

ICANN

Moderator: Chantelle Doerksen
April 14, 2016
10:00 am CT

Chantelle Doerksen: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the BC member's call on April 14, 2016. On the call today we have Jay Chapman, Jimson Olufuye, Geoffrey Noakes, Beth Allegretti, Paul Mitchell, Barbara Wanner, Susan Kawaguchi, Jay Sudowski, J. Scott Evans, Gabrielle Szlak, Angie Graves, Philip Corwin, Chris Wilson, Andy Abrams, Andrew Harris, Claudia Selli, Hibah Hussain, Laurence Olawale-Roberts, Kevin Audritt, Marie Pattullo, Claudia Martinuzzi, Tim Smith. We have apologies from Tim Chen, Laura Covington, Olga Yaguez, Steve Del Bianco and Cheryl Miller. From staff, we have myself, Chantelle Doerksen. I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you ever so much and over to you Chris.

Chris Wilson: Thank you Chantelle and thank you everyone for joining today's call. As you'll see from the agenda I'm wearing a few different hats today. Obviously Steve won't be joining us on today's call and we continue to express our sympathies for him during this difficult time. I just want to reiterate for folks who may not have seen my email I guess yesterday if you're interested in making a memorial contribution in tribute to Steve's son Danny you can do so through the Navy Seal Foundation which is Navysealfoundation.org.

I know he appreciates the expressions of sympathy that those that have offered to him. And, you know, no timetable on when he may come back to us but will proceed accordingly. And I know Steve is – appreciates all the thoughts and prayers everyone has expressed. So in that regard I want to go ahead and do my best Steve DelBianco impersonation and run through the policy calendar for folks. Maybe Chantelle if you can go ahead and put that up. Thank you.

So I have more or less worked off of Steve's calendar from two weeks ago. As best I can tell nothing – there's been no new public comment matters open since then. And I'm looking – we're sort of looking back now at what we have open and pending and that what we've talked about, we sort of talked about a couple of weeks ago which was maybe get status reports on these items.

So moving right through to channel one on the first item we've got the draft framework and principles for the Cross Community Working Groups. Comments close on April 16 which is Saturday. As you can see there's - Steve has provided a little bit of background information there. I know two weeks ago we had reached the point where we really had not received much substantive comment from BC members on this manner. I know Marilyn Cade has suggested a few items. John Berard has suggested a couple of things but we really didn't have much there there.

I know Steve had volunteered two weeks ago to provide a draft for folks to work off of. Obviously he was unable to do so and won't be doing so. So we as of now we don't have any substantive comments from the BC on this issue. And considering comments are due in two days we - we're stuck a little bit on this one.

But I'm opening up the floor to folks if there are substantive comments and things we want to say on this we can, you know, try to work on putting something together quickly. The alternative would be if we have something to say but we don't have enough time to put it together because of Steve's absence we can perhaps, you know, seek a temporary, a brief extension on time just for purposes, unusual circumstances of the BC having to deal with Steve's absence.

Are there any – just on this first item any thoughts or issues or persons writing in the chat room? Are there any thoughts or concerns on this or thinking about this?

I know Marilyn had posted to the listserv I think last night that a couple of trade associations that are members of the BC USCIB and ICC Basis are working on comments on this matter. And perhaps we can try to incorporate what they have said into a BC comment.

I have not taken a look at those comments yet unfortunately. And I don't think they've been circulated to the full BC. But we can see if – I can see if I can find those and do so. I know Barbara you're on. I think maybe you could just speak to US CIBs. Will you all be filing specific comments on this?

Barbara Wanner: No. Actually I think Marilyn might be a little bit confused. USCIB will not be filing separate comments on this. We defer to ICC Basis on this particular submission.

Chris Wilson: Okay thank you. I – that's I think that's what I thought. So I haven't seen – maybe I missed it. I have not seen a draft from ICC Basis on this. But once I get one I can certainly send it around. But I think considering we haven't had a lot of member feedback on this and it's been open now for weeks I'm

inclined to not file something concerning the guideline is just two days away. I think it'd be tough for us to sort of get something done but I'm open to further suggestions. Denise I think your I see your hand raised. Denise?

I see Denise has got some audio issues right now. She's typing in the chat room. But I'm open to other – any other - while Denise is typing any other thoughts on this matter from folks? Okay I see Denise for a second. So I can – for us that might be the best course of action. We can seek an extension. I mean I know the deadline on this matter was extended already but I think considering our circumstances I think it's reasonable.

I'm happy to do that and will do that. But if we're going to do that then I think we need to make sure we're going to file something. I'd hate to ask for an extension and not end up filing anything. So if, you know, sort of put out another call for folks who have thoughts on this matter that we really need to get them out to the BC for consideration so we can put something on paper. And we can...

Barbara Wanner: Chris excuse me. This is Barbara again. I'm happy to – I am rooting through my email now trying to find the latest draft of ICC's comments on this particular issue. Once I find it I'll forward it to you.

Chris Wilson: Great thanks and I...

Barbara Wanner: Okay?

Chris Wilson: Sure that's great. And with we can – if it's – if nothing else we can use it as a template for discussion and consideration for the rest of the BC. I know many – there are many BC members who are not members of the International Chamber of Commerce and Basis. But if it can at least stimulate discussion,

you know, that can be helpful. But Denise I thank you. I see you're offering to help so I appreciate that.

So I will work on seeking an extension time we – I think maybe another week maybe by the end of next week. But I - more than that might be ambitious but that's sort of where I'm headed on that. All right so if there's nothing further on that issue then let's go ahead and move to Number 2. Again this is final recommendations of Geographic Regions Review Working Group. You know, comments closing April 24. Andrew Mack has drafted a comment but that it's from Jimson, Susan and Denise.

I don't think any further edits have been made to this document as far as I know since our last call two weeks ago. So are there any further thoughts on this matter edits – there haven't been any change. Okay my apologies. I missed that. All right Andrew has thought that it's I will – I don't think Andrew is – Andrew are you going to be able to circulate or maybe you already have recirculated a revised draft? Andrew Mack are you available to...

Angie Graves: Yes, Chris this is Angie Graves. I'm just going to last out the last of our email exchanges and see where that was left a few days ago. And with - yes I can follow up on this with Andy just to make sure that we have our submission and it's complete. I'd love to hear from Andy but he may not be able. Thanks.

Chris Wilson: I see Andy's in the chat room but he may not - he just may not...

Andrew Mack: Yes, sorry guys I just got here. I was...

Chris Wilson: Okay.

Andrew Mack: ...those three meetings. If you don't mind catch me quick up. Angie what were you - what would you like to comment on?

Angie Graves: Oh were just talking about the geographic diversity and what those comments were. And I had add some a week or so ago and you and I talked about it and I hadn't seen anything since. I was just trying to feebly update the group.
Thanks.

Andrew Mack: So I sent out a – I sent out the revised version that I thought included the comments that both you and Marilyn had made, very brief comments. Did that not go down to the group?

Chris Wilson: This is Chris. It may have. I might have – I think I just missed it. So maybe if you don't mind though just circulating out again today...

Andrew Mack: Sure.

Chris Wilson: ...for folks.

Andrew Mack: No problem at all. Just so everybody knows all I did was I tried to keep the same quick pithy style so not adding a lot of text. I took Marilyn's point about the STGs and mentioned that. And I took Angie's point about adding additional kinds for referencing. But there are many kinds of diversities but keeping our ask to the two things that we discussed in Marrakesh which were taking the role if you will, of people by geography and by gender. Just because we thought that that was a dual ask and, you know, something that would get us immediate results. Fair enough?

Chris Wilson: Great. Thank you. And yes that sounds good and if you could just yes recirculate that I mean...

- Andrew Mack: You've got it. No I'll dig it up and send it up as where on the thing.
- Chris Wilson: Great. And so people can take a look at that. Again comments close on April 24 so we have a, you know, time...
- Andrew Mack: Chris just as the primary writer on this what is the process? Do – will the Excomm be the ones who post that? Will I be? And if so would someone tell me what I need to do and I'll – I'm happy to do it? You tell me?
- Chris Wilson: As far as the main officially filing it? Yes, obviously Steve has always handled that so we will figure out the best way forward on doing that assuming Steve won't be available to do that.
- Andrew Mack: Right, understood of course. I will then send that out just now and if anybody has any more questions you can reach out. Thanks.
- Chris Wilson: Okay. Any other thoughts on number two? Okay moving right along then to Number 3 here on Channel 1 regarding the new GTL program safeguards to mitigate DNS abuse. Again this draft report comments close on this draft report on April 25. We've always commented in the past on the GAC safeguards on a couple circumstances.
- I know we've got, during the last call we've had a variety of BC members Susan, Alissa Cooper Angie Graves, J Scott volunteered to help draft comments. So I see Angie you have your hand raised. Do you want to speak on this?
- Angie Graves: Hi. This is Angie. I actually have done some regarding this, nothing ready to be sent. But I just thought since there were so many of us working on it I

didn't want to duplicate efforts. My intention is to have at least a basic draft out tomorrow close of business. I just hope that doesn't conflict with anybody else's. Thank you.

Chris Wilson: Great. Thanks. Thank you Angie. I mean one – maybe - that's great. We can send that out. And perhaps those that have volunteered as well as everyone else can take a look at that and add comments and edit where they want. I know again comments close April 25. So we've got a little bit of time to work on that. But thank you Angie. That will be helpful to get us thinking on this.

Because as Steve noted a couple weeks ago this is a big issue. It's an issue that the BC cares deeply about and one comment that will be very important on this. So thank you for that. Any other thoughts on this from members?
Okay.

Number four the draft FY 2017 operating plan and budget comments close April 30. You can see the link. There's a link provided to our previous comments for FY '16. The same drafting team that worked on those will be working for the most part, same drafting team is working on our current comments. You should have seen that was Attachment 3 in the email I sent out yesterday. And please take a look at that. I know maybe - maybe probably have to further edits to that document in the near future but, you know, Jimson did you want to say anything about those comments?

Jimson Olufuye: Yes, Chris thank you very much and good to hear everyone. Generally, we have for observation and then general position and specific observations in the comments. We noted that the ICANN Finance Team they done a professional job like starting the budget process securely and involving, you know, the SOs and ACs. And they mostly cooperated really realistic assumptions. They are based on revenue or in FY '16.

So the general observation we had was that there was need for Alissa's report, the reports on the registry or registrar compliance against signed agreements. So I think our members requires us to be (stronger). So and also we raised the issue of (unintelligible) orbitals so that we could review the financial performance from the point of view of an external auditor. And also wanted, you know, some kind of feedback on the - on general effectiveness, and staff driven and supported initiatives on an annual basis. So then the Ad Hoc Committee, Ad Hoc Finance Committee needs to be sustained to talk about this.

And then on the talent management, so we raised an issue of adequate provision for training of staff to prevent the issue of (unintelligible) on all of you so which we absolved this – it's mostly as the result of social engineering. So, as Chris mentioned there is something that we'll add. We did submit a budget request for it by '17.

And one of the requests is that we wanted the number of Excomm provided with travel support to be increased from three to four apart from the counselors. We have two councilors. They are provided with some council support and then we have the officers for (unintelligible) provided four. So we wanted (unintelligible) by audit fours are covered. So we'll be taking that request through this comment and because this might be a better approach to getting that message across.

Even as we mentioned then even if some of our members or our officers cannot use it, you know, a number of our members are quite active that could make sure this opportunity to be further engaged in the policy work. So that needs to be sent across. There is also the request for increasing the number of

officers to be supported with travel, you know, travel support. So that's edit will go out shortly. Thank you. Back to you Chris.

Chris Wilson: Thank you Jimson and thank you for your work on this and as well as Marilyn, Chris and Angie, Denise and Susan for helping on that. And again you'll see it was attached to policy calendar I sent yesterday. As Jimson noted there'll be some further edits made. But we welcome all member feedback. Susan, I see your hand raised.

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes, just a quick point to clarify. I didn't help with that.

Chris Wilson: Okay.

Susan Kawaguchi: I helped with the one last year but I didn't give any input on that.

Chris Wilson: Well least in spirit Susan we'll consider you.

Susan Kawaguchi: Oh, okay. Thanks.

Chris Wilson: Any other further thoughts on the budget comments? Okay moving to the next item again release of country territory into gTLDs. dotPICT just that these comments closed on May 10 – closed on May 10. I know Andy Abrams has done work on this regard before and will be volunteering to draft BC comments on this issue. I think it won't - you know it shouldn't be a happy lift.

Hopefully, you know, Andy I don't know if you have any of that. Obviously comments aren't due for a little while so you may not have anything to add on this issue but we'll keep it on the calendar. Was there anything you want to say on that?

Andy Abrams: No. I'll get a draft comment to everybody within the next week or so.

Chris Wilson: Perfect. Thank you very much Andy. Okay I think that closes down the current public comment process for us. And obviously if things crop up between now and the next call we'll add it to the calendar. But I appreciate everybody's hard work on these matters and look forward to closing the loop on these comments here in the next week or two.

All right let's go ahead and move on to Channel 2 with regard to the GNSO council. I think we go ahead – we have Phil and Susan on today. Maybe Phil and Susan I'll turn this discussion over to you with regard to today's – later today I know that GNSO Council will be meeting. Maybe you could provide a little more clarity on what's going to transpire.

And I know we talked about this a little bit a couple of weeks ago but now that we've had a couple of weeks to look at some of these items maybe you could speak to them a little more for us. Phil, Susan?

Philip Corwin: Okay Chris, Susan how did you want to proceed? It's - is there any items here you want to take the lead on or should I just start reading through them?

Chris Wilson: For me?

Philip Corwin: No I was asking Susan...

Chris Wilson: Oh.

Philip Corwin: ...how she wanted to proceed on these. I'm happy to start talking and let her lead on any that she wants to. Does that work Susan? Well I'm not hearing her so I'll just get started.

First item we're going to have a presentation on possible next steps in resolving the issue of permanent protection of certain Red Cross identifiers. Back in 2013 the Council approved final recommendations from a working group on the protection of IGO INGO identifiers.

Of course there's another working group on curative rights processes which I'm co-chairing on that general subject. And I'm happy to report we just got a final memo from a legal expert. So that working group will be able to move forward now.

But getting back to this item, protections were adopted for the Red Cross for the full names Red Cross Red Crescent Red Crystal Red Lion and Sun at both the top and second levels in all six UN languages. However, there is still open questions regard to names and acronyms of 189 national Red Cross societies and the International Red Cross movement.

So we're going to get a – we had a presentation at ICANN 55 from Red Cross representatives. And they're going to further brief us today on possible next steps on those protections. Having not yet heard the presentation which will take place late today, I can't give you any more detail on what they're going to propose or how the council might react to it.

On next item is GNS review. This was a review undertaken by the ICANN board by its Structural Improvements Committee which is now known as the Organizational Effectiveness Committee. They used Westlake governance as their examiner. And there's been a long trail on this. The most recent

development was council received the working party's proposed implementation feasibility analysis in late February.

And yet two days ago some councilmembers and others received were part of a 90-minute briefing on some – on the working party's recommendations for the priority, which of those should be implemented, which are already being implemented and which shouldn't go forward. And they assigned different priorities. You all got the slide deck on that. I sent an explanatory email on that last night.

So we're going to review the feasibility analysis and vote. We're just voting on whether we're comfortable with the general approach they've taken to these. But if any of you have a concerns about any of their decisions regarding priorities or how they analyzed the recommendations you can raise them now or you can get it to Susan and I before the call which starts at 2100 UTC which is 5:00 PM Eastern 2:00 PM Pacific today. Did anyone have anything on that right now? Denise did you have a comment?

Denise Michel: Yes, and I'll send it to the list, but, that just a heads up we had a – there was a call yesterday. And part of that discussion it was suggested that on the item the GNSO undertaking analysis that gTLD trends that are informed, you know, the community it was suggested that that be moved from red opposed to yellow. You know, there may be something we want to consider in that vein.

It was suggested that we address staff to work with the GNSO to institute some methods of information sharing of highly relevant resources related to gTLDs and help GNSO community members increase their knowledge base. I'll send this around. But the thought here is that with expansion of ICANN staff they've added a number of, you know, researchers' data collection.

They're doing a lot more in this area. And there's frankly a lot of the public domain related to, you know, data analysis and research that's relevant to what's happening in the gTLD the environment. And I think everyone would be better served if those involved in trading GNSO gTLD policy had a correct and better understanding of the gTLD marketplace environment. Thanks.

Philip Corwin: Okay well thank you for doing these and we'll look for your email and be happy to convey those thoughts on today's council call. Susan the next item relates to the GNSO response to the GAC Marrakesh communiqué. I see that you're going to present the motion on that in the council later today. Did you want to speak on that one since you're the...

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes, let's actually go back up to Item 6 because I think that's important too.

Philip Corwin: Okay.

Susan Kawaguchi: The...

Philip Corwin: Oh sorry for jumping that.

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes, no problem. I was on mute earlier so sorry about that. Item 6 we're voting on the features to select the GNSO liaison to the GAC. This was a new position that started ago. And I wasn't aware of the process previously but it appears that it may have just been, you know, several people applied and then, you know, someone was picked. But it was not a clear set out procedure for selecting the GNSO liaison.

So this person will work with the GAC very closely every ICANN meeting. They are interacting with the GAC sitting in the GAC meetings and coming

back to report to the GNSO and then we – the GNSO provides input to go back to the GAC.

So I think it's an important position and thought that it should be rotated between the stakeholder groups. There was some pushback on that but I'm going to go back to the GAC. So I think it's an important position, but that it should be rotated between the stakeholder groups. There was some pushback on that, but I'm going to continue to push forward on rotating or just at least making it fair and the fact that it shouldn't always be a registrar or a registry, one of the contracted parties.

That just gives us some issues with non-contracted party selection. But I think if we want representation there, that's what we're going to have to ask for. So if anybody has a comment on that, but if no.

And then on the Marrakech communicator, wasn't much to comment on this time except that the -- and we discussed this a little bit in the last call -- the GAC would like the board to hold off approving the recommendations of the PPAI, the proxy privacy working groups' recommendations, and they would like to discuss them more.

The actual draft is still a little bit up in the air. The IPC asked that we make a very sort of mild statement that we're disappointed that the GAC has input and questions about this but hope they can be resolved soon.

We also commented on the fact that the GAC had said that they were going to work harder on having someone in the PDPs to be their voice. So we added a comment that we appreciate that fact because that is what needs to happen. The GAC needs to be part of the multi-stakeholder process.

So that's probably all on that. Do you want to do the budget?

Philip Corwin: Sure, sure. I would just comment on the two items you just covered. They're interrelated in a way. The outgoing GAC is on Mason Cole from the registry stakeholder group. And I've worked with him in my co-chair role on that IGO Curative Rights Working Group. It's a tough role and it requires a lot of dedication to do it, to try to bring the GAC along and get them more involved in the policy process.

Here you have a perfect example where no matter what one thinks of the elements of the final report or the PPSAI working group, that's the working group that labored for more than two years to reach final consensus recommendations. And then the GAC puts out a communique asking for a delay in their implementation over an issue that was thoroughly vetted by the working group.

So it just illustrates the need to better integrate the GAC and the importance of that liaison role.

On the proposed FY '17 budget and operating plan, yesterday I forwarded all BC members an e-mail with the attached draft GNSO comment. While we're going to discuss it in council today, the actual filing date deadline is April 30. So there is I would think good likelihood that the somewhat sketchy statement that exists right now from the council is going to be fleshed out over the next two weeks, which means that BC members can continue input to Susan and I, and we can continue to influence the final form of that comment.

If anyone wants to say anything about any of the elements of that draft statement as of now, that's fine. But, again, there are two weeks to go before it's going to be finalized and submitted on the deadline.

Next item. Implementation of the IANA stewardship transition plan. And that's ongoing. I've been on one or two of the CSG calls. I've been on several of the CCWG accountability calls where they're basically reviewing and clarifying questions about draft bylaws that are being prepared by the attorneys as well as other technical implementation steps on IANA.

We're going to just discuss the state of play and see what's next. But my impression is that the implementation is moving along rather well. I don't know if other BC members have views on that. But this is just a discussion item for council today.

Next item. We're going to plan for the meeting B in Helsinki. There are concerns about how much time will really be available for actual policy work in meeting B because - and whether different groups will be able to meaningfully interact with one another.

We just - there is a letter posted in the last 24 hours from Nick Tomasso to James Waddell stating pretty firmly that adding a day in front or in back for meetings of some of the major PDP working groups that are going on. Ones the next generation data services, subsequent tLD rounds, and the new one on RPMs and the UDRP is not an option that they're going to have to do whatever they do within the four days for this meeting.

Again, it's a discussion item. But ICANN seems pretty dug in on not letting any additional work be scheduled outside the four-day window. So we're going to have to figure out a meaningful way to get our policy work done within the confines of those four days.

Next item we have is...

Chris Wilson: This is Chris Wilson. Actually, Denise has her hand raised.

Philip Corwin: Oh, sorry, Denise. Yes, go ahead.

Chris Wilson: I also want to make a quick point after Denise. Go ahead, Denise.

Denise Michel: Just really quick. If they have provided - there is a lot of discussion about the inappropriateness of this draft that apparently staff created for the Helsinki meeting in terms of the agenda and how time was spent all of the sort of outreach and non-PDP related issues that fill the agenda.

Is there an updated draft? Could you circulate it to the list?

Philip Corwin: Sure.

Denise Michel: I just underscore the discussion that we had at our L.A. retreated. And that is that the original intention of these B meetings was to get work done. And our work is PDPs. So I would be very supportive of doing everything we can to make sure that we prioritize our time working cross-functionally, of course, but also carving out time to move our PDPs forward face-to-face.

Thanks.

Philip Corwin: Sure. Yes. Thank you for that comment, Denise. Again, with the latest development with the meeting planning staff pretty much telling the council chair that it's not going to be countenance to have face-to-face working meetings for those major PDP working groups on the day before or after the official meeting.

I think the council, given the quickly-approaching date, it's only two-and-a-half months away, the Helsinki meeting, we're going to have to grapple with proposing whatever restructuring of that meeting we believe is necessary to get our policy work done.

Next time. Status of cross-community working group on internet governance. This is another discussion item. This cross-community working group was ratified by the ccNSO and GNSO councils back in Fall 2014 and by the ALAC in Spring 2015. We're going to be discussing how to further the work of this working group on internet governance. That's a 10-minute discussion toward the end of the council meeting.

No big votes coming up today. Nothing that's significantly controversial. Again, the meeting starts at 5 p.m. eastern today, 2 p.m. pacific. So any BC members with further thoughts on any of those items simply post them to the list during the course of the day. And Susan and I can convey your views during the meeting.

So I will stop there. I don't see any hands up. So I think we can probably proceed to channel 3, Chris.

Chris Wilson: Thanks, Bill. Real quick, I will say with regard to meeting B and - one thing. First, Chantelle has posted the tentative schedule in the chatroom for folks. There is a link there.

I'd also say that the CCWG accountability group will be - they will actually be starting - they'll be meeting, I guess, on that Sunday before in Helsinki as a way to jumpstarting the Work Stream 2 work. So to some extent, there is going to be work being done on that day before. But obviously, it won't be directly related to the PDP stuff. But I'm just suggesting that the people will

be there early anyway, for those that are interested in the Work Stream 2 matters on the accountability work. So I just throw that out there for folks.

Philip Corwin: Yes. Thanks for mention that, Chris. And there was an item that crossed on the CCWG list in the last 24 hours indicating that at least - it wasn't clear from the wording, but the message I took away from it was that at least for the official members of that accountability group that ICANN's going to be paying for their extra night to be part of that meeting. So they've made an exception for that one.

But they've been resistant on approving any meetings outside the four-day window for policy development process working groups.

Chris Wilson: Great. Well, thank you.

So why don't we turn to channel 3. I'll be wearing Cheryl Miller's hat today. Cheryl can't be with us. But there are a few items for me to talk about. As you see sort of right there on the screen, there will be a likely commercial stakeholder group leadership call in early May. That date has not yet been finalized. Discuss the FY '17 budget with staff at ICANN and some board members.

It looks like right now we'll do a joint call with the few different constituencies to discuss these constituency comments, this will occur after the comments have been filed on April 30. So we're still in the throes of scheduling that call, but it's an opportunity to provide some further feedback into the process on that. And when that's finalized, I can let folks know.

Let's go to CCWG. We've talked about it just briefly, I guess, a little bit. But I did get an update a couple of days ago on the community leaders' call with

ICANN leadership. Theresa Swinehart provided an update with regard to the bylaws, a drafting of the bylaws to map to the CCWG accountability recommendations.

The bylaws are still being worked on. There were two calls held earlier this week on April 11 and April 12 to try to run down any final concerns and issues. The expectation is that the revised draft bylaws will be published for public comment on April 20 and run for 30-day public comment period.

Theresa mentioned that the expectation then would be by the end of May, they will be, after taking into consideration public comments, sent to NTIA and U.S. government at the end of May for their final consideration as a part of the overall package of the transition proposal.

So that gives you a little bit of an insight into where we are on the bylaws, the bylaw drafting. Again, as I mentioned, the expectation is that Work Stream 2 matters will be launched in full force during the - contemporaneously with meeting B in Helsinki. That's sort of where we are there.

Let me give you a little update on the ICANN 57 meeting. This was discussed as well during the community leaders' call. As you know, it's been scheduled to take place in San Juan, Puerto Rico. However, the same concerns that were - that colored the decision to move meeting B from Panama to Helsinki apply in the case of Puerto Rico as well with the Zika virus. It's prominent right now in Puerto Rico.

So Nick Tomasso and his team have come up with some alternative sites for meeting, the ICANN 57 meeting. Right now it hasn't been formally decided. I think the ICANN board will be meeting today to consider moving the meeting. But as of now, it looks like it will likely be moved to Las Vegas and

would occur the week of October 22 to 28, which is a week earlier than the meeting is currently scheduled for right now.

According to Nick and his team, that is the best option available. It's tricky because October is a very popular conference month, not just in the United States but all over the world. So a lot of the venues that they would otherwise look at have been - are simply not available.

So Las Vegas is deleting candidates for the new location. I think they've also mentioned Macau and Orlando. But I think Vegas is the leader in the clubhouse, if you will, right now. So we hope to know more, I guess, in the coming days when the board officially considers it. I can say on the community leaders' call, there was general consensus among leaders that we should move the meeting to be prudent and that Vegas itself is a suitable option for folks.

I'll keep folks posted when that becomes official. But that's where we are with regard to ICANN 57.

There also was discussion on the call with regard to ICANN's sexual harassment policy. As you know, there was an incident that occurred in the ICANN meeting in Marrakech. It was discussed in the public forum. ICANN is interested in sort of doing a comprehensive review of its policy and procedures in this regard including regarding how to handle complaints, et cetera.

They would like it to be sort of a full, multi-stakeholder bottom-up review. There has been some discussion and pushback that perhaps it may - from community leaders it may make more sense to get and list these systems of experts on sexual harassment policy to sort of take a look first and to provide

input and then perhaps there would be an opportunity for the community at large to comment on that rather than sort of the community itself coming up with a new policy.

So I think ICANN staff has taken it to heart and will provide some more clarity on exactly how they want to proceed on this going in the near future.

Phil, I see your hand raised.

Philip Corwin: Yes, Chris. Just two quick points on that. On the incident that occurred in Marrakech, the ombudsman at his ombudsman blog did publish a report on his intervention and his findings in regard to that incident. I think that was posted about a week, 10 days ago. So it's there if anyone hasn't seen it.

And you're mentioning it has triggered the realization that a few weeks ago, it looked that the GNSO council might be discussing a potential letter to ICANN on that, and that was dropped off our council agenda for today. So I just wanted to note its absence. I guess intervening events have caused the chair to decide not to engage on that issue on this month's call.

Chris Wilson: Okay. Great. Thank you. Thank you for that.

So, one last thing because I just got word today. There will be-- reporting back on reporting from the intersessional in February, that intersessional meeting just started discussion on GNSO's structure reform, in particular, the ISPCP and Christian Dawson were interested in really putting together an ad hoc look to take a hard look at structural reform of the GNSO and circulated in a draft charter document in that regard.

There will be a call now that is scheduled for April 20 to start thinking more productively about this work group and the work going forward on this issue. Invites were sent to the delegates of the intersessional non-contract party house. So I will be on that call. Those that I think were at the intersessional should have received that invitation as well.

But we can report back to the membership what was discussed and how things are going to proceed on our next member call, certainly, which is scheduled for a couple of weeks from today. But just wanted to flag that for folks that, that's now been calendared in. That Work Stream is moving forward.

I think that covers the landscape on CWG. Any questions or thought on all of that? If not, maybe we can turn back to the agenda, Chantelle, and I think Jimson is next, I believe, with regard to budget and operation. Jimson, do you have - would you like to say anything on operations, Jimson?

Jimson Olufuye: Sure. Thank you, Chris. On operations, just to quickly respond to any question earlier, for the filing of that coming, that the Excomm will be responsible for that. Of course, (approval) to get it done from Excomm.

Also to report that member speaks on board and it's still ongoing. Memberclicks is an application to help with operation, any voices and also managing member's profile expeditiously.

I want to give members a head up on the invoicing for FY '17. As you know, FY '15 ends June 30. So expect invoices by end of May so we have one month to prepare. By the time we enter into the FY '17 will be the remainder invoices coming, to be sent, as well.

I want to thank a member that's already gone ahead to pay their FY '17 dues.

Also in the finance, the finance committee met. And we've been working on the draft BC FY '17 budget proposal. So nearing the (final finance draft) now. So by the time we meet next time, in two weeks, the proposal should be ready for review and additional input.

That is all from my side now. Thank you, Chris.

Chris Wilson: Thank you, Jimson. Thank you very much for that. I know our next call - our business for our next call will occur Thursday, April 28 at the same time. Then we can finalize the budget and comment if we need to a couple of days before the comment deadline. Thank you for your work on that.

Also, Marilyn wanted me to mention that the WSIS forum will be occurring May 2 to 6 in Geneva. There will be, I think, at least one workshop there that will be focusing on ICANN, I think IANA transition, I believe. For more information, we talk to Marilyn directly and she can provide more clarity on that.

But for those might be already there planning to go, look for that workshop. I'm not sure which day, unfortunately, that's occurring, but there will be some discussion there.

Phil, I see your hand raised?

Philip Corwin: Yes. Chris, were you done on any other business. I don't want to interrupt you. I just wanted to...

Chris Wilson: No. That was the last item. So, yes.

Philip Corwin: Okay. I just want to update BC members in regard to the leadership of the new working group to review all of the rights protection mechanisms and phase 1, and then in phase 2 to conduct the first ever review of the UDRP. I presented the motion to adopt a charter on that working group in Marrakech and was appointed interim chair and GNSO liaison, a nomination for permanent leadership positions opened a week ago.

Susan was kind enough to place my name and nomination. I've received significant support. The other two candidates for leadership are Jay Scott Evans also from the BC and Kathy Kleinman from the non-commercial side of our house. The contracted parties have indicated that they don't wish to put someone in play from their side of the house; that they're satisfied with the current nominations.

The first meeting will be next Thursday, April 21. Without getting into too much detail, I can tell you that all three of the candidates for the chair positions -- and this can be structured in a number of ways -- are very cognizant of the long road ahead for this working group and the importance of launching it in a very collegial and cooperative fashion.

And we are engaged in our own conversation to see if we can present something to the full membership of that working group, which can be adopted as a leadership structure on that first call. I'm optimistic right now that, that will take place.

Right now that group is up to 123 members and close to 80 observers. And people are still joining. So we're going to have lots of volunteers available for structuring subgroups, if we get into that.

So I just wanted to bring members up to date, particularly since two of the leading candidates to lead that working group are from the BC. Thank you.

Chris Wilson: Thank you, Phil. That's great to know. We appreciate that.

Any other further thoughts from anyone else? Any comments or concerns? I see no hands raised.

We can go ahead and wrap this call up a few minutes early. Thanks very much, everybody. We look forward to talking to you two weeks from today. Certainly, is not then, we'll certainly talk to you over the list in the coming days with regard to comments that we need to file.

Thank you, all, very much and we'll talk to you soon.

Chantelle Doerksen: Thanks, everyone. Operator, you may now stop the recording. Please remember to disconnect all remaining lines and enjoy the rest of your day.

END