

ICANN

Moderator: Chantelle Doerksen
July 21, 2016
10:00 am CT

Michelle Desmyter: Hi. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Welcome to the BC members on Thursday July 21, 2016. On the call today we do have Barbara Wanner, Chris Wilson, Andrew Harris, Beth Allegretti, Steve DelBianco, Tim Smith, Angie Graves, Jay Sudowski, Susan Kawaguchi, Philip Corwin, Matt Cohen, Denise Michel, Hibah Hussain, and Marilyn Cade. I apologize if I missed your name due to Adobe Connect issues.

We do have apologies from Andy Abrams, Jimson Olufuye, and Olga Yaguez. From staff, we have myself Michelle Desmyter. I'd like to remind all participants to state their name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you ever so much and over to you.

Chris Wilson: Thanks, Michelle. This is Chris. Thank you all for taking the time to be on today's call and apologies again for the technical glitches we're having with Adobe Connect, but I think, yes, we should be able to go ahead proceed without the benefit unfortunately of the chat room. And so I mentioned earlier, Steve had circulated the policy calendar to everybody yesterday. Hopefully you can pull that up via e-mail and take a look at that.

So why don't we go ahead and turn to Steve and we can go ahead and dive into policy calendar. Steve?

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Chris. Is there any member on the call who needs me to resend the e-mail with the policy calendar?

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: Sorry. Steve, if you don't mind it's Marilyn. Can you just send - I don't know what our technical issues are but if you could just resend it, but keep talking.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks, Marilyn. I'll shoot that over to you. In fact, I just sent it now. All right everyone at the top section, Channel 1, are comments that we've already filed. I'm going to highlight two since our last meeting. On July the 6th, filed a very brief comment supporting the Restated Articles of Incorporation for ICANN. And our comments echoed what most others did in that the draft articles reflected what the cross-community working group recommended was necessary.

And in particular the BC wanted to ensure that ICANN couldn't change its form of incorporation or place of incorporation without a change to the articles, and we ensured that the change to the articles would require unanimous written consent from the empowered community. On July the 20th, well yesterday, we filed the attached comment on amendments to the base new registry agreement.

This was one of the more interesting and controversial comments that we've had in the past couple of years in the BC and actually things worked pretty smoothly in the end. I think our charter is pretty wise in the way it tries to generate momentum through a set of comments and tries to recognize the fact

that if you have objections to any aspect of a comment by more than 10% of our members, then we kick into gear other kind of procedures, conversations, negotiations and compromise.

And I had talked to Denise Michel, who led a very strong draft and then when presented with concerns that were expressed by 10% of our members, made some key compromises. I also want to thank Paul Mitchell, Cecilia Smith, Andrew Harris for contributing edits. That comment was submitted yesterday, and thanks to all who helped to make it happen. Are there any other comments on that? Thanks again, everyone.

Let me turn it to the open public comments. You'll see from the policy calendar that there nine open public comments that are particularly relevant to the BC right now. That's a lot. And the first one is a review of this ICANN fellowship program, and namely the application process for that. Andrew Mack and Jimson Olufuye volunteered to draft one for that, and just moments ago Andrew Mack sent me two paragraphs for a BC comment. We're waiting on Jimson, who's traveling today, to endorse that. And once I get that, I will send it to all of you and the subject line will read "For Review" because this one is due the 29th of July. It's going to be a very brief comment, hopefully two paragraphs.

The next three, numbers two, three, and four all deal with PTI. That's a new acronym to add to your lexicon at ICANN, and it means Post-Transition IANA. And it's a new affiliate, a wholly owned subsidiary of ICANN, which will be charged with the work of operating the IANA function. So there are three sets of comments that are open right now. The first is on the articles of incorporation for PTI, another on the governance documents, and then finally the bylaws for PTI.

So we should treat these as a package, but unfortunately ICANN has them staggered when comments need to be submitted. So you'll see the two of them are the 7th of August and the 11th of August. Those are the two with the most meat to them. Because the 31st of July comment on the articles of incorporation, I don't think it merits a comment. It already reflects pretty accurately what we recommended in the report, and I didn't see anything controversial in there.

Do I have any volunteers who are particularly interested in the naming, numbering and protocol perimeters, aspects of post-transition IANA that will assist me in drafting a BC comment on two, three, and four? I'll stop talking and - so this is the part of the call where if Adobe were working, all these hands would go up where people are volunteering. So you'll just have to speak up on the phone.

Hibah Hussain: Hi, Steve, this is Hibah. I would love to help with that, looking into the PTI articles.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks, Hibah. I appreciate that. Anyone else?

Barbara Wanner: Yes, Steve, this is Barbara Wanner. The governance documents and the - have you had a chance to look at these yet? I apologize that I have not. But do they basically take elements of the proposal, the CCWG and the naming functions proposal, and incorporate them as text, or are they moved from scratch?

Steve DelBianco: Well they're from scratch in the sense that never had a PTI before. So they created a new entity. But to the extent that the entity has to reflect what its mission is and how it works, Barbara, they did take that from the approved community proposal.

Barbara Wanner: Okay. Okay great. Fine. I'm happy to work with you and Hibah on that.

Steve DelBianco: Great. Hibah and Barbara, I'll follow up with an e-mail with the two of you so we can prep things for the 7th and 11th of August. Any other volunteers there? Great thank you.

Jay Sudwoski: Hey, Steve, this is Jay with I2C. I'd like to volunteer as well.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Jay.

Jay Sudwoski: Naming and numbering, technical stuff is more in my wheelhouse than most of this other stuff that we deal with. So.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks, Jay, appreciate that. Let me turn to the fifth one. It's an important one for ICANN. It's the .com registry agreement held by VeriSign is - would have been up for expiration in 2018, is under a presumptive renewal clause, the way all the TLDs are, but nonetheless it's sort of an important anniversary date. However, VeriSign also has been - is becoming under contract to run the root server, the authoritative root server. It used to do so in a contract with NTIA, but as part of the transition, it's ICANN that'll control, namely PTI.

So VeriSign needs to change its agreement. It will no longer be with the Commerce Department, but instead it would be with ICANN. And as part of that agreement, they wanted to extend it at least eight years from now, an eight-year term. By making that an eight-year term that means the contract expires in 2024 and what VeriSign asked for was to make the .com agreement coincide with the root server, root zone maintenance agreement that the operate.

So Akram Atallah with ICANN wrote a blog a few weeks ago explaining the rationale for the move and the tying the two together. I found it to be pretty persuasive, but then again VeriSign is a member of NetChoice, so full disclosure. And then it's currently out for public comment to close on the 12th of August.

Now keep in mind that there's only one single amendment to the entire .com agreement. All they did was amend the term of the agreement so it coincides with the root zone maintainer to 2024. There weren't any other amendments made to the agreement. So I included in here links to the agreement, links to the root zone services agreement and Akram's blog. And I guess I'm interested to know whether the BC wants to comment on this at all and if so, who's interested in helping to draft. I'll take a queue.

Marilyn Cade: Steve, it's Marilyn. I'd like to be in the queue.

Philip Corwin: Yes, Phil as well.

Steve DelBianco: Go ahead, Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: Thanks. Having been involved from the very beginning all the way through where we are today, I just want to comment about my interest in making sure that we have a very stable infrastructure in the majority of the gTLDs and not to link or misunderstand different roles that the gTLD operators might have.

So I would speak in support of this and think that the primary interest that BC members have, I have no relationship with VeriSign at all, but I do have a big concern about making sure that we have a very stable environment as we go through this transition. And when I say stable, I mean operationally stable. So

I'm inclined to be supportive of this change as proposed, and not to question it but I welcome hearing from others who might have different views.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks, Marilyn. Phil?

Philip Corwin: Yes, Steve. I just want to chime in with a couple of points because I'm actually completing a memo on this for ICA members so they understand the situation. Number one, the original announcement was that they were going to ask for a ten-year extension of the .com registry agreement, which would have been till 2026.

In fact, now they're proposing an eight-year extension to 2024, which coincides with the extension that VeriSign would have been entitled to in 2018 under the six-year - a new six-year contract, you know, assuming that there is no violation that would be, you know, vitiate their presumptive renewal call for the registry agreement. So it winds up the same place, it just goes, you know, without having to go through formal renewal.

Second, on the RZMA contract, which is related, and I thought Akram's blog and other materials laid out a very interesting and strong case for the interrelationship between the technical operation of the root zone and of the .com registry. VeriSign's currently performing that function for the U.S. government for zero dollars. They are proposing to do it for ICANN for 25,000 a month but possible - but subject to possible callbacks for failing to meet very strict goals each month of up to \$25,000. I don't have a problem with that of, you know, it seems like a reasonable sum for all they do.

Third, the, you know, I've read one piece recently which questioned whether the U.S. government has any review role on this because of the current cooperative agreement, under VeriSign both operates the RZMA functions

and - which also applies to .com, so I don't know what the U.S. government position will be on that.

Finally, I have no opinion on whether or not the BC should file a comment on this, but the - as you point out, the amendment to the .com agreement is simply striking 2018 and inserting 2024, whereas the related RZMA agreement is a 47-page document and highly technical in nature. And I'll stop there. That was just to help inform BC members on some of the key points here.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks, Phil.

Denise Michel: Steve, it's Denise. Would you put me in the queue?

Steve DelBianco: I will. Thank you, Phil. That was helpful as well. And before I go to you Denise, I wanted to note that Adobe seems to have awakened. There's a few of us that are in there. But if those of you who have tried to log in, you might try again. Go ahead, Denise.

Denise Michel: Thanks, Steve. I'm not volunteering.

Steve DelBianco: I already wrote your name down.

Denise Michel: No, no. I just wanted to actually to pose a question to whomever might know whether if the BC does decide to submit some comments on this, whether it would be an appropriate stepping off point to once again reiterate the BC strong support for VeriSign finally following through on their implementation of thick Whois historically. I mean, yes, going back for, I don't know, well over five years, maybe even more, the BC has been trying to get VeriSign to implement thick Whois.

And it's been several years since the GNSO passed the consensus policy directing .com to implement thick Whois and it still has not been implemented. So if we do decide to go forward with comments on this, link my question in. Unless someone has additional information as to why we shouldn't, I would suggest that we once again reiterate that this needs to come to a close. Thanks.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks, Denise. I'll note that in Helsinki, I believe you were with me when we went to the meetings specifically on the thick Whois implementation, and staff, ICANN staff spent a lot of time walking through the timeline on what it would take and representatives of VeriSign chimed in with ideas that they had for federated access and other potential ways of giving a centralized access to Whois without asking all of their registrars to transport the data over because I think registrars are raising more and more concerns over privacy laws that prevent them from moving personally identifiable information to the United States for the purpose of sticking it in VeriSign's servers.

So there was no conclusion to that discussion, but I did speak up on behalf of the BC's strong priority and suggested that it would be appropriate to address these legal privacy concerns right now rather than go through an entire implementation plan only to have lawyers tell us late in the game, "Oh by the way, this won't work for the following registrars because they're covered by certain laws. This won't work for registrants who happen to be citizens of, say, Ireland because their law prevents the movement of that data."

So I'll - I'd just add that to put a finer point on what Denise raised. The thick Whois is a live topic and it might be something to add to any comment we do on thick Whois for .com. Anyone else in the queue? You can use the Adobe or speak up. Thanks everyone.

Let me go to the next one. It's item six. These are new operating procedures for the GNSO Council on how we elect our chair and our vice chair. All or you are aware of the kind of mess we had in Dublin for trying to work that out and the lingering lack of cooperation between the non-contract party house CSG and NCSG. And I don't know, maybe you can solve this by operating procedures. Maybe we can solve it with more social interaction, but we probably do need to solve it before the next round of elections.

Those comments don't close until the 14th of August, and there's plenty of time there. But, here's where I would really like to look to Susan, Phil, to other members of the BC who have been on council, who witnessed firsthand how dysfunctional sometimes our split house voting can be. So I'll take a queue on that to see whether we have any volunteers to formulate a comment.

Marilyn Cade: Steve, it's Marilyn. Can I ask that we also add, if you don't mind, a discussion about the board election? I'm involved in that. I'm not involved in the chair and the vice chair but I am involved in the process on the board election. And if we might add that in to this discussion, at least for the future, that would be very helpful.

Steve DelBianco: Marilyn, I don't think that this particular public comment involves board but are you suggesting we add it to anyway?

Marilyn Cade: No, no, I just mean within the BC I'd like to add the topic for us to talk about and not - yes.

Steve DelBianco: Okay. All right. Angie?

Angie Graves: Yes, this is Angie Graves. I'm just happy to offer any insight. I've been working with this group on these comments since shortly after October. We were requested by the GNSO Council to form a solution to this issue. So if anybody wants some insights and details, I'm happy to provide. Thank you.

Steve DelBianco: Angie, take a minute please. Tell us what's the really essence of the solution and why do you think it'll actually work?

Angie Graves: Well the essence of the solution is targeted squarely at -- hold on one second please. I'm not going to be able to control the volume outside of here in about eight seconds, so I might need to do that via e-mail.

Steve DelBianco: Okay. Angie, would you be able to, since it's not as easy for you to speak where you are, on number six, it's not due until August the 14th, but as someone who follows it closely, could you summarize in an e-mail to the BC private where you see the promise in the solution and the procedure or where you see things that we need to press for in a public comment? Whether we publicly comment on it or not, the procedures themselves will be subject to a vote in council where Susan and Phil would cast their vote. But let's use this opportunity to raise concerns about the procedures if we have it. Thank you, Angie.

Number seven and eight are not due for quite some time and I think in the interest of time I will defer those two until the next BC call. And I will bring up number nine because Angie Graves who just spoke to us is on the panel for the new gTLD marketplace health index. And that panel has published a beta of their marketplace health index. The comments are closing on the sixth of September. So there's a lot of time there but this is for sure something the BC will want to comment on.

In a separate e-mail this morning, Angie, since she's close to this, volunteered to pull together notes and lead the BC's drafting on the comments on number nine. And Angie, thank you for that. If you'd like to add anything, by all means to. I really appreciate that.

All right I don't see any other names in the queue and I have three other items before we turn to Phil and Susan on the council. One is the gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group, and this means subsequent procedures for opening up new gTLDs after the 2012 round. And they may not necessarily be rounds of new gTLDs, it might be a perpetually open application window, and I think that's why they call it subsequent procedures.

That working group suggests that they're looking for help to establish historical record on advice that's been given in the 2012 round. I think that there is no constituency who's commented more frequently than the BC on the new gTLD round, and our website is abundant in specific indications of where we commented on it. But, Chris, you received a note from the working group. Are they looking for us to add more to that? Do they want me to just catalogue with hyperlinks all the times we've commented? What are they actually looking for right now?

Chris Wilson: This Chris. It's a good question, Steve, and I'm happy to reach back out and get more specifics. I don't have specifics there. At a minimum if we want to provide, you know, sort of guide them to what we've said prior, that would perhaps be a good start and then we can, you know, ask them if they want further information that we haven't already sort of provided in the past. But I don't have specifics. It was - they just sort of asked me if we've had any input to provide. So why don't we just maybe just start with what we've done and then see if we - if there's more that we can add. We can revisit that.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks, Chris. What I'll do then is I'll follow up on the e-mail that you forwarded me and I'll copy all of BC private and then we'll include a list of all the times we've commented on the 2012 round, and then I'll ask them if they needed any more to let us know. How about that?

Chris Wilson: Yes, that'd be great. Thanks.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you. Two other quick items. Phil Corwin, you and J. Scott are co-chairs of the group, the PDP working group on reviewing all the rights protection mechanisms that are used in all gTLDs. The last time we met you guys as co-chairs said you're seeking input on several key questions in a letter, and it's the fourth attachment to this. So, Phil, my question for you is are you getting the responses you need and, in particular, are you wanting the BC to try to give you a response? Go ahead, Phil.

Philip Corwin: Well we're getting some responses from the SOs and ACs. All of them haven't responded yet, but I don't think we've reached the deadline yet. If the BC wants to give input, we'd welcome that but with J. Scott and I both from the BC and quite familiar with BC positions on RPMs, I wouldn't say it's absolutely necessary. And this is going to be a long process through next year on the new TLD RPMs and then starting in 2018 on the UDRP.

I think generally - he's not on the call today but I know both J. Scott and I as well as Kathy Kleiman, who's the third co-chair, are very pleased with the way this is going. We're on or maybe even a little bit ahead of schedule. We're reviewing right now the PDDRP. And even though that's never been used to challenge a registry accused of engaging in or actively encouraging infringement, we're having a good discussion of possible tweaks that might make it more useful, and we're getting set to launch into the trademark clearinghouse discussion in early September.

So we welcome BC input but for myself, I would say it's not absolutely critical, you know, because we've all been with the - both J. Scott and I have been with the BC a long and pretty aware of your views. But if there are members who think that there are concerns or issues which have arisen since the launching of the TLDs that are uncovered in those previous, you know, comments, that might argue for some input on those.

Steve DelBianco: Hey, Phil, it's Steve. You probably know this well, trademark claims extended, sunrise periods for those who come out twice, the notion of URS, the contractors, and then PIC enforcement, things like that have been prominent in all the comments we've done. And a lot of it relies upon data showing whether or not the trademark claims are a chilling effect or are they having the intended affect. We won't know until you start to generate some of your findings, right?

Philip Corwin: Right, right. Yes, and we've got a lot of BC and other business related folks in the working group. We have well over 100 -- I forget the exact count -- but I think it was 130, 140 members, and about half that number is observers. So we have very broad distribution by, you know, by different sectors, by geographies. So. And again, we're going - each of these topics is going to be discussed for several months, so there will be plenty of time for input.

I would point out that PICs is not an RPM we're looking at. That's in the ballpark of the subsequent procedures group.

Steve DelBianco: Got it.

Philip Corwin: It's not an RPM.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Phil. Okay, Marilyn and then Susan. Go ahead, Marilyn. Marilyn, can't hear you. All right, not hearing Marilyn, so maybe we lost that connection. Susan, go ahead.

Susan Kawaguchi: I just wanted to say that Andy Abrams and I had volunteered to provide some comments to the RPM group, and he sent me his comments and I delayed and not gotten that to the RPM. So I will do that and make sure, you know, and set it out to the BC as soon as we have a full draft form.

Chris Wilson: Fantastic. And you guys are working off of Attachment 4 so it's the structured questions that they asked about right?

Susan Kawaguchi: Correct.

Chris Wilson: Fantastic. Thanks Susan, appreciate it. Marilyn are you back?

((Crosstalk))

Chris Wilson: Marilyn are you speaking? Not hearing Marilyn so let me turn to one last item here is the next generation RDS. We have 5 BC members who are really active on that working group and it's something that Susan is really familiar with as well. I note that Beth you're on the call, Andrew's on as well. Is there anything more that you need from us on the items that I've inserted right here to the policy calendar. This is at the bottom of Page 2? That would be Susan, Andrew, Beth?

Beth Alegretti: This is Beth. We - if anybody has any comments I think Susan might have a comment. I don't know if that's premature Susan but at this point we're just plugging along and just if any BC members have any additional requirements to the list of 800 or so that have attached?

Chris Wilson: Wow.

Susan Kawaguchi: So this is Susan. I actually do have some possible requirements that I thought would be good for the BC to submit and but once again I'm delayed in getting those out. It's been a little busy. So and most of these can - or all of these are concerned with providing documentation and about not conveying individual privacy data protection rights to commercial entities.

So as we as the RDS moves along not everyone gets data protection in the same way because of if you're a commercial entity that there are no laws to protect that or they're different laws. So I will submit that to the BC so that, you know, for anybody else's comments as soon as I get time. So...

Steve DelBianco: Susan I can - this is Steve. I can assist you with circulating collecting comments for the BC members that we're to coordinate like I'm supposed to. So I can take that off your shoulders as long as you're able to give me at least a rough form of what you'd like to...

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay.

Steve DelBianco: ...talk about.

Susan Kawaguchi: Perfect thanks.

Steve DelBianco: Okay? Thank you. Beth, anything else from you on this or Andrew?

Beth Alegretti: No I think that's it.

Steve DelBianco: Great.

Beth Allegretti: That's it for me.

Steve DelBianco: Marilyn Cade are you on the line yet? Okay not hearing Marilyn so I'm going to turn things over to Susan and Phil to walk us through Channel 2 which is the support on council. You guys have a council meeting today so I've indicated the items from your own agenda where you usually can highlight for the BC members and discuss the votes that you're likely to take today thank you.

Philip Corwin: Well I'll start, Phil here. Yes, Susan and I actually we corresponded on this earlier today and we don't see any - she may have a comment on one issue regarding the GAC communiqué and PPSAI. But there's nothing on the agenda today. There are some votes scheduled but we don't see anything particularly controversial or problematic coming up in today's meeting.

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes. And the only there's actually two things that I would like to comment on. The PPSAI the GAC didn't provide formal advice so I just want to make sure I asked that it be on our other business part of the agenda just to make sure that we keep moving that along that the board is planning on doing something in the next board meeting so that will be probably a real quick discussion.

The other thing is and I - Steve you may have to help me with this. It's the CFC, IANA Committee that we are - the GNSO is - was had a call for candidates. I was on the - I am on the Committee, GNSO Council Committee to pick a representative to that for the CSC. And we had quite an elaborate process set up but we only got one candidate. So James Gannon is sort of a slam duck because we other choices either. Also I think James would probably do a job so...

Steve DelBianco: Susan it's Steve. I'd like to echo your view that James is an excellent candidate. Let me ask you this? Do we need to propose an alternate as well as a principal representative?

Susan Kawaguchi: We do but there was quite a call - if you've noticed there was quite a call for candidates that went out several times and we just the GNSO did not have any other candidates. So when it comes to making sure we have geographical diversity, you know, that's going to be a little rougher because we don't have an alternate.

Steve DelBianco: Then I have one request. When you have a council meeting today presumably James will be on the line to speak to the vote but make sure the James understands that if there is a situation where he cannot attend the Customer Standing Committee meeting or his career or something else would get in the way that he needs to give council advanced notice well in advance council can find an alternate to sit for him in a single meeting or potentially for longer.

Susan Kawaguchi: So actually the alternate as I was thinking and, you know, the materials that I've received - and that's a good point and I will make sure that that point is made. But the alternate that the GNSO was supposed to provide was a geographical diverse candidate so that if we put James in and I think he's from Ireland we have somebody from Latin America also so that the CSC when the registries and the other members have present their candidate they could pick one or the other. We've - we were supposed to have two and be happy to go along with either one of those based on the diversity of the council or the committee. So but I will also reinforce that point too that we always want representation.

Philip Corwin: Yes, and Steve one more comment before we finish with council. When Susan brings up, you know, asking for board feedback now on the PPSAI I'm going

to bring up again a topic that was discussed at some point in Helsinki which is the fact that is on the Red Cross and IGO protections were particularly on the IGOs the GNSO put out a PDP recommendation, the GAC put out advice to the board. Contrary to those recommendations for the last two years the board has - certain board members have been holding closed door meetings with GAC and IGO representatives.

And there's two problems here. One the board's been talking to one side but not to the other. And two they're two years and they haven't reached a decision yet. And that's starting to have an impact on a working group I co-chair which in fact I have to co-chair the call today in 17 minutes of the IGO curative rights process working group where we've now received the legal advice we need from an outside expert. We're moving to final recommendations. And it really complicates our job curative rights if we don't know what the preventative rights are. And the board's been dicking around with this for two years already. So it's time for them to come to a decision whatever it is.

Steve DelBianco: Phil this is Steve. Can ask you a question on Item 7? This is the next steps relating to procedures to address Whois conflicts with national law. So I presume that staff will discuss things on that topic. And I would just ask and Susan anchor that discussion on the whole Thick Whois for .com and .net discussion.

We had it earlier in this call because it's actually the Whois conflicts with national law and there's a legal complication about registers moving all of their personal information on all of the registrants into VeriSign servers. So please bring that up in that context and ensure the ICANN legal is paying attention to this just as much as ICANN technical.

Philip Corwin: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you.

Philip Corwin: Thanks Steve. If I defer to Susan on Whois because I recognize that she has a great deal of expertise in that area.

Susan Kawaguchi: Thanks Phil.

Chris Wilson: Great, thank you. Susan and Phil anything further from you?

Philip Corwin: That's all I have.

Susan Kawaguchi: Not for me.

Steve DelBianco: Okay great. And Marilyn Cade's been in the queue quite a while so before we turn it over to Cheryl Miller or CSG Marilyn what was the point you wanted to make?

Marilyn Cade: Look I might want to - I'll comment that I asked you to understand that I'm really out of queue. I wanted to mention that - and we can perhaps move this after I discuss it, move it to later that has to do with the ICANN staff engagement at the IGF. I don't want to take up time on this so Steve perhaps we just move this under AOB if you don't mind?

Steve DelBianco: Great, no problem. Cheryl Miller anything you want to add on CSG?

Cheryl Miller: Yes, thank you Steve. A special thank you to everyone who helps participate in the CSG meetings that we had in Helsinki. There was one topic with respect to a letter that Steve had drafted. You might recall we drafted a letter

that sort of raise some of the challenges in some of the concerns associated with the ICANN venues being moved. And right now, you know, we had a good discussion in the room there with the CPH during a luncheon session. Unfortunately, the CPH explained that the registrars and registries cannot sign onto the letter.

The gave a number of reasons. That they would possibly support document disclosure. They thought the focus to the board should be shifted and focus should be instead be put back to the staff and that some of the issues in their minds might have already been answered in some of the posts on the same topic. And so right now with respect to support for the letter the ISPCP has said that they will support and we are hoping that also on the IPC will support and I'll stop there. I don't know if there's anything that you wanted to add Steve in any of your follow-up conversations but that's sort of where we are on that.

Steve DelBianco: It wasn't me who drafted that letter initially Cheryl but and I have nothing else to add. I think it was a group effort. Thank you.

Cheryl Miller: Oh, apologies on that, apologies.

Chris Wilson: Yes, this is Chris. I'll just say and Andrew Mack took the lead to the laboring war on that letter. And just to know that we have - it's not been forgotten and we are - hopefully we'll know soon that the IPC can sign on. And I think that way at a minimum we'll have the entire Commercial Stakeholder Group sign on to the letter and then we can go ahead and send that out. I don't think it. I think it's just as timely frankly now as it was when we initially drafted it. I don't think anything's changed. So hopefully we'll have - get an answer from the IPC very soon and then we can go ahead and formalize it and send it on its way but that's where we are now.

Steve DelBianco: Hey Chris, it's Steve. I only have one other item in Channel 3 which was the - I wanted to point out to everyone that on last Thursday Larry Strickling gave probably the most one of the most passionate speeches of his tenure at ICANN where he explained the whole process of the transition and where it currently stood with regard to approval by the administration and by Congress. And then that was followed by a debate where I participated in a debate over some of the controversy that's been stirred up a certain members of Congress.

So there is a link to Larry's remarks as well as to the debate from IGF USA. And I recommend that highly to anyone who's actually looking for a relatively entertaining way of discussing and debating the transmission. That's it for me, over to you Chris.

Chris Wilson: Thanks Steve. I'll just state lastly exactly with regard to transition and because you - see Workstream 2 is also noted in the policy calendar and I'll let everyone know that I've signed up to be a co-rapporteur for the transparency subgroup. So those BC members that are that are interested in that particular topic feel free to reach out to me and to learn more just to simply say that we have not the transparency subgroup has not yet had its initial call. We intend to do so during the first week of August.

All the rapporteurs of these different subgroups are having a collective call next week to I guess to sort of organize and set the stage. And then the subgroups will then break out and begin work. But I think the expectation is that the transparency subgroup will start - have its initial call during the first week of August for just an hour and then hope and potentially have weekly calls going forward as we set the agenda against start getting - getting to work on that topic.

So happy to take any questions folks may have on that issue if there are any. I see - but Barbara, I don't - with regard to jurisdiction group I don't know what their state of play is to be honest with you. But I'm sure you could presumably email the rapporteurs. If you don't have their email, we can see if we can find them and then see what the status is. They may very well be waiting until after next week's call as well...

Barbara Wanner: Okay.

Chris Wilson: ...before they put out their (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Barbara Wanner: Chris, will then you let us know through email when the first official call is or would that be on the Web site? How will people be contacted?

Chris Wilson: With regard to Transparency Subgroup, yes. There's been an email list set up for - well frankly for every subgroup. So as soon as my co-rapporteur and I have got a date and time locked down we will then of course email the entire - everyone that's provided their emails for that subgroup email list if that makes sense? So you'll - you should be able to receive an email so...

Barbara Wanner: Great.

Chris Wilson: When sent anything out yet.

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: That would come from staff. That probably wouldn't come rapporteurs. It would come from staff. And I put instructions in the policy calendar for any of you who want to be an observer or participant to any of the groups I indicated how you can do that.

Chris Wilson: So, Phil I see your hand up.

Philip Corwin: Yes, Chris, just really quick. On the IANA transition and the Strickling speech which was very strong argument in favor of the transition against its critics I did circulate to BC members a link to an article I posted on that earlier this week. And then I updated the article because a day later the Republican platform was issued in final form and it contains a plank opposing the transition. How that may affect Congress in September I don't know but the language is there for those that want to see it. Thank you.

Chris Wilson: Thanks Phil. Any other quick questions or concerns about the transition? Let me go ahead and turn - and Jimson can't be on the call. He sent his apologies. He's traveling back from the states to Nigeria. He just simply wanted me to reiterate on his behalf apologies for confusion with regard to invoicing. We've had some glitches I guess with member clicks, our third-party source for this. And if it hasn't already been resolved it will be resolved soon so he wanted to again reiterate his apologies for that for those glitches.

Other than that I don't have anything else to report on the finance and operations side. And with just a few minutes left perhaps we can go ahead and turn to any other business. As you can see the first item there bolded is the GNSO councilor election. I'm happy to report that Susan Kawaguchi has expressed a desire to run for another term as our - as one of our GNSO councilors.

And in light of this and in light of the fact that she will be going on a sabbatical, a much deserved no doubt sabbatical this fall we have a - we - Jimson has put together a timeline for the election. And obviously it's open to other candidates as well but we thought we would in an effort to sort of meet with Susan's own calendar sort of provide a calendar for members.

And I can send this out via the list but also wanted to go ahead and quickly just say the nomination period will be opened up on Monday, August 15 and will close on Friday, August 26. We'll then do a candidates call on Monday, August 29 and then voting will commence immediately after that Monday call and close on Monday, September 5. And the election of course will be conducted by our secretariat Chantelle. So that is that's the timeline we're working with regard to...

Marilyn Cade: Chris?

Chris Wilson: Hold on one....

Marilyn Cade: Chris?

Chris Wilson: Marilyn hold on one second. And so that's, you know, that's what we are GNSO councilor election. I see Marilyn has asked a question about large and small business. As far as I know there's no distinction for councilor for large and small. There is for NomCom but not for GNSO councilor but both councilors are to represent the BC as a whole whether they come from a small business or large business. So there as far as I know there's no distinction to be made with regard to that as far as the GNSO councilor is concerned. But do you have further question on that?

Marilyn Cade: I did thanks Chris for allowing me to speak. It's Marilyn Cade. In the past we've always tried to have representation across the board so I just wanted to ask if you could please clarify, you know, your - you defined the nominating process but could you save it for about what the criteria is from the executive committee?

Chris Wilson: As far as the GNSO councilor I think the - as far as I know the criteria is the same as it was and has been since we've, you know, been doing this. I don't know of new criteria. And I can defer to Jimson. He can provide that information when he's available. But as far as I know, you know, obviously we want as many members who are interested to apply to apply. Obviously I think a familiarity with the GNSO is of help - is helpful. And the BC of course familiarity with the BC and the BC's positions is paramount since they are the representing the BC on the council.

You know, other than that obviously we always strive for diversity geographic, gender, et cetera. And so, you know, call for candidates is open to all. I'm announcing that fact that Susan has expressed a desire to run again but that doesn't preclude others if they so choose to throw their name into the ring. So, you know, I, you know, that's where I stand on it. If others have - others from the ExCom have further insight or opinions I'm open to them to expressing them. But that's how I - I'm approaching it. Phil I see your hand raised.

Philip Corwin: Yes, and in fact the ExCom had an online discussion just this morning. The charter does not and has never required a larger - has never split the council seats into large or small business. Having said that Susan of course has run a very large and successful Internet company. I represent a trade association of mostly small and medium-sized Internet entrepreneurs so we have that balance. We have an excellent working relationship but when we're

representing the BC on Council we're not voting the Facebook position or the ICA position. We're - we are there to articulate in advance and defend the BC consensus position. So that's all I have to say on it.

Chris Wilson: Thanks Phil. Any other quick questions on that? We just got a couple minutes left?

Marilyn Cade: Yes, Chris. I just have one quick question. So could we have just a posting to the list on whether anyone has a term limit? That would just help everyone to understand. Term limits aren't decided by us. They're decided by the council. So if that could just be posted that would be very helpful.

Chris Wilson: Sure. Okay moving right along non-compositions are due by August 5. I know that Steve Coates who's been our voice if you will on the NonCom is leaving the BC, changing jobs, changing companies and will not be able to be our NonCom rep going forward. So we will have to sort of work on filling that role going forward as well. And so I will send out more information on filling that position. But I know we have - I don't know if the August 5 deadline is necessarily for Steve but I think we have other positions we need to fill and think about so I will send out more information or have others send out more information in that regard too to do.

Related to the Board, we've already talked about that with regard to the meetings, Cheryl mentioned that. Credentials Committee further to this is that both - as again Steve Coates is leaving and Laura Covington changing jobs within Yahoo!, no longer being engaged - will no longer be engaged with us on a daily basis with the BC. They are two members on our Credentials Committee who will be leaving the Credentials Committee if not soon have already done so. And therefore we need to, you know, volunteers right now to fill their slots in the Credentials Committee.

So this, consider this an initial call out for volunteers to serve in the Credentials Committee. I'll send an email of the full list as well for volunteers. But we are interested in members considering that opportunity to be on the Credentials Committee and we'll send out more information soon on that. Any questions about that? Phil is that an old hand?

Philip Corwin: No, well I just want to say as the current chair of the Credentials Committee and I'm actually past my sell by date for that and we've agreed within the ExCom I'll be rolling off at the end of the year we need two people to fill those slots. It's not a strenuous job. It's not a lot of time. It's only - you're your own active when we get membership applications. And I'm just going to be staying on a short time to help educate the new members on the review process.

The only time there's any significant time commitment is when we're asked to review a member's eligibility, remain on the BC. And that's only happened twice in the last three years so I'll say something more online. I've got to leave now to chair this other meeting.

Chris Wilson: Thank you, Phil.

Philip Corwin: So bye all.

Chris Wilson: Thank you Phil. And I see Arinola has volunteered as to be on it. So that's one name. Thank you very much Arinola. And if others, we welcome others as well. The committee holds up to three members from the BC on our committee and so obviously the more the merrier.

Lastly just last note we'll have the next meeting on Thursday, August 4 same time as this meeting. And so hopefully all can join in that call as well. Any further - I know Marilyn you had one more point to raise in AOB. If you can do it very quickly I'll let you do it now.

Marilyn Cade: No.

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: No Chris it's not necessary. I'll just send an email as just an FYI for those who are interested at ICANN meetings. There's a NRI session. I'll just send it to Chantelle and she can share it. Is that okay?

Chris Wilson: Yes. That would be great. Thank you. Okay thank you all very much. We can stop the recording.

Michelle DeSmyter: Great. Thank you. Today's call has been adjourned. Everyone have a fantastic day. Thank you again.

END