

ICANN

Moderator: Gisella Gruber-White
September 17, 2015
10:00 am CT

Coordinator: The recording has started.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you (Unintelligible). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody and welcome to the BC Members call on the 17th of September 2015.

On the call today we have Jimson Olufuye, Andy Abrams, Paul Mitchell, Steve Coates, Angie Graves, Steve DelBianco, Cecilia Smith, (Carolyn Ingrein), Aparna Sridhar, Tim Chen, Chris Wilson, Andrew Harris and Ellen Blackler has just joined the call.

We have received no apologies for today's call. And from Staff we have Terri Agnew and myself Nathalie Peregrine.

We would like to remind you all too please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you ever so much and over to you Phil.

Phil Corwin: Good morning all, thank you for joining today's call.

Just two quick items in the opening section of our agenda. One, a reminder that the nomination period for the Council Election remains open until next Tuesday with a call with candidates scheduled for one week from today.

To date, I am the only candidate nominated and seconded. If others have an interest in that, you have a few days left to throw your hat in the ring.

The other thing I wanted to bring up in the beginning is I've sent to the constituency, I believe twice, forwarded from ICANN Staff that have assisted us with business engagement activities particularly at the ICANN meetings.

We do have on Business Engagement One, which is going to be held Monday in Dublin. Aparna has volunteered to be a speaker at that to discuss why her company participates in the BC and then what they're interests are.

We're still looking for a member of the BC from Europe to participate in a pre-ICANN 54 Webinar to be held the first week of October. If you're a BC member headquartered in Europe, this is a good opportunity. We'd appreciate any volunteers on that.

And we're also looking for members to volunteer to be in one-minute issue videos to I guess put together a short video for newcomers and prospective BC members to understand why various members have joined the BC.

So I bring that to your attention again, and particularly for the European BC members to participate in that webinar; hopefully someone will volunteer to participate in that.

And with that, that's all the initial comments and I'm going to proceed to Item 2, the policy discussion, and turn the discussion over to Steve DelBianco to lead it.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks Phil. I think Terri will load the policy calendar in the PDF; it's in there. And I sent it all around to each of you this morning. I think this will be a relatively quick report.

We start with what's been filed. And in the last two weeks alone, the BC filed five rather extensive comments; taking them in order from most recent to previous.

From the 12th of September, we did extensive comments on that CCWG Accountability second draft. And Chris, Aparna, Ellen, Andrew, you're all on the line and I wanted to thank you for helping so much for helping with that draft.

The BC comments are extremely detailed and I can tell you that it's one of the CCWG members who has to then respond to the comment. I will once again be sure that I try to raise the BC concerns in a way that gathers consensus from other members of the CCWG.

We got some but not all of our items last time around, and I predict the same outcome this time in the second draft. But I'll press the issue.

On the 11th of September, we did a comment on allowing .SHARP to drop the searchable Whois. We had help there from Andy Abrams, Chris Wilson and Steve Coates and that went in.

And then on 8 September, we did comments on the IANA Stewardship Transition. Aparna, thank you for leading the drafting on that. And we had great help from Andy Harris, Ellen Blackler, Steve Coates and Claudia.

On the 7th of September, we commented on the data metrics initial report. Angie, you're on the call, thank you for starting that off, and then Andy and Tim for helping.

And then finally on the 6th of September, we did comments on the Preliminary Issues Report about the next generation gTLD registration. That's the replacement for Whois in the long run. A great filing on that; Tim Chen did the initial drafting and then Andy and Aparna helped, Susan, Angie and Ellen.

So thanks, and amazing amount of participation. This is a frequency that the same names tend to come up over and over again, and I hope that's an inspiration for those of you on the call who haven't participated lately to put a shoulder to it and help us out with the upcoming comments.

There are four public comments that are open right now, and they're on the bottom of Page 1 and top of Page 2 in the Policy Calendar.

The first is a design team of a plan for the key signing fee rollover. Now a key signing fee, it's a cryptographic fee for the DNS Root Zone, the root table, and it's time to do a change -- a rollover of the key.

You know, this is a cryptographic exercise. Its way overdue; ICANN should have done this something like two to three years ago, so it's overdue. But it isn't something that's hard to do.

Anybody on the call have significant expertise or concerns about ICANN's plan to do this rollover?

Angie Graves: This is (Angie) Steve. I have technical experience with that.

Steve DelBianco: Oh awesome Angie. So Angie, would you be able to take a quick read - I put a link there to the comment - a quick read of their plan, and then email over the next several days. Send a note around to the BC whether you see concern with their plan and whether you think the BC ought to comment on it. That would be so helpful.

Angie Graves: Very good; will do. Thank you Steve.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks Angie. Anyone else want to work on that with Angie who has experience there? Okay great, thank you.

Number two; there's now a Preliminary Issues Report for Procedures for the subsequent round of new gTLDs. Now the comment has been extended; they won't close until the 10th of October, so we've got some time. But it's coming up quickly.

This is in response to Council's request to analyze that little discussion group that went on for about a year. Bret Fausett had led that discussion group and he had come up with a list of subjects or a table of things that should be considered, that Excel sheet, in the next round.

The BC got some input into that, but now is our time to determine whether all the bases have been covered.

Now Susan Kawaguchi, not on today's call yet, but Susan volunteered on our last call to take a look at that. And Susan hasn't circulated anything else on that yet.

Anyone else in the BC could help Susan at reviewing that preliminary report and helping the BC to draft a comment?

Andy Abrams: Hi Steve, this is Andy Abrams. I can help Susan with that.

Steve DelBianco: Andy, thank you very much. I see Phil Corwin's hand up. Phil, go ahead.

Phil Corwin: Yes Steve. I'll backup Susan on this as well because it is a Council item.

I think everyone on the BC is aware that when the Council meets next week on the 24th, there's a pending resolution to extend that comment period by 20 days which was the Council consensus position when we had a discussion on this and the September 3 call. So we will almost certainly have until October 30 rather than 10th to complete that; there was strong feeling on Council that having that close just before Dublin was not a good procedure.

Steve DelBianco: Hey Phil, check that because my read of the Resolution was that the Resolution took it to the 10th of October.

Phil Corwin: Well I can't check it right now but the intent was to extend the period to past the Dublin meeting.

Steve DelBianco: Interesting. Motion to extend public comment - I'm bringing it up right now.

The current motion as noted on the Council Web site resolved extended from its current 40 days to 60 days. And when it was published, it was published on

August the 31st. August the 31st plus 40 days would have been mid-September - well mid-October because...

((Crosstalk))

Phil Corwin: No, no, it would be October 10.

Steve DelBianco: Okay excellent.

Phil Corwin: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: Okay, I hope that works out.

Phil Corwin: Yes, it should. It's still up to Staff on doing that, but if the Council is united on asking for an extension, we expect that to occur.

Steve DelBianco: You expect that to pass, right?

Phil Corwin: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: Awesome. Thank you.

Any other BC members interested in helping out on this? Tim Chen, thank you; appreciate that.

So with four of you on there, let's get moving on it. Review it and if in fact the Council extends the deadline until after Dublin, this is a perfect opportunity for us to discuss it when the BC meets in Dublin because we'll be able to look at the subsequent rounds procedures that are up for study, and indicate on

which of them the BC wants to either add some color or add entirely new items that haven't been considered in this preliminary report.

The BC's position was none of this should actually be put into a list until after the AOC Review of the new round, which really won't be done for well over a year. But there are plenty of other momentum factors that say get started now, so the BC has to continue to watch this and be sure they haven't missed anything.

The third item up is another request for some brand and generic new gTLDs to do the release of geographic name. These comments close the 14th of October so we've got some time.

And thanks once again to Andy Abrams of Google who's volunteered to draft this one too using, you know, as a template what Andy had done on previous mixed batches of brands and generics.

Andy thanks again for that. Maybe we'll look to circulate something before the end of September so that we'll have 14 days to review.

Last one - and Phil, I'm going to turn to you to discuss the correspondence you've had with Staff on Number 4. Number 4 is comments will close on the 18th of October for a new Staff-driven discussion paper for what to do or a process to determine what to do with the auction proceeds -- some \$60 million -- that were acquired in the auction of new gTLDs.

Now Phil, I would like to turn to you to talk a little bit about this; you've been our thought leader on it. But you also have some detailed correspondence with Staff. Why don't you talk this through and we'll help to recruit some volunteers in the BC to help with our comment.

Phil Corwin: Yes, thank you Steve. And I don't know that I've been the thought leader but I've been concerned about this process. Anytime there's a large amount of money involved, and it's currently \$60 million and potentially more than that, it could get ugly if we don't have a very well-controlled and thoughtful process for deciding the criteria for even considering how those funds should be dispersed.

And this discussion paper, it was not something Council requested; it came out of the blue when it was unveiled on September 10. I immediately - on the Council list, I immediately raised questions with Staff. And that's Marika Konings is the point person on this and she generally does a very fine job on Council in providing policies for it.

What concerned me was that if you recall when the Council first passed/stated that it wanted the issues for this to be looked at by a cross-community working group, there was an email from Steve Crocker pretty much dismissive of that and saying, "We have other ideas on how to proceed and want to reach out beyond ICANN to the broader Internet community."

And then the Board seemed to retreat a bit on that, but then seemed to be going in the same direction again particularly with the notion that some other process besides the CCWG could be proposed in responses to this.

I was also concerned that did not only did this Staff paper and request for comments generated by Staff under direction of Senior Staff for the Board or whoever, but that the comment period closed on Sunday, October 18 which is the weekend that the ICANN meeting begins in Dublin.

So it was not just a comment out of nowhere, but the fact that it violated the general view that a comment period shouldn't close just before or just after an ICANN meeting because people are traveling and people are overburdened with preparing for the meeting or recovering from it.

I got a thoughtful response from Marika; I'm not going to go through all the elements. But, you know, I continue to watch this; we're going to discuss it on Council call next week.

It's my hope that they at least extend the comment period to past Dublin. It seems quite unwise to ask people to come up with subtle comments on a very important and potentially divisive subject with the comment period closing the weekend that the ICANN meeting begins.

So I'll continue to keep BC members informed on this as it moves forward and we learn more through the Council communication channel.

Steve DelBianco: And Phil, thanks for that. I did want to note that in Marika's reply to you she acknowledged that, you know, the date is inconvenient. But she goes on to say that Staff was hoping that the feedback they got by the 18th of October would then let the community review that feedback when they meet in Dublin.

And, you know, that sounds good in theory, but the discussions that happen in Dublin isn't part of the public record of comment that Staff would consider.

So I would support your view of seeing if Council can ask for an extension even if it's just a week or two -- say two weeks. The two week extension so the Dublin discussions can then be reflected in the public record and comments to the file.

To do that, would you have to - I mean there hasn't been time to notice that motion for the 24th of September Council Meeting. Would you have to do it in the very next Council Meeting or can it still be done now?

Phil Corwin: I'm not sure operationally what the answer to that is Steve, but we'll certainly explore it on the Council call. I think maybe we don't need a formal motion but can just communicate, you know, if there's a consensus view that this should be extended, we can communicate that in some way to Staff from the Council.

But there's no - the deadline for motions has closed so we can't bring up a motion for the September 24. And the next Council meeting is during Dublin.

Steve DelBianco: Is during Dublin. So Phil, there's seven days until your Council meeting. But the deadline is what, 10 days, the advance deadline?

Phil Corwin: Yes, but we passed it a couple of days ago.

Steve DelBianco: Shoot. Well for what it's worth, perhaps circulating something on list to consider that would be helpful. But thank you.

Any other BC members interested in helping Phil whose taken a real leadership role on this particular public comment? It's the last one I've got listed. And if the deadline is not extended folks, we are going to have to put some work on this prior to when we all leave for Dublin.

Angie Graves: This is (Angie).

Steve DelBianco: Okay, go ahead.

Angie Graves: I'm sure Phil is perfectly capable of doing it, but Phil whatever help you need I'm here; Angie Graves. Thanks.

Steve DelBianco: Angie, thank you very much again.

Phil Corwin: Thanks Angie.

Steve DelBianco: Phil, the next section is Channel 2 -- the next section of Policy Calendar. And what I've done there was to highlight the agenda and (unintelligible) transcript from your previous meeting. I indicated both the agenda in motion for the meeting next week, and I pulled out several items with links that are particularly interesting to the BC.

But I did want to turn to you to lead us through that. Okay? So Channel 2.

Phil Corwin: Okay. Well on the first item, we had received a letter from Steve Crocker to Jonathan Robinson requesting the GNSO to take up the issue of Exclusive Registry Control over Generic Strings.

Jonathan, this week, has circulated a draft response to Chairman Crocker which is - I thought it was a good response as did several others on Council. I believe it's going to be sent out tomorrow. No one has suggested any changes to that so far.

It basically says Council would be willing to take it up, but there needs to be further discussion of what the phrase public interest goal really means. It means a lot of different things to different people. But that's in the works. And once a final letter is sent, we'll share it with BC members.

On Item 4, the Motion to Extend Public Comment for New gTLD Subsequent Procedures, as mentioned there's been a motion filed which will be voted on next week which would extend it from 40 to 60 days. And that was based on what appeared to a consensus position within Council at the last meeting, so there's no reason to think that that will not be adopted.

The Council does not have control of the decision to extend, but the feeling is that if the Council is united in asking for an extension, that Staff would respond affirmatively. They're not required to but we hope that they would.

And I don't have much detail to provide on Item 5 and Susan's not on. So I'm going to have to pass that one.

There was discussion of the paper on new gTLD auction proceeds. I don't remember getting to any detail on criteria for doing so. It was a brief discussion.

Again, I don't recall anything significant on the final report of the Independent Examiner and GNSO Review. There's been significant dissatisfaction on the Council with the way that Review was conducted and its conclusions, but nothing new came out on the call.

Accountability, we discussed what was going on between the CCWG and the Board, and of course things have moved very rapidly since then. And you may want to bring that up before we finish the policy section Steve.

And we discussed the meeting strategy. There's not much more to discuss there. It's a (state of complex). Everyone's wondering how the mid-year meeting, the four-day meeting with no advance meeting of the Council or

anything like that, permitted before the official start is going to work out in practice. We'll just see how that goes next year.

On the Chair Election, I mine as well report on that now rather than waiting for the Council Report section.

Steve DelBianco: Sure.

Phil Corwin: The CSG is united behind Heather Forrest of the IPC. We've had discussions, back-and-forth emails, with the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group. So far we don't know of them having their own candidate they want to advance.

They did want an understanding that if the Chair was from the CSG that the CSG would not fill the Non-Contracted Party House the Vice-Chair slot, which is a slot that Susan, you know, has made herself available if - not pushing herself but willing to fill it if it's appropriate.

We've indicated back to the NCSG that that's fine, that we would defer, and agree with them that the Vice Chair should be from the Non-Commercial side of our half of the House rather than the CSG if we get the Chair position. If we don't get the Chair, that wouldn't bind us and we could push (Heather) or someone else for vice chair.

We still don't know whether the contracted parties have their own candidate for chair and all this is coming very - coming up to deadline very quickly. We only have a week before nominations have to be advanced for council chair.

So I'm rather - I've never been through this process before. I'm rather surprised at how fluid and it remains just a week out from the deadline but that's the state of play. But so far as we know, there's no one being pushed by

the non-commercial folks or by the Contracted Party House for chair at this time but that could change any hour. So we'll keep you apprised.

And then finally yes I'm on the privacy proxy standards accreditation group and that working group is going to have a face-to-face meeting in Dublin on the Friday prior to the weekend council meetings and the official start of the Dublin meetings, so...

And that working group is really - is going slowly because there was a deluge of comments on the initial report and a great many of them were negative on any unveiling of shielded registrant information other than subject to court order.

So that's what that working group is struggling with, and there's significant gaps between particularly the parties most focused on intellectual property violations on the Internet versus what I would loosely describe as privacy advocates. And there's nothing new about any of that.

Steve DelBianco: (Phil) let's close then with one other item which is the Cross-Community Working Group on Accountability. It's meeting in Los Angeles at the end of next week. And I'll be there for the CSG. It's a Friday-Saturday meeting. It happens at ICANN's headquarters.

The attendance is relatively light from CCWG members. And the board will be - well, in the same building. Of course the board is welcome to participate on the CCWG. We've had active participation from day one from Chris Disspain who's on the board and likely to be the next chair and from Bruce Tonkin, represents the GNSO on the board and is very knowledgeable on these things.

It may well be that other board members would come in. Some of them have made interventions on the list as you know lately, like George Sadowsky, even Mike Silber.

I want to make sure that the BC members understand that while the board can participate the face-to-face meeting in LA is by no means a negotiation. We are not there to strike a deal or a compromise with the board. And the co-chairs are clear that that's what CCWG is insisting on.

The second is that we'll do an awful lot of work while we're there on analyzing the 88 public comments that have come in. And they are very substantive comments.

And they have led to the preliminary conclusion that there are enough concerns about the CCWG proposals - setting the board aside for a moment - there are enough concerns from chartering organizations and it doesn't appear possible that the CCWG will circulate a final report two weeks before we get to Dublin with the intent of having all this chartering organizations approved in Dublin.

I think that's unrealistic right now and the chairs agree. We may get something a day or two before Dublin or a day or two after, but it's not going to be there two weeks ahead of time like we had initially hoped. I will advocate a certain positioning and have been emphatic about this in meetings with the co-chairs and the general CCWG is that we will completely be firm about the community's requirements for accountability powers.

They are very familiar to members of the BC, the five community powers the BC talked about last May, May of 2014, were firmed up and affirmed by the community as what we needed in terms of accountability through this

transition. So we'll be firm about what the requirements are but we ought to be flexible about the approach needed to meet the requirements.

And I for one don't want to assume that the only way to meet the requirements was the membership structure that uses the community mechanism as the single member. I still believe that it's the best approach and the BC's comments on CCWG reflected that.

But we are open to hear from Jones Day and the board whether they had something that meets the requirements without creating other disadvantages and be able to be open to that. So that's the attitude going in, and I seem to be getting agreement from other members of CCWG on that. But I am happy to hear input from BC members on how to handle things in Los Angeles.

I can take your comments on this call or I can take them as e-mails right up to next Friday. So (Phil) that's it for now. I do see your hand up. Go ahead.

Phil Corwin: Yes thank you (Steve) and I'm glad you suggested BC members provide input before you head off to LA next week. I want to second that. BC members should really - the board provided four separate documents but there's one that summarizes the MEM - the member empowerment model - which is the - really their substitute proposal to the single member model that had been the - has been the consensus view of the CCWG.

Just a couple of quick things I note it's very complicated. I know the CCWG has a big job. There were 88 comments filed including the board's which is very expensive. But there's an awful lot for it to consider. I think it was very wise to admit that there's no way it can provide a final proposal to be considered in Dublin.

A couple of things I would note from my initial review of the board's proposal, and one can, you know, think about how much deference should be given to that since a lot of this exercise is about making the board more accountable. So they're the object of the exercise.

But two things in particular - I clarified an exchange with Bruce Tonkin. I asked - I noted that nowhere in the board's response was there any identification of anything the CCWG had proposed which rose to the level of creating a threat to the global public interest which in the working group's charter is the criteria for kind of mandatory consultation when a final report is delivered to the board.

And Bruce replied that so far as he was concerned - and of course he can't bond the board but he is vice chair - that he didn't see anything in the CCWG proposal that rose to that level of objection. Likewise neither the board or general counsel or Jones Day has identified anything in the proposal which creates legal issues. All of it is within the applicable legal framework.

The other thing is that the scope of the - we're not talking about the same scope. The CCWG proposal for a single member model creates a process by which any board action that's alleged to violate anything in the articles of incorporation or the ICANN bylaws can be challenged whereas the MEM proposed by the board only covers alleged violations of the fundamental bylaws. That's bylaws which are harder to change to amend or down the line.

So it's much (unintelligible) and for everything else the current IRP would be the available redress. And there's pretty broad agreement within the community that the current IRP is not sufficient. So it's a much narrower response. I think it has other issues which would make it less likely to be employed even where it should be.

But I'd urge BC members to look at the comments generally and particularly the board's input. And I hope that if anyone tries to start negotiating with the board in LA you'll stand up and protest very vociferously (Steve).

Steve DelBianco: You can bet I will (Phil). We are working with staff on a summary of the 88 public comments. And when that's available I'm going to circulate to everyone in the BC as well. It might be easier to digest that than to read through the detail of all 88 comments. Okay.

Phil Corwin: Okay.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks (Phil). Back to you.

Phil Corwin: Okay so I believe the next agenda item is council reports. Let me just check that.

Steve DelBianco: Oh I think we covered that.

Phil Corwin: Well just let me look over the - there may be one or two things I want to highlight about the upcoming council meeting very briefly. And let me just bring up my...

Here we go. Yes just I forwarded to the BC what's on the council agenda next week, but just to amplify we're going to vote on that motion on extending the comment period on the new TLD subsequent round. We're going to have a quarter hour discussion on that global public interest framework and its development.

We're going to have a 20-minute discussion of the new gTLD auction proceeds which will give a good sense of where council is starting to come out on that. We're going to devote more time to the GNSO review paper and we're going to discuss what's going on with accountability and the meeting strategy.

So just noting that's all on the agenda for next Thursday's call. And I already covered the state of play regarding discussions with the non-commercial side of the house regarding the chair and vice chair candidates. So we're done with that.

And I guess David Fares is not with us. He informed us on the ExComm a few hours ago that he has a distinguished visitor in town and might be called away from the call.

So on Dublin planning, all I wanted to note is that in terms of - I've noted on the last call that it's more difficult to schedule our usual early morning breakfasts in Dublin because the meeting facility does not open until 8:00 a.m. And trying to schedule things at 8:00 conflicted with other groups who wanted to get together with - who had other things scheduled at 8:30 or 9:00.

So right now it looks like we're going to be getting together with the non-commercial stakeholder group at a reception late in the day on Wednesday but that's all still in discussion. But obviously with Dublin coming up quickly we'll have more details soon. So - and then is Jimson - I don't see Jimson in the chat room. Is he on the phone line?

Jimson Olufuye: Yes (Phil). I'm right here.

Phil Corwin: Okay, well...

Jimson Olufuye: Good day everyone.

Phil Corwin: Jimson we're up to you and your operations and finance report, so please go ahead.

Jimson Olufuye: Okay this is Jimson. Thank you everyone and in particular (Steve) for the work you're doing, the CCWG on the field for coordinating of very well so far.

You can recall that Robert Hoggarth briefed us two weeks ago with regards to secretariat. So any moment from now we should be expecting a new secretariat for the BC.

Two proposals on board for BC outreach, particularly in Malaysia, about six to seven in conjunction with our new member from Asia (unintelligible) during the leadership summit. And also the Outreach Committee, they're working on their outreach in Dublin. So I believe any moment from now they will finalize all the arrangements. I'll be able to get concrete preparations communicated to everyone.

By the way, (Andrew), (Andrew Mock) is coordinator of BC outreach (unintelligible) but (unintelligible) before we close this meeting. So (unintelligible) have that across.

With regard to finance, I believe everyone has received their invoice now and if you have not, please let me know. And also appreciate everyone that have paid promptly. You recall I talked about some members that have issue with tax ID and (unintelligible) for (unintelligible) processing. So we have

contracted now Greenberg & Lieberman, a law firm so (Andrew), this requirement for the BC.

So they have commenced to work to register BC as a Washington based non-profit organization. So they will secure for us a tax ID and (unintelligible) members to easily pay their dues, those members that require this information.

So I project it will be accomplished before the end of FY16. And in this respect I would like to thank (Angie Gray), (unintelligible) and the ExComm for their cooperation making progress in this regard. So that's all from me. Thank you. Back to you (Phil).

Cecilia Smith: Hi Jimson. It's (Cecilia). I have a quick question for you.

Jimson Olufuye: Okay.

Cecilia Smith: You were saying that the law firm in D.C. will be helping to process those tax IDs. Does that mean that the payment can be made in U.S. dollars or still in euros?

Jimson Olufuye: Well firstly the firm is based in Washington, D.C. but BC will be registered as a D.C. registered organization. They are not the ones that be processing the tax IDs for us. They are going to get us our own tax ID as of an entity, nonprofit entity and also (unintelligible).

So towards the end of FY16 you will have all these parameters to put this (unintelligible) ourselves. So with that, the members can pay in (USD) going forward.

Cecilia Smith: Okay, great.

Jimson Olufuye: Easily and they can do (unintelligible).

Cecilia Smith: Okay, thank you. That would be really helpful.

Jimson Olufuye: Yes.

Cecilia Smith: Thanks.

Phil Corwin: Well thanks very much Jimson for that updated report. And we're now at the quarter hour before the end of the hour. We're up to any other business. Does anyone on the call or in the chat room or on the phone line have any other issues they want to bring up in regard to anything we've discussed or in regard to planning for the Dublin meeting or anything else of concern?

Well I don't see any hands or hear any intervention on the phone line. So I think with that we can conclude the - hold on, I see someone. Oh (Steve) calendar for BC elections, office elections. Do you want to speak to that?

Steve DelBianco: I just wondered whether we have anything to announce so that we can get BC members to think about standing for any of the officer positions in the BC.

Phil Corwin: Well I think as soon as this call ends we're going to have an ExComm, short ExComm call in which that's an agenda item. But my understanding is that we're looking to hold the elections late fall or early winter. Of course we'll discuss that in greater detail.

But people should start thinking about if they want to run for any of these positions because other than the council seats the other four election positions

including the chair, interim chair - while I appreciate the honor I have my hands full with Council.

And particularly we're going to need someone who's interested in taking on the chair role which I can tell you so far is primarily administrative in nature but of course it also is going to require at some point some skills in forging consensus within the constituency when we have issues on which there is a broad diversity of opinion.

So it's primarily administrative on a week-to-week basis but there is going to be - there is a leadership component to it. I don't know yet whether the other officers - current officers - plan to stand for reelection, which doesn't stop anyone from throwing their hat in the ring.

So I don't have anything beyond that, is that people should start thinking about it because it's late September and we could be looking at holding an election possibly as early as November just before Thanksgiving time. But certainly it will be by December and the Thanksgiving/Christmas interval.

So - and as we all know everything comes up very fast because we're all busy with lots of ICANN work and our day jobs. And so people - BC members should start thinking about if they're interested in taking on the responsibilities of one of these officer positions that will be up for reelection. That's all I have on it at the moment.

And hearing nothing further and seeing no other hands I'm going to call this BC member call to a conclusion. There is a call next Thursday, a candidates call to take questions for the council position for which I've been nominated for reelection. So that call will be held whether someone else is nominated for that position or not because it's still important to discuss council and what BC

members expect of their counsellor for the coming two years once that election is held.

And with that we're going to end the call and ExComm members should stay on the call so we can begin our ExComm call in a few minutes. Thank you.

END