

ICANN

Moderator: Chantelle Doerksen
May 12, 2016
10:00 am CT

Coordinator: Recordings have started.

Chantelle Doerksen: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the BC members call on May 12, 2016. On the call today we have Jimson Olufuye, Kevin Audritt, Lawrence Olawale-Roberts, Jay Chapman, Steve DelBianco, Tim Smith, Barbara Wanner, Chris Wilson, Andy Abrams, Jacqueline Ruff, Hibah Hussain, Philip Corwin, Susan Kawaguchi, Denise Michel, Alex Deacon, Paul Mitchell and Claudia Selli. We also have Andrew Harris.

We have apologies from Andrew Mack, Cecilia Smith, Jay Sudowski, Marilyn Cade, Marie Pattullo, Steve Coates, Tim Chen, and Olga Yaguez. 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 thanks everyone for participating in today's call. First off, as many of you just saw in the BC list, Jay Sudowski just had a baby so officially on the record, congratulate Jay and his family on the birth of their

daughter. And we welcome - look forward to re-engaging with Jay when he's back from sort of paternity duty, so congratulations to Jay on that.

Let's go ahead, maybe - I see Steve is available and ready and waiting, so why don't I go ahead and turn to Steve to look at the policy calendar and then we can proceed from there. So Steve, if you're ready, let's go ahead and start.
Thank you.

Steve DelBianco: All right, thank you, Chris. The first thing I'll note is since our last call, we filed three comments and they're at the top of the policy calendar. On the 30th of April, we filed a comment on the op plan and budget and thanks for Jimson, Marilyn and Denise, and I know we got a follow-up question from ICANN staff about that so let's be sure to follow up on that.

Number two was, on May 5th, without a comment on the safeguards to mitigate DNS abuse. If you recall, we filed them early because we had them ready and because we hoped that others would perhaps pick up on the specific things that we raised.

This comment period closes on the 13th of May. There have been five comments filed so far including ours. So if any of you are aware of other groups within CSG and other groups even outside of ICANN who might be inclined to support or amplify what we said, this would be a great time to forward them the link to our comments and tell them they've got a couple of days to get theirs in.

And then on May 10th, earlier this week, we filed a comment supporting the release of country and territory names in two dot brand gTLDs (unintelligible). Thanks to Andy Abrams forgetting that in, and I should have also said that with the gTLD safeguards, I wanted to thank Angie Graves, Andy Abrams,

Denise Michel, Olga Yaguez, and you, Chris. Thanks very much for getting that done.

So that's the comments we filed since the last call that we've had on the BC. When it comes to open public comments, this ought to be brief. If you scroll down on the policy calendar, there are only two open comments at this point that we need to probably focus on as a BC group.

In the first one is the draft new bylaws for ICANN. This comment close down the 21st of May and the point of this comment period is to assess whether the lawyers and the CCWG working group and CWG working group have faithfully translated the final reports that we all approved into bylaws language for ICANN.

This isn't supposed to be an opportunity to add something that we wish we had gotten. It's not an opportunity to argue with something we don't like. This is an exercise where we're all trying to stay very focused on - our community worked so hard to approve those two final reports to the IANA stewardship transition and accountability and now the key is to turn that into bylaws language.

I have to say, I'm amazed at how well it's gone to where there are only a handful of paragraphs in the draft bylaws where there's some question as to whether the actual bylaws legal language faithfully reflects what was in the report.

And it isn't really about controversies that people are trying to fight all battles. It comes down to genuine differences unambiguous language, for instance. Or it comes down to the fact that the lawyers from ICANN and our lawyers,

when they put together a draft bylaws, in some cases they added a little something extra for clarity.

And then the CCWG comes back and says, “Well, wait a minute. That doesn’t clarify. That doesn’t belong there.” And that’s the way we had conducted that. The first attachment to the policy calendar that I sent to all of you is the draft of the BC’s comments on these bylaws and I prepared that with the help of Denise Michel. Thank you, Denise.

It really focuses only on a few areas. We basically have five points were making in that comment, one of them with respect to how do you grandfather the current registrar or registry agreement? And our point there is why we support it in the CCWG, and that is that the only agreements that are grandfathered are the registry and registrar agreements.

Other agreements, particularly those that haven’t even been written yet, shouldn’t be part of that paragraph. That’s a relatively easy one. And then Denise and I worked on three comments with respect to the reviews.

That is to say, the affirmation of commitments reviews that are brought into ICANN’s bylaws. We made a number of fine tuning enhancements to those, the one of which had to do with the timing of the reviews.

Instead of every few years, which is required under the affirmation and damned near impossible to do, we made it every five years. And that five-year flexibility has been twisted into a problem.

Now, there are some who suggest that, because the WHOIS review is already late, that we need to change the bylaw to create flexibility. And you’ll see on Page 2, where Denise and I have suggested, is that we’re actually not

concerned that the bylaws, when they go into effect, what immediately say that we are late on the WHOIS review.

We believe that applies the appropriate pressure to get it done as soon as possible. And Denise came up with some good text about the WHOIS review which is already linked, right, under the affirmation.

But we do want to have it focused tightly on implementation of WHOIS one, and the current WHOIS policy. So the BC might be an outlier on this and so I think that it might be helpful if we make sure all of us embrace this comment and maybe one where we'll want to circulate to the intellectual property constituency to see we can get them to support it as well.

We made the same point on the security, stability and resiliency review, the SSR review, and we believe that it's fine if the bylaws reflect that it's already overdue. That will just increase the pressure.

Now, the only potential downside of passing bylaws that say we're already late is that we're passing bylaws where we are aware that there is an apparent violation but I don't believe that carries any risk at all.

And IRP against ICANN, saying that you're already late for a review, would result in exactly what we want. It would result in getting the review started. I don't believe there's any chance that it would be a community IRP.

In the time that it would take to do an IRP, we could have already started the review. So Denise and I are of a mind that it's fine for us to have the bylaws reflect the fact that it's supposed to be five years under the WHOIS review. We are already late. Let's get it going. I like to take a queue on that and see if there are any further comments. I see Susan. Go ahead.

Susan Kawaguchi: Hi, Steve. I absolutely agree with the comments and on the GNSO call this morning, it was decided that the GNSO council would deliver comments also. So Philip and I can make sure that the viewpoint is at - hopefully added to that GNSO council's comments.

Steve DelBianco: Hey, Susan, thank you for doing that. And they should say that the individual in the CCWG who's most concerned about passing bylaws where there's already an apparent, you know, late violation, was Alan Greenberg of ALAC who's often a big ally of the BC and I don't have any disparaging things to say about Alan.

But he's a stickler for things like this just on the basis of being technically correct. I think he's fine with doing the review as soon as possible. I mean I - and I haven't heard anything from other people that believe that's the case.

But I have a feeling that at council, the non-contract party house, will not want to do the review of WHOIS in the short term but would prefer to stretch it out until we replace WHOIS. That's my guess. You may let up against the buzz saw on the council.

Susan Kawaguchi: Right. Well, we'll try to see what we can do about that then.

Steve DelBianco: Unless there are any objections from the folks on the call, would it be okay if Susan and Philip that we share our draft within council? I know we have several days until we have to finalize this, but are there any objections to having a draft be circulated with council?

All right, seeing none, Susan, what are you and Philip see if you can get that into the mix? The only other comment in our bylaws, which I - is the

comment number two. It has to do with the framework of interpretation on human rights and that is a work stream two project.

And it will take a long time and it will be extremely controversial because human rights came up over and over again in discussing the CCWG accountability and there was a fun agreement about whether one would cherry pick a few human rights such as privacy, free expression, fair use and something like that, or what it be all human rights, all 19 of the UN declaration of human rights?

And those - all human rights include the right for creators to earn a living from their content, so there's a balance when you use all human rights, but if you can cherry pick human rights we believe that could be a real sore spot for ICANN.

In the second would be are human rights things that would give rise to enforceability under and IRP? And I can tell you that most of the business community, all the business community was opposed to the idea that suddenly the UN declaration of human rights or some subset of that would suddenly become enforceable action that others could take against ICANN.

Instead, we set up our language to say that ICANN would respect human rights as required by applicable law - respect. So respecting human rights is something that's acceptable but it should not go to the point of enforceability.

And that's a long-winded way of explaining why comment two - we came up with the phrase at the bottom to say it's really about respecting human rights and there is no bylaw in here anticipating that human rights would be enforceable action. Barbara, question for you?

Barbara Wanner: Yes, I'm sorry, I was muted. I just wanted to say and support sort of the backs of the BC's comments that USCIB and are comments we'll be making a similar point concerning B through D and the grandfathering section.

And also, too, we felt that the language pertaining to human rights was appropriately cabined, if you will, to not expand ICANN's mission. Is that in accord with what the BC will be suggesting?

Steve DelBianco: Slightly different, Barbara, but if you please look at Page 2.

Barbara Wanner: Okay, okay.

Steve DelBianco: Page 2, Item 2, you'll see that I have quoted the text in the draft that was circulated for public comment and it broadly felt that it is ambiguous and it creates an ambiguous expectation, that the framework of interpretation in work stream two could come up with enforceability.

Because this is the words, "except as provided herein." And that exception opens up the door to say that enforceability could become a reality. And that is why, at the bottom, in italics, you'll see what I came up with, "it shall not obligate ICANN to enforce it."

Barbara Wanner: Okay.

Steve DelBianco: So if your membership could see clear, it would be better they supported our alternative text rather than what's in the current draft.

Barbara Wanner: Okay, I will run that by them. Thank you. Thanks for that clarification.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Barbara. I'll take a queue now. Is there anyone else who wants to suggest other parts of the bylaws? And it is a pretty hefty document. I don't fault any of you for failing to read it. And are there any other parts of the draft bylaws that merit attention from the BC?

Chris Wilson: So, Steve, this is Chris. You know, one slight thing I recognized in the bylaws, I think it's Section 4.3A, maybe little 2, but anyway, there's - it references the mission as - ICANN's mission as using a (unintelligible) of limited technical.

And while there is - while I think ICANN's mission is largely technical, I think, at least certainly since the new gTLD rollout last year, that there's more - ICANN does more than just purely a technical function.

And so I thought, you know, I suggest perhaps we consider - just when it's in regards to bylaws, we simply just limited and technical and justifying missions defined in the bylaws and just simply just referred to mission wherever possible because it's already defined, rather than adding sort of pejorative adjectives to what the mission may or may not be. That's a suggestion for folks to think about.

Steve DelBianco: Chris, thank you for that. The first thing I'll do is I'll check how well the draft tracks to the approved final report because if the words limited, technical, were in our approved final report, right, I will be able to fight that battle at this point because then we would be differing from the report.

However, if our lawyers added or repeated that phrase in place is that we didn't have in our report, I'll promise you that I'll indicate that that was unnecessary and doesn't match the report. Would that be okay?

Chris Wilson: Yes, that's fine.

Steve DelBianco: Yes, because I mean, you may be 100% correct but if it's what we had in our final report, we're not going to be able to get it out of the bylaws. And I'll do that, okay?

Chris Wilson: That's great, thanks.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you. Good catch. I'm not seeing any other hands. Thanks again, Denise, for the help you gave me on those reviews. And then we did take the chance in our comments to point out that the ATRT3 review, while we're not quibbling with the bylaws language, we are reminding everybody of what the BC is saying is that we prefer to finish will work stream two accountability item, because seven of them are squarely in the purview of ATRT.

We prefer to finish them under work stream two and then begin ATRT in 2018 which would be in keeping with the new bylaws. And the beauty of that approach is that work stream two has far greater power to impose its recommendations over a board and management that doesn't want to accept them.

ATRT has less power than work stream two does. And ironically, to make this work, we have to say to the community that while the board was going to start ATRT3 in 2017, it doesn't need to.

The bylaws allow them to started in 2018 and let's use the extra year for work stream two. So do not, do not agree that the BC is being inconsistent. We are being consistent with what the bylaws require.

And into cases, it means that these reviews need to start right away, SSR and WHOIS, and in one case, the ATRT, it doesn't have to start until 2018. And

so we are - we're being principled about this and trying to get these reviews done on the schedules that the bylaws dictate. Go ahead, Denise.

Denise Michel: Thanks, Steve, and apologies, I'm in traffic so it might be a little noisy here. Is there - what's your sense on whether we can be a little bit stronger than preferring that the current - that the SSR and WHOIS reviews be conducted as the current commitment requires?

I haven't, obviously, been involved in these negotiations so I defer to you on what's appropriate, but preference sounds a little weak to me and what we're dealing with is an actual board resolution that directed staff to start the SSR and WHOIS reviews on specific dates.

Those states have passed. So that's the current mandate and I would prefer - I would (unintelligible) with a little stronger, requesting that they (unintelligible) on current mandate. Thanks.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks, Denise, and user footnotes citing the board approved resolutions. And the word prefer is certainly not as strong as it could be. I don't think we can have the word demand but I am happy to have suggestions about how the BC expresses its preference, it's strong preference, in another phrase.

Denise Michel: Can adjust be we request that ICANN follow through on the board approved start dates?

Steve DelBianco: I'm happy to go with request. If anybody has better phrases, stick them in the chat. Thank you, Denise. Anything else? Okay, I'll add those two items. The next item on the policy calendar, the only other public comment that's open is our release of country territory names for three well-known brands - Hyundai, Kia and GoDaddy.

And Andy Abrams has done a fabulous job on BC comments in the past. You'll note that ICANN finally acknowledged a request when they put out these RSEPs, that they that's in together so that dot brands are together and not mixed in with open TLDs.

I hope that they're doing it because we requested it and not just because that's the order in which they've been coming in. But, at least in this case, we have that. Andy, you're on the call. Can I mean on you to do a Hyundai, Kia and GoDaddy draft in the next several days?

Andy Abrams: Hi, Steve. It's Andy. Of course.

Steve DelBianco: Outstanding. Thanks again, Andy. I appreciate that.

Andy Abrams: Sure.

Steve DelBianco: Okay, if you turn to channel two in the policy calendar, we discussed council. What I've done here is indicate for you the previous meeting. I've indicated for you the minutes, the four resolutions they've passed in the transcripts. And teeing this up for Susan and Philip - I'm sorry, Denise, is your hand up? Go ahead.

Denise Michel: Yes, just really quickly since you are mentioning RSEP, I wanted to note that in sort of doing a more wholesome research and analysis on the RSEP program over the last ten years, that posted basic data on a couple of - a Webpage, which is certainly useful to see that.

However, they did ignore our specific request to provide data on public comment. And so, you know, we need to go back to them and specifically

asked them to do that. I think part of what the BC will be interested in, and we're looking more holistically at this program, is that the purpose of it, in part, is list it as and consider that it's appropriate in corporate public comments.

This is an important aspect of this program, actually, over the last ten years, that both the level of engagement, type of engagement and the results of that engagement.

So I feel pretty strongly that that's an important data point that's missing, that staff hasn't followed through on. And we might see the BC reinforce that point. Again, we can see we can get staff to provide - to publish that data as well. Thanks.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks, Denise. I had noted this in the channel three under the policy calendar on the RSEP analysis. And the ICANN responds was probably not particularly tuned to the BC.

It was part of the global domain division operations metrics page. So, yes, let's do that. Let's do an email from our chair to staff expressing, you know, appreciation for the operations metrics but attaching and reiterating our earlier request for the public comment analysis.

Chris and I can draft that. Let me get a look at it and then send it over. It's just a follow-up to a previous CC request. So I don't believe it needs to be noticed for 14 days by the membership.

Chris Wilson: Steve, this is Chris. Real quick, I was - you know, I know that Chantelle has reached back out to ICANN - pertinent ICANN staff to make that point sort of informally. So I'm happy to do a more formal thing as well if you want.

But maybe we want to - maybe Chantelle, if you have any news on - if any feedback has been given to you on our follow-up, that will be helpful now. But we can certainly talk more about this going forward. But, to be clear, we have done at least an initial follow-up since that email was sent out.

Steve DelBianco: Chantelle writes into the chat, Chris, the know follow-up has been given, but Chantelle, does that mean that - did you follow up and get no reply? Okay, so Chantelle, would you forward us whatever email or communications that you did and then I guess we'll have to follow up with a letter from Chris.

You know what, Chantelle, send it to the full BC private, not just to Excomm. Wonderful. And because whatever words you used, it might be that - and by the way, if there's someone on staff, Chantelle, that you were friendly with, it would be a great chance to say, "Look, this is escalating into BC because you haven't replied. Please reply so we don't have to go through this."

I mean, if you make that request today, is a chance you'll get a response. I'm just waiting for Chantelle to finish typing. Okay. All right, Chantelle, thank you, and Denise.

So back to channel two on the policy calendar before we turn it over to Philip and Susan, I did want to note that we've got in here the agenda for the Council meeting which occurs at 1200 UTC today.

The agenda is in here and there are no motions on the agenda, just discussion. So Susan and Philip, to the - well, you know, actually I don't think we have Philip on the line, so Susan, go ahead. Or if Phil as well, either one of you.

Philip Corwin: I'm on the line, Steve, but go ahead, Susan.

Susan Kawaguchi: Thanks, Steve. Thanks, Philip. Yes, we had the call this morning which is 5:00 am my time. But - and so there was an interesting discussion that I thought was important. And, Philip, anything I don't cover, please pitch in.

Philip Corwin: Sure.

Susan Kawaguchi: So the CCWG on Internet Government Olivier Crepin-Leblond gave a presentation. And there are some concerning things going on in ITU and ITS in general one of which is some countries are claiming that IP addresses are not allocated fairly and they want - they're asking for control country by country to allocate instead of regional which that would be a concern in my opinion at least. And they're some of the countries that were sort of not in favor of that are sort of coming to the middle and supporting some middle ground and that seems danger. So that's something we need to keep an eye out for.

He also thought that the reason that they're suggesting a middle ground is just to - do to a lack of knowledge. And then there's also a call for GNS resources to be international governmentalized. That was his wording in his document. So the (A raise) root should be taken away and moved over to Geneva to an international framework. And that's about all he really said. There wasn't a lot of detail there. But those two things could be, you know, could definitely minimize IANA's control. And so we should keep an eye out for that. And anybody that participates in IT or IGF maybe could lend a hand in educating those that may not have the knowledge they need. I don't know if there's a discussion on that at all if anybody wants to add anything.

The other thing I did mention already was that we're - the GNSO council is going to provide a comment on the bylaws, IANA's bylaws. So we'll make -

Phil and I will work on that with - Paul McGrady's doing the first draft. So it might be helpful just to send our first draft, our draft over to him. I had a question though for you Steve. There's the Customer Standing Committee, the CSC and there will be an opportunity to have GNSO counselor as liaison. And it has to be a non-registry. And I was wondering how important or integral it would be to have someone more from the CSG than for the NCUC or the registrars?

Steve DelBianco: Hey Susan so that question was for me. So I'd respond that I think it would be valuable that the naming - I mean the registrars are obviously going to be very interested at getting that GNSO slot on the Customer Standing Committee. But if there's an opening I certainly think that the CSG would prefer to go after that rather than allowing it to go a non - an NCSG, a Non-Commercial Stakeholders Group. So it'd be my view that the registrars are the logical choice to get that. And if they're not pushing hard for that, that council oriented piece, the CSG should find a way to get it.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay. And then so I'll make sure that we keep an eye on that. I guess that has to be formed by July 15. So it probably will be a bigger topic in Helsinki. The last one on my list was that the IRT for the Thick Whois that is already combined with the RDAP IRT is now suggesting that the translation and transliteration of Whois be combined into one single IRT and because there's a lot of interdependencies. But there wasn't much support for this which I was really glad the registries and the registrars pushed back. The Thick Whois was approved almost three years ago I think. And since the board for implementation and it might be implemented in the next six months to a year but only if RDAP's ready. And there's some debate of whether RDAP is really ready yet because this policy's really surrounding development surrounding RDAP.

So my viewpoint is that adding another set of issues to this IRT to be combined is just going to push everything off to another six months to a year which then we're going to be close to where all - where's the RVS, you know, working group? Do they have recommendations ready? Maybe we should push off or wait for that. So I think we need to fix Whois now as much as we can and then also continue down the stream of - workstream of, you know, the next generation RVS. So those were - that was a concerning issue on today's call too. But there was a lot of pushback. So Phil anything else that I didn't cover?

Phil Corwin: Yes thank you Susan. Just a few quick things I'd add. First towards the beginning of the council call on the consent agenda they confirm the three co-chairs for the RPM Review Working Group which is myself J. Scott Evans and Kathy Kleiman from the NCUC. There was some discussion of Meeting B there may be some groups want to see if any time can be carved out where they can meet together or collectively. And there was also a desire to have a seeing if we can get a council meeting with the board at some point in that meeting. But overall folks seem to be pretty satisfied with the way Meeting B is shaping up with a heavy emphasis on policy which is what it's supposed to be.

And I circulated on the BC list a few hours ago the latest version of that schedule. The only thing I have to add to the - what Susan said about the Internet governance discussion it says becoming clear that the IANA transition is not completely wanted the pressure from what we refer to as the usual suspect governments for an alternative to IANA within the ITU and that needs to continue to be monitored of course.

And let's see. And there was some discussion of the Red Cross. And there may be an opportunity at Helsinki or shortly after to resolve the Red Cross

concerns which are a separate issue from more general IGO issues. So that's all I had to add on the council call. Again it was - there were no votes on this morning's call. And the next council meeting is in Helsinki. Thank you.

Chris Wilson: Jimson do you have your hand raised?

Jimson Olufuye: Yes, Chris. I just wanted to chip in on Item 5 Internet Governance to let us know that I have been appointed to the working group on the house corporation, that is the CSG Working Group on the house corporation. This is part of the engagement we talk about too little be on the lookout and I can assure you about that. The second Phil - as Phil and Susan noted concerning pressure for an alternate their organization this list of ICANN would just to let you know that yes this was then started and have been appointed to be in that working group and we will be quite watchful. Thank you.

Chris Wilson: Thank you Jimson. Susan so anything else from your side?

Susan Kawaguchi: Not for me.

Chris Wilson: Okay.

Susan Kawaguchi: Jimson, I'm glad that you're working in the IFG.

Phil Corwin: Yes, nothing further on council Chris.

Chris Wilson: Do you want to turn to Channel 3? I guess I can...

Philip Corwin: Go for it.

Chris Wilson: Yes, I'll - why - I'll pinch hit for Cheryl again, really only sort of two things of note. There was a - one we had is a call on May 9 with the sort of leadership of the different commercial stakeholder groups, constituencies to - with ICANN staff to discuss their respective comments on ICANN's budget. I'll let Jimson talk more about that when he - when we get to him. Jimson was the lead on that on the call and provided input. There was a follow-up question from ICANN staff on a suggestion or a comments regarding better clarity into compliance efforts from contract compliance office, et cetera, with registries, registrars. And we're trying to - well we're working on getting response to them on that issue. And again I'll let Jimson talk more about that when he's up.

And then secondly with regard for Meeting B the Commercial Stakeholder Group leaders were having a call on May 17 to sort of finalize to what extent the CSG would perhaps be meeting during Meeting B. As of now there's nothing scheduled but there is thought being given to doing a CSG meeting at some - during one of the lunch breaks for meeting B. I should say that the BC - we're currently scheduled the BC as requested space to meet on Monday during the lunch break on Monday to have a BC meeting. So if there's going to be a CSG meeting it would occur hopefully, you know, Tuesday, Wednesday or Thursday during the lunch break. But really the lunch break seems to be the only real good time to do any sort of meeting. And so we're still - I'm still sort of talking with IPC leadership and ISP leadership on what on how best to do that.

In addition to that is also discussion about whether or not and to what extent we can do a CSG sort of engagement with the GAC in lieu of a breakfast because a breakfast just wouldn't work for this meeting since all the working sessions begin at 8:00 am. It would be too difficult to pull off a breakfast with the early workday. So we're also exploring the possibility of maybe trying to

do a lunch instead but that's something we'll have to hammer out on our call May 17. I know we have to get back to Glen by May 18 for any requests so we'll hopefully have more on that next week but that's what's calendared for now from the CSG side of things. Any questions from folks on that? Okay Jimson perhaps we can turn to you then.

Jimson Olufuye: Okay, Chris, thank you very much. That my presentation? Okay while she brings it up yes we did engage with the ICANN Finance Team on Monday. Chris and I were in there, provided some at least one response, one clear response to one of our issue raised, and also requested for clarity for one of our issues, as Chris mentioned on the - from request. So on the screen you should have a link with regard to - yes you can see the link. This asks the question about the external (audit and cost) report of ICANN finances, so we pointed to the linke where you can all get the previous estimate of the cost report on ICANN finances. So that's one, and then two, the requester for clarification on the prior comments - if a document is made on the Item 2 in the general organization and five-year business plan.

So our comments on item 2 stated that the BC move that management is team are provided to the communities (unintelligible) response from the range of operational concerns. However, we felt that if you report on Registry and Registrar compliance is a signed agreement so this is are key metric that should be regularly reported. So I drafted this and was on the backdrop that a number of members have complained many times that - about issue of compliance. So the question was posed, what report and data is the the BC team looking for? So can you please share your expectations and the metrics you want compliance to regularly report on?

So, when I drafted this I had in mind that at least this reporting that we're okay they are following the agreement by super percentage (unintelligible) for

by 50% compliance, and so on and so forth. So now here is the background to that observation or comment. That is in Point 18, Item 4.4, which ICANN can commit to promote more clarity and establish mechanisms to increase trust within the ecosystem, those that are rooted in the public interest and so on and so forth. So providing that kind of report will put a build trust and confidence. So back to members know what specific metrics this on that question like (unintelligible) is provided compiling registry or registrar or compliance?

Chris Wilson: Jimson, this is Chris....

Jimson Olufuye: Also, we can also take written comments.

Chris Wilson: This is Chris. Just to clarify, I think you're seeking BC input...

Jimson Olufuye: Yes, Chris?

Chris Wilson: ...on how best to respond to ICANN's question is that correct?

Jimson Olufuye: Correct.

Chris Wilson: So perhaps maybe we take a look at that question for those and see what, you know, what input we can provide Jimson to properly respond to ICANN staff and give them some more clarity on what exactly where were talking about on that. So folks if not on this call because we are getting to the end of this - end of the hour if not on this call perhaps people can send Jimson feedback sort of emailing the BC private list but including Jimson and then making sure what - we have information that we can provide staff on that.

Jimson Olufuye: Okay, thank you Chris. And also, to let members know that invoices for FY17 will be sent by the end of May, and also I want to thank all the members that

contributed their efforts and input to the BC comment on the BC FY17 proposal. So, it is before you, and your suggestions are welcome. In respect to operations, we are still the testing stage for the new BC website and that's the link there, so, we project that it will be activated before the end of this month. We're going to migrate to the Memberclicks platform, but so far the process is (going) smoothly. Then also, to remind us of the upcoming charter review call (later this month), and for members to take a moment to review the draft charter. While this opportunity also appreciate all members of the Charter Review Committee led by Andy. So, thank you Chris. Back to you.

Chris Wilson: Thank you Jimson. That's - any other questions for Jimson or any other further thoughts on that? Well if not then we can go ahead and move to any other business. Just real quick we'll have our next call in two weeks' time on May 26. Hopefully at that time will also have a better, a much firmer sense of what will be taking place with regard to the BC and the CSG during Meeting B and we'll know as we get closer to the end of June in Helsinki.

I should note for as far as Meeting B for those who may not know ICANN just I think early this week we post - listed hotels that they've negotiated rates with. I know that it's been unavailable for a little while but now they are available on the meeting Web page. So for those that are not yet booked that are going but have not yet booked their hotel I suggest you go - and Chantelle's kindly put the link up on the in the chat room so you can go there now and find the list of hotels and book accordingly. Also wanted to remind folks that you received I guess a week ago from me the updated charter for your consideration. I know Andy Abrams also did have a follow-up email to that so please if you haven't already take a look at that document and Andy's email.

As I think I mentioned we're going to have a call on May 31 at 12:00 noon Eastern Time. I guess that's 16 UTC to just devoted to looking at the charter

and answering questions people may have about it and so forth. So please do take a look at that. It's a very important document, very important for the BC. This is a - not something that's done often so it really is important that folks take a look at it and provide feedback and input so we can finalize this in the near future and put to bed the very hard work that many have done on this over the - frankly over the years. So just again a reminder May 31 we'll have a call on that. That is it for me. Anyone else have any other business or thoughts or issues that they'd like to raise?

Steve DelBianco: Just one for me Chris?

Chris Wilson: Sure.

Jimson Olufuye: I think Chris, I think he's there yes.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks, Jimson too. On May 24 the US Congress Senate Commerce Committee will be holding a hearing about the ICANN and IANA transition. And that is the committee on which Senator Ted Cruz sits. And we are assured that he will be there for that hearing. And again he's got plenty of political issues that don't have a lot to do with the domain name system but it will certainly be a very lively hearing.

I've been invited as a witness and have accepted. There will be at least one from CDT that's the Center for Democracy and Technology. We'll also have a witness David Gross who's got many clients among the members on this call but ICANN is also one of his clients. And I don't know about the other witnesses but we can expect that there may be one or two that are very opposed to either the timing or the even idea of the transition itself so that should be a lively hearing. I'm appearing on behalf of Net Choice not on

behalf of the BC but happy to keep all of you informed and try to articulate the BC's perspective.

Chris Wilson: Thanks Steve, worth noting for sure. That - this - as Steve notes the expectation is that this hearing might be - will certainly be a little more lively so shall we say than the hearing that occurred in March right after Marrakesh and in no small part as Steve mentioned because Senator Cruz will be present and will be sure to make his point - his points clear during the hearing so it will be interesting to see how it all plays out. Any other thoughts, issues from folks? Seeing none then I will give everyone ten minutes back of their time. And thank you all for being here and we'll talk again in a couple of weeks. And ExCom will do a quick call, just give us a couple minutes and we'll do our call early. Thanks everybody. Chantelle we can stop recording.

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

BC ExCom members, please stand by and we will be transferring your line shortly.

END