

**ICANN**

**Coordinator: Chantelle Doerksen**  
**April 28, 2016**  
**10:00 am CT**

Coordinator: Recording started.

Chantelle Doerksen: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the BC members call on April 28, 2016. On the call today we have Jay Sudowski, Angie Graves, Lawrence Olawale-Roberts, Jimson Olufuye, Jay Chapman, Chris Wilson, Steve DelBianco, Paul Mitchell, Philip Corwin, Beth Allegretti, Andy Abrams, Barbara Wanner, Alex Deacon, Marie Pattullo, Denise Michel, Olga Yaguez, Claudia Martinuzzi, Steve Coates, Cecilia Smith, Marta Capelo, Andrew Harris, Susan Kawaguchi, and Kevin Audritt, and Laura Covington.

We have apologies from Tim Chen and Gabriela Szlak. From staff we have myself, Chantelle Doerksen. I'd like to remind all participants please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you ever so much and over to you, Chris.

Chris Wilson: Thank you Chantelle. Thanks everyone for taking the time to join us today. Per usual we have a fairly full agenda and so without further ado, perhaps why don't I let Steve - turn it over to you for review of the policy calendar.

Let me also just say Steve that the BC is heartened to have you back with us and certainly continue to keep you and your family in our thoughts and prayers. But we're glad that you're back engaged and we look forward to working with you further. So Steve, back over to you. Thank you.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you Chris, and thanks to all of you for your condolences and good wishes from - in particular Phil Corwin attended my son's memorial service. It's really meant a lot to me to have the support of all of you friends and business colleagues.

I'll also apologize that I probably will get a lot of this wrong on today's policy calendar since I pretty much missed the last three weeks of my life, and apologies for that. I'll catch up soon enough.

First thing we'll take at the top of the policy calendar is the only recent comment that I was able to track is on April 23 we sought our comment on the geographic regions review. Thanks again to Andy Mack for leading that, several of the rest of you for contributing edits.

Let me know now though. Are there other comments we submitted prior - between the 18th of March and the 23rd of April that I've missed?

Chris Wilson: Steve this is Chris. I don't believe so.

Steve DelBianco: Great. So if any of you become aware of things that I have failed to track and put onto the business constituency Web site, just please let me know. And thanks again Andy Mack for taking care of that.

Let me move to the four open public comments that are available now. And this won't take too long. The first is our comment on ICANN's draft op plan and budget for Fiscal 2017. And great news is that we already have a draft. It was led by Jimson. There has been plenty of help trying to get it done.

And what we'd like to do is try to understand whether the BC is going to need to put a significant discussion in on this. These comments close in just a few days on April the 30th. So this would be the time to record whether you want to add anything specific.

This is the first attachment to the policy calendar, which any of you can click on the policy calendar, bring it up. It's only two pages long. And we have some specific observations and a request for increasing the supported traveler slots for public meetings, the Business Constituency requesting a small expansion to send the entire executive team to the ICANN public meetings.

So we have a total of five slots today at ICANN public meetings, but we have two elected counselors – we use two of them – and then only three of the executive committee members who are going to carry most of the weight of the work. So I think it's an appropriate request.

Are there any comments in the queue on additions and changes? I see Denise. Go ahead Denise.

Denise Michel: Hi. Just a couple of items and I'll send some text today. I think it would be useful to underscore what I believe has been a general past position in the BC, and that is asking for continued improvement in the planning and budgeting process overall at ICANN, and in particular the KPIs, key performance indicators or sort of metrics, both in articulation of what the objectives are,

essentially what they plan on doing with the money, and how they're measuring their – and reporting on their success – still needs to be improved.

So I would suggest that we include some text on that. In addition, again I think connecting back to previous positions at the BC, I would also suggest some text calling for additional transparency. And I believe this ties in with some work of the CCWG on accountability and that is a publication of all the contractors and consultants that ICANN uses and in general calling for more transparency in ICANN expenditures. Thank you.

Steve DelBianco: Denise, this would fit under Category B – general observations – number one, would be a good place to put transparency. And then I do believe B2 probably is better for transparency, B2.

And then if you could add a paragraph on the key performance indicators or KPI. Today being the 28th and the comments are due in two days, could you circulate those two paragraphs in the markup as soon as possible? And then I'll put out a - we'll make that last call for BC members. Let's try to get that in today. Do you think you'd be able to accommodate that?

Denise Michel: Absolutely. I'll send it out today.

Steve DelBianco: All right.

Denise Michel: Thanks.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you Denise. Any other comments? Jimson and the rest of you, thank you very much for drafting that together. And I know that you had help from Marilyn and Chris Chaplow, Angie and Denise and Susan. Thank you.

Second item on the policy calendar is country and territory names at the second level and a couple of new gTLDs, .TORAY and .PICTET. These comments close in about 13 days. And for closed brand gTLD, dot brand gTLD, and thankfully Andy Abrams has just circulated yesterday or the day before, circulated a draft on .TORAY and .PICTET. I didn't have time to put that out to the rest of you. I was doing some things on the Hill yesterday.

But I'll send those around immediately after today's call. And then we'll have a full 13 days to review. Andy, thank you again for pulling those together. And agreed, these are our steps where the BC is very concerned that ICANN staff's not really paying much attention to our requests.

But thanks to Andy's efforts it's relatively easy for us to reiterate our principled comment on giving flexibility for Dot Brands to release the second level geographical names. Any comments on that? Andy Abrams, thank you again.

Number three, these are on gTLD safeguards to mitigate DNS abuse. And these comments close in about 15 days. It was just extended. There's been fantastic work by a number of BC members – in particular Angie Graves has led so much of this. Chris Wilson's worked on it, along with Denise Michel and Andy Abrams, and even a few others I probably have missed.

But that is the second attachment to today's policy calendar, the BC comment on safeguards to mitigate DNS abuse. So this would be an appropriate time to hear from any members who want to pitch in general ideas or offer to provide additional paragraphs.

This is a relatively short comment, about two pages right now. And again what we look at are the safeguards that were sort of developed in the 2013

framework, most of which came from the government advisory committee or GAC, safeguard advice, which was provided in Beijing.

And it took a while, but many elements of that were eventually implemented. And most but not all had the support of the BC. The BC did not completely buy into the full set of GAC safeguards, so we want to be as supportive as we can be.

But in this case, it's really a look-back to see whether they've been effective. So any comments on the draft that was circulated as a second attachment? Okay Denise, your hand's up. Go ahead.

Denise Michel: Thanks. Just a point of clarification. This draft report can be a bit confusing but the whole purpose of it is to propose research and data gathering that will support the CCT review in its broad examination of DNS abuse (unintelligible) in the new gTLDs.

And for those who haven't had a chance to read the report, although there was certainly very focused GAC efforts called DNS abuse safeguards, when looking at potential for DNS abuse and activities and rules and protocols that help safeguard from that, it's actually quite a broad category and includes a whole host of activities that the community undertook during that long period of developing the applicant guidebook.

So you'll see in the letter that we have a list of things like the 2013 RAA that included very specific requirements for the registrars, many of which really go directly to helping mitigate abuse. So I just wanted to - the draft report is written in sort of a confusing way. So I wanted to make sure people understood that the point of this paper is to draw a box around what staff will be researching and collecting data on.

And Facebook's contention is that it should make sure that it draws the proper box and catches really all the key things that the community did over the course of several years to help with DNS abuse in gTLDs. Thanks.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you Denise. Let me also acknowledge the contributions of Chris Wilson and Olga Yaguez on this first draft as well. Are there any comments? Because I know that – Angie when you circulated, Angie Graves – you circulated the last draft a few days ago, it was in anticipation that the deadline was - well, two days ago.

So given that we had the extension of time there's an opportunity to enhance this. There's no requirement that we do so. If there aren't any further comments, I will submit it. But I will wait until the deadline of May 13 to make sure that if anybody has a last minute item that...

Let's take advantage of this time and not wait till the last minute if you want to add something to the draft comment. So with that let me go to Angie Graves.

Angie Graves: Hi, thank you Steve. This is Angie. Just to add to Denise's comment, we really do want to help ICANN draw a box around what should be considered in determining – in measuring DNS abuse.

So if there are other documents or source materials that we have not yet considered, I think Denise did an amazing job adding so many to the list of what we should consider. That would be a great place to contribute.

So if you think of a document that exists that we could use to add to ICANN's scope of research or drawing the box a little bit bigger, that would be very helpful. Thank you.

Steve DelBianco: Angie, I'll note that on the first page of the draft comment that you and your colleagues have prepared there is a list of items. And specifically we are asking ICANN to consider and incorporate abuse mitigation elements from all these different documents.

Do we have an expectation that staff will then dive into those 15 different documents and do that work? Is that part of the plan that staff will do after this implementation report?

Angie Graves: Yes, this is Angie again. If you read the call for comments – and Denise may want to add to this as well or someone else – but their report did include three documents named that they were going to look at. And so it was our expectation that they would look at those three and just add it to the list they started.

Steve DelBianco: All right then I believe it might be necessary to call sharper attention to the fact that while staff acknowledged there were three source documents, we have come up with a dozen more relevant source documents. And maybe more explicitly call out that we recommend that staff look for abuse related elements in all these other documents as well, just to make it a little bit firmer of an ask. And maybe that's an edit that I can provide. Denise.

Denise Michel: Yes. I think that's a great suggestion. I had one question and then also a comment. The question is whether the - I didn't have time to check into this, but if there was official BC support for the GAC safeguard then that could be elevated into the bulleted list as well. Was that the case?



Steve DelBianco: Denise this is - yeah Denise, this is Steve. In the write-up that I did initially for this, I indicated that we supported many of the GAC safeguards in December 2014 with quote/unquote "this letter." So that link. And then in June 2013 we went further in the second link.

So I will put both of those links into the body of the comment with footnotes hyperlinking to the earlier BC comments. Would that be helpful?

Denise Michel: Yes, I think that would be helpful. And my expectation is that in doing this research and data gathering that staff does look at all of the additional elements that we list there and pull out appropriate indicators for this work.

Steve DelBianco: They do, but in the paragraph in the draft it says you may find our path to public comments useful. And that link goes to our entire list of well over a couple of hundred comments.

Denise Michel: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: What I will do is link...

Denise Michel: Yes, I included that for education purposes more than anything. This really seemed like a draft report written by someone who was relatively new to this area. But what I was referring to was the specific list of - the bulleted list that we include there...

Steve DelBianco: Ah, I got it.

Denise Michel: ...and responding to your question of - yes I would expect a researcher to actually look at all of those documents and come up with a much more fulsome list of research and data metrics for this report.

And then finally because there seems to have been a fair amount of confusion about this draft report and the direction that it should go, if the BC can come to closure sooner before the extended deadline I think it would benefit the broader community to file the BC comments sooner before the deadline so other community groups who are interested in this topic can read them and factor that into their comments as well. Thanks.

Steve DelBianco: That's a good suggestion. It's not as if we're worried about staff looking at it sooner. They've got enough to do, but your point is other members of the ICANN community might agree with what we're submitting.

Denise Michel: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: I think that's an idea worth pursuing, so I will make the two changes I just offered to do now right away and circulate that. Maybe I'll put that out for a last call giving say three days in the hopes that we can put this in on May the 1st. And that would give other parts of the community a chance to echo our concerns.

Any objections to that plan? Okay, seeing no hands, let me again acknowledge the work of Denise, of Angie Graves, of Olga, Andy Abrams, and Chris Wilson. Thank you very much.

I only have one more. It's the CCWG accountability draft bylaws. This is Item 4 on my list of the policy calendar. And it is referenced in the third attachment to the policy calendar, which is a document I have prepared for the leadership

of the CCWG. And we will be discussing with CCWG on our next call as we plan ahead for Work Stream 2.

Work Stream 2 bylaws will end up being an important consideration. But this particular public comment Number 4 is about the full set of bylaws, and it's several hundred pages. And these comments will close on the 21st of May.

It's the result of work between the two law firms hired by CCWG as well as ICANN Legal, who worked off of the final approved report on CCWG transition and CWG transition for IANA to come up with a set of bylaws to implement that final report.

And that was supposed to be a strictly confined exercise that didn't look at re-litigating or re-thinking the final report but simply coming up with bylaws that faithfully implemented what we had in the final report. But I can tell you that on many calls it was a significant temptation where someone wanted to sort of reopen earlier debates or reinterpret what was in the final report.

We were able to resist those temptations I think and pretty much come up with bylaws that faithfully implement those. The timeline we've been able to meet so far has been pretty heroic. And if we keep this up and get these comments closed on the 21st, providing there are not significant fixes required by the public comments, the board of ICANN can probably adopt those bylaws a week later on the 27th of May at a meeting they've already scheduled for this purpose.

And that will give us the opportunity to hand it over to NTIA, the U.S. Commerce Department, who can then evaluate whether the new bylaws are sufficient so we can get this transition implemented.

So this puts ICANN and the community on track for a September 30 expiration of NTIA's IANA agreement, although there are many other factors still. And many of the rest of you in Washington, D.C. are aware there are other political factors that may or may not lead to perhaps some extension of that deadline.

But let's be sure to get our work done because politics are what politics are. So I will volunteer to draft the BC comment on those bylaws, given that it reflects a report that we in the BC approved. I don't expect these to be extensive comments at all. So at this point I'll take hands from anyone else who'd like to assist me in that drafting or comment on this one. Phil?

Philip Corwin: Yes, Steve. First of all, I'd like to volunteer to be a backup on that drafting. I've been participating in the recent CCWG accountability calls. I've reviewed the redline draft of the bylaws once. It does seem to pretty faithfully reflect what's in the final report. There hasn't been any game playing.

And there's only one item that's being discussed right now that I'm aware of. There's some question about whether it completely tracks it.

My question though is I think it's pretty clear that the bylaws are an accurate reflection of the report and that they're going to be completed on time to allow a transition let's say October 1, the day after the appropriation freeze expires and the contract expires.

But there's a lot more to be done. I noted for example that both the PTI, which is a new corporation that ICANN will contract with or perform the root zone functions as well as the empowered community, both of them have to be established as non-profit California public benefit corporations.

Do you see there being enough time? We've got basically five months left to get all that other stuff done besides the bylaws that must be not just approved but implemented for the NTIA to complete the transition on October 1.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks Phil. I think October 1 is eminently doable for the establishment of paperwork, establishment of corporations. It's probably not sufficient time to actually assign and hire personnel and to fully populate the policies and procedures of PTI.

That is understood by Larry Strickling, who said that the determination he has to make in mid-August will have to be one that's based upon an expectation that some tasks will take a little longer.

But I think that what Strickling will be looking for by mid-August – and that's when he has to decide whether to extend or to suggest that it would expire on September 30 – is as long as the paperwork is in process to establish the legal entity of PTI, there's an understanding that the rest of that implementation could take after August the 15th.

I hope that answers your question. And I do appreciate your participation on those calls and volunteering to help me with this comment.

Philip Corwin: Yes, thanks Steve.

Steve DelBianco: I have just one small related matter, and I covered this at the very bottom of the report. Before I turn this over to Phil, Susan, and Cheryl. But with respect to this IANA transition and ICANN accountability, Work Stream 2 items, there are nine significant items. And six of them overlap very tightly with what would be covered in the next accountability and transparency review team or ATRT 3.

So I had been assigned by leadership of CCWG to lay out a case for whether we should hand off to ATRT 3 in January of 2017. Or should CCWG take an extra year to do the work of six of these Work Stream 2 items and defer the beginning of ATRT 3 until January of 2018?

I did the research to determine that our new bylaws would allow that because the bylaws say five years between reviews whereas the AoC had three years. And so far anyone I've checked with is on board with the idea that CCWG has a greater amount of power to force the board to implement changes than the ATRT would.

And therefore we would like to get as much of the Work Stream 2 items done by the CCWG under those bylaw powers rather than handing them to an ATRT that wouldn't have the same level of power.

So my notes on the policy calendar as well as the third attachment to the policy calendar lay out the case that I've been trying to make. And I'd be grateful for feedback from BC members about whether that's a plan you think we should pursue. And I'll take a queue on that. Go ahead Denise.

Denise Michel: Sounds reasonable to me. Thanks.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you. And Susan?

Susan Kawaguchi: So - and I have no issue with - I think that sounds as Denise said, reasonable, and it's a good plan. But this does bring up the other AoC reviews which there's getting to be quite a discussion on different threads.

One is the SSR review. Now that hasn't had as much discussion, but there's definitely a lot of pushback on the WHOIS review that should have been implemented, you know, started already, and now is maybe late fall 2017, somewhere in there.

People are saying that we should, you know - and using the CCWG bylaws to say oh we have more time, which is sort of true.

Steve DelBianco: Not really. Not really. The...

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: ...CCWG bylaws say five years between reviews. And we'll already be late...

Susan Kawaguchi: Right.

Steve DelBianco: ...on that.

Susan Kawaguchi: Exactly.

Steve DelBianco: Because by our calculation, when was the beginning of the previous WHOIS review, Susan?

Susan Kawaguchi: Well we delivered the report in 2012. That's when we delivered the report.

Steve DelBianco: Okay.

Susan Kawaguchi: So - and there's definitely a growing dynamic to say that the RDS Working Group has to be completed before a WHOIS review team is seated. So I think that along with your - you know, the issue on ATRT, that the BC should

definitely develop a stamp on that and be proactive in asserting that, what we want, because there's quite a few different stakeholder groups that are saying absolutely not, just wait for 12 months after the RDS is done. The RDS isn't going to be done for...

Steve DelBianco: Years.

Susan Kawaguchi: ...maybe four years, yeah. So - and I think the WHOIS review team is looking back, see what has been done over the last few years and have the original recommendation, have those been implemented.

So I think we – along with – need to develop a position for the ATRT. We also need to do that for the WHOIS review team and the SSR and be very public about it – I'm not sure how, but...

Steve DelBianco: Okay. All right, Susan, that's a great point. It doesn't exactly dovetail with this particular one. What I was getting at here is that of the nine items in Work Stream 2, six of them fit neatly into ATRT. And rather than let ATRT start and take them over, we want to delay ATRT because we can, in order for CCWG to finish the six.

None of those nine items have anything to do with WHOIS. So the WHOIS discussion has come up on the call, and you'll be quite amazed. I guess it was yesterday, it was an acknowledgement – Alan Greenberg I think brought it up – that we are already late on the next WHOIS review if you follow the timeline of the Affirmation of Commitment. We're already late.

Susan Kawaguchi: Right.



Steve DelBianco: The point that was brought up is that with the bylaws that we've recommended for CCWG there's a five-year interval between reviews. And once we put those bylaws in this year, we're immediately going to be late on WHOIS because we didn't start it this year.

So there was actually a call to say let's have a transitional paragraph in the bylaws suggesting that there could be more time to start the WHOIS review. I could understand doing that so that it doesn't look as if we've implemented bylaws that we are already in violation of. I could get that, although it didn't really bother me very much on the call.

I'm afraid however that some will use that transitional bylaw to create even more delay for the beginning of the next WHOIS review. So Phil and I have been very...

Susan Kawaguchi: Exactly.

Steve DelBianco: ...active on these calls. And we will take your advice and if there is any transitional language to avoid saying that we are already in violation of the bylaws, we won't allow that to turn into an excuse for further delay.

I take your point that we want to start the WHOIS review within the next few months, not to wait for after the RDAP, not to wait until the RDS is done.

Susan Kawaguchi: Correct.

Steve DelBianco: Do I have that right? Okay.

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: Got it. Denise?

Denise Michel: Yes, so I think to draw a finer point on this, the relevancy here is in acknowledging that there's a very unique situation with the CCWG accountability and transition work and such a strong overlap with the ATRT scope that it's appropriate in this case to delay.

But, you know, we think that in doing that it would also be appropriate to lay out a sort of BC position and have some leadership here in ensuring that this is seen as a unique delay and articulate what the BC would like to see in terms of a review schedule coming up.

And that would help lay some suggestions that would review only be kicked off...

((Crosstalk))

Denise Michel: Are the S's done or that we ignore that the FSR review needs to start. I think rather than wait for staff to suggest something that, you know, that the BC could potentially have some leadership here. And maybe – perhaps come up with a statement that articulates our understanding and desire in ensuring that some of, you know, the timing of some of these...

((Crosstalk))

Denise Michel: The scope and...

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: Got it. And the way I had articulated it with its third attachment is we're not trying to create some excuse for delaying ATRT 3, but suggesting that the sixth work stream to accountability item would be much more powerfully implemented if the CCWG kept them rather than hand them off to ATRT 3.

So you're right. We're not going to try to make it seem as if we're making a case for delay, because in fact, you know, the bylaws would accommodate starting ATRT 3 in 2018.

The bylaws is probably not the place where the BC would take this position on starting the Whois review and the SSR. But it's a position we can develop so that we can use it at council meetings with Gus, and if in fact the public comment were to come up. But I agree with you. And...

((Crosstalk))

Denise Michel: Yes. I'll just, I'll draft something just so we have an opportunity to get on the same page about the reviews in general and in case we find it useful in the future.

I think we in particular wanted to for stall any suggestion that because we're supporting a delay in ATRT 3 it would we would want to push all of the reviews out quite a ways. And I don't – that's certainly not the case...

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: You know; I have an idea then. In the comment we're submitting on the new bylaws, okay, that's a great opportunity, the one that Phil Corwin's going to help me with. I'm going to add you to help on that because that's a great

opportunity for BC to recognize that the bylaws accommodate the ATRT in 2018.

And that we support that. But to reiterate our concerns that Whois review should begin as soon as possible and not wait in the FSR review. So why don't we add that to our comments on the draft bylaws since it will be a great place to focus it on.

Denise Michel: Sure.

Steve DelBianco: Okay Denise. I'll add you and Phil to help me with that.

Denise Michel: Okay.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks. All right, there's nothing else for me there. So Chris, I wanted to turn it back over to you and to our councilors on Channel 2 discussion of GNSO Council.

Chris Wilson: Great. Thank you Steve. Phil and Susan, why don't we go turn it to you and here what's going on in the GNSO Council? I know you all had your meeting a couple weeks ago after the BC Member's meeting. So I'd love for an update there and then what we can expect going forward.

Philip Corwin: Sure. This is Phil. I'd be glad to start off and have Susan chime in if that's okay with her.

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes, that's fine.

Philip Corwin: Okay yes. The last council meeting was on April 14. It was a little bit after our BC call so we were able to discuss the issues right before we went into that council meeting and get very near-term feedback.

The next council meeting is on May 12, which is two weeks from today. It's probably another day we're going to have a BC meeting. But the council meeting takes place at 1200 UTC, which is 8 am East Coast Time and 5 am, sorry Susan, Pacific Time.

So it's going to be before the BC meeting. So we'll interact with the BC just prior to that to get any guidance we need on issues coming up. The document filing deadline for motions and other documents is this coming Monday, May 12.

At the April meeting we took – we approved three items by votes. One was the approval of our – of a council proposed approach for implementing recommendations from the GNSO review.

The second vote was on approving the procedures for governing the selection of a GNSO liaison to the GAC. And I know staff was going to be sending out a notice to the constituencies and stakeholders, but I'm not sure if that's gone out yet. But if any BC member has an interest in that position, we're going to need someone good on that.

Mason Cole from Donuts and the registry stakeholder group has been doing it the last two years. I had worked with him quite a bit in my role as co-chair of the working group on IGO rights processes. And it's not – it's an important job. It's not an easy job.

It requires being in the GAC meetings at ICANN meetings and developing relationship with the GAC. And help with trying to help bring them along in integrating the GAC into the policy process in a more timely way, which is going to be even more important as we go to the new post-transition system.

And so again, if any BC member has an interest in that role, there's an opportunity to volunteer and put your name forward.

The final vote was to approve the input to the ICANN Board on the GAC Marrakesh wall communicate. And let me stop there, if you've got any questions on council action at the April meeting. And I don't see any.

Susan Kawaguchi: There's not questions. I have a couple comments. This is...

((Crosstalk))

Philip Corwin: Sure.

Susan Kawaguchi: So on the GAC liaison, one of the things we had advocated for was rotating the position. But we didn't win that battle. I do think it's important that it not only – not always be a registrar. And, you know, we've only had one of these, but we don't have a pattern of that.

But I think different viewpoints from the community in general would be good for the GAC to, you know, someone with different viewpoints would be good for the GAC to interact with.

So – and I think the BC probably has more issues aligned with the GAC sometimes than the registrars or registries. So, you know, if we did have a

candidate to put forward that would be great. And I agree with Phil on that to urge people.

The other thing is we did approve the recommendations from the GNSO review, but there was three recommendations that were not recommended to go forward that we implemented.

And one of which was to look at the structure of the GNSO in general. And as you know, we all struggle with, you know, being a part of the CSG and not having a complete voice of our own.

And so that was one of the do not implement. And it was categorized and read. And they changed that to be – to make sure that there's some understanding that at this time maybe in the GNSO review it should not – we should not move forward with restructuring the GNSO.

But that doesn't mean that there is no interest or agreement that there are issues and that we should think about that in the future. Because I was concerned that down the way somebody would go oh, the whole GNSO agreed. Look, it's in red. We should never talk about that subject. So we did get that changed in the record.

Philip Corwin: Okay thank you for adding that detail Susan. The one other item I wanted to bring up is the planning for the Helsinki meeting I sent to the BC list. There have been two tentative schedules so far. The latest one was earlier this week to briefly review what's going on.

You all have that Excel spreadsheet. I don't know if we have that to put up in the chat room. But the way it's structured, now there will be a meeting of the

CCWG accountability on Sunday afternoon, as I understand. Steve is that correct?

Steve DelBianco: Yes Phil.

Philip Corwin: Right. And that's the only meeting that's taking place outside the four-day window. ICANN staff was quite resistant to any and all other requests to schedule meetings pri – outside the four-day window.

The GNSO schedule at this point and time is on Monday to – in the first part of the day to have council meeting and discuss quite a number of issues. And then in the afternoon, early afternoon a meeting of the working group by co-chair and IGO curative rights processes.

And I'm happy to report that we finally gotten the final draft report from our legal expert on cyber immunity of IGO's. And I don't know if we can complete our work in Helsinki, but we're – we expect to move forward quickly now.

The afternoon – mid-afternoon to late is for cross-community discussions. Interestingly the board's schedule for this on most days is participation in SO, AC, SG and say policy development work. So I guess that means the board members are going to be spreading out and sitting in on GNSO meetings and ALAC meetings.

And the second day, all morning is taken up by the working group on next generation registry data services that Susan's involved with. And then the afternoon session is going to be on cross-community working group of the auction, the last resort auction proceeding.



And then late in the day again, concluding with cross-community discussions. On Wednesday, there's going to be GNSO Council bilateral meeting requests. I'm not sure what that means, but that's what's on the schedule.

And then the rest of the day will be meeting of the subsequent procedures working group, which is looking at whether they'll be a Round 2 of new TLDs and what, if any changes should be made on the applicant guide book other than the rights protection mechanisms.

Again, the day ends with cross-community discussions. And then there's a council prep session late in the day from 6 to 8 pm. On the final day, the morning is taken up with an hour and a half meeting of the new working group on rights protection mechanisms.

And while it won't be official till Monday, the – there's trifecta or troika co-chair arrangement there were two of the three co-chairs will be from the BC. One is myself, one is J. Scott Evans and the third co-chair will be Kathy Kleinman from the MCSG.

And in the late morning there's a council meeting. Then there's a council wrap up session. And then there's cross-community discussions. Now you'll note in that schedule there's no slots for stakeholder constituency meetings. And quite a few have asked for time to do that. So I think they'll be further adjustments in the schedule. But that's where we stand now.

My personal reaction is that it's going to be a very busy meeting and very focused and hard working on policy issues. It will be quite different from the ICANM meetings we're used to. So I'll stop there. That's the last item I have on council report and see if there's any comments. I think Denise has her hand up. Go ahead Denise.

Denise Michel: Yes, clearly I had too much coffee this morning. Just a couple quick comments looking at the first day. It would be great if – I think it will be really useful to have the full cross-community groups discussing, you know, key shared topics. It would be great if CCNSO could suspend tech day for an hour and a half to join the rest of the community on Monday.

And then also I think it would be useful if instead of staff opening the session on Monday morning, we had the chairs of the SOs and ACs opening the session. And giving them an opportunity to highlight what they see as critical issues they would like the rest of the community to join them in throughout the few days.

And then finally, I'm a little (unintelligible) copy that GAC has so early in the process provided such detail to all of their schedules is kind of showing us up. And it would be great to have similar detail on the GNSO Council, on the GNSO schedule as well. I think it's really shaping up to be a very productive meeting. Thanks.

Philip Corwin: Thanks for those comments Denise. And yes, as I said, I think it's going to be a hardworking, productive meeting. As well, I took down notes on your comments and we can convey them back to council as we provide further feedback and further develop the schedule.

Chris Wilson: Phil this is Chris. Maybe if I could take the time maybe.

Philip Corwin: Sure.

((Crosstalk))

Chris Wilson: For folks that are on the call right now. Who knows for sure that they will be attending Meeting B? I know it's two months out, but if you know you're going to attend, could you may be put a green checkmark by your name?

Laura Covington: Hey Chris, it's Laura Covington. I'm not on the Adobe, but I'll be there.

Chris Wilson: Great. Thanks. I see we've got, you know, 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9 people from the BC. We still got to participate on today's call acknowledging they'll be there. So I was just curious just to get a sense of BC participation and engagement. And that's helpful. So thank you very much everybody for doing that. Andrew Mack I see your hand is raised.

Andrew Mack: No No.

Chris Wilson: Okay.

Andrew Mack: Sorry. That's old.

Philip Corwin: Okay. Well I think that's all we have on council. So we can move on to Channel 3.

Chris Wilson: Great. Thank you Phil. Cheryl cannot be on the call today. So I will just quickly substitute for her with regards to CSG activity. Steve, in the counter Steve has mentioned some of the work that's already starting (to skass) with regard to IANA transition and ICANN accountability.

I will save in the agenda added, there will be a call on May 9. The CSGs and the GNSO will be doing a call on May 9 with ICANN staff, in particular discussing the all book comments and it is regarding the budget – ICANN's budget.

So it will be a joint call with the ISPCP, the IPC and the BC to sort of orally present our comments, if you will, provide further clarity on our comments to pertinent staff.

We're going to – those that will participate will be BC Excomm and those BC members who volunteered to draft the comments with regards to the budget. So we – I'm happy – we can certainly report back to folks on that. What was discussed. But it will be a joint CSG call on May 9, the morning of May 9 to discuss budget comments.

What's further to CSG discussion, and actually I think sort of dovetails with it, a little bit of an email threat we had if not this week, last week on BC planning and CSG planning for Meeting B.

As folks know, as you get Phil discussing the calendar, there's not constituency day for this meeting. Obviously a lot of activities revolve specifically around the policy PDP work and so forth.

So the question is to what extent, if any, should the CSG do collective activities during the Meeting B. And of course, to what extent constituencies should be doing their own meetings.

And so the discussion came up of whether or not we should do another CSG GAC breakfast as we did in Marrakesh during – and in Helsinki. And what my initial information was to perhaps not do that for Meeting B and then perhaps just wait until Meeting C.

I know others within the CSG leadership are interested perhaps in doing a breakfast during Meeting B. So it may be that we'll soon be planning a CSG

GAC breakfast in Helsinki for one of those mornings. And I will hopefully get more information on that.

Outside of that I don't think we'll have any planned CSG activities for Meeting B. It may be that we reserve the right to sort of have a CSG meeting if we think there's need for collective input into some of the working group activity going on during those four days.

And so we may sort of do maybe an ad hoc meeting at some point. But as of now I don't think there's, pending the schedule, CSG meeting during Meeting B. But we – that may be – that may change. But as of now that's not the case.

And whether the fact that the board is not scheduling to meet with the CSG as they usually do during Meeting B, I don't think we'll have a board – necessarily have a board CSG interaction – formal board CSG interaction during Meeting B either.

But welcome comments on that if folks have interest in that. And I see Phil, I see you made a comment regarding the GAC breakfast. You know, I think that – it goes without saying we would do it – certainly do it earlier rather than later because of what's going on.

But, you know, maybe that we do a 7:30 breakfast. Give folks a chance to do that and then go off to do their work beginning at 8:30. But that's a good point Phil. And we'll discuss that. Other thoughts? I see Barbara do you have your hand raised?

Barbara Wanner: Yes, thanks so much Chris. I was just wondering if you had any further information concerning Meeting C. Are they – have they narrowed their decision for venues?

Chris Wilson: So as far as – well, they certainly – their venues, I think they're only down to three venues as far as options. I'm not – I don't believe they formally have announced, and I certainly haven't heard a formal announcement that they will be moving Meeting C.

And as I mentioned before, Las Vegas is the leading candidate for the next – for the alternative venue, which would be a week before the meeting is currently scheduled to take place a week earlier than scheduled.

But I have not seen any official announcement on that. I don't know if the board – at the last board meeting I don't think it was actually on the agenda, which I thought it was going to be. It doesn't seem to be on the agenda. It was not on the agenda.

So as of now I have no new news on that. If others have heard something else, please, please let us know. But as of now we're still scheduled to go to San Juan. But I do think we'll get a note – we'll learn soon that that's not going to be the case. Okay anything else? Any questions or concerns on what I just said? Phil.

Philip Corwin: Yes, Chris I just want to – I noted the other day. They put up a revised meeting schedule. And it lists the locations of the meetings in 2017 team, but for the C meeting in 2016, the San Juan is no longer listed. So it looks like we're not going to San Juan based on that. But they haven't met yet and decided where we are going.

Chris Wilson: Great. Thank you Phil. Okay, so for rest, I'll go ahead and turn to Jimson for his update. Jimson you available?

Jimson Olufuye: Yes, Chris and everyone, Jimson Olufuye. I did send the first draft FY17 to the list. So, I'd like to encourage our members to take a very close look and provide input, particularly in the area of the expense level.

We're projecting that for FY17 we do more outreach across continents like Latin America, Asia and of course, Africa. So, and there was a draft provided to coordinate around resources, you know, outreaches.

So I want to thank the Finance Committee, Chris Chaplow and Angie Graves. And of course Marilyn, and the Outreach committee as well for their inputs on the draft outreach and budget proposal. The two are a work in progress. We have the (unintelligible) for gTLD.

Of course, we have some members that are in the new membership process membership (unintelligible). And so we'll pick of the day of the – this I will have to – until June 30th

So in respect to operations, so the General Counsel from the last time agreed on the clause for a decision. It's proposed that the indemnification will cover general counsel and all of the Excomm officers will not be covered.

And to take care of the indemnification to buy in insurance that (unintelligible) that. And the corporate piece around is the same corporate piece that is seven days. (We're still working on the paperwork).

So here is from the Excomm there is no objection on the clause. And also I wish to request a decision from members on some of this. So if there's no objections, then we'll go ahead and finalize the entire process.

So, that's across the clause on the screen. So like I said, please go ahead and take a look at it closely. Also I want to thank the Charter committee, the Charter group that have gone ahead and to provide a preview of the charter. They even received the incorporation based on a review of charter. So I want to thank the entire committee for the new charter.

Then lastly, I want to talk about the Memberclicks. And you can recall the in the updates a petition that was announced. But to help us more, it's members of management, it's a kind of a profile update to change things that are...

Chris Wilson: Shall we read it Jimson?

Jimson Olufuye: Hello? Can you hear me?

Chris Wilson: Yes.

Jimson Olufuye: Yes. My telephone got cut off. So I'm switching to Adobe. Can you hear me?

Chris Wilson: Yes.

Jimson Olufuye: Okay great. So for the last part, I'll be talking about Memberclicks, over the next two to three weeks, we'll be finalizing this. My question to the chatroom, and I want to encourage members to visit the new website. This [cbu.memberclicks.net](http://cbu.memberclicks.net). If possible, Chantelle could you type it into the Adobe chatroom. Soon, the new BC website with Memberclicks will be used: [cbu.memberclicks.net](http://cbu.memberclicks.net).

So, once we finalize the transfer, the migration, then we'll consider this URL. Once we configure it, we'll configure it to be our main URL name. That is



bizconst.org. So the website, and all our email, customized email, (will remain) intact.

And by that time, we'll be ready to also send invoices to our members. So we're targeting that by end of May, we'll be able to send invoices around to all the members. So, thank you, from my side. Chris, back to you. Any questions?

Chris Wilson: Thank you, Jimson, for that. I know Steve mention in the chat box, just saying your audio is much better when you're speaking through Adobe audio, for what it's worth, rather than the phone. FYI in the future if you can use Adobe audio.

Jimson Olufuye: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Chris Wilson: But, thank you, Jimson for that update. Let me just quickly say next meeting will be Thursday, May 12, two weeks from today, same time. And then lastly, for those that maybe aren't out in Washington or in tune with what was going on, there's been a change.

The US GAC rep has been Suzanne Radel for at least the last ten years. She's transitioning to a new role within the Department of Commerce. So someone will be replacing her as the GAC rep. His name is Chris Hemerline.

Chris is relatively new to the ICANN space. He had been doing more other ITU work and other Internet governance work within NTIA Department of Commerce. So he's now – but he will now be the full-time GAC rep for the US Government.

And so for those that are in Washington, I – who haven't yet met Chris, I encourage you to try to do so. He's a great person and will be a great US Government representative on the GAC for the US.

So I just wanted to announce that to folks that may not have already heard. And so for those that will be in Helsinki, I also recommend you going up and introducing yourself. And he thanks us to hear from US businesses especially and learn more about what their interests are and how he can be helpful as a US Government rep.

So any other thoughts, concerns, questions from folks? Terrific. Okay well everybody thank you very much. Excomm will do our call momentarily. Everyone else thank you very much. And we'll talk to you in a couple of weeks. You can stop recording.

Chantelle Doerksen: Thank you everyone. Operator you may now stop the recording.

END