

ICANN

Moderator: Gisella Gruber-White
August 6, 2015
10:00 am CT

Coordinator: Recording is now started.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you (Elisala). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody and welcome to the BC members call on the 6th of August 2015. On the call today we have Andy Abrams, Andrew Harris, Beth Allegretti, Elisa Cooper, Ron Andruff, Steve DelBianco, Cecilia Smith, Susan Kawaguchi, Phil Corwin, Aparna Sridhar, Stephen Coates, and Samantha Demetriou.

We have received apologies from Angie Graves, (Tisan Longelder), (Unintelligible) and Laura Covington. And from staff we have myself, Nathalie Peregrine.

I'd like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you ever so much and over to you Elisa.

Elisa Cooper: Thank you so much Nathalie. I want to jump right in and turn it over to Steve because he's got a limited period of time. And then I have some information to share with the group under any other business. But Steve, over to you.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks Elisa, appreciate that. And thanks to Nathalie for displaying the policy calendar since it's out two days ago. First thing I'll quickly recap for you is the fourth comment we saw recently on the 3rd of August. Andy Abrams drafted an excellent comment on four new gTLDs for geo names. Thanks again Andy. I'm glad we got that in.

A lot of you know that on July the 24th we filed an extensive comment on the GNSO review draft report. Big thanks to Laura Covington, J. Scott Evans, and (Maurice Betula) for that.

After we filed it, the NCSG - Non-Commercial Stakeholders Group - said to us, "Let's do a group letter calling for a structural review of GNSO." And we agreed. The ITC agreed, and the ISTs also agreed.

But in a little bit of a twist, the Non-Commercial Stakeholders Group themselves began to have dissenting views about whether they should team with us and ask for structural review. And I read some of their e-mail lists and, you know, suffice to say, they can't figure out whether cooperating with us is really going to suit their purposes, even though we both believe that the structure of GNSO doesn't help CSG or NCSG.

But we have completely different reasons for feeling that the structure's not quite right for us. But based on that they decided not to file. And, you know, we'll part as friends and probably fight this battle again at some point.

And then on July 7 and 8 we filed comments on privacy and proxy services. And again instead of renewal for (cat and pro) - and thanks again to Phil Corwin, Andy Mack, (Jim Unintelligible), and Andy Abrams and Ellen Blackler, okay?

So let's turn to the current ICANN public comments. This will be easy because really only one of them is due in the short term. And the rest are due in the distant future - not till September. So this ought to be quick.

So the very first one here is referenced on the first attachment to today's policy calendar. And the fact is that the board is about to make a decision on the translation and transliteration of the contact information. This is pursuant to a PDP recommendation.

Now the BC filed comments on that PDP initial report back in February of this year and we have Susan, Ellen Blackler, Steve Coates and (Tim Chen) to thank for that.

Then on our last two calls we showed some interest. We realized we cannot convince the board to deny or amend PDP recommendations of the final report. They won't do that since it's coming over into the final PDP. But we could file a comment reiterating our disagreement with one of the main decisions which is not to require a translation of contact information, WHOIS information.

And then we could ask for a post-implementation review at some point so that staff would be able to look at how well is this voluntary translation system working. Now Steve Coates took up the ball on this and drafted really what I think is an excellent comment to review.

It's the first attachment and it consists of Steve reiterating our earlier point, the main point of disagreement on mandatory translation. And then Steve followed it up with eight specific questions that we would suggest that ICANN would ask in doing a post-implementation review.

So we're getting ourselves on record. If any of the eight questions turns out to reveal - and our own position - that it's not working very well (unintelligible) comment we're filing to say would you please do the review? We have suspicions that very few are translating or they're being translated inconsistently. So this is going to be an opportunity to do that.

So Steve I thought I would turn it over to you for just a moment and walk through what you were thinking when you formulated the eight questions. And then we'll take a brief period of discussion on that. This one is due next Tuesday the 11th of August. Steve over to you.

Stephen Coates: Thanks Steve. Can you guys hear me okay?

Steve DelBianco: Yes just fine.

Stephen Coates: Can you hear me?

Steve DelBianco: Just fine.

Stephen Coates: Oh good, oh good. So thanks for the introduction Steve. I did reiterate our prior position. I tried to make it very pithy in a three-paragraph comment. And then I prepared eight questions. And all it meant that I reached out to a few people and got ideas on what those might be and took a stab at what they are.

We'd love comments on those. To the extent that we missed anything, to the extent that anything's overreaching or I rely on you to let me know if any will potentially cause any other political problems, especially with the registries. I can get into the specifics but it's probably not work the time in this particular venue.

Steve DelBianco: Steve thanks again for that. I think depending on (unintelligible) it may turn out that the next WHOIS review -- which is mandated by the affirmation of commitment - will end up looking at these questions - voluntary translation/transliteration.

So I'll look in the queue. Is there anyone who has any comments or suggestions on Steve's draft?

All right, take until Monday night the 10th of August to get back to us with comments on Steve's draft. And since it's based on a prior submission from the BC I'm very comfortable that we have an abbreviated review period. So comments close the 10th on this. The comments close on Monday night.

So that means that by Sunday night, midnight UTC on the 9th, I'll need to have comments back to you on Steve's draft so that Steve and I can put it in final form. So if there's no further comments on that, let me just thank Steve again for the draft. I really appreciate that.

Channel 2 - if you scroll down for us Nathalie - thank you. There are still three other public comments that I said were due in September - bylaws and then the Dot Sharp brand TLD. And this is dropping their searchable WHOIS for a corporate controlled second level domain.

So Nathalie if you can scroll up please to Number 4 under Channel 1. Scroll up just a little higher please. Nathalie are you there? I don't have scroll control on my screen folks, so counting on staff to help us with that.

Nathalie Peregrine: There you go. Scrolling's enabled. Sorry about that Steve.

Steve DelBianco: It's probably better for everybody that way, thank you. So if you scroll to - a little lower on Page 2, the top of Page 2. Number 4 is the Dot Sharp brand TLD wants to drop searchable WHOIS for all of its second level domains which they will control at the corporate level.

I think this is the first time this has happened and I want to be sure that we're paying attention here. Does anyone have a particular point of view on whether this - there would be any potential down side or whether we think this is desirable for dot brands to disable searchable WHOIS?

All right, not seeing any hands right away but we're going to need to look into this. And a number of you have been so good at helping out on WHOIS before. So Susan go ahead.

Susan Kawaguchi: I'm just a little concerned that this could be a slippery slope. So I understand why a dot brand who's just using it for internal uses does not want to provide a WHOIS. But is it really that big of a burden? And, you know, I mean if it was Dot Facebook we could just put it in all of our regular - basically the same information, you know, that's on Facebook.com.

So I don't quite understand why they're making that request. You know, I mean, I wouldn't argue strenuously against it, but if anybody else - there's something about it that makes me a little hesitant. And so I was wondering if anybody else had any issues with it.

Andy Abrams: This is Andy Abrams. My initial thought is that maybe we draw the line at closed versus open. If it's a closed brand TLD then it technically should be a single registrant model. And maybe that's why - and I'm happy to kind of look further into it, but it seems like for a closed brand, you know, we

wouldn't object simply because it would just be the same registrant over and over for each individual (unintelligible) domain.

Susan Kawaguchi: But even that, wouldn't we want to know that, you know, who that registrant is? I mean WHOIS is an easy process. Where would we - where would...?

Steve DelBianco: What is the searchable part that they would be turning off? Do you use that feature, the searchable WHOIS feature?

Susan Kawaguchi: Oh, am I misunderstanding this then? That it's - they would still provide the WHOIS (record). I'm sorry, I read that very quickly, so...

Andy Abrams: Right, my understanding is the WHOIS would still be provided. It just wouldn't be searchable.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay, I'm sorry. I misunderstood. Then I don't have any objections.

Steve DelBianco: So given that, Andy, would you maybe take a look at that and see if you start to form the idea of a BC comment on that?

Andy Abrams: Sure, I can do that.

Steve DelBianco: Not due until 11th of September, so a lot of time on that. It won't get in the way of your August break which I hope you're taking. You've really been working hard for us and we appreciate it.

There's another one in September the 12th. It's number 5 on the policy calendar. It has to do with bylaws amendments based on the GNSO Working Group. Now Zahid had helped draft BC comments on these recommendations.

And they're more about the GNSO policies and procedures and how to implement GNSO policies. I don't think there's anything controversial there. I'll reach out to Zahid and see if he can help draft another set of those.

Now Number 6 and 7 on the policy calendar -- they're at the top of Page 2 of the attachment - are much a bigger deal for us. Again they don't close until the first week of September. Now here's the BC's opportunity to comment once again on the IANA stewardship transition proposal and then Number 7.

I want to thank Aparna who has already volunteered to help draft the BC follow-up comments on the IANA stewardship transition. This would be a good opportunity for anyone else who's interested in diving into that and volunteer to help Aparna on it.

Last time around (Claudio), Andrew Harris, Ellen Blackler and Steve Coates - all of you contributed to this BC draft comment.

Andrew Harris: Steve it's Andrew. Please sign me up.

Steve DelBianco: Andrew Harris, fantastic. Thank you. It's my assessment that they're not significantly different than where the naming proposal was the last time that we (copied) in May. However we do have protocols and numbers to be part of this because it's a combined proposal.

I did want to also mention that here in the (unintelligible) are the critics have been suggesting that the PTI model is (unintelligible) (contract co.) and that (PTI) is (unintelligible). He thinks (unintelligible) could be more difficult. And I do think that's the point, that (unintelligible) throw the IANA functions up like a (jump fall) first time we had an upset with ICANN.

So we may have to give a lot of thought to (unintelligible) with (PTI) and we were in our (unintelligible) comment. They have to provide some support (unintelligible) in a positive way because I think it's going to come under a little bit of criticism.

Okay, Aparna, Andrew, thank you both very much - and Steve Coates too. That's great, all three of you.

Number 7 is something that's pretty near and dear to my heart. We've been working on this 30 hours a week for the past (unintelligible). And it's long but it's incrementally different than the first draft that we commented extensively on in June.

The big difference is that instead of requiring each of the ACs and SOs to become a legal member we were just suggesting that the community itself is a sole member of ICANN. And this eliminates any potential legal mischief that could be wrought by a member who wanted to exercise statutory rights under California law.

The rest of this proposal is very similar to what we commented on in June. But again I have to caution you it's quite long. And the executive summary's a good read but until one dives into the details it's tougher to know where the comments should be.

We didn't structure this report with a series of questions to answer so we'll have discussion on what in the draft we wish to comment on. And we might well use as a guide the comments that we filed in June and take it from there. While so many of you helped to draft those comments in June, I'm willing to work - I take the lead perhaps - but I did want to make sure that as many members as are interested can get involved in that.

So any interest from folks in the BC at working on the accountability enhancement? These aren't due until 12th of September. It's great to have Aparna, Andrew Harris, Steve, but we need some others. Go ahead.

David Fares: Steve it's David Fares. Chris Wilson is stuck and not able to join but I'll nominate him.

Steve DelBianco: Okay David, great. So Chris Wilson and Dave Fares.

Lisa O'Hal: Hi Steve, it's Lisa O'Hal and I'll be happy to help as well.

Steve DelBianco: That's great Lisa. Really appreciate it. So Lisa and David, I'll send a note around to both of you as a reminder because it's probably good to dive into our draft report now, get an understanding of what's in there.

At the end of next week I'll be able to give you details on which of the BC's comments have been incorporated in draft because we're analyzing all the public comments to be able to show how let's say the BC or the IPC suggestions made their way in.

One particular suggestion the BC had made it into Work Stream 2, but it's still something that's committed to. Andrew Harris, go ahead.

Andrew Harris: Thanks. Obviously would be happy to help here too, but I just was wondering real quick if we were going to have any time on this call for you to provide us some highlights of where things stand and where you think the biggest issues with the draft are at this point.

Steve DelBianco: Yes Andrew I'd be happy to give a two-minute overview. Earlier I said that we changed the structure so that the community is the member, not each and every AC and SO. And that means that we'll be able to exercise all these powers to overturn a bylaws change to block a budget to spill the board, to launch an IRP.

All these decisions would be taken by ACs and SOs voting in the same way we vote today. And there will be no change, no legal structure. It's only if ICANN refused to follow the results of the voting that's laid out in the bylaws that we would end up trying to use our legal and statutory rights as a member.

And it would be the entire community acting as a member so I think we've removed instead of added controversy with that move. And area where we're going to have some pushback is from the governments who still don't like the fact that there's been several ways that government powers have been trimmed in moderate but significant ways at ICANN.

But at the same time we invited with open arms the government as a multi-equal stakeholder and we're allowing the government to have five votes - 5 of the 29 votes -- in the community voting mechanism. It's not entirely clear that the government will get its act together in order to be able to exercise those votes. But we did welcome them as multi-stakeholders.

At the same time we did implement Stress Test 18, which is to change ICANN's bylaws so that only GAC consensus advice would merit the deference that we give it today which is to try and find mutually acceptable solutions.

And Andrew I know this is near and dear to your heart. We changed the bylaws in significant ways so that if the board of ICANN followed GAC

advice that was in violation of the bylaws either by standing at commission or by failing to follow the bottom-up multi-stakeholder process, then an IRP or independent review panel could file a binding decision overturning the ICANN board action.

The GAC is well aware that this is designed in many ways to stop the GAC from coming in over the top with advice that undermines the entire bottom-up process. The GAC is well aware that this could compromise some of their influence at ICANN. So there's a lot of pushback from the GAC and it's likely that the GAC will not be able to take a position on the CCWG report because they're split.

They won't oppose it and I don't think they'll endorse it either. But individual governments will then weigh in. So I feel like there's the largest source of controversy. On a call two days ago, Steve Crocker weighed in with something that also could prove controversial.

I told you earlier that in response to stress test 14, we brought the entire affirmation of commitments in ICANN's bylaws so that they're a permanent part of the bylaws instead of something that ICANN could cancel. Well that includes the reviews.

And one of the reviews is the WHOIS review. Another is the review of the new gTLD program. And Steve Crocker was on the phone on our first Webinar this week suggesting that the WHOIS review should not be (unintelligible) to the bylaws.

He feels that the WHOIS review is destructive and should be completely changed while bringing it into the bylaws if at all. So that's ignited a new controversy and we're going to have to work that out in the public comment.

The WHOIS review itself is something I know Susan has worked on twice (unintelligible). And it's a tremendous tool that we have to hold ICANN accountable to the obligations maintaining to it. Okay Andrew I hope that's a little bit of a background. Susan, your hand's up. Go ahead.

Susan Kawaguchi: So I was not - did not listen to that Webinar. But somebody else brought that - Steve's comment to my attention. And Steve has a tendency - you know I spent a lot of time working with him now because of the EWG - and he has a tendency to sort of go off on tangents but then reigns it back in.

And so he - I think what his, you know, the person that came to me about it had actually had another conversation with Steve offline. And he doesn't object to the Whois review but does object to how it's described and wants the CCWG bylaw language to better reflect policy and obligation.

So I don't think it's an outright we don't want this, you know, he does not want the review to happen, but he would like to tweak some of that language. So I'll dig into that a little bit more and see if we can't come up with language that he would - well we don't really care completely if he approves or not, that he might be comfortable with and that would also get us where we want it to be.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks, Susan. So far Steve has just complained that the language in the affirmation of commitment was inappropriate from the start and suggested we should never have signed it, we should never have done it that was. But that happened in 2009, and you've been part of a party that's done a Whois review since then.

Steve has not yet, to my knowledge, suggested new language. Instead he's just saying don't bring it over, and that's not going to work. We're not going to be

able to dump an affirmation review and claim to ICANN stakeholders and Congress that we've preserved ICANN's obligation. So if we do work with the language, I don't think a significant change will be allowed, but a small change might be. I think we are trying to be loyal to the affirmation.

Susan Kawaguchi: And I'm not advocating for, you know, his point of view of not allowing - or not bringing it over, the affirmation of commitments, but I do think we, with some additional discussion with him, could sort of address his concerns, maybe not in our document. I mean I think we should be strong on that point, but maybe in the background just sort of settle him down again. Because this is a constant with him. But he also hasn't gained any traction, in my opinion, to push back and make it a true change, so. Let me see what I can do and come up with.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks, Susan. In the chat I've pasted the language we brought over from the affirmation for the Whois review, review number four. And what I pasted in the chat are the two paragraphs that Steve Crocker says shouldn't be there. But these paragraphs are the entire meat of what that affirmation review is about. So that's what we have to work with. There's no giant hurry on this. We have until the end of September to do it.

There are some like Avri Doria who are saying let's just punt this to Work Stream 2, but very few of us want to do that since we want to bring the affirmation over intact. If we have to tweak it in a certain way like you're discussing, then let's explore that. But thanks, Susan, for looking into that.

Susan Kawaguchi: All right.

Steve DelBianco: Elisa, I now have to drop but I'm going to hand the ball to Susan and Phil to handle channel two, which is on council as well.

Elisa Cooper: Thank you as always, Steve. Susan, Phil?

Philip Corwin: Yes I'm on. Susan, how did you want to proceed?

Susan Kawaguchi: Sorry, Phil. Go ahead.

Philip Corwin: Okay. There's not a whole lot. The last council meeting was the same day as the last BC call. There was some action items coming out of that meeting. One of them was on TLD auction proceeds, where stakeholder groups and constituencies are encouraged to provide input to the now active public comment forum.

One item which came up since the meeting that I forwarded to the BC was council received a letter from Steve Crocker to Jonathan Robinson advising him that on June 21 the NGPC met to further address the - an item from the Beijing communiqué GAC advice, the advice being for strings representing generic terms, exclusive registry access should serve a public interest goal.

And that letter - in that letter, the NGPC requested the GNSO to include the exclusive - issue of exclusive registry access for generic strings serving a public interest goal to take a look at that issue. So that's going to be on the council agenda.

The big issue for the BC and the entire commercial stakeholder group is that existing chairman, Jonathan Robinson, is term limited. There's going to be a new chair of the GNSO Council who will take his seat midway through the council meeting in Dublin. And the non-contracted side of the house needs to see if it can agree on a candidate to run for chair from the non-contracted side, as well as vice chair. So that's before us.

I should note also that the seat I'm filling my term expires. I was filling out the unexpired portion of (Gabby)'s term. Mine expires in October, so we're going to need an election to decide who fills that seat going forward from Dublin for the coming two years. And that's pretty much it for council. Did you have anything to add, Susan?

Susan Kawaguchi: No, I just think, you know, we should probably discuss the candidates a little bit because the candidates coming forward for the chair of the GNSO Council is, and I'm blanking on her last name, Heather...? I'm sorry.

Philip Corwin: (Heather Wilson)?

Man: Heather Forrest.

Susan Kawaguchi: Thank you, sorry. And then James Bladel has, you know, stated his interest to me at least in running for the registrar group. So those are the only two candidates I've heard of, and I mean obviously Heather Forrest would be - is the - from the IPC and, you know, that - we would have to decide to support her, which I think she would be a great candidate. But that looks like it may be the race right now, and it's just whether or not we could gain enough support.

And I also put my name forward for vice chair, not that I think that it's that important that I become vice chair, but I thought we should have a candidate. And if Heather was voted in, then I would assume we would not have, you know, we would not have a chair and a vice chair from the CSG. So, you know, we'll see how that plays out also.

David Fares: Susan, this is David. It's my understanding that the non-contracted party house is supposed to nominate both someone for chair and vice chair.

Susan Kawaguchi: Right. But I just think in the long run would we win both seats is what I was going for.

David Fares: Right, right, right.

Susan Kawaguchi: Right.

Philip Corwin: Right. On that, I think the prohibition is that the chair and vice chair can't be from the same constituency or stakeholder group. I'm not sure if it's stakeholder - we can check that out if there's restriction on it.

Susan Kawaguchi: Right. Well and, you know, it could be that, you know, if my name's put forward then that's like a throwaway, oh well, you know, we'll pull my nomination and, you know, but support Heather completely and see if that isn't a bid we could, you know, use for, you know, negotiation with the contracted parties house.

Elisa Cooper: All right. Anything else on council?

Philip Corwin: No I think that was it, but just to put everyone on notice that the other side of the house needs to nominate a candidate by September 25, which is some time but August goes fast. So it's on the radar screen now.

Elisa Cooper: Yes. Well thanks, Susan, thanks, Phil, as always. Nathalie, can you pull the agenda back up? I think next on the agenda is probably Jimson. So Jimson, over to you.

Jimson Olufuye: Okay. Can you hear me? Elisa, can you hear me?

Elisa Cooper: Yes, we can hear you.

Man: Yes we can.

Jimson Olufuye: Okay. So good day everyone. I'm in the room and the network may be a little unclear but bear with me. I'll give a brief report. One is that with respect to the FY '16 invoice from today, two, just to let us know that we are making progress with the process of registering the BC as a nonprofit organization to obtain tax ID and employee ID numbers required by a number of our members for use of processing the dues. So we are currently discussing with the law firm Greenberg & Lieberman, who has accepted to be our registered agent and the responsibility party on behalf with regard to filing an estimate of communication (unintelligible).

So ExCom is currently reviewing the terms and they will approve by the end of the week for us to proceed with the engagement. I would like to thank the finance committee, the members of the Finance Committee, Angie, Angie Graves, Chris Chaplow, for their support on this, and also appreciating Phil, Phil Corwin for his (unintelligible) on this matter going forward.

I will give you the opportunity to announce our Charter Review Committee that will be needed to update the charter to include provisions like delegate filing through the GNSO, to delegate filings, I beg your pardon, to delegate filing through the GNSO Council and also the BC designate an officer to whom the GNSO Council will answer to, and also that BC appoint the GNSO Council as the responsible party on bigger matters.

You can recall that we have to take this course because ICANN has declined a request for bank and invoicing support, so we needed to go this route. Inevitably we have been forced to take this route.

So the third point I want to mention is with regard with (unintelligible) coming up in (Dubock), South Africa, so it's still on schedule. And finally that members and associates for (unintelligible) main articles for ICANN's newsletter, they have till August 25 to do so. They have until August 25 to do so. So I don't know if there are questions for me on our engagement of legal counsel going forward. I know the matters have reached already. Thank you.

Back to you, Elisa.

Elisa Cooper: Thank you. Any questions for Jimson? Okay. I'll turn it over to David Fares.

Chris Chaplow: Elisa, Chris Chaplow here.

Elisa Cooper: Yes, hi, Chris.

Chris Chaplow: Not so much a question, just a comment and really to thank Jimson and Angie because this particular problem, i.e. the BC doesn't have any legal status other than mere mention in the ICANN bylaws, was one that I encountered right at the beginning of tenure as vice chair, and we looked to different options and none of them were easy, none of them - they were all expensive.

And, you know, I have to confess we sort of kicked the can down the road a bit with this one and what to do with it because it isn't easy. And just to thank Angie and Jimson.

And when the ExCom and the members review something that, you know, wow I didn't realize we sort of had this problem. I just want to underline yes I'm afraid the problem is there. This is a long-term solution, and I support Jimson and Angie and whoever on it. Thanks.

Elisa Cooper: Thank you, Chris. That's really helpful to have that background. Any questions for Chris? All right well I'd like to also thank the entire Financial Review Group as well. So thank you for all your work on this.

David, over to you. I think we may have covered much of what you wanted to talk about, but over to you.

David Fares: Actually we covered everything that I was going to talk about when we were talking about the council elections, so thank you.

Elisa Cooper: Okay. Fantastic. So I have a couple of items for any other business that I'll ask and see by a show of hands if there others that also have items for any other business to cover. Okay. So I had a couple of items. First, I did - we did have the standard SO/AC/SG team call, which, you know, occurs on a monthly basis with Fadi.

And the call was fairly noneventful. I think the big point that he was making on the call was that he felt that the IANA transition for the most part was on track. You know, I think the risks that, you know, he sees are, you know, if there were to be a major change to governance that that would, you know, could have a very negative on timing.

But assuming that doesn't occur, also, you know, he recognized that if something were to happen outside of ICANN politically, you know, if there was change with the US agreement to, you know, obviously relinquish the contract, which obviously the contract, obviously that would have, you know, that would, you know, be a major risk, but assuming that neither of those things happen, you know, he felt that things were fairly well on track.

Any questions about that? Another item for housekeeping. So we also need to appoint two members to the Nominating Committee, one for small business and one for big business. So (unintelligible) who has been our small business rep has agreed to continue on for another term. There's no one opposing or that is also interested in running for that small business seat at this time. I did ask for anyone that was interested if they let the list know by the end of the week.

Now for the big business seat, both (Lisa Ohall) from (GF Corp) and (Steve Coats) from Twitter have both expressed interest. So, you know, assuming there aren't any others by the end of the week, I think that we'll need to have an election to determine who should fulfill that role. So that's something we'll need to work on.

Any questions about that? Okay. And then I have a final piece of news, which is very difficult to share with you. That is that after 13 years I'm going to be leaving MarkMonitor, and so with that that means that I'll need to step down as the chair. And, you know, I'll leave it in the very capable of hands of the remaining ExCom leaders to decide how to move forward.

So they were notified yesterday of this. My last day will be the 21st, and, you know, I just want to thank everyone for all of your support over this time. It's been an incredible experience working with you and being part of ICANN. And I want to thank everyone. And again, you know, it's a very difficult decision for me but a new opportunity has presented itself and it's something I'm excited about. I full intend to join the BC once I'm settled in my new position.

So I know that's a lot of information, and I had to step away from my desk while I was sharing that with you. Not everyone here knows this information

yet. It'll be made publicly available - publicly known later today. But any questions about any of that?

David Fares: Elisa, this is David Fares. I don't have any questions. All I want to do is thank you very much for your dedication, for your camaraderie and for the professionalism with which you've held your position. It's been much, much appreciated.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: I completely agree with David. It's been a pleasure working with you.

Elisa Cooper: And I feel the same way, I really do. So I really, you know, like I said I appreciate all of the support, you know, we've had definitely over the last few years, a number of challenges, but, you know, I'm very proud of where we're at right now.

And I think the BC is respected, we've done a tremendous job, and a lot - I mean just so much kudos to obviously all the members and Steve DelBianco, who's not on this call to hear this since he had to leave early. But, you know, he's done a tremendous job, so I feel, you know, very proud for what we've done. And like I said, I'll be back. I'll be back.

Anything else from anyone? All right. So I think that kind of brings us to the end of our call. I'm sure you'll probably be hearing from me or the ExCom in terms of next steps for how we'll fulfill the position in the interim, because there's a few months left actually on the term anyway.

All right thank you so much everyone and I believe I'll be with you for one more call. So I look forward to speaking with you. And then like I said, I'll see you again after I'm settled. So thank you so much everyone. Have a great day.

Man: Thank you.

Woman: Thanks.

END