ICANN

Moderator: Chantelle Doerksen
June 9, 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 June 9, 2016. On the call today we have Jimson Olufuye,
                     Chris Wilson, John Berard, Andy Abrams, Isabel Rutherford, Arinola
                     Akinyemi, Tim Chen, Tim Smith, Carl Schonander, Steve DelBianco, Hibah
                     Hussain, Cheryl Miller, Susan Kawaguchi, Philip Corwin, Denise Michel,
                     Angie Graves, and Beth Allegretti. We have apologies from Marie Pattullo,
                     Cecilia Smith, Jay Sudowski, Steve Coates, and Olga Yaguez. 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. Thanks everyone for participating on today's call, some
                     actually very important activities just come about here in the last hour here in
                     Washington with the NTIA announcement regarding the IANA transition and
                     the CCWG proposal. I'll let Steve talk more about that a little bit later but a
                     lot to get to and as we ramp up to Helsinki here in just a couple of weeks. So
                     Steve maybe I'll go ahead and turn it to you in the policy calendar and then we
                     can move forward from there.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you Chris. Chantelle if you don't mind displaying the policy calendar, appreciate it, thank you very much. Folks I sent this out on Tuesday. In the recently filed category I only have one minor update. As you know back on May 21 we filed comment on the new ICANN bylaws. Several of our comments were accepted, a few were not and we were among 31 who posted. Now the ICANN board approved slightly amended new bylaws from those comments on the 27th of May. They did indicate though that those bylaw changes don't take effect until termination of the IANA contract.

And as I indicate this is really not our expectation based on what the board members said in Marrakesh. The CSG pressed the board on our Tuesday meeting and suggested that would the board implement the new accountability measures or wait around for NTIA to terminate the contract? Well Steve Crocker, Bruce Tonkin were among the three board members who said no. The community has spoken clearly, the train has left the station and we're going to implement. So it was a surprise that all of the bylaws, all 300 pages in the bylaws changes don't take effect until the transition of IANA contract.

We'll get near the end of the policy section. We'll discuss a little bit more about the timing and potential roadblocks to the transition. But if the community has spoken and the board acknowledged it we fully expect the new accountability measures to go into effect. A back and forth with the ICANN board resulted in Bruce Tonkin suggesting that if the NTIA transition were significant delayed or derailed that the board would work with the community to determine how to implement the bylaws effective now other than those that are dealing with the IANA functions.

So there's some complexity there. I have to give the board one bit of acknowledgment. The complexity has taken that 300 pages of bylaws and

figuring out which elements could take effect now and which others were contingent upon the NTIA contract going away that it's not trivial and we were certainly short on time. But we're going to keep the pressure up. In fact, it looks like we're going to have a significant delay. Now Chris I know you brought it up at the top of the call and I would defer to your judgment whether you want to dive into the transition news right now or have me go through the rest of the policy calendar. What's your preference?

Chris Wilson: Well since you're already sort of talking about it why don't you go ahead and provide the state of play and then we can dive into the rest of the calendar. Maybe that makes sense. Yes.

Steve DelBianco: Great. All right so a lot of you watched or read about the hearing in the US Senate on May the 24th. I participated in that hearing and did my best to educate members about the contours of our accountability proposal and to specifically respond to concerns that were raised about ICANN leaving the US, governments getting more control, concern about human rights implementation and enforcement and a handful of other concerns that were raised by members of Congress. And we did our best to address those but it didn't necessarily satisfy some senators and there's also a political element. And if you're a senator and you're used to I guess criticizing the administration this is certainly a move that the administration is vulnerable to criticism about, that is to say the move from March of 2014 to simply terminate the IANA contract before it had fully run its extension course.

So a couple of events yesterday Senators Cruz and Lankford along with representative Duffy of the US House of Representatives introduced legislation that had two parts to it. One part of the legislation said that you can't give up IANA unless there's a certification that .mil and .gov are permanent and exclusive property of the US government. This should be no

surprise to anyone when the Internet was created. .mil and.gov were the US
.mil and .gov. every other country puts its mil in gov at the second level
mil.uk, gov.ca. And so the US is in the unique position of having really no
significant permanent control of mil and gov.

So I brought this up in the hearing as well and the paperwork is already
underway to give the US Department of Defense and General Services
Administration permanent control of .mil and .gov so that's half of what's in
the Cruz legislation. The second half of the Cruz legislation suggests that
commerce cannot relinquish the IANA contract unless the US Congress says
that they can. That's a very challenging position to take. It's not a delay. It's
an infinite to deferral of the transition.

And when the legislation gets to the floor if it does it's difficult for members
of Congress to vote against a bill that would give them the right to vote on
something. So this may end up being dragged into partisan politics between
Republicans and Democrats who want to defend the administration. I'm not
certain there will be any substantive discussions at this point because the
substantive concerns about human rights are addressed, substantive concerns
with regard to the role of the government are abundantly addressed that we
have in fact contained and limited the role of governments in the new
transition proposal and of course US headquarters of ICANN is cemented into
the Articles of Incorporation not just the bylaws.

So this is going to be a very challenging time in the congress. So the only
other thing I'll add is that this morning at 10 o'clock Eastern Time in the US
the Commerce Department released its long-awaited report on Day 89 of the
90-day deadline. And they concluded across the board that the IANA
transition and accountability proposals meet all of NTIA's criteria for the
transition. They also implemented a 60-page framework on examining the

transition from the GIO. And finally they added the corporate governance experts at the Berkman Center at Harvard University issued a report that concludes that our accountability measures would effectively prevent capture particularly by governments.

So that would set into place the timeline between now and mid-August when Congress will take a long hard look at all this and although Congress goes on recess on July 15 that still gives the Commerce Department another month to let ICANN know by August 15 whether they intend to extend or terminate the contract at the end of September. And those extensions could be a month or two, taken at the end of the year. It might be several months, a couple of years to get it, the 2018 hard stop on the IANA contract. A lot of political balls in the air and Chris I would be happy to take questions. I think Phil is first in the queue.

Chris Wilson: Go ahead Phil.

Steve DelBianco: Go ahead.

Phil Corwin: Thanks Steve and yes I'll be brief. By the way Steve is that Berkman Center report is that out? Do you have a copy of it?

Steve DelBianco: I'll send that around.

Phil Corwin: Okay because I haven't seen it. Yes, I just want to comment I don't think, you know, the Cruz legislation or anything similar is going to pass or and if that was it probably would face a White House veto. I think the real game here is that this is becoming more partisan which isn't that surprising in a Presidential election year. And, you know, no matter what Congress says before they go out of recess the real game is in the Appropriations Committee. It seems pretty

clear with the announcement by 16 conservative groups that the House if they pass a freestanding Department of Commerce bill it's going to contain the freeze, the one-year extension of the freeze that's in there.

I don't know if the Senate will do a free-standing bill. Last year's extension made clear that a continuing resolution that to fund the Department of Congress would not extend the freeze so it's all going to come down to whether the Congress passes an appropriations bill in September for commerce that contains a freeze extension. NTIA is on the record saying that does stay their hand but that may not be the White House view. So it's all going to give very political I think and I'll stop there.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you Phil. They question of funding is an open question. It's not at all clear that money needs to be spent to terminate a contract. The entire Commerce Department can just stay home from work on September 30 and the contract expires of its own.

However, the money that was spent to evaluate the community proposal might well have been challenged in Congress by saying they spend money on the transition. The answer that NTIA will probably give is that Congress in writing has asked the Commerce Department to evaluate the proposal. They've asked the Commerce Department to report to Congress on the status of the transition. So that $20,000 they spent with the Berkman Center might well be in service of their reply to Congress. But we shall see. There are many arguments that could be made. Any other questions on this? All right Chris why don't we dive back in if you don't mind to the policy calendar.

Chris Wilson: Steve I think I see Denise's hand raised, sorry.

Steve DelBianco: I missed that.

Denise Michele: Hi.

Steve DelBianco: Go ahead Denise.

Denise Michele: No I was late sorry. And I had to dial back in so I apologize if I missed the discussion about this. Did we discuss a follow-up on the parent change or evolution of the board's position on implementing bylaws now, particularly those that relate to accountability rather than directly to the IANA function?

Steve DelBianco: Denise we followed-up immediately and got the explanation that the board has committed to work with the community to bifurcate the bylaws into those things that can be implemented now and not. But they don't want to take that step nor would I suggest that they do. They don't want to take that step unless it becomes clear that we have a significant delay in the transition.

Denise Michele: Okay thank you. Thanks, apologies.

Steve DelBianco: And I concur with that.…

Denise Michele: And can you repeat that?

Steve DelBianco: …it would be - it's a big job. Thank you.

Denise Michele: Right thanks.

Steve DelBianco: All right back on the policy calendar. We only have a few public comments that are open right now because as you know in the walk up to an ICANN meeting staff tries not to bury us with new comments to prepare since we're all preparing to get together. So the first one is the comment on the release of

some geo names in three .brands -- Hyundai, Kia and GoDaddy. And those comments closed today. I circulated thought two weeks ago draft prepared by Andrew Abrams and Andy thanks again for doing that. They're - the comments are substantially equivalent to ones that we've done on a dozen other .brand geo name releases. Unless I see any objection I'm going to post it as soon as we finish this call.

Seeing no objection, I'll go to number two. This bears a little discussion here today. It has to do with ICANN's proposed revisions to the expected standards of behavior. And those standards of behavior are there to cover everyone who's participating in ICANN meetings and ICANN processes to cover the ICANN staff board and everyone related to ICANN because there was an incident of sexual harassment incident in Marrakesh that provoked quite a bit of outcry on the last day of Marrakesh. ICANN's board and staff then have added a paragraph to the expected standards of behavior. That's on the screen in front of you.

And Denise Michele was asking about where did they get this anyway? And it was taken from the IETF's anti-harassment standard. And that IETF standard with a couple of small additions but in general it's pretty much of a standard statement with respect to what's not in harassment.

So the BC has an opportunity to comment on that language. I can answer questions about what it means but the BC may or may not have a concern. And I don't believe that ICANN is expecting a lot of comments on this but let's take a queue. Who believes we should consider commenting on the new language? Denise I see your hand up.

Denise Michele: Yes. So I was hopeful that the ICANN staff would conduct due diligence and provide useful language and supporting documentation on this. It's not that I

have any type of problem per se with this language. I think however that ICANN should provide additional context and implementation support for this language. It's rather vague. It's pretty clear they really didn't do much in the way of investigating sort of international best practices in dealing with harassment and this type of behavior.

So I think I'd be happy to draft a short note just asking ICANN to follow this up with, you know, more clear guidance, examples and more robust implementation materials so people from different cultures around the world can understand what this language actually means. Thanks.

Steve DelBianco: Denise those are really great points and thank you for volunteering to take that on. The ICANN version of this has two new words that were not in that IETF, the word ethnicity and medical condition. So those are the list of protected characteristics.

As you mentioned examples Denise and in the IETF version I think I sent a link to you yesterday. In the IETF version they do list some examples for instance the use of offensive language or sexual imagery in a presentation and display, degrading verbal contents, deliberate intimidation, stalking, harassing photography or recording, inappropriate physical contact and unwelcome sexual attention. So is that what you have in mind in terms of…

Denise Michele: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: …specific examples? Got it.

Denise Michele: And…

Steve DelBianco: So Denise all the examples are in the IETF link that I sent you.

Denise Michele: Yes, thanks. I think this can be handled rather quickly. Thanks.

Steve DelBianco: Beautiful. And you're right it was selective. It was selective on the part of grabbing some of the IETF harassment policy adding two words and then dropping all of the examples so I think you're right on. Any other comments? Phil Corwin?

Phil Corwin: Steve I have no objections at all to the proposed language but I think it would be useful for the BC to make an inquiry about how this will be enforced. I mean if someone in the community alleges that someone on the board or staff or another community member has engaged in harassment that's covered by this language what is the process? Who will investigate the charge? What punishments are available? This is all completely silent on that and that's the really - we want certainly the words to have meaning and to be enforced but we also want an enforcement process that's fair and objective. So I think we should be raising some questions about that.

Steve DelBianco: All right Phil and Denise when we do that we'll have to look into the standards of behavior and see where they fit in to ICANN's documentation so we understand what the complaint and enforcement process is. It might just be the ombudsman who has already gone on record of supporting this new statement. But it would be helpful to all BC members to understand well what does one do if they feel that the standards of behavior have been violated? Where do they go? I think that would be really helpful. Thank you. So Denise you're going to take a look at that. Andrew Mack is in the queue. Go ahead Andrew.

Andrew Mack: Steve just a quick question. One of the things that I have been told on a number of occasions by people attending the conferences is that many of them are not very assessable for people who are disabled, a lot of steps a lot of - and

I'm just wondering is that something that's been visioned under this new policy that we would try to make an effort to increase accessibility and what impacts would that have and what other budget locations?

Steve DelBianco: Yes, well the word disability is right there in that last sentence…

Andrew Mack: Yes, no, no…

Steve DelBianco: …in the IETF.

Andrew Mack: …what the practical impact would be, that's all.

Steve DelBianco: Right. So I think Denise just brought that up and they're going to ask about the enforcement mechanisms. But you're asking about another aspect, a practical aspect and does this require budget for disability access? Is that your question?

Andrew Mack: I - yes I think the budget and also, you know, whether that's a - have someone request or does that factor into how we choose, where we're going to go -- things like that?

Steve DelBianco: Got it. All right let's raise that as a question. Denise when you finish your draft Andrew would you please take a look at that and help to add a question about that if you don't mind?

Andrew Mack: Sure.

Steve DelBianco: Denise will get something turned around in the next few days. This one is due on the 25th of June so we got a couple of weeks. All right, great comments all, thank you. So number three on this is the revised Articles of Incorporation. As

you recall the BC insisted that the new articles be published at the same time we publish the bylaws because the articles were where we filled in this notion that ICANN shall have its principal facing business in the California, should be a California nonprofit corporation and no changes to the ICANN Articles of Incorporation can occur without the consent of the empowered community.

This is a fundamental part of the report we came up with and yet ICANN hasn't bothered to have their attorneys mark up the two pages of Articles of Incorporation. So we pressed on this and ICANN immediately conceded and came back with the revised articles and they did in fact match with what we asked for. So we have an open public comment period until the 6th of July. I'll be happy to start the draft on that unless someone else wants to jump in.

Okay fantastic. I'll go on to the last one. There's proposed amendments to the New gTLDs' registry agreement. And this is the base agreement that all of the New gTLD registry operators had to sign. And as you know there's specifications in there for .brands, for communities and geo (unintelligible). So there are different kinds of additions that go in. And this comment period is open until the 13th of July.

It was work out in a bilateral way. ICANN staff worked with the registries themselves, the contract parties on what they considered mutually acceptable contract amendments. That doesn't mean they're community acceptable. It just means it was acceptable between the ICANN staff and the registries themselves. I'd like to know if any of the companies on this call who also have brands I'd like to know whether any brands were part of that Registry Working Group. If anybody has an answer, please let us know.

But one of the changes that I noted for you is that a registry wouldn't have to get ICANN's approval to change its domain name also prices. And as you

know wholesale prices translate to retail prices once a registrar marks them up. Another change is that global amendments cannot amend the provisions of Spec 13 for brands. And I - I'll bet the .brand guys on the call are probably very happy about that since it suggests that you cannot touch Spec 13 unless it was mutually agreeable by the brand operators. So I'll take a queue. Is there anyone interested in participating and analyzing the amendments to the registry contract drafting a BC comment? Phil you're up first.

Phil Corwin: Thanks Steve and by no means do I mean to monopolize the comments today. It's just a couple of things I'm interested in. I believe I circulated to the BC list something the other day where I went through the explanation of this. Two things caught my eye. One is I'm not sure that registry, you know, ICANN has never set places for the new TLDs. But it - so I'm not sure they had to approve price changes but they certainly it eliminates any need to give notice to ICANN. And I'm concerned there now about transparency and I think it affects businesses who have acquired new TLD domains whether it's for proactive or defensive purposes there should be some transparency in the pricing process.

The other one which is a brand-new provision that did not exist in the - that does not exist in the current contract allows ICANN to reduce or waive registry fees. And I don't - I think we need to know what that is intending to get. It looks like it may be intended for registries which are not doing very well and basically for cross subsidization where asking them to pay their full registry fees would be infeasible and they might have to shut down. So I think we need an explanation on that and need to decide whether we want ICANN propping up registries which are not making it in the marketplace. Thank you.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you Phil. In the chat I pasted the exact text that ICANN used to describe this change and they're the ones that used the phrase ICANN's

approval. You're right, it's one thing to give notice. It' another thing to obtain approval so we'll probably need to dive into that since ICANN is claiming that it was requiring approval. So Phil can I put you down to be among the volunteers on drafting…

Phil Corwin: Yes, absolutely. I've already looked into it. I don't want to be the lead. I'm just too burned with other, you know, two working groups and council duties but I'd be happy to participate in the drafting.

Steve DelBianco: All right we're grateful for that and it's not even fair to ask you to lead with everything else that you're doing. Denise Michelle go ahead.

Denise Michele: Yes. I'm just volunteering to be a drafter on this.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you Denise. Anyone else? Any brands on the phone who can tell us whether brands participated on that Registry Working Group?

Denise Michele: Could we put that question to the BC list? I suspect there's several people missing but it would be good to know and they would be able to also provide additional insight into the rationale behind some of the changes?

Steve DelBianco: Okay. Okay great. That's it for the current public comment. If you look at the item right before Channel 2 however there's a PDP Working Group on reviewing all rights protection mechanisms in all gTLDs not just new. We have the good fortune of having two of our members, Phil Corwin and J. Scott Evans, they're among the three co-chairs of that working group. And that working group sent a letter seeking input on questions they have and that letter was the second attachment to the policy calendar. We have until July 5 to respond. And Phil since I know we have you here on the call can you shed

some light on the nature of those questions and what you guys expect to do with the answers? Maybe I surprised Phil with that question. I probably…

Phil Corwin: I'm sorry. I thought I un-muted. Yes, I don't have that letter in front of me but basically we're asking all the stakeholder and constituency groups to give us, you know, we're referring to them to the questions that were laid out in the charter and an appendix to the charter. But we're - that doesn't necessarily cover all the questions. We want to make sure all the groups understand this working group is up and running now, it's proceeding first through January 2018 we're going to be revealing the new TLD RPMs and then we're going to move on to UDRP. And we want on the new TLD RPMs the - their feedback on what are there any questions that should be asked that aren't already out there that things that we want our working group to look at?

                 This is also to get people thinking about all this because we're going to have a cross community session on this working group in Helsinki so where we can - people can air any concerns they have about the current rights protection mechanisms.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks Phil. I put all three questions into the chat.

Beth Allegretti: Hi. It's Beth Allegretti. Can I chime in here about…

Steve DelBianco: Thank you Beth.

Beth Allegretti: …another working group?

Steve DelBianco: Beth before we jump to the another working group I did want to point out the third question is about what specific data points do we advise the working group to pursue in the data gathering? And it's really been the BC leading the

charge on looking for specific key performance indicators and data points. And that - I'll bet that question's directed at us. So I think we're going to want to try to pay particular attention to that. Go ahead Beth, sorry.

Beth Allegretti: Okay. So the other group that I'm on is the next generation registry directory services to replace Whois working group. And we also have sent out a questionnaire just to make sure that all the constituencies see what's going on and if they have anything they want to add. What we're looking at right now are requirements for a new registration data service. So the list that we sent out are all a really broad list of documents. And we've summarized the requirements from each of those.

And so what we're trying to do is get sort of the global aspect of all the requirements for a new service, you know, related to data, privacy, everything to do with it. And we are asking for all of the groups to take a look at to see if there's anything that they want to add, anything that's missing, any comments they want to make.

I just took this on the other day. Apparently the first outreach went out a couple weeks ago. So I will send that out to the list and an informal one will be going out of the next day or so. So if everybody could, you know, just take a look and just to see where the group is at if there's anything people might want to add, any areas that we need to focus on that we haven't that would be great. And then once if anyone has any comments I will funnel those back to the working group. Thanks.

Steve DelBianco: Beth, that's wonderful. Thank you very much. And right above channel, right above the end of Channel 3 I did indicate the five BC members who are on that working group yourself, Geoff Noakes, Susan Kawaguchi, Andrew Harris and Alex Deacon.

So we would look forward to you putting it on the top of our inbox about the kind of questions and what we need to get back to them and we'll coordinate a response. Thank you.

Beth Allegretti: Okay.

Steve DelBianco: Phil for you and Susan then the next Channel 2 item on here is for council. I'll note that the previous council meeting was on the 12th of May and I have links in there to the work that you guys did. And since the next council meeting's not until Helsinki we don't have any agenda or motions for us to notice. But I turn it over to you and Susan to talk about council.

Phil Corwin: Yes, thanks Steve. I'll start and let Susan chime in. Not that much is going on in council. We don't have any agenda including possible resolutions yet for Helsinki. We haven't seen a proposed agenda yet.

The - one development is that there was an ongoing search for a new liaison to the GAC from the council from the GNSO because Mason Cole is leaving that post. And we just got advised the other day by James Bladel that the - just a few applications came in and they didn't view the folks as sufficiently qualified checking all the boxes they're looking for.

So they're going to push that back and time it to complete the search at the final ICANN meeting in Hyderabad.

They believe that some of the people who might've been interested are tied up on things that'll be ending by the India meeting and that they'll get a better pool of applicants then.

We're still looking for BC reps on the GNSO Working Part - GNSO Review Working Party and I think you've all seen the proposed subject - the proposed schedule for Helsinki.

The one change I know that might still occur is that the cross community consultation between the RPM Working Group and the community - right now it's scheduled on Wednesday and it conflicts with another consultation that would - so it may be switched to a time slot on the late Monday afternoon where nothing else is scheduled.

But other than that the schedule for Helsinki is pretty much getting locked down and I'll stop there and see what Susan has to add. Thanks.

Susan Kawaguchi: Thanks Phil. I just want to go back to the point of the GAC rep from the GNSO. The IPC actually put forward a candidate and for some reason - and I dug into this a little bit with Staff yesterday. But there's a feeling that this should be a very confidential no one should know who the candidates are because somebody might be disappointed if they didn't get the role.

And the - that's the way the process was developed previously and, you know, for Mason's role candidacy. And I argued against that at - in the Marrakech meeting because I thought we should be - we should always aim for transparency and, you know, using the CCT Review, you know, there was over 70 candidates.

There was only 15 seats so obviously somebody's not going to get picked in every - in those - most seats. So they wouldn't - James would not divulge the candidate and - but Paul McGrady did.

And it was an IPC candidate that - his background is having never - the person had never been a GNSO Councilor but worked extensively with the GAC in his duties with INTA and the - that single candidate was rejected and they're looking for others.

So I do think we have a - we should think about whether or not we back the IPC and pushing forward more evaluation of their candidate. It's definitely - the Registries and Registrars came out pushing back hard on Paul yesterday.

And I just think that, A, there should be no reason that at least all the councilors should know who applied; and B, should - just because only one interested candidate applied during the specific time period given, that we should immediately ignore that candidate and move on to an additional period of open application.

So, I mean, do we want to back another group in the CSG or do we want to hold off and just let the process go the way it's going? It looks like Denise has her hand up.

Denise Michele: I do Susan. Thank you. I have a - definitely a basic concern about process here. I don't understand why the GNSO Council uses transparency in so many other selections it makes such as the, you know, filling the chair on the board or appointing people to the Consumer Protection Committee and other advisory committees, and yet for a GAC liaison it seems transparency doesn't apply.

And furthermore Council input doesn't seem to apply and I'm not sure why it's just the chair and vice chairs are selecting the GAC Councilor who presumably will facilitate communication between the GAC and the GNSO Council at least and probably more broadly with the GNSO.

It also at first blush seems that someone who has extensive experience with the GAC could potentially be even more effective than someone who simply has at some point in their life served on the Council but may not have any experience with the GAC.

So I have a problem with the basic process of non-transparency and how this person is being selected, as well as apparently the initial decision to discard the one person who applied for this position.

Further I think there really is merit in looking at diversity of GAC liaisons in terms of, you know, Mason Cole being from the Contracted Party House and presumably this person being from the Non-Contracted Party House I think in a spirit of, you know, diversity and being responsive broadly to the interests of the GNSO.

This - again I don't know the person but it seems like a productive path to go. So I think there's a number of issues at play here and I would support our councilors addressing all of them in a, you know, transparent and wholesome way. Thanks.

Susan Kawaguchi: Phil do you have comments?

Philip Corwin: Yes. Yes, I wanted to thank you Susan for going into all the detail on that. You know, I did read most of the exchanges yesterday, which got a little bit heated on the Council list over this.

But - and the chair did point out that the - one of the vice chairs from the IPC - and had agreed that the person wasn't qualified but I think that's all water under the bridge.

I think we should insist on a more transparent process going forward since the decision apparently won't be made until the final ICANN meeting. This shouldn't be something that happens in a back room with just an announcement that's a fait accompli to the rest of the Council.

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes, and I don't - I think it was the GAC-GNSO Working Group or one of those that sort of came up with this process originally. But that doesn't mean that we can't revise the process so I think we need to push forward a little bit and back our IPC brethren.

((Crosstalk))

Philip Corwin: Yes, so I think we should consult within the CSG and see if we're all on the same place on this and make sure it's brought up when Council meets in Helsinki.

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes, I would agree. I didn't have anything else except Steve I just wanted to note on the RPM questions - that I put in the chat that I would volunteer to do the initial draft on those and Andy was going to…

Steve DelBianco: Yes.

Susan Kawaguchi: …help too.

Steve DelBianco: Yes, that's fantastic Susan. Thank you for doing that. Appreciate it. Any other questions for our Councilors right now? All right, seeing none let me jump to the next channel, Channel 3.

I did want to indicate that the RSEP - this is the Registry Services policy review and the BC has gone back and forth with ICANN. This started with an inquiry that Denise Michele led for us when we were in Marrakech of really pressing them to say, "Wait a minute.

What about the comments that come in our separate requests? What are you doing to react to those comments? Who's commenting on them? How frequently? What kind of applications?"

And we put those questions to them and yet ICANN Staff keeps coming back and saying, "We're not sure we understand your question." What they did was publish the Global Domains Division's standard page on operational metrics.

And I guess they were hoping that we'd be satisfied with that but not the BC. We're looking for more detail about how they handle our comments. It's been one of the standard concerns that we've had.

So Chantelle was good at being persistent with Staff back and forth, and what Staff did is instead of giving us an answer is asked for a conference call. And Chantelle I'm going to ask you to put the coordinates for that conference call into the chat, because any interested BC member who follows closely this RSEP process, and I'm looking at you Denise in particular, should join that call.

It's today at 16:30 UTC and I have it on my calendar as coming up at - that's 12:30 pm East Coast U.S. Time so roughly an hour from now. Get a quick show of hands.

Any BC members in general interested in joining that call? Thank you Denise. Anyone else? Andy Abrams, the RSEP requests on geo names are where we

have been so diligent at making comments. Is there a chance I can impose on your schedule to also join that call?

Andrew Abrams: Steve this is Andy. Unfortunately, I won't be able to make that call but I'll definitely follow up with - afterwards.

Steve DelBianco: Okay great. Thank you Andy and we'll definitely bring up the general concerns we have on the lack of responsiveness. But let me ask you this Andy.

Would you say that in response to the BC's concerns that almost all the RSEP geo name batches have been separated between those that are brand and those that are generic?

Andrew Abrams: You know, I think the recent ones have been and so we do appreciate that, because for I think the first six or seven were not and they were mixed. But I think the last three or four have been separated so we would like to see that trend continue.

Steve DelBianco: Got it. I'll thank them for listening to us and state the expectation that they continue that way. Thanks. Denise your hand is up. I know you're joining the call. Did you have any other comments?

Denise Michele: Just for everyone's edification this is a - really just a follow up to get basic data and analysis about the RSEP program, which has been going on for a decade without any review or assessment.

So just to be clear the intent here is really just to get data and analysis and it's been three months since our request and the GDDs that - haven't really even fulfilled the basic particularly relating to public comments.

And you'll recall that there's been an exponential increase in RSEP public comments that clearly the community is having a lot of trouble keeping up with.

So it's appropriate to take a step back and just look at how the RSEP is working these days. And so really that's the impetus for our initial request and now I guess we have to talk to the Staff to get them to fulfill our initial request.

But this isn't really a discussion about any changes or things we like or dislike about the RSEP. Rather the intent here is really just to get basic information and review of the program. Thanks.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks. Thank you. All right. Before I send it back to you Chris if folks go to the third page of the policy calendar, what I've done is remind everyone who's interested in Workstream 2 on accountability - I've reminded - it was Phil Corwin, Alex, Andrew, Paul Mitchell, Chris Wilson, Andrew Mack.

I've recorded in Page 3 all of the areas that you thought you were interested in, so I've reminded everyone about the face-to-face meeting in Helsinki on the 25th of June but there's something new here.

Those of you who are interested in observing or participating should please fill out the Google Doc, and I have a hyperlink right to it in the document, any time before the 25th of June.

And that's where you indicate your interest and expression of interest in being part of any of the different streams, the nine different sub-projects within Workstream 2.

I'll paste that link in the chat one more time. If it doesn't - and Barbara Wanner I see you brought your name with it and that's great. I'll add you to my list.

But what you've got to do is click on that link and update the document so that ICANN knows you're interested. That way you'll get the emails from them about Workstream 2.

You'll be on a specific list for Workstream 2 under the sub-project. Okay everyone? That's it for me. Chris?

Christopher Wilson: Thanks Steve. Thanks everybody and it'll be a busy Sunday - that first Sunday in Helsinki with all that work kicking off. Why don't I go ahead and quickly turn to the CSG report?

I know Cheryl Miller had planned to join us today - unfortunately can't. But I know that she's sort of back in action now at - in her role at Verizon - her regular role at Verizon.

So I expect that she'll be able to provide us our regular reports going forward now that she's focused - refocused back on her normal day-to-day work product at Verizon.

Just real quick there will be a - we - it looks like - I think we're locked in. Chantelle you can confirm for me if I'm incorrect but we are locked in for a CSG meeting with the Registry and Registry Stakeholder Groups on June 29 - think it's that Wednesday during the lunch period in Helsinki.

I think it's still to be determined exactly how many people from each constituency can attend that meeting. I know due to room's size constraints it

would be difficult I think to have, you know, all BC members, all IPC members, all ISPC members, et cetera attending.

So I think that will be something that we'll have to run down - the CSG ExCom will have to run down in the coming days to finalize the exact numbers.

But I think as of now - I see Chantelle looking in the - looking at the chat. Looks like it may be just for leadership but I think it - we may have left it where it's possible - if we can accommodate a couple of other members from each constituency who have a strong interest in the meeting we could perhaps do that.

I will - we'll come - we have a CSG and ExCom call on Monday morning June 13 or like it's Monday afternoon on the 13th and we can - I will seek to get clarification on who can attend that meeting.

Regardless of that we'll obviously have a report back out to the BC on what was discussed and any steps forward from that meeting. I - also on the CSG ExCom call I will - Susan and Phil I will raise the GNSO-GAC liaison sort of issue if you will and flag it for folks on that call.

I might as well take advantage of that opportunity and see if we can come to further discussion on, you know, process forward on that issue. Denise I see your hand raised.

Denise Michele: Yes, thanks. Particularly if this CSG Registry Registrar meeting is going to be closed, could you make sure that there's an agreed upon sort of agenda or a list of issues that'll be discussed and share it with the BC in advance?

Christopher Wilson: Yes, and that - I expect that that will be on the agenda for the call on Monday with the CSG ExCom. So when that is - when all - when that meeting - all the details for that meeting - the June 29th meeting are finalized I will certainly send it all out to the BC for everyone's knowledge.

Any other questions on that? Okay. Why don't I real quickly also note - so I think that you all saw I sent out a - sort of an APB to the BC membership a few days ago early in the week regarding trying to get a BC rep for a - to participate in a drafting team regarding process for a selection of someone to fill Board Seat 14.

As you know the IPC and ISPCP each have nominated somebody and as well as from - and as well as other folks from the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group have also nominated a couple of people.

I think in being consistent with the fact that each constituency has nominated one person we would - the BC also would just nominate one person. Thankfully we've of course received - we've received three people who volunteered to be that rep.

So I think in the interest of comedy I think it would be best if the membership agrees that we would sort of put this to a ballot among the BC members to determine who that - among those three - the three volunteers who would be the BC rep on the drafting team.

Is there anybody that would not - opposed I guess to doing a ballot? If we didn't do a ballot then I guess the ExCom could make that determination, but I think it'd be more democratic if the BC at large would determine who that BC rep would be on that drafting team.

Is there any opposition to doing that? And I see - Arinola I see you've - you recognize that Marilyn has - in your words more qualified, that you could step down.

But that - certainly your prerogative and that's fine and I certainly thank you for volunteering in the first place. I know that still leaves Marilyn and Lawrence who've both - have - two have volunteered for this.

So we still would have two people for one position so I wonder if we still should not have, you know, have a ballot discussion about a vote I guess on that rep.

Anyone against/opposed to that? If not, then we will go ahead and get that launched and we can have the BC hopefully very soon make a determination as to whether Marilyn or Lawrence would be the BC rep on that drafting team.

I know that that - there might be an expectation that that - that the drafting team will actually meet informally in Helsinki one of those days just to sort of have a meeting of the minds and start thinking about the work product.

So that has not - nothing's been finalized on that front but I know that there's been some initial discussion about doing that. So I hope to - we get somebody - get our BC rep named before Helsinki so that that person could participate in those - in any discussion that may occur during the meeting so I - we'll get that started.

I think that's it for CSG report but I did want to quickly turn - before I turn to Jimson real fast, you know, we - to Andrew Mack if I could - if you're still available maybe talk quickly about the letter you've drafted and have - we've had some revisions to it regarding the meeting location/transparency issue.

ICANN
Moderator: Chantelle Doerksen
06-09-16/10:00 am CT
Confirmation # 8671965
Page 29

I think it sounds like there's a lot of support for the letter as currently edited and revised, so I'm wondering if we can go ahead and finalize that and send that off to the proper parties within ICANN. Perhaps Andrew do you have any further thoughts on that?

Andrew Mack: For me I'm fine. Thanks to everyone who contributed in. You know, it's a - I think we did a really good BC job of it and it's pretty clear and if anybody has any more things that they'd like to add by all means.

Christopher Wilson: And I just looked - thank you Andrew. I see the letter, you know, Chantelle's posted the letter in the chat room or, you know, on the Adobe room.

One question I had and this is really completely off the top of my head is whether we would - is the BC interested in seeing if other constituency groups or stakeholder groups would want to join us in this letter?

I don't know if that - maybe at this late hour it - and it may be too hard to do but I - it just occurred to me especially in the light of the fact that I'll be having discussions with other CSG folks here in the next day or two whether we would want to see if we could get additional buy in.

It may - frankly may carry more weight - additional weight if we have the whole CSG with us or others. But I - I'm just really throwing that out there as a brainstorm.

If we don't think that's necessary or feasible then I'm happy to not pursue that. Steve I see your hand raised.

Steve DelBianco: Only to say that it would be - I think it's a great idea. It'll magnify the impact of the letter signed by three constituencies like the CSG. Even better if we were able to get the NCSG to join us and I'll bet they would.

So since there's no time pressure to get this done, there's no deadline, why not allow another 24 hours for BC members to suggest edits and then under your leadership approach the other chairs of constituencies to see if we can expand the signatures. I think that's a great idea. Thank you.

Christopher Wilson: Thanks Steve. Any other thoughts from folks on that? I'm happy to do it. I think it's a good letter and I think it's worth seeing if we can get additional buy in.

So I will - why don't we give - like Steve said why don't we give folks within the BC another day, maybe by like I say COB tomorrow to look at the letter and any - provide any further comments or edits to it?

And then we'll assume if we haven't heard anything by the end of tomorrow that we can go ahead and shop it around to - I will just go ahead and shop it around to other constituencies/stakeholder groups and see if we can get buy in from them so terrific.

I think that's it for - as far as CSG report. Any other questions/thoughts/concerns on that? I know we're very close to the top of the hour. Is Jimson – Chantelle, is Jimson back online?

Jimson Olufuye: Yes, Chris I'm right here.

Christopher Wilson: You know, Jimson if you can…

Jimson Olufuye: My line…

Christopher Wilson: Yes. Go ahead Jimson.

Jimson Olufuye: Okay. Yes, my line gets off cut 10 minutes to the hour, because I get called earlier, 10 minutes before the hour. Well, fortunately the FY17 invoices started to go out and we also are informed that we have some Euro challenges with the euro sign/currency sign, too but we pay in the Euro and I believe you all understand that clearly how our budget/accounts get paid. An updated BC FY17 Budget proposal will be forwarded to members before the next meeting.

So that we could look at it and possibly approve the FY budget proposal by Helsinki, by June 27. And for the FY17 budgets requests, I did provide feedback at the last meeting, and we've said that there is just one more request.

We are waiting for ICANN to give us the feedback and we've gotten that, and that is addressed back to, well, the one additional travel support that we requested. That will not be forthcoming because they deferred it until after the IANA transition; so, it's possibly to be part of the post-IANA reconsideration.

So - but Chantelle, perhaps you could send your comprehensive summary of ICANN responses to the budget request to the list? Thank you. Then lastly, on Operations, we have begun to push the migration to the Memberclicks' application, so that you are aware.

So, during this weekend, if you're accessing the Website you may have the difficulty, reaching bizconst.org. But by Monday, after the ISP propagation will have been fully resolved to Memberclicks platform, you will be able to access bizconst.org.

Also, please note that the membership application is still work in progress and new ideas are welcome. But when we are through, we'll have a session to go over the application, especially the members section and the social media section.

And finally, I would like to urge members to do a more critical review of the charter so that it can be finalized for our EIN application process. We really want that finalized so that we can – have online payments on this new application. So that's it for me. Chris, back to you.

Christopher Wilson: Thank you, Jimson, and thank you for all the hard work on the Memberclicks migration. It's been a lot of work and you should be commended for leading the charge on that so thank you.

It's now the top of the hour - one minute after the hour so I will be very, very quick on any other business. Just reminding folks that there will be a BC open meeting Monday, June 27 in Helsinki.

We have confirmed that Dan O'Neill who is the consultant - outside consultant for ICANN working on the pilot project - policy development pilot project will be speaking to us just for 15 minutes providing us a - an update on the status of the project and answering any questions folks might have.

That meeting will be - we're going to do it from 12:30 to 1:30 during the lunch hour in Helsinki and he will - we're going to have him launched, you know, at the beginning of the meeting so we can move quickly after he - he's provided his input.

The - I think a reminder folks that we will have a call - a BC - I will have a call along with Steve and Jimson with the new ICANN CEO, Göran Marby Marby, also on Monday, and we'll hear from him about his vision I guess for ICANN and perhaps any other thoughts he may be having with regard to the transition, et cetera.

Just following up on Denise's point from our last call I certainly will raise the issue that, you know, we would like additional outreach from him to the broader Business Community, not simply just BC leadership and, you know, we'll get that.

Also and then just lastly we've got - as Steve mentioned we'll have the call from BC ExCom as well as additional interested members with the GDD team momentarily, the next half hour regarding the offset data gathering process.

So I will say also in lieu of - so we've - because we have the BC open meeting on Monday the 27th, you know, currently we - we're scheduled to have a BC meeting call on the 23rd.

Because we have one scheduled for that following Monday I don't see any need to have a call on the 3rd for the BC members call. However, I am inclined to have - reserve that time and I think the ExCom agrees that we have that time reserved for a final review and vote on the revised BC charter.

We had a nice call at - on May 31 going over the charter. Andy, excuse me, Andy Abrams led that discussion. We had some good substantive discussion on it and some good edits and revisions that were made and Andy circulated those around I think earlier this week.

I know there was an additional discussion with John Berard and Andy. I don't know if that - we've run that discussion down or not but regardless I think we need to sort of think about closing the loop on our - on a review of the revised charter.

So my expectation and goal is to have a call with this hour reserved on the 23rd for final review and vote on the charter. If there continues to be discussion and uncertainty about it at that time, then we can certainly delay a vote.

But I think I'd like to get us thinking about doing that on the 23rd so I will have Chantelle schedule that and send it out. And please for those who have not yet taken a look at the revised charter, please look at the most recent iteration that Andy sent around earlier this week and provide thoughts/comments/edits via email to all and we can - and finalize this.

So that - so in lieu of a full BC members call we'll have a charter review call and vote call on the 23rd. Is that doable for folks?

Andrew Abrams: And Chris this is Andy. Just to clarify the revised version of the charter after the meeting has only been sent to the ExCom and the charter discussion group, and so we're still kind of circling around in that group for final revisions.

And so I'll recirculate the final version to the entire membership soon I think once we sort of resolve the last couple of issues there.

Christopher Wilson: Right. Thank you Andy and thank you for that clarification. I missed that so I apologize, so good. Okay well then for folks to - be on the lookout then for the most recent iteration of the revised charter and then start proceeding

with a - the belief that we'll have a vote on it on the 23rd and so that we'd welcome folks.

And I'll send a - we'll of course send a note out to the full list about that as well but for those that are on the call today please mark that in your calendar. Any other thoughts/questions/concerns?

Okay great. If not, then we look forward to talking to you all via email of course and then also talking to you on the 23rd during the charter call so thanks all. Thank you all very much for participating. Have a wonderful day.

END