

ICANN

**Moderator: Nathalie Peregrine
January 27, 2016
10:00 am CT**

Coordinator: Recordings have been started. You may now begin.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you ever so much, (Elmer). Good morning, good afternoon and good evening everybody, and welcome to the BC members call on the 4th of September, 2015.

On the call today we have Jimson Olufuye, Andy Abrams, Ron Andruff, Steve DelBianco, Ellen Blackler, Susan Kawaguchi, David Fares, Phil Corwin, Beth Allegretti, and Barbara Wanner, Laura Covington, and (unintelligible) (Hall) has just joined the audio bridge.

We received no apology for today's call. And from staff we have Robert Hogarth and 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, Phil.

Phil Corwin: Yeah, good morning, everyone, at least it's morning in Washington. I'm going to get started here on the first item is - well I'm having trouble getting into the chat room but I'll be there in a moment. Just want to welcome everyone and

mention one item, which is that there is, within the CSG planning going on for an intercessional, which it appears will be in late January or somewhere between late January and mid-February. The location has not been set yet.

I'm monitoring this along with David Fares and Chris Wilson of 21st Century Fox has volunteered to kind of be point man for the constituency on just watching the details. But I'll be backing him up as will be David. And we'll keep you all informed as we get more details on that and we'll get your feedback on that. So

And again, I'm having a computer issue. What's our next agenda item? As I wait to get in the Adobe.

Steve DelBianco: Councilor elections.

Phil Corwin: Oh yes, yes. Yes, thank you, Steve. Want to remind everyone that next Tuesday a one-month period opens for Council elections. This is for the seat that I presently occupy. As you recall, I was elected to replace Gabriella when she resigned. And that was for the remainder of the one-year period for that seat. So you received a separate email on that. The nominations period opens next Tuesday for two weeks.

And if you have any questions just refer to the email that you received on that. Following the two week nomination period there'll be a one-week period in which candidates can provide statements and there will be a call with candidates and then there'll be a one-week election period. And that covers that.

What's our next item, Steve?

Steve DelBianco: Policy.

Phil Corwin: Policy. Yes, this should be an interesting conversation, Steve, I know there may be some updates on the regular issues but the main issue for the BC to start discussing is what's happened this week with the Jones Day memo and particularly the board CCWG - the three-hour call that was held on Wednesday evening, which I was on and Steve was on and other BC members. And trying to figure out where things go from here. So go ahead, Steve.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks, Phil. It's - as chair it's your prerogative but I did want to suggest that we have five comments due within the next eight days, all of which are circulating for member review. And I spent several hours yesterday reconciling all of the different comments and edits on them. That's quite a bit to get through in 20 minutes if we were to use more than - more than five minutes just to talk about one of those five comments, the CCWG on Accountability.

So my recommendation, and of course glad to do whatever you wish, but my recommendation is to go through in order the policy calendar so that we can quickly understand how close we are to final approval on five of those comments. Is that all right with you?

Phil Corwin: That's fine, Steve. Go ahead.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks, Phil. The first one, everyone, is the next generation registration directory services. This is the visionary effort to replace Whois. It's Item 1 on the policy calendar and it was the very first attachment that I sent with the policy calendar last night. Andy, you're on the call, Susan, Ellen, you guys have all been really helpful on this.

And it was a bit of a challenge to try to pull together comments that some of you put into the document, comments and questions, but I did my best. I think that this first attachment still needs a little bit of clarity because, Ellen, you and Susan, had comments and questions in the document that still need to be resolved.

If you open the document, and if you're using Word or if you're online, you'll be able to see those comments and questions. They show up as highlighted areas. You have to hover over the particular item to see the comment itself.

I would Susan and Ellen it would use too much time to do it entirely on this call, since there are several questions in there. Susan and Ellen, could I just ask that perhaps even over the weekend just spend a little bit of time seeing if your comments have been addressed with the edits that are made. And if not turn your comments into some text that's in the document as opposed to a comment that's hidden in Word.

And I see - thank you, Ellen, appreciate that. Because this comment is due the 6th of September, right, that's this Sunday. I'm traveling later today but tomorrow I'll be able to look at it late tomorrow night. I don't want to just disregard the comments and questions that Ellen and Susan put into the document, but I don't treat them the same as if they were track changes, embedded text, right?

So in many cases the comments are you sharing some misgivings or general thoughts but you haven't taken it to the level of editing the document. And that sort of leaves me in limbo. Okay? Thank you, Ellen and Susan. I appreciate that. Any other comments from members of the BC on replacement for Whois? Okay, thanks again, Andy, Susan and Ellen.

The second one, it's the second attachment. Is the initial report on the use of data metrics for policymaking. The BC's been a big leader in the use of fact-based and it was gratifying to see that Angie put together an initial draft and then Andy and Tim Cheng quickly came back with substantive edits. I think this one looks good and is ready to go. Is there any objections to the second attachment being ready to go? Fantastic. I think this is the clean one for us.

Let me go to the third. The third which is Attachment Number 3, is the IANA stewardship transition proposal. And this one is extremely difficult. And we have gone back and forth over the way to phrase certain concerns that we wanted to express to raise questions about things like post-transition IANA, root zone management.

And we're currently at about six pages of a comment. You know, hats off to Aparna, Andy, Steve Coates, Ellen Blackler, and Andrew. All of you have done a great job on this. Now Claudia and Eric from AT&T also added some edits, which I've put it in there.

And then I circulated some suggestions for top level paragraphs there were no objections, so I added those as well. So right now this is close to being ready and it's due on the 8th of September. Right, so that's Tuesday.

There isn't too much time left on this one. So I'm happy to take a queue. Are there any questions from members of the BC? And again, this is on the IANA stewardship combined proposal. One of the dilemmas we had is that the BC is confused about the separation process, if there should be a separation of the IANA naming functions from ICANN at some point in the future how would that go, who would put together the working group.

Well I'm here to tell you that we're not the only ones that are confused. There is nobody who can explain how that is supposed to work. And there was a situation that Andrew Harris identified where gosh the ICG was assuming CCWG would handle it, and CCWG was deferring to ICG. So long and short of it is the BC is suggesting that it's really not desirable to go to separation, it's certainly a last resort.

And we'd much rather see disciplinary action taken on ICANN rather than put the IANA functions up for grabs since if you toss that ball up in the air, folks, there's lots of people from the United Nations I think will try to get in there and grab it too. Do I see any hands or comments on the stewardship proposal? Great, thank you.

I'll go to Number 4 which is the searchable Whois. This was a fun one to do I think because it's the first time we've discussed this with respect to a closed dotBrand TLD where they have Whois but they don't want to keep the searchable aspect open since all of their second level domains would be corporately controlled elements within the Sharp brand. They might be geographic, product line, who knows how they want to do their second level. But they're all controlled by and the principle registrant of record is going to be Sharp.

So Andy Abrams, thank you for a great job on circulating a draft. Marilyn Cade commented generally that we shouldn't go there but a number of you pushed back on that. So thanks anyway, Marilyn.

And then Chris Wilson made some edits and worked out a compromise that's in the fourth attachment. Now Chris and Andy, your back and forth in email wasn't reflected in the document. So I did my best to turn your compromise text into language. So let me please ask you to open that fourth attachment

and you'll see the paragraphs at the top. This is only a one-page comment, folks, so please do open it.

And, Andy, what do you think? Did we get to what you and Chris were working out here?

Andy Abrams: Hi, Steve. This is Andy. I'm looking at it right now as we speak. Let's see, I think the area where we had some back and forth was regarding the benefit of searchable Whois.

Steve DelBianco: That's right. It's the first and second paragraph under searchable Whois not necessary for a close (unintelligible).

Andy Abrams: Yes, I'm fine with it.

Steve DelBianco: Oh awesome. Okay great. And David, you're on the line but Chris isn't so if...

((Crosstalk))

David Fares: Yeah, just reading it now.

Steve DelBianco: Okay great. Thanks, David. And, David, I'm happy to wait until after the call if you want to bring Chris Wilson back into this. And if there's any questions about it we can work it out. This one is due the 11th of September so we have a little bit more time, okay?

David Fares: Okay. Yeah, great. Thanks. He's traveling today but that'd be great.

Steve DelBianco: Okay.

Beth Allegretti: Hi, this is Beth Allegretti. There was some comment that Sharp is - hadn't signed their Spec 13 that they're not a brand yet.

Steve DelBianco: Could you check on that too and if so we'll add it to the comments.

Beth Allegretti: Yeah.

Steve DelBianco: I think we would still stand on the principles that Chris and Andy worked out, right, but we could do a caveat to say in no event should they be given this RCEP until they've signed the Spec.

Beth Allegretti: Okay.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you for pointing that out. I hadn't realized it.

Beth Allegretti: Sure.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks, Beth. Okay Number 5 on here is the proposed bylaws amendment. I had asked Zahid to help with that. I did not hear back. So that is one we are probably not going to file on. We had already endorsed and supported the initial recommendations. This was just the proposed final recommendations. I don't think it's necessary for us to comment again.

All right let me quickly get to Number 6. And finally, Phil, I guess for the - I get to the item but I think I've left plenty of time for us to dive into this for your request. So Number 6 on the policy calendar, and it's attachment Number 5, is the current draft of the BC's comments on the big Cross Community Working Group's second draft for enhancing ICANN's accountability.

And all of you on the phone are pretty experienced in these matters so you understand this is sort of our leveraged opportunity through the transition to ensure that when the US government is gone how is it that the community can question and challenge the ICANN corporation and hold it accountable to bylaws that limit ICANN's mission and require policy development and implementation to be bottom up.

So many of our frustrations with ICANN over the past decade have bubbled to the surface and they have their last chance to try to seek a permanent or long-term structural remedy to keep the corporation aligned with the community. And that's a sentiment that I honestly believe that even the board shares with us. And yet all the difference is in how we get there. So back and forth that's gone on in the BC has actually been really helpful.

We have focused in the BC on what seems like are relatively small point but it is vital to the BC and it's the question whether if we limit ICANN's mission rather tightly, we reiterate that ICANN's not supposed to be regulating the content of domains. We require that everything be supported from a bottom up processes and we say all that and then we turn around and realize that right now we expect ICANN to enforce UDRP, URS. We expect it to enforce Whois. We expect them to enforce contracts with the new gTLD contract and public interest commitments that are voluntarily made by registries.

And then you scratch you head and say, well what if five years from now, three years from now ,someone challenges those particular enforcement actions and they say, wait a minute, that's outside the mission or those weren't supported from a bottom up process.

And technically they'd have a case to make. And the good news for us is this wasn't even speculative. Danielle Kale and David Post with the New America

Foundation had submitted two stress tests that I was - I'm the stress test author on the CCWG.

And those stress tests pointed out very clearly that their intention was to see whether those could be blown up, whether the enforcement of the RAA and the enforcement of PIC SPECS could be exploited in the independent review process. So, look, this is an important issue. And yet the BC doesn't have to resolve it be all and end all in this comment. We can continue to beat the drum over resolving the ambiguity that is buried in the bylaws that are being proposed.

So if you open that document - and I'm watching for a queue because I'm happy to have anybody at all comment on this. If you open that document again it's the fifth attachment on the second draft proposal. One of the first things we'll do is ask Ellen to look at the red text that's right down there on Page 4, Ellen, to see whether I guess faithfully translated the email that you sent around suggesting, you know, stepping back at a higher level.

And Ellen, in the chat, you've indicated yes you like it. Well thank you, Ellen, for that. I realize that only about four BC members had commented affirmatively to Ellen's text. And I do want to hear from Chris and David since you guys had preferred something a little bit stronger in the other direction.

But I do think Ellen has come up with something that will definitely make the point to the CCWG that there's ambiguity and it needs to be resolved. That was on Page 4.

David Fares: This is David.

((Crosstalk))

David Fares: I think we can live with that. But, again, Chris is traveling and he's really doing - taking the lead on it. But I think initial thoughts are that it works.

Steve DelBianco: Okay thanks, David. As you know we went back and forth over whether enforcing a contract does it necessarily or not necessarily imply the regulation of content. I keep bringing this up, David, on the CCWG calls. And there are some who say, look, we've already resolved that. Contract enforcement is not regulation. And so I'll push back and say well who says that? Where do we point to a black and white letter that says that?

And Becky Burr is a brilliant lawyer with huge experience and I trust every word she says. But she won't be around to say we went through that and it's not a problem. Need to have it in writing and we need to have this ambiguity worked out. So appreciate everybody paying attention to that.

There's only one other area in this comment that I updated in the document I sent around last night. If you're able to scroll to Page 4 - sorry, Page 6 - you'll see some red text there where we had teed up this ball on Whois, right? The Affirmation of Commitments has a Whois review done every three years. And Susan Kawaguchi, you were the lead for CSG on the first review, and part of the BC's recommendations for this transition was to bring all of those reviews from the Affirmation and put them in ICANN's bylaws.

Because the Affirmation of Commitments under Stress Test 14 could disappear any time ICANN wanted to walk away from it. And if they didn't have to retain the IANA contract with NTIA I highly doubt they would stay in the Affirmation for long.

So while pouring over the review for Whois we really struck a nerve with Steve Crocker who suggested that the Whois text in the Affirmation was destructive, dangerous and could really be disruptive to ICANN. So we relaxed and say, okay give us your next text. And that's what's in red on Page 6. I think it was a pleasant surprise. The board did not come back and gut the Whois review. And frankly did not make a substantial change to what we had proposed.

The only difference that I've noted, which is in the final paragraph in red, is that the board is suggesting we return to a five year window from the date the board took action on the previous review. But I think we need to start that window based on the date the previous review was convened. If you wait until the board took action, Susan will correct me on this, but I think it took a year for the first Whois review and for the board to take action took another several months. So that puts you between, well, six or seven years apart between reviews.

So we're trying to start the reviews on a cycle measured from when the teams convene as opposed to when the board takes action. Glad to take a queue on this. I see Susan with your hand up. Go ahead, Susan.

Susan Kawaguchi: Yeah, I'm not comfortable with that wording at all for the reviews because like you said, it could take six to seven years then. You know, so either we revert to convene and agree to the five years, which I understand the five years on some of the issues and maybe Whois is a good issue because it's been going on forever.

But I'm not comfortable when it comes to maybe a security and stability review because cyber security changes at lightning speed. And then need for cyber security and the issues. And so it seems like we need to be more on top

of that issue, for example. So, you know, I'm not comfortable with their five years. And as the board takes action. And I would want to - if we stayed with the board's action as the trigger I would want to clarify what a board action is, is it the resolution, is it the implementation.

So either we need to back it off back to three years and board action with clarification or we need to say convene. But I'm not sure five years is good for all the reviews. Security is...

Steve DelBianco: Thanks, Susan. I wanted to clarify that the five year no less frequently than five years at the minimum it's every five years. The community is free to do it as frequently as we want to. And it was the CCWG that nearly unanimously endorsed the five year, it didn't come from the board. But the CCWG also was unanimous about measuring it from when the teams are convened and not off of board action. There were three public comments in the first round suggesting that security stability and resiliency review could be done more frequently.

We pointed out in the response to those comments that by saying no less frequently it would be an option to start it as frequently as ICANN wanted to. And that would be the community driven decision.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay.

Steve DelBianco: So that's where five years came from.

Susan Kawaguchi: I missed that part.

Steve DelBianco: Got it. And text reflects pretty much what you said is that the BC is pushing back on the board and saying that we want to stick with the CCWG proposal

to start the window from the date the previous review was made if that's a good idea.

Susan Kawaguchi: Then I think we push back with, you know, I'm fine.

Steve DelBianco: Great.

Phil Corwin: Steve, Phil here. We're getting near the end of the time allotted for the policy report. Were there other key things you wanted to raise on this comment? I know that the filing time is very soon.

Steve DelBianco: Yeah, we have - yeah, you're right. This filing is the 12th of September. And we're probably 90% of the way there. I do think that there's a chance that new things could come up in the next eight days, right, we could see from the board more detail about their counterproposal.

As Phil indicated, and all of you who have been following, the board led by their law firm, Jones Day, doesn't like ICANN to change to a membership model even though the, quote unquote, member is really just the existing community of ACs and SOs. Membership gives ICANN legally enforceable powers to overturn board decisions, to fire the board of directors, to challenge a budget or a bylaws change.

And those legally enforceable powers seem to have made Jones Day nervous. And Becky Burr told us that Jones Day has - for well over a decade, resisted the idea of ICANN, like most nonprofits, becoming a membership organization accountable to its community.

So we have a little bit of an impasse. I actually am not surprised about that, we probably should have seen this coming. Wednesday night's call did not go

well. I think it's because the board was not as prepared as perhaps they could have been to answer with details. And there will be many more discussions and meetings in the weeks ahead.

I just can't tell you folks how much of this will be clear by September the 12th when these comments are due. So we're going to be filing our comments only sort of vaguely aware of the board's counterproposal. And that could be a challenge and that might mean we have to wait until the final proposal for us to lodge our comments. But I'm holding the line as the BC and CSG rep to suggest that we want to stick with an enforceable model that goes with the five powers the BC talked about over a year ago.

Phil, I'll quickly run through the last three items because I do want to see whether we can get volunteers...

Phil Corwin: Okay.

Steve DelBianco: ...to work on Number 8 or 9.

Phil Corwin: If you can hit them quick, Steve. Thanks.

Steve DelBianco: Sure. Thank you, Phil. Number 8 was the preliminary issues report for the subsequent rounds of new gTLDs. And Phil highlighted this earlier I think he discussed getting council yesterday. Comments don't close until 10 October but this should be a significant interest to BC members because it's the preliminary report on that spreadsheet full of issues that the discussion group work done let by Bret Fausett.

And, Phil, you are leader on that. Is there any more you want to add on that...

((Crosstalk))

Phil Corwin: No, all I would add is that a review of this report is whether it's covered all the bases because this is going to form the template for the PDP that follows. And once there's a final issues report. And if there's an issue in there that's of any importance, if it's not listed now it's going to be very difficult to get it into the PDP. So we're looking for whether this is comprehensive and covers everything we care about.

Steve DelBianco: Yeah, this is a great observation. And you and Susan worked hard in Buenos Aires to try to amend the motion so that at least the review of the new gTLD program, the one that's called for in the Affirmation could be done before coming up with a definitive list of issues. We lost that battle barely, but we - this is why we have to look at this. So we do need volunteers in the BC. Anyone signal their interest right now on Number 8.

Susan Kawaguchi: Steve, this is Susan. I'll take a whack at the first draft of that.

Steve DelBianco: Wonderful. Thank you, Susan. And, again, all we have to do is to run through it and say have they missed anything.

Susan Kawaguchi: Yeah.

Steve DelBianco: And we are not restricted to what Bret Fausett had in the spreadsheet. We are allowed to add more.

Susan Kawaguchi: Yeah.

Steve DelBianco: Okay great. Thank you. The last one, Phil, was - there are a handful of new geo names in a batch that close the 14th of October. It looks an awful lot like

the last one that Andy Abrams drafted for us because it's a mixed batch of brand and open. And I'll probably go back to Andy to see whether he can amend his previous comment for these.

Andy Abrams: That's fine, Steve. This is Andy. I can do that.

Steve DelBianco: (Unintelligible) got this down to a science by now, right?

Andy Abrams: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: Phil, that's all I had for policy.

((Crosstalk))

Phil Corwin: Thanks, Steve. Great report as always. All I'm going to add on the developments this week, the Jones Day memo and the three hour call between the CCWG and the board on Wednesday night, is one. The two law firms advising the CCWG prepared a - in quick response to Jones Day a broad overview high level response. And then last night they - maybe you can just - if they haven't been forwarded maybe you can forward them to the BC, Steve, last night they provided a line by line response to everything - all of the entire Jones Day critique.

So there's now a response from the two law firms who are advising the CCWG. All I'll say on what happened Wednesday is that it raises a lot of procedural issues both whether there's going to be this meeting in LA and how it - the board has asked for a two-day meeting in Los Angeles late this month. It's not clear how that fits in within the normal comment period and consideration of comments. And whether - how all this is going to affect the

timing, whether we can adopt a - what the CCWG put out in Dublin or whether we're going to need yet a new additional comment period.

So these are all issues we're going to be watching closely. I'm going to move real quick to the report on Council developments. There was a two-hour Council call yesterday which is why this call had to be postponed. Susan and I were both on.

The Council adopted the timeline for chair elections and we're working within the CSG on that. Heather - do you recall her last name, Steve, I'm blanking out on her last name...

Woman: Forrest.

Steve DelBianco: Forrest.

Phil Corwin: Yeah, from IPC, is probably going to be our candidate for chair. And we're working to set up a conference call with her. The Council had a rather robust discussion of that preliminary issue report on new gTLDs. And the consensus seemed to be that the comment period should be extended to at least 60 days and at our next Council meeting on September 24 we're going to consider a formal motion on that, although Jonathan Robinson noted that the ultimate decision on the length of the comment period is up to staff. But they certainly be influenced by input from Council, BC and other constituencies.

And there was discussion exclusive registry access for generic strings. There was a letter to the Council from Steve Crocker on this. Susan raised some concerns about the lack of specificity in that letter. And finally there was discussion toward the end - a truncated discussion of the Wednesday night call where Thomas Rickert noted that the decision on whether it would be proper

to have a meeting in LA, how long it would be, who would be invited, what the purpose would be, was entirely in the ball court of the CCWG.

And so that's where things stand. Did you have anything to add on any of that, Susan?

Susan Kawaguchi: No, except on the board letter I'm less concerned about that now. It may be the board just kicking off it's, you know, list of responsibility to the GAC communiqué and saying, okay we sent it over to the GNSO Council. We did our job. And if that's true then - and Jonathan's drafting the response as long as he drafts the response (unintelligible) thank you very much, we received your - something with that respect.

Is somebody on hold? I'm hearing music. I don't know about you guys.

Phil Corwin: Yeah, I'm hearing that music too. It rather sounds like a call on hold music. Nathalie, is there any way to mute that?

Susan Kawaguchi: Wow, that's even worse than the Yahoo hold music.

Phil Corwin: I don't - I'm sending him a private email. Okay I just advised them in a private chat that we're ready for his report. In the interest of time, not hearing him, I'm going to go on to a quick report from David Fares on CSG developments particularly in regard to Dublin. David.

David Fares: Yeah, great thanks. Just a few things to report. First I think on the last call we discussed what we were going to do regarding the meeting with the board in Dublin. You may recall that we as the BC had requested that the CSG send a letter saying we liked the format but we would like additional time since each one of the constituencies ran over.

There are different views within the CSG about whether it's a good idea to request more time so I think it's going to be an individual constituency response if we want to do that. So I think that that's a question for us to discuss. I don't know, Phil, if you want to do that now if you want to pose that - if we should pose that to the group on the list and see how we want to proceed with that.

Phil Corwin: You know, in the interest of time unless you think it'd be good to have a two or three minute discussion now that might be an item to be better handled on the email list. What do you think?

David Fares: I'm fine with that.

Phil Corwin: Okay.

David Fares: And then really the only other issue is that it looks like we - due to scheduling conflicts we're not going to be able to have a breakfast with the NCSG which we were hoping to do. But we are looking for alternatives. And again, I think what I'll do is just post that on the list and ask people if they have ideas about which constituencies or which groups they'd like to meet with if we can organize a breakfast in Dublin.

Phil Corwin: Right. And just to elaborate, the problem we're running into with the breakfast is that it turns out that the - nothing can be scheduled at the meeting facility in Dublin before 8:00 am which is kind of good news. The good news is you won't have to be at any 7:00 or 7:30 am breakfast. The bad news is it makes it more difficult to schedule those early morning meetings when other groups have things scheduled at 8:30 or 9:00 so that's the problem we're running into.

And was that it, David?

David Fares: Yeah, that's it.

Phil Corwin: Okay. I got - Robert was having a problem in Istanbul but I think he's with us now. Are you there and ready to report...

((Crosstalk))

Phil Corwin: Okay, go ahead.

Robert Hogarth: Thanks. I'm glad you can hear me. And this is not setting up good when I'm going to try to convince you to hold the intercessional meeting here in Istanbul. So thanks for your patience.

Phil Corwin: Okay.

Robert Hogarth: The purpose of the - I have a - just a few minutes and so I'm going to focus on an overview for all of you that the purpose of this briefing, and thanks very much for giving staff a few minutes of time on your call, is to share with you an overview of the support resources available to the BC in the fiscal year '15 that we're in now for ICANN, calendar 2015, FY'16.

And the reason for this came up in some recent discussions with Jimson where we were working on his - it's a outreach summit that took place a couple of days ago. And we thought it was very important to be able to share with all of you the full scope of the activities so that you collectively can maximize what's available to the community during this fiscal year and help us to look

at future years to improve what's available to you, find better ways to deliver it and increase the resources that you have at your disposal.

I'm hoping that sharing the information today at this high level may prompt some further discussions, brainstorm or ideas when your exec team and any of you who are interested in maximizing the work that you're all performing from the BC perspective.

While I'm keeping this at a high level today I'm more than happy to discuss the sort of questions that arise, take things offline, do individual briefings if any of you think that that's necessary so thanks for giving me that context and that brief sort of introduction.

What I'm going to talk about a little bit is sort of our governing principles, the overall strategy providing support resources. And then I'm going to talk about the five major categories of resources that are available this year. I think it's important overall that you appreciate that there's a theme primarily driven and I think really supported by the current board and senior management is the recognition of the time that all of you are devoting to the work of ICANN is literally our most important resource.

And that it's very important for us ICANN in the background to be able to provide you all with the logistical support, the administrative support and other means and mechanisms so that you can really focus on the work that Steve was describing earlier so that you can spend less time worrying about logistics, bureaucracy and administration and really be capable of doing the work that you all participate in ICANN for.

And the strategy is that over time we continue to expand those resources, identify areas that you have picked or that you see needing or require

additional support and collaborate with staff to make that happen. We all know the challenges within a multi-stakeholder community moving fast. Our goal is to move as quickly and expeditiously as possible to get stuff delivered to you all. And I hope that these discussion, conversations like this and future ones are going to help maximize those opportunities.

There's really five major categories of support this fiscal year that have been made available to all. Some have existed for periods of time, some of you in pilot projects for this year. The five major areas are the outreach, content support, administrative logistics, travel support and substantive support. And I'll just take those in order, 30, 45 seconds, a minute on each one.

In the outreach area the major resource that we are using and we've used for the last couple of years is the community regional outreach pilot program. That's something that was introduced a couple of years ago because we got a number of requests from various GNSO communities saying how can we leverage and expand the ability of all of you as individual communities to do outreach and engagement, to bring in new members, to make new members interested, informed about what you do and to maximize the work of existing leaders and potentially help people move up or improve their capabilities within the community.

For the last couple of years the only option that was available to you as GNSO constituencies was five travel or trips available for you to send members of the community to places around the globe on a regional basis, you know, sending someone from one part of the region to another to promote the constituency or to engage with the other players.

That structure was modified this year by giving you the additional option of just sponsoring a particular outreach activity or event. And this year you all

chose to opt for the specific event. That was the AFICTA summit that was just held in Johannesburg that Jimson organized and operated. And I'm sure he'll provide an update on that and how well that went.

But I think that was an opportunity that you all used early in the fiscal year with a very nice sort of momentum builder on some Africa outreach that you did just three or four months ago. And so I think that that's something that (unintelligible) is going to provide you with some momentum and Jimson, ideally, potentially some new active members coming from the African region.

In the area of content materials ICANN has had for the last couple of years available through the communications team, the ability to provide printing and publication support. That's something in the past that Marilyn Cade and Chris Chaplow took advantage of for your community newsletter that you all produce in and around every ICANN public meeting.

We've expanded that capability this year to include the flexibility to allow you all to work on video and web presence content as well. And there are dedicated members of the communications team who are available to consult with you all on those types of quote unquote publications. They're available functionally to help you on both production as well as to arrange printing of any, you know, printed materials that you're going to hand out at events.

They're also available to provide editorial support and design support as well. That's a resource that's being provided and implemented by the communications team but those of us from GNSO staff support are more than happy to help liaise with you all and to help coordinate that work.

It's the responsibility of that department to manage the resources they've been given but what we've observed over the last couple of years is that at the end of the year there's always a couple thousand dollars left in that bucket of funds and so we really want to maximize the opportunities for all of you to be able to utilize that capability in the coming year - in the year that we're in right now.

A critical area, and, Phil, you and Elisa as your predecessor, and Jimson in his role, in terms of managing a number of the resources for the BC have been very interested in the admin and logistics area particularly the secretariat support. I am delighted to share with the larger membership that we have been able to move forward with the hiring of a secretariat support person to replace your most recent secretariat support person. And she will be coming on board the 16th of September to begin a variety of training regimes that put her up to speed and get her capable of working with you all almost immediately with respect to call management.

And Nathalie I hope is smiling somewhere on the phone because that will certainly help those members of the secretariat team. But in addition to that, the secretariat support - exists to provide a potential range of support for you all across a wide area including Website, wiki management, you know, populating those resources for you, maintaining your email lists, in addition to providing the teleconference support helping the executive committee and Phil develop the agendas, providing meeting reports and minutes.

Helping to manage the elections, work with you just as a general support mechanism for the work of the executive committee and also to help you with respect to membership databases and some of the work that's being done in that area to provide more logistical support and actually resources that we hope in the near future will mean some sort of somewhat customized off the

shelf software for the membership management support standpoint and will help you much more in terms of your recordkeeping and membership information management.

So that's an area that has been traditionally supported by Glen de Saint G ry and her team. And we're looking slowly but surely to continue to expand that. Right now the support is part time, about 12-15 hours a week depending upon what's going on for you all during the year. And that's something that ideally as the pilot project works, can potentially evolve to more independent secretariat support where ICANN is providing the support and funding but we've got individuals who are dedicated directly to your community exclusively.

A major area of support that ICANN has done for a long period of time that we constantly look at - to improve is travel support. There's a basic package of support that you have as the Business Constituency. And the support is provided really in three major areas, public meetings, intercessional type meetings and outreach engagement activities.

On the public meeting side at every public meeting you guys have five supported travelers. That is typically spots available to your two councilors as well as three travel slots available to executive team leadership, your elected leadership to be able to participate at ICANN meetings.

The councilor support has been there for a considerable period of time, the leadership support is something that's literally only been introduced in the last three or four years and we ended up going from a pilot experiment to now that's a core part of the ICANN budget every year.

There are ICANN travel guidelines that allow GNSO constituencies to split those travel slots and leverage opportunity by essentially micro-granting support so that those five slots can magically become 15 if you imagine that at any point in time if you decide to do it as a community you can give someone the airline slot, the hotel slot or the per diem slot. And I think that flexibility at the time has allowed now only the BC but other communities to expand opportunities for travel particularly some people who are just coming regionally who don't have to go as far.

On the intercessional side and Phil mentioned this at the beginning of the call, plans are underway for the third non-contracted party house intercessional meeting of the GNSO. This also started as a pilot 3.5 years ago. It seemed to work well, we've been having (unintelligible) Los Angeles headquarters of ICANN. Continued with a meeting last January in Washington DC. And we're now, with the encouragement of CSG leadership, looking to consider a location outside the United States to hold an intercessional meeting in - as Phil mentioned, January February timeframe. We'll see how that develops.

But in the past, and I would expect this to continue this year giving the budget we have available, that would include eight representatives from your community participating in that. And then finally on the travel side, outreach and engagement on a pilot basis continued from last year. There are two what we call somewhat loosely fellowship slots that are available based on your executive team's request to present leadership development opportunities from developing countries.

Where this fiscal year you had two travelers per ICANN public meeting, available to come to the ICANN meeting either folks who are part of the community already or folks that you think are in a good position to recruit can come consistent with the ICANN fellowship guidelines, to participate in the

activities, to participate in the meeting and to otherwise network with you all when you're in Dublin, Marrakesh, and in Latin America meeting locations later next year.

The final category is substantive support. And this is something that a number of you on this call can be taking advantage of in terms of your charter and bylaw revisions work where what we're trying to do more consistently for you is to provide substantive staff support to help you in drafting or moving forward on initiatives that require, you know, drafting or other types of support that is important for you all to do your work.

Presently Ken Bour, one of our outside consultants, is helping your team work on the charter bylaws amendments for the BC. We're also looking at a pilot project opportunity that I like to call the Elisa Cooper legacy in that Elisa made a very solid pitch to ICANN senior staff as part of the SO AC leadership discussions that take place prior to every ICANN meeting. And with her lobbying Fadi and David Olive were able to go to the board and secure funding for pilot project this fiscal year to provide you with additional document management, with document production support.

Steve DelBianco has been very helpful in working with another one of our outside consultants, (Daniel Leo), and members of our staff team to provide ideas and insights to help us set up the framework for that pilot project where you would have some additional resources whether that be from a research perspective, a drafting perspective, a facilitation perspective to help you in some of the drafting work and developing some of your positions going forward.

We've received a lot of different feedback from different communities on that. And we're currently designing a framework for policy project that we hope

will begin in the January February timeframe. So, Phil, that's essentially the overall outlook at general support categories and services.

As I've indicated, I'm more than happy offline (unintelligible) directly or with anybody who's on the call with questions about any of these resources to chat with you about it, to brainstorm about it, to talk about ideas not only for how we implement these capabilities but your thoughts for FY'17 and beyond for areas where we might do some additional improvements we could identify new opportunities because we are continuing the special community budget request process that takes place every December, January, February timeframe. And I'm hopeful we'll come up with new ideas for pilot projects and capabilities next year.

So I'll stop there...

Phil Corwin: Okay.

Robert Hogarth: And with...

((Crosstalk))

Phil Corwin: Thank you very much, Robert, for that comprehensive report. There was a lot of content in there. I plan to review the transcript when it's available. And so I fully can grasp everything you laid out there. But we appreciate all the hard work of staff and supporting the BC and the CSG and all the resources that ICANN expends on our behalf. And noting that you're in Istanbul and it's probably early evening there I would encourage you to get out of the office and start the weekend.

Robert Hogarth: Thank you very much.

Phil Corwin: Okay. Thanks so much. In our remaining time I'm going to turn to Jimson for an update on operations and finance, our final order of business today.

Jimson Olufuye: Yeah, thank you, Phil. Let me quickly ask Rob - Rob (unintelligible) did you say around 16 we might get secretariat in?

Robert Hogarth: I'm sorry, Jimson, could you repeat that?

Jimson Olufuye: Yeah, the new secretariat, the new secretariat, when is she coming on board? The new secretariat.

Phil Corwin: She officially starts September 16.

((Crosstalk))

Jimson Olufuye: Okay just wanted to be sure of that.

Phil Corwin: Yeah, mid-September.

Jimson Olufuye: Okay, thank you so much, Rob. Okay, thank you so much, Rob. Well quickly to my part we got to the outreach we just had in (unintelligible) was a successful one. And I want to thank Steve - Steve DelBianco the Vice Chair Policy and Andrew Mack for their rich information. The audience were well illuminated about ICANN role, BC particular and what we do and the need for policy and strategy.

Also to thank Andrew Mack for active committee (unintelligible) outreach awareness in all regions, in regions that we have no awareness of ICANN and BC.

Rudi Vansnick, the NPOC chair, board member of Global Knowledge Partnership Foundation, was there. He was conducted a workshop on DNS for (unintelligible) opportunity and then also got to know how the Internet works and the role of all the community members including the BC, and the NPOC, etcetera. So full report be made available shortly about what is clear we can expect more members from this outreach.

Well, also to let you know that why three new members joined (unintelligible) from North America and (unintelligible) from Nigeria (unintelligible). I would like to (unintelligible) outreach committees to consider an outreach in Dublin could boost our membership from Europe.

So finally on the operation I would like to just ask (unintelligible) BC councilor election comes up in the 8th, that's next week, so therefore (unintelligible) on that.

And lastly on the finance, I want to thank members update promptly. Many have been responding. And also to say that some member did ask for the tax ID and EIN (unintelligible) show you that the BC ExComm you're working on it. In fact the ExComm has approved the commissioning of (unintelligible) to handle those processes for us, the process of registering BC and also giving our tax ID and employer identification number.

So that is basically it from my side. Over to you, Phil.

Phil Corwin: Well thank you, as always excellent report, Jimson. And BC members noted the Jimson informed us of both new members and departing members of the BC. I don't plan to make many changes as interim chair but I did think it'd be useful to keep the BC updated on these calls as to particularly new members

coming on so we can be aware of them and welcome them to the constituency.
And thank Jimson as always.

And thank ICANN and the support that Rob outlined for the outreach efforts which are bringing more and more members from the developing world and giving us their perspective within the BC which is excellent.

So I have 12 noon unless someone raises their hand with burning any other business I'm going to adjourn the call. I don't see any hands. So we're going to wrap up here. And for all of you in the United States I wish you a long and happy Labor Day weekend. And we'll be back on together in two weeks. So have a great weekend, everyone. Good-bye.

And we can stop the recordings.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, (Elmer). This concludes today's call. You may now stop the recordings.

END