

ICANN

**Moderator: Gisella Gruber-White
July 23, 2015
10:00 am CT**

Coordinator: Recordings have started.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much (Jule). And good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody and welcome to the BC member's call on the 23rd of July 2015.

On the call today we have (Unintelligible), (Andy Abramson), Steve DelBianco, Elisa Cooper, Angie Graves, (Steve Post), (Kim Chen), Samantha Demetriou, (Angela Harris), Phil Corwin, (Paul Mitchell), (Bob Ruwana), (Narris Tulow), J. Scott Evans, Aparna Sridhar, Ron Andruff and Beth Allegretti. From staff we have myself, Nathaline Peregrine.

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

Elisa Cooper: Thank you, Nathalie, and want to thank everyone for joining today's call. A couple items that I want to cover before I ask if there are any other issues for AOB.

The first is, the executive committee is still trying to determine how to allocate some extra travel funds that we have just to let everyone know. The officers of the BC received travel funding but neither myself nor David Fares take the funding so there are some additional travel funds available for one person.

So I think there are a couple of people that have expressed interest in the executive committee will be meeting later today to discuss the best to allocate those.

Also, Fadi will be having as SOAC SGC leader call coming up. And of course, I'll report out on any information that is shared on that call. Are there any other items that folks would like to make sure that we cover on today's call? 'll take a queue. Okay, seeing none, actually I will turn it over to Steve so that we can dive into policies. Steve.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks, Elisa. I think this will be relatively brief because the policy calendar I sent around last night, I hope you all received it, reflects only a few open comments and we haven't found out anything new since the last.

So let's go right into the open public comment and we have for that are in front of us. The first is the draft review, the GNSO structural review, and I shouldn't say structural review. That maybe the point we made, is that it wasn't structural enough in terms of the review.

Now, what I had hoped to do is to take questions from members on this call and discuss it with the primary authors of this particular document. Now, the trick is that (Jay Scott), I think is in transit right now and not yet on voice.

(Laura) is not on the phone right now, not on the list at least. (Marie), you were very helpful so I'm glad you're here for this. So I would suggest we may have to defer the discussion of GNSO structural review until the second half of the call when (Jay Scott Everson) will be one.

Is that all right with everyone? Great. Let's go to the second one. The second is the release of country and territory names in four new gTLDs. One of them is an open. It's dot global.

Three of them are brands or dot brands. (Andy Abrams) at Google did a great job of repurposing previous comments he's drafted for us where the BC takes a strong support for dot brands having flexibility for country and territory names at the second level.

And a slightly more guarded level of an open door for the generics like dot global. That's the second attachment to the policy calendar that I sent last night. And I'd be happy to take a queue if anyone has the questions. (Andy)'s on the call as well with us and can help to talk through any questions.

I wasn't anticipating any since this is something we've covered before. Okay, fantastic. (Andy), thank you very much for doing that. In the next item on here was the translation and transliteration of contact info.

There were PDP recommendations for the board and the board is now in the formality of approving the PDP final recommendations. Those comments close on August 10th.

Now the BC, we've filed a PDP initial report back in February. Thanks to (Susan), (Alan), Steve and (Tim) for that. And we did not agree with the

primary conclusion of the final PDP which is ICANN is not going to require the translation of the WHOIS contact information at the point of (entry).

They're not going to require translation. And so we didn't agree with that. And on the last call two weeks ago, there was interest here on the BC. I remember (Steve Coats) speaking up about it - is that the BC submit a comment to the board reiterating our disagreement with the main conclusion, but then asking for something else.

And we started tossing the idea around that we would ask the board in the staff to do a review of this - of the effect of this policy after it were implemented.

So, for instance, so when you're after implementation we would ask staff to do an assessment of how many of the contact records had been translated successfully, and how was it working out, this voluntary ad hoc translation regime?

But I'd like to take a queue on any members of the BC who feel strongly and no a little bit more about this and can help us to draft what it is we're going to ask ICANN to review.

Again, this is any of you have had to dive into WHOIS information for whatever purposes and found that the contacts were any script other than ASCII our language other than the one you use, language other than say, English, or whatever it is that you use, and then you struggled to be able to translate a properly and be able to contact people. That's the main topic here.

(Steve Coats), are you on the call with us today? I think that's you. It says Steve right above my name. Okay, great. But Steve's not on audio but, Steve,

can I ask you to work with me on drafting what it is we won the board to review? You can answer in the chat.

Thank you Steve. Any other comments from BC members on this? Okay, seeing no hands, let me go to the next item. Thank you, Steve. Next, and the final item I had was that the replacement for WHOIS which has long been talked about as next generation registration directory services, and directory services might be a better way to think of it.

It was devised - some very extensive work by the expert working group, and Susan Kawaguchi, our counselor, did a fabulous job representing the BC interest on that. And they came up with a new design.

In the BC has commented three or four times on different iterations of the design for the replacement of WHOIS. So now we're about to start a preliminary issue report and work off of that to do a PDP to talk about replacing WHOIS with the new directory services.

Just to refresh your memory, it has multiple layers of requirements for what has to be disclosed about the WHOIS contact, the directory services contact. And there are even provisions in there that folks who need to protect their identities because of extensive political speech would be able to obtain waivers when they need to disclose.

Jimson, you and (Tim Chen) worked with (Susan) on that comment. And I'd like to ask whether I can turn to the three of you to help to come up with a comment on this preliminary draft report.

Now, we have a lot of time because it doesn't close until the 6th of September. So Jimson, (Tim), (Susan), looking to you first to see whether I can, and you to help.

Jimson Olufuye: Yes, this is Jimson. Absolutely, Steve.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Jimson. And (Tim), thank you, (Tim), in the chat. (Susan)'s not with the sat on the call. She might still be on the council call. I don't know for sure. Phil Corwin is on this call right now so maybe council is concluded.

All right, so Jimson and (Tim), thank you for your help on that. And the other BC members that think they can help the BC comments on the preliminary issues report for designing your replacement for WHOIS?

All right, thanks everyone. (Angie), your hand is up. Go ahead. Go ahead, (Angie). Okay, so (Angie), was that of volunteering or - fantastic. And (Steve Coats), too. That's great. Thanks everyone.

All right, that's it for the current open public comments. It's a relatively light load here late in the year. I'm glad for that. (Channel) two is about council. In the policy calendar we displayed some of the key motions that were going to be discussed today. And I put notes and there from Phil Corwin regarding that.

And I wonder if staff could display, in the Adobe window, the content of my policy calendar email while Phil leads us through channel two on the council. Over to you, Phil.

Phil Corwin: Thank you, Steve. Can you hear me okay?

Steve DelBianco: Yes we do.

Phil Corwin: Okay and I don't see that yet. Let me bring up your email which had that. Okay, yes, we approved the item four, the motion to approve GNSO review with the GAC communiqué from Buenos Aires.

This was - there was no controversy. It was simply a resolution to approve the review. But it's the review format where the GNSO is not both noting the content relevant to its work of the GAC communiqué and putting it out in the format with a notice and a note to what the GNSO has done or is doing on a particular item.

So - and then they sent it to the GAC. So it's a way to facilitate communication between the GNSO and the GAC on policy matters. And it was adopted without any dissent at all.

On the gTLD registration date of policy process, after the meeting which was very early this morning - it was 7:00 am Eastern Time, 4:00 am Pacific Time for (Susan) which may be why not on our call.

I didn't see you. The - I did circulate, after the call, there was a PowerPoint presentation from staff about that process going forward, so you all have that PowerPoint now. You can look at it at your leisure.

As Steve noted, we have until September to file a BC comment but this is a - when to be a PDP with a three phased multitrack process. And frankly, my own reaction in seeing all the different issue tracks was wondering how they'll ever find enough volunteers to do all this work.

Especially, it doesn't raise to the same level of general concern as the transition and accountability. But if it all goes right, it's going to take a couple of years to work out.

So it's - we're at the beginning of a very long process with this comment letter due in September. gTLD auction proceeds, it's really - we're in the process stage of putting out a - moving forward to develop a process which will then consider potential uses.

So that's another one that's just getting started and it's going to take quite a while. It's premature to even talk about potential uses of the funds. Right now, we're putting together the process which allows the community to consider all those auction proceeds will be utilized.

And it's going to, frankly, in timing, take a backseat to some of the accountability stuff and all that is worked out because both the community and staff are overloaded.

On the term - on the council chair election, there was a display - a draft staff outline of the process which I copied from the screen and circulated after this morning's call to everybody in the BC.

And the key thing is that each house must nominate - Jonathan Robinson is (term) limited. He must roll off. Each house must nominate a candidate for chair by September 25th.

The actual election will be by the council members at the council election in Dublin - the council meeting in Dublin in October. As for the vice-chairs, they can stay the same. That's up to each house. Each house appoints its vice-chairs for a one-year period.

Really caveat would be that if one of the vice-chairs is, you know, nominated and elected to be chair, he can no longer be vice chair. And if one of the vice-chairs is from the same stakeholder group is the new chair, they'd have to be replaced because the council charter forbids, both the chair and the vice chair being from the same stakeholder group.

So we have that ahead. I don't know if - I guess David Fares is not on our call today but hopefully we'll get a report from him by email as to what the CSG is thinking in terms of (coalescing) on a candidate and outreach to other members of the non-contracted party house because, particularly with lots of people off in August, probably will happen is people on focus on this until after Labor Day and then there will be a rush to figure out what the house - the non-contracted house wants to do about the candidate.

And then, yes, the privacy proxy service group, I'm on that working group as some other BC members. There was a massive influx of comments on that, the second-largest in ICANN history. Second only to the comments filed by conservative groups on the triple X domain years ago.

Most of them were generated by a campaign opposing any exposure of hidden data by anything other than a court order or similar legal process. The working group has not yet decided how to evaluate all those comments but they have decided that the massive influx of comments is going to require an extension of the timeline which will delay filing a final report until after the Dublin meeting.

So they have not yet decided whether they want a full or half-day meeting on the Friday before the Dublin meeting to consider where things are at, at that

point, which should be finished evaluating the input and working on the final report.

But they are the group that, if there is a pre-Dublin meeting for any working group, they will be the working group that gets that slots. They're going to have to decide soon.

One other issue that I reported on this morning concerning a working group I co-chair, it's the working group on (curative) rights protections for international, intergovernmental organizations.

That's - there've been some new developments very recently, as of yesterday, on that. That working group was making good prog- great progress and was getting close to completion but really couldn't reach final conclusions without some access to expert legal advice on the current consensus view within the world of what is the scope of sovereign immunity for IGOs.

Because that affects critical components as to the appeals process for curative rights protection which could be the UDRP and URS, or then with some modification, or new one.

We've been unable to get that advice. ICANN is trying to identi- ICANN staff are trying to identify candidates but we're not going to be able to get funding for that until the new fiscal year. And then just yesterday - Melanie find this.

Just yesterday the working group was made aware of the July 20th letter and I can share this if BC members are interested, from the head of the OECD to Fadi Chehadé.

There was a meeting in Paris last week, just before the ones on accountability, attended by the OECD, by Chris Disspain of the board, (Tom Schneider), chair of the GAC, and some - the WIPO and some UN representatives and ICANN staff.

And they're proposing to move forward expeditiously with the OECD and its IGO colleagues working with Chris Disspain, the GAC and ICANN staff to draft a comprehensive proposal on IGO protections for GNSO consideration.

Now, frankly, the IGOs have been completely non-cooperative with the group - working group I'm chairing. And when members of my working group saw this letter, frankly, they feel that the board may be trying to work with a GAC a political solution which goes beyond new TLDs and which basically goes around are working group, which has been bogged down by lack of access, to legal expertise.

And there's great concern about that. Petter Rindforth and I, for the co-chairs of the working group, are supposed to be on a call with these other folks who met in Paris, next week, to get greater detail on their plan.

But I did report on that and Jonathan Robinson expressed some concern. So this may be another area where we're seeing the board and staff working in a way to create policy which is not consistent with the bylaws or procedure for making policy and we'll see what develops.

But I wanted to highlight that since I had reported on it on the council call just two hours ago. That is my report on council. If anybody has any questions on that and - other than that, Steve, are you going to report separately on what happened in Paris on accountability?

Steve DelBianco: I will.

Phil Corwin: Okay. I have another question on that but I'll wait until your report on that to question - I raised during the call this morning when Thomas Rickert reported on that - on those developments. So does anyone have any questions regarding anything I just went through?

Steve DelBianco: Phil, it's Steve.

Phil Corwin: Yes, Steve.

Steve DelBianco: Yes, quick question. With respect to the GNSO council, reaction to the GAC communiqué from when sorry, is this really just a courtesy where we'll acknowledge receipt or did the council literally dive in and make any substantive observations about GAC advice?

Phil Corwin: Well, that's actually the question I raised on the call where, they somewhat Thomas said, he said that it was undecided whether the GAC would remind advisory or what have a voting role on accountability measures.

And I asked whether that would have, you know, whether that would be consistent with the NTIA principles that governments being strictly advisory role and not having any ability to capture ICANN.

He noted a US government input which he portrayed as being comfortable with that potential GAC role. But that's, in fact, the question I wanted to raise with you.

Steve DelBianco: All right. Thanks, Phil. I'd be glad to get into that now. On the policy calendar, it's under channel 4, where I put a sentence or two about this ICANN

accountability cross community working group, and that Friday and Saturday in Paris, for a face-to-face meeting, to try to drive to the finish line and get a second draft of the accountability enhancements proposal out by the end of July.

I'm pretty confident we'll do that. I just got off a two hour call. We're working on that. I'll try to answer Phil's question about the particulars of government engagement in Paris.

It was certainly focusing all of us. There were several GAC reps there including the GAC chair, (Thomas Schneider). Initially, they get a little bit wrapped around the axle (over) stress test 18.

And just to summarize, stress test 18 says the GAC can, at any time, change its voting procedures from the current full consensus is something else, like simple majority.

And we - I think the BC first identified that stress test and suggested that we needed to modify the bylaws slightly so that only GAC consensus advice would get this extra special consideration from the ICANN board.

And by that I mean the article in the current bylaws says that if the board receives GAC advice of any kind, that the GAC is obligated to try and find a mutually acceptable solution.

ICANN doesn't have that same obligation for any other advisory committee or stakeholder organization advice. It's a special deference to the GAC on matters of public policy.

And all we are doing to respond to stress test 18 is to insert the words in the bylaws that say that when GAC advice had consensus in the GAC, well then, ICANN has the application to try and find a mutually acceptable solution.

It simply provides a carrot to the GAC that - for advice, they want that special deference. They should be sure that it's consensus advice. They're free to change their voting rules to simple majority anytime they want but only consensus advice would receive this kind of deference.

So that - I honestly believe that the GAC reps at the meeting and the GAC Chair, I have to believe they simply misunderstand the impact of this change because it doesn't tell the GAC what to do at all. But I'm starting to believe that they understand it perfectly well and that many GAC members want to deviate from consensus, and they'd love to move to something like simply majority. And if they did, well, they'd still think that ICANN has to defer and try to find a new acceptable solution.

So this is a real impasse at the CCWG in Paris. And the impasse was broken when the representative of NTIA reiterated what they've said twice before in writing. And they said they don't want to mince the IA's requirements for this transition is that governments not have a significantly expanded role in ICANN policymaking. And they regard Stress Test 18 in our bylaws proposed change as essential to meet that requirement.

So NTIA is sort of for the last time in the driver's seat on what does and does not meet the requirements. And they spoke up and went on record one more time, but that's a requirement.

So that ended that conversation, so the GAC moved on to other concerns they have such as whether an independent review would stop ICANN from accepting GAC Advice that violated the bylaw.

You would have thought this was already in the bylaws, but it isn't. So we are tightening up the bylaws to suggest that ICANN has a rather limited mission and that it can't exceed the mission. There's a handful of other changes that have circulated to you before; we commented on them on the first draft.

But we are trying to provide an opportunity for ICANN's Board to turn to the GAC and say, "The reason we can't accept this or that advice is that it's in violation of our bylaws.

If the Board didn't do that, the community could mount an IRP, Independent Review Panel, and the standard of review would simply be to look at the bylaws themselves and see if the decision to accept that advice violated the bylaws.

An example might be something where the GAC imposed a new policy requirement on the operation of TLDs and there was no bottom-up consensus policy from GNSO to derive that implementation. And that would violate a bylaw's requirement for bottom-up multistakeholder process of developing policy and implementation. So that's just an example. And I think we're going to prevail on that one was well.

And I don't know Phil, to your question, about whether the GAC is going to participate in the new voting powers that we've given to the community. It may take the GAC several months to figure that out.

In the CCWG we are trying to say that the GAC is another stakeholder; they are a multiple equal stakeholder. So we are offering them the same opportunity to participate in these community powers as any other AC and SO.

It may be that they cannot do so and they may step back from that, but it's not because the CCWG excluded the GAC; it's because the GAC excluded themselves.

The US Government expressed a written preference that the GAC not participate in the voting. But believe me that does not rise to the level of an NTIA requirement for the transition. It is a preference of the USG and they expressed it in writing but didn't say much while we were in Paris.

So I'll stop there and see if anyone has any questions about where we are in the CCWG.

Ron Andruff, go ahead.

Ron Andruff: Thanks Steve, thanks for that report.

You talked about the GAC consensus change and you said that, in the discussions you were having, there seemed to be some appetite by some nations.

Who was driving that? Are we talking about the USG or are we talking about the European Commission, large blocks or people who control large blocks of votes, or is it just another nation? I'm just trying to get a sense of that and then I have a follow-on if you might answer that.

Steve DelBianco: Yes the three governments who spoke up in France against Stress Test 18 were France, Switzerland, Spain, but also the GAC Chair, but not speaking for the GAC, only speaking for himself.

Ron Andruff: Okay so that's helpful to know just who's driving that and where that's coming from. Because I think, as you I think pointed out as well, that would be bylaw changes that they would have to go through and a number of changes that would have to be implemented.

I'm just wondering is there any other mechanism that you see as, you know, having inside eyes that could be applied to that to, you know, take that fear away because the GAC have been - it's always been about full consensus, and that was where they had their power in their discussions and their arguments. It's frustrating as it is to them as it is to us and we're trying to find a way. But at the end of the day, governments all agreed within the GAC that they would do this on full consensus.

So my question is do you have any other like silver bullet that might solve that problem if there was a change? Any thoughts on that?

Steve DelBianco: Yes, the challenge would be waiting until the GAC changes their operating procedures and then trying to react by changing the ICANN bylaws. I believe that would be very confrontational and difficult to do, and that's why the CCWG is proposing this one-sentence bylaws change now.

And it doesn't have any impact on the GAC because today, as you point out Ron, today the GAC operates on full consensus. What we're doing is recognizing in the bylaws that ICANN's obligation to try and work out a mutually acceptable solution has always been for advice that came from the

GAC with full consensus. It's just that the words in the bylaws didn't say consensus; they simply said GAC Advice.

Ron Andruff: Right.

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: We tried to put that word in their now. I don't see a way - and again, we're making many changes to the bylaws as part of the CCWG enhancements, and this is one of the more minimal changes to the bylaws. And this is the time to get all that implemented because we have the leverage and the opportunity of the transition to do it in.

Ron Andruff: Well that's very helpful and I agree. And actually just one footnote on all these many bylaws changes.

As you know, we had the Board Governance Committee came back with a report probably about a year ago now on they thought that there was changes that should be made to the Nominating Committee. And clearly it was roundly rejected by the community.

But there were two things that we felt were valuable and they required a bylaws change. And that would be that the members sitting on the Nominating Committee would sit for two years and the Chair would sit for two years so that we would be able to capitalize on the experience gained as opposed to just losing this experience year-after-year with just a one-year appt.

So I'm not sure if there's any discussion about that within your dialogue at the CCWG level.

Steve DelBianco: There is not; there is not. It's not part of the CCWG. It would be essential to the transition so it's probably going to be deferred to what we call Work Stream 2 which is the post-transition.

Ron Andruff: Okay, very good. Thanks very much. We appreciate it.

Steve DelBianco: You're welcome Ron. We have many NomCom members, Avri and Cheryl and others who are all very active on the CCWG. But they did not insert that particular item into the Work Stream 1.

Chris Wilson.

Chris Wilson: Thanks Steve; appreciate it. And thanks for the report.

I hope you give us a state-of-play on two, I guess, proposals we made on BC comments on the initial proposal. One being adding the jurisdictional issue as a fundamental bylaw Article 18, making that a fundamental bylaw which I think has been not accepted at least at this point, and then also the BC proposal to add additional bylaw on transparency regarding ICANN interactions with government officials, et cetera.

Where are we on that particular proposal? Has that been dropped? Accepted?
Where are we on those two things?

Steve DelBianco: Thank you Chris. So the first one was whether or not Article 18 of the current bylaws would become a fundamental bylaw. Article 18 is a requirement in today's bylaws that ICANN shall have its headquarters in California.

There's one other element which is that the Articles of Incorporation for ICANN say that ICANN is a California corporation.

The public comment on the question of whether we needed also to make Article 18 fundamental was evenly split with three governments and another individual on one side, and on the public comment side the BC, MPAA, USCIB and the IPC were the only commenters who supported making it fundamental.

The current - given that it's a split and substantial opposition, the current thinking in the CCWG is that there's substantial opposition to that there's not likely to be a requirement that Article 18 be fundamental.

I'm currently drafting that text and I'm seeking clarification from the lawyers who were serving us -- the independent lawyers -- that it changed to the Articles of Incorporation is equivalent to a fundamental bylaw.

Let me explain Chris. The fundamental bylaw provision would be that a change would require the approval of community member as opposed to a regular bylaw where a change could be blocked by the community. So one is positive approval and the other is the opportunity to block.

But the Articles of Incorporation under California law would require two-thirds Board approval and two-thirds community approval to make a change.

So Chris, what this effectively means if I can verify that from the attorneys is that we effectively get the same thing as fundamental bylaw treatment, because to change the Articles of Incorporation, it can't be done without two-thirds of the community mechanism; that's two-thirds of the ACs and SOs approving the decision. And that's exactly the same protection we would get if it were a fundamental bylaw.

So I'm pending to get some verification on that, and if that's the case I would feel as if we would have gotten the protection we wanted because I can't drive it through, even though it's a BC initiative I can't drive it through in the face of split and public comments on that.

Chris, anything more you want to add? And then I'll go to your second question.

Chris Wilson: No, that's helpful; I appreciate that insight. Thanks Steve.

Steve DelBianco: All right, as to the second question, the BC was the only entity who asked - I will check this; there may have been a few more - but pushed for this notion of transparency about the corporations' interactions with governments.

When I did bring it up on CCWG interactions, there was immediate reaction from the Co-Chairs that we ought to defer it to Work Stream 2 in a post-transition environment as something we would do, and there was also a press to do it in the first ATRT; that is the Accountability Transparency Review Team.

So the first ATRT that would convene after the transition would have this on their agenda and could make the recommendation that it be implemented in the bylaws. If ICANN Board declined to make that change, the community is able to override the Board's decision through an IRP because if the community wants that in the bylaws, the Board cannot stand in our way.

So that's a long-winded answer Chris to say that it's likely to be post-transition, and it likely be part of an ATRT. And the reason for that was the lack of a broad support for that idea on the CCWG.

Any more on that?

Chris Wilson: No, that's helpful; thank you.

Steve DelBianco: At this point, we are cramming to get the minimum amount of things that we need to give the community the powers in Work Stream 1, and we're less than I think seven days away from publishing our second draft for public comment.

Things that the BC feels we didn't get in the second draft we will continue to hammer at them in the second round of public comments. I don't think we'll see significant huge changes to the proposal, but we definitely can insert and reiterate our concerns in the second round of public comment.

All right, thank you. I don't see any other questions on that so now we're going to turn back to the comment we skipped earlier, and this was the public comment on the GNSO restructuring.

Susan Kawaguchi, J. Scott Evans, Laura Covington have done heroic work on this -- Marie Pattullo as well -- at coming up with a draft statement for the BC.

Now these comments are due on the 24th of July; that's tomorrow. So what I'd like to do is to give J. Scott an opportunity to talk us through the draft; I distributed it last night with the policy calendar. You've all had it in your hands for almost two weeks. And then I will bring it up in the Chat window while J. Scott is talking and we'll take a queue because this is the last chance for BC Members to ask questions or make suggestions because we're going to finalize it tomorrow.

J. Scott, are you on the audio and can you walk us through?

J. Scott Evans: I am. Can you hear me?

Steve DelBianco: We do. Thank you.

J. Scott Evans: Okay, well as you all know, we have circulated I think two drafts of a proposed draft statement or comment from the Business Constituency to the consultants and to ICANN about the GNSO Review.

We divided the comment into two sections. The first section in the opening section basically deals with the fact that, as we have publically stated when we had our meetings with Westlake, we are disappointed and do not believe that the draft report goes far enough because it doesn't consider the changes -- the structural changes -- that occurred in the last - after the last review. And we believe that this is a great weakness in the report.

And we close that section by asking for a review because as you'll see here - I don't know if you can move this down, but the Board Resolution talks about looking at structure to deal with the particular structure. And they didn't do that. So that's what we pointed out and we say that they need to do a structural review in order to align the draft report with what was called for in the Board Resolution. And the Board Resolution you will see from September 28, 2013, the center of the screen in the Adobe Connect room right now.

I also want to thank Aparna from Google who supplied a great many comments to assist us in refining that original draft.

And so then we go in, you know, and actually deal with specific recommendations. And I want to give a great shout out to Marie who was the permanent (sic) drafter of this particular section.

And in that section we grouped them dramatically according to the way that they were grouped in the section of the report which talked about how they grouped things in that way. And so that's what we've done.

And we just went through the recommendations generally, and it's a little wordy because you actually have to refer to those recommendations in order to comment on them.

Generally, we're fairly supportive of most of the recommendations although we're pointing out in many points some of those things we have questions and queries with regards to the efficacy of some of those things that have been suggested.

So - I mean we've put this altogether. It's been circulating now I think for about 3-1/2, 4 weeks it's been considered and we need to just wrap it up. The latest version that was circulated yesterday with the policy calendar incorporates the comments we've received over the last few weeks, and we believe, you know, we've just need the BC to let Steve know that this is in order so that he can finalize the last red lines and get it into appropriate format for submission tomorrow.

I do know that to date I think only one comment has been filed although I did see a lot of movement yesterday saying that a lot of groups plan to file their comments tomorrow.

Any questions?

Steve DelBianco: J. Scott, thanks for the walk-through. You've all had this draft. I'll take a quick queue if anyone has questions or comments.

Today's the 23rd. Let's go till midnight UTC today for anything else that comes in by email, and then tomorrow I will format it in the BC style and have it submitted to ICANN.

And let me just thank again J. Scott, Aparna, Laura Covington and Marie. You guys have done a great job on this drafting and we truly appreciate it.

Alright with that Elisa, let me conclude the policy segment of the call and turn it back over to you.

Elisa Cooper: Thank you Steve and thanks to everyone for their continued support. I think it's a tremendous effort and I really appreciate it.

Actually at this point I'll turn it over to Jimson for an update on Finance and Operations.

Jimson Olufuye: Thank you Elisa. I'd also like to join you and appreciate the (unintelligible) and all (unintelligible) of the excellent (unintelligible).

Very briefly, I'd like to report on the Operation Membership and Outreach and the upcoming ICANN54 Newsletter that you see.

Firstly on Operations, we are still awaiting ICANN's assessment for the (unintelligible) (unintelligible). But in the meantime, we have (unintelligible) contractual that will handle the year-round invoicing process as (Unintelligible) approved. So probably the next two to three you will get notifications.

Secondly, except of the notification of the (Prob) Program which I mentioned on the last call, all the FY16 budget (unintelligible) were approved (unintelligible) for policy assistance for this call that meets in Singapore.

For new members, I'm happy to inform you that we have three new members; (Mr. Asocio). That is (Asio Isonio Completing Industry) organization (Unintelligible). You can recall that we did invite the second general to join us in Singapore.

Also BF Corporation USA and (Unintelligible) of Brazil has also joined us.

And then we got to Outreach. We'd like to thank the Outreach Committee and the remarks telling (Unintelligible) for their work concerning the Outreach Committee. They've approved the conduct of an Outreach in (Unintelligible). This outreach is done (unintelligible) in conjunction with (Unintelligible). And that is scheduled for September 1 to 3 2015; September 1-3 of 2015 we will be conducting the BC Outreach along with the (Unintelligible) in (Unintelligible).

And lastly, so we have started a process of committing materials for ICANN54 this newsletter. So this is (unintelligible) for all members, (unintelligible) related to ICANN and the (unintelligible) in particular.

So I'd like to thank all those who contributed to our (unintelligible) newsletters; the Chair, the counselors and our policy chief (unintelligible). So thank you all very much for your articles I'm expecting for the next edition of our newsletter.

So that is just briefly from me. Over to you Elisa. Elisa?

Elisa Cooper: I'm sorry. Yes, thank you Jimson. So I think that probably covers it for today. I know that David was unable to join us. Are there any other topics that members would like to raise on today's call?

All right, seeing none, I want to thank everyone for joining the call today. Again, really appreciate everyone's participation. I feel really great about where we're at and all the work that's being done.

So thank you so much everyone. We'll see you again in two weeks and look forward to speaking with you all on the list. Thank you so much and have a great day.

Man: Thank you.

END