

ICANN

Moderator: Chantelle Doerksen
May 26, 2016
10:00 am CT

Coordinator: Excuse me. The recordings have started.

Chantelle Doerksen: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the BC Members call on May 26, 2016. On the call today we have Jimson Olufuye, Arinola Akinyemi, Paul Mitchell, Denise Michel, Philip Corwin, Chris Wilson, Jay Chapman, Kevin Audritt, Hibah Hussain, Tim Smith, Steve DelBianco, Andrew Harris, Claudia Martinuzzi, Jay Sudowski, Barbara Wanner, Marie Pattullo and Ellen Blackler.

We have apologies from Andy Abrams, Gabriella Szlak and Steve Coates, and Angie Graves is noted to arrive shortly. 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.

Christopher Wilson: Thank you Chantelle. Thanks everyone for taking the time to join us today on this ICANN Business Constituency call. I see some folks are seemingly having a difficulty getting onto the phone line, but hopefully they'll be able to get plugged in soon.

Without further ado perhaps maybe Steve we'll just go ahead and turn to you. It's been a busy week certainly here in Washington on ICANN matters but also a lot of activity going on in ICANN as well, so perhaps if I could turn to you to review the policy calendar that would be great. Thank you.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks Chris. Chantelle if it's possible could you display the policy calendar and then you can bring the agenda back up later. Thanks a lot Chantelle. First thing I'll do is - since our last call we did file some very detailed comments on the new ICANN bylaws – the draft new ICANN bylaws and those are necessary to implement the IANA transition and ICANN accountability enhancements.

This was a major topic of the hearing in the U.S. Senate on Tuesday that Chris mentioned earlier, which was very rocky and indicates that Congress may still put a few speed bumps in the way of the transition.

I guess a speed bump but a couple of months/several months of delay is certainly not going to break the entire transition but ART just pushing for a two-year delay, which I think would have a significantly negative effect.

As people try to relitigate where this transition goes you get changes to the bylaws that were unsuccessful at getting the community to approve over the last two years.

I also think it ends up lighting the fire under potentially United Nations and ITU who say, "If the U.S. wants to retain the IANA role that it has they're so desperate to retain it that must be something worth having," and that just makes it ever more attractive for the United Nations to suggest they ought to step into the U.S. shoes as opposed to turning it over to the community.

So that was a bit of a diversion but it's been on my mind all week. So we commented on the new bylaws on May 21. Let me thank Denise Michel and you Chris for your help in getting our comments in.

Chantelle thanks for the edits as well. Since our comments were developed early enough we were able to incorporate those comments pretty closely with what the Cross-Community Working Group's comments were on the bylaws.

And the new bylaws reflecting these comments will be discussed on a call later today on part of that Bylaws Review Group, so in a few hours I'll have a better idea about whether the board will vote on some of the changes we asked for.

One of the comments the BC made was that the reviews of SSR, the Security, Stability and Resiliency, and the review of WHOIS, which are required in the Affirmation of Commitments, are already late for the Affirmation of Commitments.

And the BC believes that the bylaws can reflect the five-year cycle time under which those same two reviews are already late. And the BC said, "We're not troubled by that," that it's fine to say that the bylaws are passed and we're immediately out of compliance with two deadlines.

We believe in the BC that will increase the pressure on ICANN to get those done, and that's the comment all of you approved. We submitted it. The Cross-Community Working Group didn't agree but I will continue to press for that.

I think the chances of us getting that through is low and more than likely the bylaws will reflect the fact that those two reviews are deemed not to be in default if they're conducted in the next two years.

So I will let you know what the new draft looks like when it comes out. Before I move on to the current open public comments are there any questions either about the hearing or about our comments on the bylaws?

Great. I don't see any hands so I'll scroll down to the current ICANN public comment period. Let's see, the first one is done. May 21 we already submitted that.

So the second one is the release of country and territory names in full – in three new brands. So the three new brands are Hyundai, Kia and GoDaddy and fortunately the Dot Brands are grouped together in the same RSEP request.

Let me thank Andy Abrams of Google for drafting the BC comments. That is the first attachment to today's policy calendar. Those comments are entirely consistent with BC comments that we filed for the past two years whenever an RSEP looks for geo names to be released in a Dot Brand.

Andy thank you for doing that and let me see if there's any questions or comments. These comments are due the 9th of June. They've been posted for review as of two days ago so we certainly have plenty of time for all of you to review them. Go ahead Denise.

Denise Michel: It's a bit of a tangent but I thought I would raise it now. So we're talking about RSEP. It's been quite a long time...

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: We are going to cover that later too.

Denise Michel: Oh are we? Okay. I'll wait then. Thank you.

Steve DelBianco: Yes. Denise it's under the bottom under Channel 3 and I'm going to ask Chantelle to be ready to respond to that, the RSEP analysis part, which is under Channel 3. So please if you don't mind just hold that thought till then.

Denise Michel: Sure. Thanks.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you Denise. Okay no other questions on that so let me turn to the only other public comment that's open right now, Number 3 on the policy calendar Page 1.

So a lot of you who attended Marrakech know that there was an incident involving a harassment – alleged harassment that has led to revising ICANN's Standards of Behavior, which apply to the community.

And in the policy calendar I pasted the new text that they are recommending to add to the Standards of Behavior. So right now there's a comment period. It's open until the 25th of June and all that's – the only material change to that Standard of Behavior is the addition of the paragraph.

I'll ask now are there any BC members who believe that it is either necessary or helpful that the BC comment on this addition? Are there any BC members who believe that we should, you know, in a one-sentence comment suggest that we support the change?

Or we could be quiet about it. All right, not seeing any action on that I'll just skip by that and assume that there's not much. Denise go ahead.

Denise Michel: Yes. I'd just like some time to look at this and I'll reply back to the list.
Thanks.

Steve DelBianco: And Denise when you do I guess the threshold question is should the BC comment at all, and if so is it something we support or do we have potential...

Denise Michel: Sure.

Steve DelBianco: ...improvements to the language? And as you...

Denise Michel: Sure.

Steve DelBianco: ...consider that get it the list. There's plenty of time between now and the 25th of June for the BC to debate that. We can even discuss it on our next call.

Denise Michel: Sure. Thank you.

Steve DelBianco: Okay thank you Denise. Appreciate that. So Channel 2 is going to be a discussion of Council. The previous meeting was 12th of May and I've indicated our link to the Resolutions transcript in the chat.

The next Council meeting is not until the 27th of June while we're all gathered in Helsinki, so the agenda and motions are not yet posted. I do want to turn things over to Susan and Phil, but I thought that since I deferred Denise earlier on the question of RSEP I'm going to quickly jump to that.

If you look at our Channel 3 the second item is the RSEP analysis. ICANN responded to our request on historical data and analysis of RSEP, but really all they did was point to the metrics page that the Global Domains Division uses.

So pursuant to some concerns that Denise has been leading for us we followed up. Chantelle sent a follow up to Staff right after our last BC Member call asking for attention to what it is we wanted.

We provided more detail on that as well and then Chantelle I believe has received another reply. So Chantelle give us that update and then we'll let Denise speak to it.

Chantelle Doerksen: Hi Steve it's Chantelle. So we had sent an email to the GDD team and just to note that last week they had a huge conference in Amsterdam so there is a bit of a lag in getting a response.

So then I personally reached out to one of the managers with a cc to some other Staff that I have a more formal relationship with just to say, "Hey we want to see if this has been acknowledged and what the timeline is."

And they said that they are working on it and we can consider this an acknowledgement of receipt and that they'll be in touch. And so that's the information I have for an update and I will turn it back over to you Steve.

Steve DelBianco: Okay and Denise why don't you pick up on your point on RSEP and then we'll go to Phil Corwin?

Denise Michel: Thanks Steve. I primarily wanted to know what the status was of the GDD team providing - so the - they sort of superficially provided a number of data

points that they raised as examples, but had completely ignored providing any data on public comments on RSEPs over the last decade.

So presumably Chantelle that's what they are working on right now so that was my question. And Chantelle if you could follow up with them and ask when we can expect to receive that information that would be great. Thank you.

Steve DelBianco: Denise here's a question for you having spent a decade inside of that Staff and in fact you were in charge of the Staff. Does emails from people like the BC asking, "When can we expect such and such report?" How are those received at Staff? Are they constructive and helpful or are they an annoyance?

Denise Michel: Yes, I guess it depends on how you define constructive. They're usually more impactful than other Staff asking for responses, so it would I suspect help to underscore that the request need their attention and needs to be fulfilled.

Steve DelBianco: Okay so the BC will continue to be persistent and respectful at all levels then. Okay thanks and Phil Corwin.

Philip Corwin: Thank you Steve. And I don't see Susan in the chat room. Is she on the phone line or not with us today?

Chantelle Doerksen: I believe Susan is still in transit in the air.

((Crosstalk))

Philip Corwin: Okay. That's fine. That's fine. It's a light report today. Anyway of course the last Council meeting took place just before the last BC call, so we gave an extensive report on what happened two weeks ago.

Just some basically housekeeping items. We're still looking for if someone wants to volunteer for BC representative on the GNSO Review Working Party.

I've sent along the latest update of the Helsinki schedule. It's very busy, very policy focused. I don't know if anyone has any comments or concerns about it but you all received the latest update.

Council is still looking for someone to replace Mason Cole to be the liaison to the GAC and to interface with them on behalf of the GNSO and our efforts to get the GAC more plugged in earlier to the policymaking process.

And so if anyone's interested in that please let us know. I also – I don't know whether it's apropos for this report of the CSG but there is a new outstanding request that I passed on to the ExCom yesterday to get someone from each of the stakeholder groups, which would be CSG that we're part of to be a liaison to the new CSC, the Customer Service Committee, to oversee the work of the PTI, which will be the new entity that ICANN will be contracting with to perform the IANA functions.

And in the last week the only other matter going on within the Council is we sent a letter yesterday to the board. We did have a presentation from the Red Cross on their issues with gTLDs at the Council meeting two weeks ago.

But there's still a strong feeling in the Council that the Red Cross issue should be solved in tandem with the outstanding IGO issues that are before the board.

That's mainly about protection of acronyms and full names at the first and second level. The board's been looking at that and discussing it with the GAC and small IGO group for well over a year now with no signs of progress.

And it's separate from the curative rights process issue that the working group I'm co-chairing is working at and working to complete our work by fall.

And so there was a strong feeling that the best way to get a resolution of the IGO issues was to keep them tied in tandem with the Red Cross as well as the fact that both issues were dealt with in a same identical PDP.

So Council members don't want to set the precedent of separating something that's been subject to the same PDP. So that's pretty much what's going on with Council and happy to take questions or comments on any of those items.

But as I noted it's a fairly light report today. We don't have an agenda for the next Council meeting which will take place in Helsinki.

Christopher Wilson: Thanks Phil this is Chris. I know Steve had asked a question in the chat room regarding the workload expectation for the GNSO GAC liaison. I think you may have spoken to this in the past because I – but maybe you could just tell us again about...

Philip Corwin: Yes. It's not tremendously heavy but it does require some commitment. And perhaps the biggest commitment which maybe dissuades some potential volunteers is that it requires spending a substantial amount of time in the GAC meetings during the ICANN meetings to be aware of what the GAC is doing.

Other than that it's oh less burdensome and simply requires exploring issues with the GAC, carrying feedback back to the Council on their behalf and plugging them in on new issues.

So there is some work involved. It's not tremendously heavy but it does require taking some time at the meetings to spend in the GAC sessions.

Steve DelBianco: Phil would you take another question? This is Steve.

Philip Corwin: Sure.

Steve DelBianco: You mentioned the notion that the brand new Customer Committee under the IANA functions is looking for another member.

Philip Corwin: Oh.

Steve DelBianco: And it's not necessarily a Contract Party, right, because the direct customers...

((Crosstalk))

Philip Corwin: It's not a member Steve. It's a liaison. These are liaison positions so the membership is reserved for Contracted Parties. These are other liaisons from the different groups that are not Contracted Parties and stakeholder groups and Advisory Committees and CSG would be one of them.

Steve DelBianco: The CSG gets one of those liaison roles.

Philip Corwin: It's one position for all three constituents.

Steve DelBianco: Got it. And it's certainly appropriate to ask BC members whether any of us have an interest in that role, but what have been the discussions at the CSG level to determine how the Commercial Stakeholders Group will select that liaison?

((Crosstalk))

Philip Corwin: I'd – I would defer that question to Cheryl. I'm not aware of whether there's been any discussion.

Steve DelBianco: And I'm pretty sure that Cheryl is still finding telephone poles, stringing cable for Verizon. As you know she's filling in on the actual work of installing and setting up Internet access because the workers themselves are on strike so Cheryl's not on the call. Chris did you have any update on how we're going to select the CSG liaison?

Christopher Wilson: There is not – I don't as of now Steve other than just that the email was out and so I think there has to be....

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: Okay. So he – I will just note that the process itself is going to take a little...

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: ...the BC member who is interested this would be a great time for us to be able to say, "We have a BC member that wants to do it." Again this is a relatively light lift.

This Customer Committee will hardly ever meet and the liaison role is probably largely is observing and reporting on what the committee does if it meets, and also maybe taking an issue that we're concerned about as Registrants.

We're concerned about a particular function of IANA. We could bring that to the CSC as a liaison so easy to do. It might be something well worth some of – even some of the newer arrivals to the Business Constituency to think about.

Yes, the key would be understanding how Registrants in particular care about smooth functioning of distribution of the root names table. Anyone interested of little BC members we have?

Jay Sudowski indicates an interest so Jay what we should do is have you drill in to the Customer Standing Committee or the CSC aspect of our report, and I can send you a note about that.

And then you can firm up your interest and confirm it with an email to the – yes to the rest of the BC because we'll need to probably advocate for that and thank you for your interest.

Anyone else? Great. Chris before I turn it over to you if I scroll to the very end of the policy calendar I have indicated that on Sunday in Helsinki -- that's the 25th of June -- all day meeting to begin our Workstream 2 projects and there are nine Workstream 2 projects.

I've indicated them right there in the policy calendar and any BC members that have an interest in participating should come to that meeting. It's our first face-to-face to start breaking down those tasks.

Seven of those are related to accountability and that's why I often bring up the synchronization between these projects and the next accountability and transparency review.

Phil Corwin has already indicated an interest in I believe the jurisdictional related questions. That's Item 6. I believe Marilyn Cade said she may be interested.

Are there other BC members who are interested in arriving Sunday in Helsinki and getting involved in Workstream 2? And if so I can give you briefing materials to be more up to speed.

Denise Michel: This is Denise. I will.

Steve DelBianco: Great Denise. Is there any particular item on there you're interested in?

Denise Michel: I – I'll take a look and email you if I may.

Steve DelBianco: Great. And do you think you'll be there on the Sunday then?

Denise Michel: I will. I'm arriving Saturday night.

Steve DelBianco: Awesome. I'll do that. Phil Corwin?

Philip Corwin: Yes, Steve. Just in addition to jurisdiction and I did publish a very long article on the jurisdiction issue on...

Woman: And please tell him we can't do that until tomorrow.

Philip Corwin: Anyway could someone mute?

Woman: Right.

Philip Corwin: Could someone mute please?

Woman: You'll have to...

Philip Corwin: Can you hear me now? Yes, in addition to jurisdiction I have an interest in the Staff accountability and transparency tracks. It all depends how much work is required to participate in each one.

But I am getting to Helsinki late Friday so I can actually see a bit of the city, though I understand most of the residents will be gone that weekend. It's their big weekend to go out in the woods but at least walk around the city before the meeting starts.

Steve DelBianco: Okay.

Philip Corwin: Well I'll be coming to the meetings on Sunday.

Steve DelBianco: Right. And if you actually sign up for three different Workstream 2 tracks you'll never get out of the woods for the next year and a half Phil. Have to be careful.

Philip Corwin: We'll see how it goes.

Steve DelBianco: And then Alex Deacon - you're going to make it as well? That's great. And then Andrew Harris also interested on Workstream 2. Alex and Andrew do you have any indication of which track of Workstream 2?

And Barbara to your question I do not yet know whether there'll be remote. I highly doubt it because we have to quickly set some ground rules and then break up into subgroups, so very hard to do subgroups on remote participation in a large room.

And Andrew Harris on just jurisdiction. That's fantastic. Somehow the jurisdiction topic is getting all confused with where ICANN's incorporated and where its headquarters are.

That's certainly one aspect of jurisdiction – legal jurisdiction but it's by no means definitive. Jurisdiction conveys any time that ICANN is affecting the citizens or businesses of a country, that country can say that their laws apply.

So we do have to sort of separate this notion of where ICANN happens to be headquartered and incorporated. All right, looks like the BC is going to have some great participation in Workstream 2.

That's fantastic. Okay also Jimson and Paul. We have a lot of great participants. Chris that's it for policy calendar. I'll turn it back over to you.

Christopher Wilson: Thanks Steve. And I'll just also add that I will be arriving Sunday morning and I intend to at least in the afternoon participate probably in the transparency workstream subgroup if you will, and then possibly also jurisdiction but we'll – that's to be determined. But certainly the transparency one for me so...

Steve DelBianco: Okay.

Steve DelBianco: Great. Okay well then why don't I go ahead and dive into just quickly the CSG report? As Steve mentioned Cheryl again is unable to join us but a couple of items to note.

One, I think on our last call we had discussed the possibility of doing a CSG engagement with the GAC sort of similar to a breakfast, although it would be maybe more a lunch.

Unfortunately, the GAC is booked up for Helsinki so we're going to have to – the CSG is going to have to revisit that for ICANN57 in Hyderabad for further engagement with them.

However in lieu of a CSG real large meeting with the GAC the CSG ExCom decided that it might be – make sense to do a meeting with the Registry and Registrar Stakeholder Groups, although focusing specifically on sort of five – four or five people from each constituency as part of the CSG and sort of the four or five people from each stakeholder group not – so as not to make it a very, you know, an enormous meeting for no other reason just space constraints.

So tentatively we've requested input from the CSG ExCom to the leadership of the Registry and Registrar Stakeholder Groups to do a meeting on Wednesday during the lunch break.

They are receptive to that. I think we're still waiting on finalization of that time period but I know they were very receptive to doing a meeting with the CSG folks.

So as far as the BC is concerned we'll have to have a session as to who from the BC should be participating. We certainly can just make it the ExCom but

if we want we can also, you know, maybe add an – one or two other BC members to that group.

So that's something we'll have to – we could talk more about going forward. I know we have - the next CSG ExCom call is on June 13 and maybe I'll have a – hopefully have a better idea of exactly what the schedule will be for that meeting, and that may dictate participation from BC members who may – who are going to be in Helsinki.

But ideally we would do it during the lunch break on that Wednesday. As you just recall we'll – the BC is scheduled to do its meeting on Monday during the lunch break so this would not conflict with the BC meeting.

But as I said we have another – a CSG ExCom call on June 13 and we'll hopefully have nailed that down by then and I can report back to the list once that's finalized. Any questions about that? Okay I think that's really all I have right now as far as CSG report is concerned. So maybe, Jimson, let me go ahead and turn it to for operations and finance, and then I can wrap up with some other business matters.

Jimson Olufuye: Okay. Thank you, Chris. Hello, this is Jimson speaking. On the finance, invoices will be going out, as I said before, by later this month, so the least of which have to be coming to you through the new platform, Memberclicks. Though the platform has options for online payment, it has yet to be activated because our pending EIN, the tax identification number, which we're processing. So if you see anything that looks like here online, it's just for you to see your invoice. through that. So it will still need to be as before. We prefer wire transfer, or through a credit or debit card.

Secondly, on the budget requests to ICANN, out of the seven we have permission for six – of six now. Of the six that we have permission on, we received positive responses on them. Membership development or to request that for. We got approval for one leader from a developing country to participate in an ICANN Public Event, such as ICANN57 or 59, IGF, and also (CFPD) or WSIS to push forward with our stakeholder agenda.

We also received support for the CROPP, we requested support in four regions world and we will continue to do more. So, we got approval for two. So, we still have functions within this CROPP. Within the region of operations, if you're North America, you could apply to do at outreach at an event in North America or in Africa, the same thing. So the set-up for CROPP to engage outreach you can use an option of two events. So I believe the outreach community will stream line this for FY '17.

So once I've got approval for outreach materials, we normally do print out these materials so that is approved. Policy consultant, the existing arrangement was to (unintelligible) and has requested to meet with us in Helsinki. So that will go forward.

Then on the BC Secretariat, which is a function that we enjoy and think it will continue. So that's continuing. And also in the Intersessional meeting is continuing. So we'd like to go on - we haven't got any feedback is with respect to expansion of support, travel support for Officers, from three to four. So we'll get a response on that. It will be June 4th when there will be responses to FY '17 budget comments published. So we'll know whether that is approved or not.

And on operations, financial operations, we have are transitioning our membership to Memberclicks. So, we want to operate the two at the same

time, bizconst.org, and cbu.memberclicks.net. So, we want to use the two platforms at the same time for one month, then afterwards once we are able to satisfy our concerns, then we can continue to migrate completely.

So as I said, you'll get your invoices shortly, (unintelligible) getting them to we're still prepping the system to ensure that it's ok. So thank you. That's it for me for now.

Christopher Wilson: Thank you, Jimson. This is Chris. I'll go ahead and turn to any other business, and there's two items there. Actually there's a few other that have come across the transom since I sent the agenda to Chantelle. But let me just go say we'll have the next meeting on June 9, Thursday same time.

And also I sent out a reminder notice to the list earlier this week that we will have a call on May 31 at 12 noon Eastern Time in the U.S. with regards to specifically the updated charter. Hopefully folks have had a chance to look at the revised charter as well as the revised membership form. That was an attachment to my e-mail from earlier this week.

Please do take a look at that. Any comments can also be sent to the BC list, but if you want to hold - or talk more then please raise them during the course of the call on May 31 next Tuesday and we can hopefully resolve or at least discuss any outstanding issues in that regard and we can then get even closer to finalizing the charter and putting it up live.

So please do take a look at those documents. It's very important. This is not an exercise that has been done haphazardly. It's taken year to do and a lot of invested time and energy for many people on the BC in doing this. So please do give those documents to consideration.

A couple - a few other items. One is the - Paul Diaz from the Registry Stakeholder Group reached out the heads of both the CSG constituencies as well as other non-contracted party house folks, as well other contracting party house folks, seeking if there might be interest among all, frankly, in signing on to a joint letter to ICANN seeking a remote hub for ICANN 57 in North America.

And part of the reason - or largely the reason why that request is being considered is that, at least many within the registry stakeholder group had planned on a travel budget to go to North American, in this case San Juan or possibly Vegas, for ICANN 57. However, knowing that it's now going to take place in Hyderabad, India, they may - I guess a critical mass of membership from the Registry Stakeholder Group are now no longer able to participate in person for ICANN 57 because of the additional cost that would entail - that would be entailed for them to attend.

So Paul sort of put out a feeler to everybody wondering if this was an issue among other constituencies and stakeholder groups, and I had indicated that we had not - the BC hadn't really talked about it. But I am curious to know if there are members on this call right now who perhaps were otherwise considering attending the ICANN 57 meeting had it been in North America, who now cannot or do not intend to attend in Hyderabad because of cost or other logistical issues? Is there anyone that fits in that category, just by a show of hands?

Okay. I see Barbara's raised her hand, and Jay, both Jays. So there's a few folks -- Tim -- that I think this may be an issue for them. So we'll have - maybe I can reach out to Paul and suggest, you know, I don't know what - frankly how - whether ICANN can do a remote hub, but I think it's worth asking if room hub can be set up. I don't know where. I think - the suggestion

would be that we set up maybe I think Paul suggested Vegas just because that was the expected Plan B locale.

But, you know, we may - if others think there'd be a better location in North America to do a remote hub, we can think about that. I mean Washington's one option but perhaps maybe San Francisco, I don't know. I'm thinking of whether - where we get critical mass of BC participation. But it sounds like - I mean is anyone opposed to at least pursuing this motion? Yes, we're not asking them, as Steve mentions, we're not asking to move the meeting. This would just be setting up a remote hub for folks.

Is there any opposition to pursuing a joint letter on this issue? I don't see any. Barbara, you still have your hand raised. Is that - do you have a question or is that just from...?

Barbara Wanner: Sorry, I'll un...

Christopher Wilson: Good. I think - well I'll go ahead and let Paul know that there's critical mass for folks in the BC. This is an issue that affect BC members as well and if we can get a remote hub set up by ICANN, that would be helpful. So I'll let know.

Two other things. Secondly, Göran Marby the new CEO, who just took office just a few days ago, has - is reaching out to each constituency group and stakeholder group to set up a call with sort of a limited leadership of each group, in this case just the chairs and vice chairs of each group. And so that would be a - that call is to be determined, but that would be me and Steve DelBianco and Jimson who are our vice chairs on the BC ExCom.

We're hoping to tie down a date and time to do that call. It would be just 30 minutes, an opportunity to sort of introduce ourselves, if you will, to him and vice-versa, and perhaps raise any immediate issues or things we want to talk about.

So when that call gets finalized, we can put out a sort of APB to - I think to the BC if there are any particular matters -- and Steve can help guide us on that as well -- any particular matters we might want to raise on the 30-minute call with Mr. Marby, we can do that. So hopefully we'll have an answer soon on timeframe and date. I know those are - Chantelle's in the process of finalizing that with his scheduler. So just be aware of that.

And then lastly, as you know, the BC has engaged with ICANN awhile back in Marrakesh with Rob Hoggarth but also with Dan O'Neill, we had a couple of calls with Dan O'Neill, who's the outside consultant for ICANN on developing the policy development pilot project. The BC provided some comments to Dan regarding the formulation of the project and strengths and weaknesses.

Dan has - it will be in Helsinki for the ICANN meeting and has requested an opportunity to meet with the BC for 30 minutes to sort of discuss I guess the current state of affairs with the project and perhaps receive more feedback from us. We're trying to figure out how best to accommodate that and maybe that we tack it on to the beginning or end of the BC meeting on Monday. It also may be that we may find that 30 minutes is more than enough time and maybe we want to just limit it to 15 or 20 minutes.

But that's something that the ExCom, BC ExCom, will discuss. But just know that we tend to have some engagement with Dan O'Neill on this policy development pilot project while we're in Helsinki for the ICANN meeting.

And that just came across my radar screen just yesterday. So I think that was it for any other business.

Any other thoughts, concerns, or issues for folks? Phil, you have your hand raised.

Phil Corwin: Chris, I just wanted to observe in regard to the Hyderabad and India are very interesting choice for the next ICANN meeting in that India just signed on to a joint statement with Russia and China favoring internationalization of Internet governance functions and support for ITU, more ITU involvement. And it's also the home of a number of civil society groups, including the Center for Internet Society, which are very much opposed to ICANN remaining a U.S.-based organization. So if there's any delay in the transition, that could be location, which is hot and more than the local temperature.

Christopher Wilson: That's a good point, Steve -- excuse me, Phil. Any other thoughts, questions, concerns for folks?

Denise Michel: Hi this is Denise. I'm sorry, I'm not online any longer.

Christopher Wilson: Go ahead, Denise.

Denise Michel: I have a couple of items. So I think, you know, an issue that I'd like to raise is I think a general concern that CEOs and staff over the last several years have, we've seen a trend towards dealing with simply chairs or leaders of particular groups rather than the broader group itself. And I think this has happened really across the board in SOs as well as stakeholder groups and constituencies and advisory committees.

So I think an important message to convey to this new CEO is sort of a reminder of not only that robust multi-stakeholder model that we have in all the various groups, but also the quite limited nature of the leadership of these - or the chairs of these various groups. There's been a tendency over the last several years for staff and CEOs to use communication with an individual as a substitute for broader communication. And so I think with your first conversation with Marby, I would suggest that you emphasize that point and ask for a conference call or a meeting with the full BC.

And then second, it seems like we've been discussing this pilot project to get additional assistance from - with Rob Hoggarth and Dan O'Neill, for quite, quite some time. We've provided lots of input in writing and have had various discussions. I would like to understand more clearly what it is we need to speak to Dan O'Neill about before we get assistance. Perhaps there are some outstanding issues we could resolve via e-mail rather than take up time in Helsinki.

But it's not clear to me what else needs to be done on our end in order for us to move forward and actually get assistance under this program. And I know they were keen to do it before the fiscal year runs out, so being mindful of the calendar, I'd like to ask you that you ask Dan and Rob to put in writing what outstanding issues there are they need to resolve with us and perhaps we could address those more quickly via e-mail. I'm not - I'm certainly not opposed to having a conversation but if there are things that we can do to expedite this and actually get assistance sooner, I'd be in favor of that. Thanks.

Christopher Wilson: Thanks, Denise. And I - this is Chris. I will say with regard to your first point, I certainly support the notion that we should have a - the BC should be meeting or engaging with the new CEO a bit large. I even - when the request was first put to me, I intended - I asked if we could make this is a bigger, a

broader audience, and David Olive told me that at least for this particular call the preference was to keep it limited.

But I take to heart what you said, I support it fully, and will certainly convey that message to him on our call when it is scheduled. So I certainly support that. Also with...

Denise Michel: Great thank you. And just to note, in case it needs to be stated, that it has absolutely nothing to do with the excellent leadership that we have both at the BC level and with the ExCom, it's more a matter of educating I think the new CEO and perhaps reeducating the staff about the importance of engaging more broadly and not using the brand individual as, you know, de facto representative of larger groups. Thanks.

Christopher Wilson: Yes. No thank you. And then to your second point regarding Dan, I think it's a fair question. I think we're happy to send Dan a note saying, you know, maybe we can lay out exactly what are any outstanding issues. And if we can, you know, rectify or handle those issues before Helsinki all the better. And if he still would like to meet, we can do that, but perhaps maybe we can find - minimize the amount of time necessary in Helsinki if we can. So I can certainly ask for more clarification from him and then we can approach it with more information. So it's a good point, a good suggestion.

Andrew Mack, I see your hand raised.

Andrew Mack: Yes, thanks. I wanted to pick back up on the conversation about moving the meetings, because it's come to us through our contacts in - well first it was around Marrakesh and then it was around the - both of the Latin America meetings. And it strikes me that from - at least from the public perception,

there is a kind of an arbitrariness around this, and I'm wondering if there's not something that perhaps we want to weigh in on.

It absolutely makes sense to me that we move if there is a legitimate security concern of one sort or another, or a disease concern. I'm not suggesting that we don't do that. But I do - I am hearing from a lot of people in the global south that there is a real concern that this feels arbitrary and that ultimately if ICANN is going to be an international organization that we need to have an international footprint which includes being places that are, you know, that are not necessarily as easy to get to for people in the global north but are representative of global south. That's one thing.

I agreed with what Phil was saying. There is a political aspect to this too in that - and about how we're going to choose where we're going to go. And again that flows into the whole is there a process around it. And then the last piece of it is as much advanced warning as we get.

I know from people who are coming from the global south it is extremely expensive to attend a lot of these meetings. So the more advanced warning you have, certainly for a small business like ours, the same thing is true where the more we know in advance the better and the less arbitrary it feels, the more we know we can lock in advance. That would be really helpful. And I wanted to know if people in the BC felt the same way and also if there's any movement to try to codify this a little bit more, both the public perception and also just for ease of use and logistics and the like. Thanks.

Christopher Wilson: Thanks, Andrew. And this is Chris. I will say, you know, this issue, the issue you sort of raised, I think was a point of discussion at the intersessional in February as to sort of, you know, how - with regard to just general schedule

- meeting scheduled and location choices. I mean in some cases the specific was please stop doing them in Singapore because it's so expensive to go there.

But I think, you know, the general point you're raising I think was also a point that was raised generally in the intersessional as well with David Olive and others about choosing locales. You know, I - I'm - if there's interest from, you know, the BC, you know, perhaps we could do a letter, you know, just sort of recognizing and raising this issue again.

You know, I will say I was a little surprised about - taken aback by the Hyderabad selection only in that we, you know, we had had a call, we being the leadership of the stakeholder groups and constituency groups, et cetera, with Nick Tomasso, and it sure - India was not on the radar screen at that point. And it certainly seemed like Vegas was going to be the selection, or possibly even Orlando or Macao.

So it was sort of - that came out - to some extent, it least from my perspective, it came out a little bit out of left field. Now others may have heard it before, but. So I'm curious, if nothing else, as to exactly how that all came about and what - it may have just simply been an easier logistical jump, but, you know, obviously it's a big change going from North America and then going to India for many people. So...

Andrew Mack: I mean it's a major budget consideration for sure, but I also think it's - it is a bit of a risk to ICANN's public perception, you know, that people say, "This all appears very arbitrary, it's happening kind of behind closed doors." There doesn't seem to be any real process by it than an outside can see and say, "Oh yes, I get that." And I know some of the feedback that we've had from people whose - groups that have had the meetings moved have been, you know, have

been very negative for ICANN from the community and I think that that's an unnecessary miss if we can get ourselves organized a little bit more.

Christopher Wilson: So yes I think you're right. I will say I think with regard to moving the two meetings this year, I mean the consensus was that, you know, there was legitimate health concerns and so I think at least with respect to moving these two meetings, there was a valid, if you will, rationale. I can't speak for...

Andrew Mack: Understood. I think it's the process that is - that irks people and the feeling that it's perhaps, you know, it's at what point do we make that decision, at what point is it, you know, what's the tripwire, that kind of thing. My point - yes you understand the point and thanks very much for addressing it.

Christopher Wilson: Yes. So I mean I think, you know, if others in the BC feel this is worth raising, I mean, you know, I think I'm happy to do that. I think, you know, maybe, Andrew, if you want if there's folks who are interested, you know, maybe you send do a draft letter and we can, you know, we could I guess think about who we want to address it to, perhaps to David Olive, you know, Nick Tomasso and the team.

And maybe, Denise, if you want to provide further input on that, that'd be helpful. But then we can sort of think about a letter and raising the issues, recognizing that these decisions to move these two meetings were valid but nonetheless there's, you know, transparency issues, I guess, related to these choices, and obviously geopolitical concerns that need to be taken in consideration.

So I see Phil's sort of seconding that to a certain extent in the chat room, that we need more transparency in the decisions. So are you up for maybe drafting maybe a short one-page letter that the BC could take a look at and we can

discuss? And if there's interest, we could, you know, I'm happy to send it. Is that something you could do you think?

Andrew Mack: Sure, happy to. And, Phil, if you'd work with me on it I'd be very pleased. I think that would be a nice combination.

Christopher Wilson: Phil, I see your hand raised.

Phil Corwin: Yes, Phil here. Yes, I'd be happy. Why don't you take a first stab at it, Andrew, and I'll be glad to take a look. I think we should also be asking not just for more transparency but how this is going to affect things forward. Here we had a meeting scheduled for Latin and North America, Puerto Rico being in the North America zone, which has now been switched to a Europe and Asia. What does that do the schedules going forward? It seems to scramble things a lot going forward where we had some - a fair degree of predictability on the rotations of region up to the last year.

Christopher Wilson: Great. Thank you, Phil. And thank you, Andrew, for raising it, and we'll look forward to getting that draft out and we can work off of that. But I think it's good points to raise.

Any other thoughts, concerns, issues folks might want to raise? Okay. I don't see any hands raised. So great. Thank you all then very much. Again, reminder the next Tuesday we have the call regarding the charter. I hope many, if not all of you, can be on that call. And we'll certainly be in touch via e-mail. So thanks very much.

END