski, Claudia Selli and Nat Cohen. We have apologies from Hibah Kamal-Grayson, Lawrence Olawale-Roberts, Marie Pattullo, and Paul Mitchell.

From staff we have myself Chantelle Doerksen. I'd like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you ever so much and over to you Chris.

Chris Wilson: Thank you Chantelle. Thanks everyone for joining us today. It's been a few weeks now since our last meeting - our in person meeting in Hyderabad. For those who were there I hope you all made it back safe and sound without too much trouble. It was a good meeting, a long meeting but a good one and it was good to see many of you there in person.

I know we've got a fair amount of comments that are due in the next week or two and other work that's going on so maybe I'll go ahead and turn it to Steve to talk to you about the policy calendar and then we can move right along. So Steve over to you.

Steve DelBianco: Hey thanks Chris. I hope everyone spent their 500,000 rupee notes before they left Hyderabad. I know I made the bartender pretty happy that last night we were there.

Okay turning to policy calendars thanks for putting it up Chantelle. Over the last two weeks there are two comments that we filed. On the 25th of November we commented on the proposed amendments to the Triple X registry agreement. This was a really strong effort that Andy Abrams started with us and then Beth, Phil Corwin, Jay Sudowski added quite a bit of strong points about the whole process of what Triple X said they were going to do so sponsor TLD and how that contrasts was what they're actually doing.

So the BC is I think can stand in some pretty good principles here about whether ICANN is honoring the right process when it comes to contracting with a bottom-up process with some input and whether they're holding gTLD registry operators to the expectations and promises they made in their contracts. So I thought it was an excellent common and I appreciate all the work that people put it on that.

Another one we filed on the 20th of November was on ICANN's Middle East and adjoining country's strategy. Lars did a fabulous job in the initial draft and got some input from Marilyn Cade and Andrew Mack. That's already been submitted. And we were only the one of a about a dozen who commented on it. And staff has already done a report on the comments received.

That report really just summarizes who said what. We don't yet know what action staff may take as a result of that report. All right so thanks again for the help on that. Let me turn to the current ICANN queue public comments. The first one is attachment one to the policy calendar. The current draft is Attachment 1 because this closes in just four days. It's about the Phase 2 assessment report on the competitive effects that arose from the new gTLD expansion.

Hibah Kamal-Grayson did a great job on her original draft and we've had help from Cecilia, Waudu, and Tim Smith. I did some edits myself and we circulated that. This is an important one because I think that the economists who put together the phase assessment were perhaps under appreciating the significant impact that the new gTLDs have had on the registration space. I won't get into the details right now but I'm happy to take a queue.

If anyone is comments on that draft we always prefer the comments be circulated as a reply all to the email that I sent out but glad to take questions or comments here on the call. Since this is due in just four days I will circulate a last call email probably tomorrow to see if we can motivate some people to weigh in on that. All right thank you.

The next one is a comment on ICANN's draft op plan and budget not for the entirety of ICANN but just for this little incorporation called post-transition IANA but they're now calling at the public technical identifiers. And it's a roughly \$10 million budget for a handful of staffers that manage the IANA functions. It used to be just a department inside of ICANN. Now it's a separate corporation and their spending is up 8% based on what ICANN spent last year.

Jimson Olufuye did a great job on the comment. It's a brief pointed comment. It's attachment Number 2 on today's policy calendar. Are there any comments? And again I would welcome the drafters if you wish to weigh in. That is due on December the 10th.

All right thank you. The third and fourth go together. These are a Thick Whois implementation proposal on the consistent labeling as well as a Thick Whois transition policy for the big three legacy gTLDs that don't have Thick Whois today, com, net, and jobs. One comment closed on the 12th of December, the other on 15th of December. These are going to be some work.

Thankfully Susan Kawaguchi stepped up to draft. And we have a new volunteer. Claudia Martinuzzi is going to weigh in on this as well. She volunteered while we were there in Hyderabad. I contacted Susan this week and thought she'd have a comment draft at least for the first one by the end of this week. And this is only 11 days away so I'm going to try to nudge Susan and Claudia to get that circulated. Let me ask now whether there's any other volunteers on this call that would throw in to help Susan and Claudia on the Thick Whois? Hi Susan, go ahead.

Susan Kawaguchi: I just want to make the comment that I've really gone through these reports that it'll probably be a combined comment between the two which we've done in the past so and pull - and really pulling from our past comments. One of the things that I missed in all of the ICANN work is that the Registry Stakeholder Group had asked, filed a reconsideration request to be board to remove the requirement to implement RDAP in the consistent labeling and display policy. So I keep going back-and-forth on if, you know, if RDAP is truly not ready for prime time to be implemented then that's a consideration. I could understand that for the registry group and registrars. But it should not slow down the implementation of Thick Whois for com, net and job.

So that's sort of the slant that I'm drafting right now. And I was really hoping to have this out a couple of days ago but hopefully this afternoon I'll have it out to the BC, to Claudia first and then to the BC. So if anybody has any ideas on, you know, whether or not we should really be pushing back on the Registry Group for this reconsideration request that would be great. And you could, you know, include your comments once I get the draft out.

Steve DelBianco: Susan hey it's Steve. Thank you for that. And by all means let's push back on attempts to delay. But I do think that based on positions you've helped draft before the BC is probably happy with federated access or centralized access to distributed Whois if in fact privacy laws and considerations are making it difficult to transfer the data#

Susan Kawaguchi: Right.

Steve DelBianco: ...to first-time servers in the USA. So I think you may confirm we're probably indifferent. It's like Steve Metalitz said at the Hyderabad we're indifferent. As long as we get centralized, single point of access accuracy standards that are upheld I guess we don't care whether the data has been shipped across the ocean to servers in Virginia or if it's simply retrieved as needed.

Susan Kawaguchi: Correct.

Steve DelBianco: Fantastic because I heard in Hyderabad from a couple of registrars that if they were forced to ship the data in potential violation of privacy concerns they would simply turn proxy registration on by default. And so all of the records they'd shipped to Virginia would end up being proxy registrations. And I don't know that that really gets us what we're after.

Susan Kawaguchi: No I would agree on that. But we should - we still should, you know, Thick Who - .com net and jobs can still convert to a Thick Whois. But you're right it could be as long as we can get that information it - where that information resides I don't think it - I agree with you it isn't an issue for us. But it should be in one point where you can grab it.

Steve DelBianco: And then if we make that clear in our comment that eliminates the source of what I'm told is their claim for delay.

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: In other words the movement of data and converted. If all of that is unnecessary in a federated access model that we have supported before then what's the delay? And maybe we can be strong about that in the sense of being practical about getting the essential features we need and not being concerned about moving data across borders.

Susan Kawaguchi: Right. Good points.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you. All right any other volunteers to help Susan and Claudia? Susan it's a big list and I appreciate that. I'll help all I can. I sent you and Susan - you and Claudia a couple of emails that catalogued prior BC comments. I hope that was helpful to get you started. And I know...

Susan Kawaguchi: Very helpful.

Steve DelBianco: Okay.

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you Susan. Number 5 on this list Denise Michel is going to help again. She's the author of a previous BC comment on data-driven analysis of the root server system stability. And it's a draft report that came out of ICANN. The comments don't close until 22 December -- plenty of time for that. And I'll be sending Denise some starter material but it's a topic that she knows very well. Susan hand is still up. Something you want to add here?

Susan Kawaguchi: Sorry old hand.

Steve DelBianco: Great. Okay just a couple of other comments that are due in the next several weeks. Number six is ICANN staff is proposing some definitions for identifier technology health indications. And I just had to put them into this policy calendar email just for a bit of levity. They got a little crazy with the Latin descriptions here and they've come up with several diseases that they believe could affect the naming aspects of unique identifier systems, (datamolgia), (abucitis), (magnitudolgia), (perflurism) and (data falxopathy). I can't believe it. So it's interesting. There is an entire PowerPoint deck behind it describing each of those five diseases and what they mean and how they might be addressed.

So I'm one who appreciates a sense of humor and creativity and looking at things like this but I do want to note that this is entirely staff driven to this point. We're going to need community to weigh in on the real substance of whether these diseases are really going to be well specific and descriptive enough that we can use them to ascertain whether there are problems in the naming system of the future. If everyone laughs it off then we won't really have gotten what we're after. So I'd love to get a queue on who would be interested in volunteering for that but I'll first go to Denise Michel.

Can't hear you Denise. I know we usually catch you on your morning commute for this call time. Denise thank you. I'll put you down as helping on that drafting. Can we get another volunteer? Yes somebody who had Latin in high school would be perfect. Come on we can't have Denise and Susan doing all of these comments this month. Let's get some additional volunteers.

John Berard is volunteering. He had three years of Latin in high school. Thank you John, appreciate that.

Think about those of you who've worked on DNS abuse and other concerns that the BC has raised in the past because I realize these Latin titles here are really just repackaging many things, data inaccuracy for instance, the leakage of data. That's what (perflourism) is. All right so we'll continue to come back and look for additional comments.

The other two are due until January. I wasn't going to address those on today's call. Let me move past this to the special project. There's a special project that Denise Michel motivated in wanting to get ICANN who is offering the services of a consultant to have them analyze the last two years of BC comments and really understand the extent to which the comments were recognized and then incorporated to modify decisions or recommendations that were made by the staff or management or board of ICANN.

Denise and I went through an entire dry run of that when we got together in Hyderabad and had a phone call last week with a consultant who's working on it to try to ask them to rearrange and then dive deeper but really explaining whether the essential elements of what the BC was asking for were ever reflected in a change of decision. What Denise and I found is that BC comments might start with words like we appreciate the opportunity to comment and we were glad that you're considering it.



Well the consultant would write that down as something the BC was making as a substantive comment. And it really wasn't at all. It was just, you know, perfunctory courtesies that we would add. And there were often times that we would endorse most of what was in a draft report but we would take issue with a couple of very controversial points. And I think that the consultants would say that the BC agreed with the majority and leave it at that.

So Denise and I drilled in to say we want these consultants to identify the controversial elements the BC has asked for. And they'll often note that there's a consistency and comment to comment on that. And what we're really interested to know is the difficult and controversial things that we're asking for making any difference at all in the decision-making process? And so we hope in the next week or two to have something we would want to share with all of you for your response. The consultants have been very responsive to us. Denise anything you'd like to add to that if your audio is working?

Denise Michel: No I'm good. Well I would say it's not although certainly some of our positions and recommendations are controversial it was more about the where we submitted comments that had multiple positions or recommendation so that the detail sections was still needed to be flushed out. Thanks.

Chris Wilson: No true enough. Thank you Denise. All right moving on to Channel 2 which is the council. And I realize that Phil Corwin has to get off the phone at some point. I know Susan's already on the line. Susan still in Channel 2 there I laid out all of the agenda highlights with links to the underlying motions and positions on the key items that are on your agenda for the council call that's happening later today. So I'll turn it over to you to walk through with members what else is on council's agenda.

Phil Corwin: Okay Phil here. Susan do you want me to take the lead on this or do you want to go forward? It doesn't matter to me.

Susan Kawaguchi: Go ahead Phil. I do have a comment on something but ask. You start and I'll finish.

Phil Corwin: Okay. All right well on Item 4 here which is the recommendations from the Bylaws Drafting Team and that was discussed in Hyderabad and put off. And I've been checking with Steve and we – Susan and I have been checking with Steve and apparently the motions we offer today is acceptable to the CSG overall. And I think it puts off the final decision till there's public comments but probably won't change the outcome. Steve any comments on that? My understanding is that BC wants the councilors to vote for this motion.

Steve DelBianco: Definitely Phil. It's better than I think we had hoped for largely due to the fact that James Bladel, the council chair saw the way that the Commercial Stakeholders Group was really upset by how this entire decision-making role was sort of usurped by council. And James sought to find a middle way and I think that's what a good chairman does.

So he's done that. And it means that we'll have an opportunity to shine a light on this decision. But you're right by no means does this indicate that we're going to be able to reverse the decision to the public comment process or even the board review. But at least we have a motion to tease it up in a way that the concerns of the CSG are going to be front and center. So I would vote for it today. Thank you.

Phil Corwin: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: And I would think James for the work he did to come up with an amended resolution.

Phil Corwin: Okay. Item 5 I guess we're scheduling a vote on response to board. I – when I reviewed this prior to the call I said - and then I checked my email feed I haven't even seen a draft of that response to the board on the GAC communiqué. So I don't know where it stands but I don't know how we're going to have a vote today on a motion of response that hasn't even been circulated before the meeting. You haven't seen anything on that have you Susan?

Susan Kawaguchi: No I haven't. I was wondering about that too.

Phil Corwin: Yes. Yes so I have a feeling we're going to defer that vote. The next item it's pretty much agreed that we're going to authorize the chair to send a draft letter to the board regarding a narrow part of the IRTPC - IRTPC implementation which goes into effect today in fact which would basically to ask for a deferral of implementation on one piece of it that could expose registrants the loss of privacy under certain conditions and asking them to defer that and leave that matter to the PPSAI Implementation Group.

I will say personally that from the domain investment community it's not quite clear this IRTPC went from being a noncontroversial technical exercise to put in some extra safeguards to reduce domain theft to something that now at least within the domain investment community the 60 day lock proposal the way staff has implemented this is very controversial and where a lot of domain investors are simply going to be signing a waiver to their registry to opt out of the lock which kind of defeats the whole purpose. But it's been implemented in a way that doesn't work very well for registrars or for a lot of

registrants and I think it's an object lesson we should learn from this and try to avoid in the future.

I did take a look at the comments on the implementation plan and most of them were negative and yet it went forward. So it's another case where comments don't seem to have a huge effect on implementation. So I said my piece on that.

On Item 7 implementation plan recommendations relating to the GNSO review I don't know of any controversy on that. It should go through. RDS is the next item. I'll defer to Susan on that if she has things to say and then council response to questions from Workstream 2 Accountability Group again noncontroversial. And finally some GNSO reps to the Security Stability and Resiliency Review Team. And Denise Michel and Scott McCormick are applicants for that.

I'll stop there. No big controversial items today and Susan you have comments to add on any of those?

Susan Kawaguchi: I do. On item 10 I thought we had a third member? And I may be...

Steve DelBianco: Jay Sudowski withdrew his name since he's awfully busy on the NonCom.

Susan Kawaguchi: Oh okay. So good to know because I'm...

Steve DelBianco: Right Jay?

Jay Sudowski: Yes that's correct Steve. I withdrew my name because 2017 is going to be a busy year for me so I don't see how I can do both.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay. Well I just want to make sure we had everybody listed from BC so good to know. So I am working with Ed Morris one of the NCUC counselors to develop a process for selecting candidates or nominating candidates for the review teams and adhering to the new bylaws. And so I've have made I've since add a draft finally. I was late in doing that also that - and I haven't gotten comments back from him yet. We were hoping to talk - add it to the AOB today's meeting if we had time.

But if you read the bylaws and Steve you drafted them so I'm sure you understand them better than I but we have a possibility of seven seats on a review team and but then it's how does the GNSO council have a standard - create a standard process and stick to it that is transparent? So I've made several suggestions. I think the suggestion, the path I would like to move forward is that all of the stakeholder groups constituencies all dominate their candidates that have volunteered and applied. And then the GNSO has to decide sort of vote on those maybe and rank them because one of the bylaws gives us we are assured that we have a - the first, second and third candidates that we submit are on the review team.

So we want to make sure that the, you know, that judgment of who those first second and third ones are not just left up to staff to pick. So we want to be very certain about our message which has not happened in the past. I was not happy with how the GNSO handled it for the CCT. So we're trying to put process in there in this and then get everyone to stick to it. So hopefully we'll have that ironed out in the next few days because we're a little late on the - GNSO is late on picking their candidates for the team, the SSR team.

Steve DelBianco: Susan hey it's Steve...

Susan Kawaguchi: Steve? Yes go ahead.

Steve DelBianco: ...in the queue. Thank you. This will be the first of these review teams after the new bylaws were adopted. And when we allowed seven I came up with that so that the GNSO would finally have the ability of nominating somebody from each of the constituencies and stakeholder groups.

Susan Kawaguchi: Right.

Steve DelBianco: So that's the idea that in our case either Denise or Scott would be put forward as one of the seven. We'd be pretty much guaranteed that we'd get at least one nominee in the pool.

Susan Kawaguchi: Right.

Steve DelBianco: There's a separate process James wants to come up with so that the GNSO would also say of that seven here are the three that we would want as guarantees because the way we set these teams up each of the seven ACs and SOs get three as a minimum on a 21 member drafting team, review team. And if anybody like for instance the ASO decided to only put one name up well then there's two extra slots that the chairs of ACs and SOs could give to the other folks who came in from the GNSO for instance. So the GNSO could end up with four or even five people on a review team. So we - this was all designed to increase the amount of participation we get as opposed to say one person from every AC and SO. So this is the first time through. It's going to be rough and I appreciate everybody trying to be patient as we work out procedures.

One other thing that came up was this question about responding to Workstream 2 questions on SO and AC accountability. It was I believe it was Item 9 of the agenda for Council. And Phil Corwin it isn't controversial. I

don't mean to say that it is but council got these questions about a month ago. It hasn't to my knowledge begun to work up its reply. But in those questions -- and I'm the rapporteur on that team, we ask those questions also be forwarded to the constituency and stakeholder group leaders and it was.

And the BC's response is only in first draft. Chantelle did the work on that. And that is the third attachment to today's policy calendar. So when you're finished with the council discussion I'll bring up the BC's submission because I'm hoping that you and Susan can highlight the fact that we have eight pages of response and eight more pages of charter already drafted so that the BC will be responded to those questions directly, not just through council, but directly. Council should also have a response about how the Council handles eligibility for officers' accountability and transparency as well. Thank you.

Susan Kawaguchi: Good point.

Phil Corwin: Thanks for pointing that out Steve. I'll review that attachment before the council call. And Susan and I can certainly bring that up.

Susan Kawaguchi: And Marilyn?

Steve DelBianco: Marilyn? Not hearing you Marilyn. Susan and Phil anything more for council?

Susan Kawaguchi: No I think that's it for me.

Phil Corwin: I don't have anything.

Steve DelBianco: Great and good luck on the...

Marilyn Cade: Steve?

Steve DelBianco: ...call today. Marilyn go ahead. Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: Steve? Thanks. In the past on review teams there was the opportunity for independent experts to also self-nominate. Have we completely lost that in...

Steve DelBianco: Not at all.

Marilyn Cade: ...the new review team...

Steve DelBianco: Yes, great question Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Steve DelBianco: Not at all. The independent experts...

Marilyn Cade: So...

Steve DelBianco: ...are still there. Here's a change. Here's the change. We do not allow ICANN to select the experts. Instead once the review team is formed the review team can select the experts that it wants and ICANN if it's required would have to arrange to pay for the travel and potentially a reasonable fee for the experts to assist the review team. So that all comes after the review teams have been...

Marilyn Cade: Right. So I just want to make a comment about I think we're making progress but we're not quite there on understanding the work that is needed on all of these review teams. I don't mean just us, by the way I mean the rest of the community.



So it would actually be great if we could end up with Scott as a member of the SSAC. And so he also brings in a unique additional perspective besides what we would bring in from the Business Constituency. So I just wanted to reinforce the idea that we want to have more than one bite at this apple and we need to use the mechanisms accordingly.

Steve DelBianco: Marilyn this is Steve. I might respond to that. Patrick Falstrom of the SSAC told us in Hyderabad that the SSAC was only going to nominate two not three for this position because he wants to hold back their third pick after he sees the full pool of applicants. And let's encourage Scott to consider approaching Patrick on that so that if for instance if we were to pick Denise on this team that Scott is still in the running if he can be selected by the SSAC is one of their three requires.

Marilyn Cade: Yes. But I'm making a different point. The independent experts are even separate from that right?

Steve DelBianco: They are. I was addressing...

Marilyn Cade: So...

Steve DelBianco: ...who nominated the team but the experts...

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Steve DelBianco: ...themselves...

Marilyn Cade: But I...

Steve DelBianco: ...picked by the team.

Marilyn Cade: Right. I'm not look, I'm very familiar with the background of many of the SSAC people. They're very, you know, I'm not sure I was thinking more that besides who got put forward from the SSAC we would – might be able to use the independent expert role...

Steve DelBianco: No.

Marilyn Cade: ...to advance Scott.

Steve DelBianco: No you can't. Because the independent experts will be selected by the review team once the review team is convened. We can't slot anybody in for that any more than anyone else can.

Marilyn Cade: No but Steve that was - sorry that's my question. But I believe people can nominate themselves and then they would be in the pool to be selected.

Steve DelBianco: That's right, that's correct.

Marilyn Cade: And right. Thanks.

Steve DelBianco: All right we'll conclude channels one and two. Channel 3 is up next in case Cheryl Miller has anything on CSG.

Cheryl Miller: Hi. Thank you. Actually yes I do. First thanks to everyone who participated in the CSG meeting that we had in Hyderabad. Really appreciate it and wanted to comment on two things.

So we've been talking about the possibility of the intersessional. And it's looking as though the dates would likely fall in February. So I wanted to give folks a heads up on that and the discussion on that is ongoing.

We also recently received a request from Glenn. She'd like us to identify a member for the new gTLD auction proceeds CCWG by 5 December. And they're looking for someone who obviously has the appropriate expertise so that they can fully participate in the substance of the group, someone who is able to actively participate in the activities on - in an ongoing and also possibly more of a long term basis, someone who can also communicate the different views and concerns of the individual within the BC and also understand the overall needs of the Internet community.

And so I just wanted to flag that for folks who might be interested. I know many of you who have worked on this issue in the past and so it would be really great if you can let us know if you are interested and you would like to participate. I think that's all I have. I don't know if Chris you had anything else or if there's anything else on any other threads that you want to add?

Chris Wilson: Yes, thanks Chantelle. This is Chris. Let me just accentuate what you said. First in regard to the auction (unintelligible) working group I want to make it clear that this is a call the expression of interest now is for the specific person who would be the CSG representative on that CCWG. This is not about whether you want to participate or be an observer on the working group the CCWG yourself.

Obviously that CCWG will be open to all. And you can - any individual BC member who wants to participate will be an observer can certainly do so. This call has been put out the CSG rep. So I wanted to make that clear for folks to understand what we're talking about. And I sent an email out yesterday to that

effect so please if you haven't seen that go look in your inbox for that if you're interested.

You know, obviously there's a different dynamic as a representative of the CSG you're sort of the eyes, ears and perhaps at times mouth of the CSG as a whole on that CCWG. So, you know, the requirement I think will be perhaps a little bit more than what you would otherwise get if you're just a participant in your own capacity where you may decide you can attend a meeting here or there. Be a little more I think your time obligations I think are a little more significant as the CSG rep that's fair to say.

And Steve, obviously, Steve DeBianco has been the CSG rep on the CCWG Accountability Group. And he can speak to the dynamics of being a CSG rep versus being simply participant. But that I just want to make that clarification for folks to not to be confused with this. This is not about being a participant per se this is about being a CSG rep on that particular CCWG.

I notice - I see a couple hands raised. Let me just turn real quickly though on the intersessional Cheryl is right. We're looking like it's going to occur in mid-February the week of February 13 is the target week right now. The target location is Reykjavik, Iceland. It was seen as a location that was central if you will between sort of the US dynamic and Europe.

And so ICANN staff this week is looking to make sure that, that the venue is - can be handled and accommodated in that week of February. If they cannot then we'll have to go back and look at other locations. Though I think timeline wise that mid-February timeline has seemingly reached the consensus among the non-contracting party house leadership. There's a lot of discussion about doing it at other times of the year including sort of the April May timeframe and then possibly even the August September timeframe. But

ultimately folks determined that it was – to mitigate conflicts with other activities going on than we would do it in February.

Marilyn I see your question about, you know, why are we doing it in Iceland and we want senior staff? I think talking with Rob Hoggarth I think it - the opinion was that even if they could not necessarily attend in person they could certainly attend remotely and participate remotely and engage in conversations from, you know, and discussions that way. I think they also thought that it's possible that I forget I think the board meeting is occurring not soon before that I believe. And though I don't remember the exact location of the board meeting I think there was a thought that they could potentially could stop over in Reykjavik for the folks on the way - on their way home, et cetera. So, you know, this issue was – I raised the issue with Rob. This question was asked by me in terms of making sure we had senior staff and other folks there. And it seemed like that was not going to be a major problem. Now we - I guess we shall see.

Of course that issue could be - short of doing it in Los Angeles I think that issue continue - would continue to be a problem whether it's in Iceland or elsewhere. I mean obviously doing it in Los Angeles was the easiest way of having senior staff and board members who may be around to come and certainly the CEO to come in popover. But there was strong pushback on doing another intersessional in the United States having had the last two occur in the United States. So that is sort of where we are. So we - I guess we'll try to make the best of it. But I'll continue to sort of be diligent on that point.

So that – those were just further accentuating what Cheryl already said on those two issues. But I think Denise has got her hand raised. Denise did you have a question?

Denise Michel: It was on another topic if Andrew would like to go first?

Chris Wilson: Okay. Andrew?

Andrew Abrams: Sure. Chris I was just following up on your call for volunteers for the CSG position. Since we've got people on the phone I wanted to get a little bit more of a sense you said that we were looking for some specific qualifications specific background. And also Steve maybe just to give us a little bit more of a sense of what the time commitment is just so that we, you know, people understand what they might be getting into?

Chris Wilson: Sure. This is Chris. I could say - I mean obviously every CCWG is different. But maybe Steve do you want to give sort of a general – thought process on how it – what it means to be a CSG rep generally that would be helpful?

Steve DelBianco: Andrew the amount of time is a function of how many weeks it takes to work out this auction process. And it will involve public comment. But on a per weekly basis you will have two to three hours of calls potentially more with prep calls. And then you need to dedicate another half hour or so in correspondence back to the IPC and the ISPCP and the BC because as the rep for all three constituencies you've got to sound them out ahead of time on issues that are coming up on the next call so that you can represent their positions. And then when the outcome is summarized you have to report back to the constituencies on what was just done. So I would say on a budget of on at least an hour and a half a week of telephone calls you should add another hour of time for approximately 2-1/2 hours a week. It will probably last six months would be my guess.

Andrew Abrams: Okay thanks. And for the – for when I’m scheduled (unintelligible) before we’re talking about specific criteria that you guys were looking for can you give us some sense of what you had in mind?

Chris Wilson: Well this is Chris. I mean that criteria is not, you know, the BC criteria. That criteria is – was put out by council I believe. And so to be quite frank I don’t have – I’m not - I wasn’t privy to those particular discussions. But if others Phil, or Susan, or others know more about exactly what we’re trying to drive at that would be helpful. So Andrew I don’t – to answer your question I don’t know we have a specific answer for you there. But we can certainly, you know, do some due diligence if you want and see what we’re looking – exactly what, you know, if there’s a certain particular kind of person we’re looking for. But I think, you know, I think they’re probably casting a wide net but obviously want someone with the proper background and experience. But we can talk off line if you want about that.

Andrew Abrams: Sure thanks.

Steve DelBianco: This is Steve. Keep in mind that the CSG since we’re three constituencies sometimes we have this notion of taking turns. The IPC might get the person who represents us on one cross community group and then it might be the BC’s turn next. That only matters if they all have candidates that are interested. My guess is this is going to be something that’ll be interesting to everyone the idea of dispensing, you know, a couple hundred million dollars in funds.

Chris Wilson: Yes, this is Chris. To that point, you know, I think, you know, Greg Shatan from the IPC was on the CCWG stewardship. Obviously Steve was our CSG appointed member for the CCWG accountability. So I don’t know maybe that argues for the ISPCPs to have someone serve as the CSG rep on this particular

one. I know Tony Harris I think has been deeply involved with this from its inception. So but that we'll see if – depending on how many people are nominated, et cetera, or put their name forward will work accordingly. But what we do have to get that name in by Monday. So we'll - so for those that are interested you'll need to make a decision quickly and let everybody know. I see. So Andrew hopefully that answers your question.

Andrew Abrams: Definitely great. I'll reach out to (unintelligible). Thank you, appreciate it.

Steve DelBianco: So I see Denise or Jimson. Denise did you want to go ahead or Jimson I don't know if (unintelligible) Marilyn did you want to talk about this specific issue?

Marilyn Cade: I do. I want to speak of this particular topic.

Chris Wilson: Denise, is that okay?

Denise Michel: Sure. Anyone can go first.

Chris Wilson: Okay. Marilyn go ahead.

Marilyn Cade: Thanks. I did a lot of work on this issue several years ago when we actually had a working group at the GNSO Policy Council on dealing with auction funds from single letter names. The - I want to be careful that this group is actually not about dispensing the fund it is about mechanisms that will create a – the kind of protected environment where ICANN doesn't put – it's not for profit status at risk. What kind of mechanisms would be established?

And there is a concern that's been raised by some of about concept of self-dealing. So if you want to benefit from the allocation of the funds or if you contributed to the allocation to the creation of the fund what status would you



have? It's been very hotly debated in a couple of places. I have in the past indicated I'm interested in being (unintelligible). But I just - the reason I am taking the microphone now is just to clarify that this group is going to come up with the mechanism by which funds would be allocated and what kind of things it could be spent on. There are people who want to spend the funds on lowering their fees to ICANN. There are other people who think that, that is - that would be very detrimental to ICANN integrity. Thanks Chris.

Chris Wilson: Thanks Marilyn. Appreciate that clarification. Why don't you go ahead Denise and then Jimson?

Denise Michel: Thanks. On this topic I assume the CSG was a blank to decide. Cheryl, could you share (unintelligible) the volunteers from the various constituencies before the CSG vote on that? And then on another topic I just want to (unintelligible). And there's a lot of echo of the line. Can anyone else hear it?

The - Mark McFadden and I were - had agreed to do a draft document that the three commercial constituencies could sign supporting ICANN collecting and putting in the public domain much more data on a range of matters. That first draft will be on the BC list for any input by tomorrow. Thanks.

Chris Wilson: Thanks Denise. This is Chris. Just real quick I will hopefully have names. The CSG sort of decided that we'll each constituency will seek names for the CSG rep for auction proceeds by Friday by the end of the week and then make a decision on Monday. So - to the extent that any names are submitted we'll certainly send them out either Cheryl or I will send them out by the end of the day Friday US time. Jimson?

Jimson Olufuye: Hi Chris. This is Jimson. Where - I wanted to talk about the meeting place for the intersessional. Chris I thought we said we should seek maybe a

compromise for this nation maybe like London or Paris where just one flight can get us to the place for a two day meeting. So I wanted to get your feedback on that.

Chris Wilson: Yes. So yes obviously that point was raised in terms of finding a location that had direct flight ability for people. Obviously I mean from - I think to some extent that was applicable to alternative cities beyond Reykjavik since Reykjavik had sort of been determined as a consensus city earlier in the process. If that – Reykjavik couldn't be - couldn't handle the meeting for whatever reason in that timeframe then when you're looking at alternative cities certainly that would be the direct flight issue would be a concern.

I would say, you know, for people in Europe and frankly those of us in Washington DC there are direct flights to Reykjavik. I know that's difficult for you and I appreciate that. And I'm trying, you know, certainly can take that into consideration. I know there are others with the non-contracting party house who have that same concern because they live and work outside Europe or the United States.

So, you know, it's something that we'll certainly work on and continue to keep hammering on that. But I think for now Reykjavic because it was the least controversial I guess seemingly city for folks that, that would be where we would start. But if we can't if it has to move away from Reykjavik then we'll continue - I'll continue to make that point that we'll need ease of travel is quite important for short meetings for folks. So it hasn't been forgotten. It just the dynamic is what the dynamic is at this point. So I'm sorry. I hope that answers your question a little bit.

Jimson Olufuye: Yes, that's okay.

Chris Wilson: Yes. Okay anything else? And I know I've got nothing else from the CSG side. Steve did you want to finish up policy calendar and then turn to Jimson or are we done?

Steve DelBianco: Say I only wanted to note that Chantelle I put this in the chat already. Chantelle was great enough to draft a roughly eight page response on how the BC documents both the current and pending charter, helps us to be accountable and transparent to the members of the business community that we were designed to serve. And I hope to hold that up as an example that the other constituencies can follow as council tries to respond to that SO, AC accountability questionnaire from Workstream 2. Thanks again to Chantelle and I'm happy to take comments via email. Just reply to the policy calendar on anything you'd like to see us add to Attachment 3 from today's policy calendar. Thank you Chantelle and thanks Chris. That's all for me.

Chris Wilson: Thanks Steve. Jimson perhaps we can go ahead and turn to you and your report?

Jimson Olufuye: Okay, thank you Chris. Yes this is Jimson. Well, in regard to BC Operations and Finance, I would like to let us know (although I have mentioned this) before but all together about seven members have not renewed their membership and so they've been removed from the list. And at this point they are (57) members, paid up members, with one new member added yesterday (after payment). And the new member is (MeoCloud Technologies) based in Nigeria. The CEO was one of the two beneficiaries of the BC funding support to obtain the BC (Outreach Event) in Windhoek, Namibia.

On the BC outreach updates the two supported business leaders to the outreach in Namibia have applied to join the BC. They have been cleared by

the Credentials Committee. One of them as I mentioned before has paid their membership dues and is now being listed among our membership.

The second one though approved what no, no, no not yet was to be approved but there are some issue with domain which for which have been advised to resolve. This issue that the Credentials Committee (asked him) to resolve some issues. We want to thank the the Credentials Committee for this (unintelligible) the smooth transition going forward.

(Unintelligible) ideas 2016 and I think the (unintelligible) committee and the planning and outreach for the locals in collaboration with WITSA and the other (associations) in Latin America. So, I don't know if Marilyn I want to provide much information on this. Marilyn? Well maybe before she comes up I like to know that the CC has approved three potential new members. And, we're just waiting for them to be financially compliant. As you all know, so we have a members' call after this timeout. The details have been well communicated and I want to thank Chantelle for doing a good job.

And lastly on finance, we are currently working on integrating PayPal to our current finance system. So the target is to have the (unintelligible) so that the members who have quite interesting menu to easily make payment of their dues. So, on this note, I'm through. Perhaps maybe Marilyn is there or there are some members that have questions. I'm ready to take them.

Andrew Abrams: Jimson, this is Andrew. Can I just jump in real quick on the little Outreach thing that we've been talking about because I don't say Marilyn?

Chris Wilson: Go ahead Andrew.

Andrew Abrams: Just really quickly for those of you we are trying to arrange something in formal with – in at IGF as Jimson mentioned. It's a little bit on the fly because we weren't sure exactly who was going to be there and there is not very good data on the business participation. But we've got some people on the line. We're going to probably try to put together something very simple a little cocktail or things along that line. So be expecting from us from outreach committee members who are there an email once we get set up. And if you can stop by and get to meet some of these people that would be great and we appreciate your support as always and thanks very much.

Chris Wilson: Thanks Andrew, thank you Jimson for that report. We've got just a few minutes left at the end - to the bottom of the hour. I have a few just a few quick notes on AOB if others have AOB please raise your hand in the chat or so forth. But just real quick want to give folks a brief update on where we are with regard to the BC charter. About a month ago after having the BC voted on it. We've submitted it to ICANN staff and ICANN legal for their initial review to make sure that were no fiscal liability concerns for the ICANN organization.

I'm happy to report that ICANN staff got back to me just yesterday letting me know that the BC charter amendments have received quote unquote a clean bill of health therefore probably next week it'll be formally submitted to the ICANN Board Organizational Effectiveness Committee who will then begin the process of authorizing a public comment period on the charter amendments.

We expect that probably will occur sometime early next year. And the belief is that full board action on the BC charter amendments well happen at the Copenhagen meeting in March. So I think we're on the timeline is the same as it was when we were first told back in September, October. So I think we're

making good progress there. And once we get sort of finalized timelines I can - I'll pass those along. But I wanted the folks to know where we were on that.

Moving right along ICANN 58 travel support requests are due. I think was it Chantelle I think by December 8 I believe which is next week. So for those that are seeking to attend the ICANN meeting in March in Copenhagen and need travel support please let the BC - let us all know and we will - the BC ExCom will make - will decide how we can allocate those requests. So please, please be alert on that. Maybe - and Chantelle we'll send out a reminder note to everybody that aren't necessarily on this call about that deadline for folks.

And it's not on this on the agenda but real quick I just had earlier today I had a call among the SO, AC leaders with ICANN meeting staff to begin preliminary discussions for meeting planning for the ICANN 58 meeting in Copenhagen. In particular the focus was on how to better deal with the high interest topic issues in particular how many high interest topics discussion should there be at the meeting. And then also the process by which those high interest topics are to be selected.

Additionally there was an initial poll taken among the SO, AC leaders today about whether a constituency day should remain a single day or it should be split in half. I'm happy to report that on that polling issue that there was overwhelming support for keeping constituency day as a single day. So I expect that that will be the case certainly for the ICANN 58 meeting they'll be a single day for constituency day rather than sort of two half days as has been proposed before.

With regard to the high interest topics as far as numbers are concerned for the next meeting it's looking like right now tentatively there'll be just - there'll be slots reserved for three high interest topics. Just to have - there was consensus

that eight was too many, eight was what was had – was what would happened in Hyderabad that even five is too many.

And that sort of - there were parties that including myself on behalf of the BC that thought maybe one to two was a better number. There were others that thought perhaps three to four was a better number. So it's looking like right now we're leaving it at three for this next meeting. That could change if depending on (pa) and proposals that come in if - that may go down it may go up I guess potentially. But I think there's enough pushback that three would be the sweet spot for this meeting. And that's where we are and that.

Again with regard to how these high interest topics were selected that's sort of still to be determined a little bit in terms of especially in terms of how the voting process would go among the SOs and ACs. There's consternation within the GNSO as to treating the GNSO as one singular entity for voting purposes whereby the ALAC, and the GAC and the GNSO were all sort of treated equally notwithstanding the fact that the GNSO has all the various stakeholder group and constituencies within it. That voting process needs to still be (sluffed) out and we hope to have better clarity on that by the next call or perhaps during the next SO, AC leaders called on meeting planning which is scheduled to occur on January 4 after the holidays.

So that's just a – that's an update of where they are - where we are there. I think there's an attempt to be made for better communication from meeting staff, to the secretariats to us about meeting planning and avoiding schedule conflicts that were a major problem in the Hyderabad meeting. So there is an effort being made to mitigate that including having these SO, AC leader meetings occurring right now and as soon as possible after the last meeting in preparation for the next meeting which really is not that far away to be honest. So wanted to provide folks and update there.

Other than that we've got the next - our next meeting will be two weeks from today on December 15. And, you know, look forward to talking to folks then. Are there any other issues or concerns the need to be raised? Marilyn, quickly yes? Marilyn we can't hear you.

Marilyn Cade: Because I'm on mute. I just wanted to thank Chantelle and Jimson for putting together the list of team members who are coming to the IGF. I think people ought to look at that and try to (unintelligible). And that will allow us to advance some (unintelligible) activities. I'm (packing) 200 of our brochures so we want to be able to send out to those of you who are coming.

Chris Wilson: Thanks Marilyn. Marilyn you have a lot of feedback on your line. But thank you for that. And just for those that couldn't understand Marilyn is bringing 200 BC brochures to the next weeks IGF in Guadalajara, Mexico. I'll be there as well as plenty of other BC members. And certainly we'll promote the BC as appropriate during the IGF, so thank you Marilyn for bringing those brochures and doing that effort.

Any other thoughts, concerns questions real quick? Okay if not then I think we can go ahead and close this meeting. Obviously we have the candidates call right – coming up right away. And I thank you all for participating.

END