ICANN

Moderator: Chantelle Doerksen
August 4, 2016
10:00 am CT

Chantelle Doerksen: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the BC Members call on August 4, 2016. On the call today we have Paul Mitchell, Nivaldo Cleto, Angie Graves, Chris Wilson, John Berard, Elisa Cooper, Barbara Wanner, Arinola Akinyemi, Andrew Harris, Denise Michel, Claudia Martinuzzi, Alex Deacon, Lawrence Olawale-Roberts, Hibah Hussain, Jay Sudowski, Steve DelBianco, Cecilia Smith, Jay Chapman, Jimson Olufuye, Ben Lee, and Susan Kawaguchi.

We have apologies from Andy Abrams, Andrew Mack, Kevin Audritt, and Marie Pattullo. I'd 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 everybody for participating on today's call, certainly appreciate it. I know we per usual we have a fair amount to discuss so why don't I just go ahead and turn it over to Steve to dive into the policy calendar. Steve?

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Chris. Folks, I distributed the policy calendar yesterday. Sorry there was a little bit later than usual. And I thought I would dive right in on the recently filed -- only once since our last call. And that was on the 29th of July we got a very brief concept on the Fellowship program application process. Thanks again to Andrew Mack and Jimson for drafting that.

Now we turn to the current set of ICANN public comments. There are quite a few that are currently open. The first two have been drafted thanks to Barbara Warner with help from Hibah Hussain and Jay Sudowski have prepared two comments. The one is due on the 7th of August over the weekend and the other is due on the 11th. And fortunately we had the opportunity to review them both and it was the first attachment to the document that I circulated.

This is a comment regarding the post transition IANA known as PTI. The PTI is a wholly-owned ICAAN subsidiary that the CCWG and CWG called for so that the functions of naming and eventually protocols and numbers would all be managed by assets and personnel inside of PTI. And it's meant to create a better path for separability in the ultimate case of having to take naming numbers or protocols out of ICANN. But more importantly it provides an accountable central place where PTI will conduct the transactions that IANA has done in the past.

So what I'd like to do is invite you to open that first attachment and since it has both comments in it, I'll give Barbara, Hibah and Jay an opportunity to discuss what was circulated. But we would like to try to get on this call to surface any further edits or concerns before we try to finalize this over the weekend. So Barbara anything you'd like to add in the way of explanation?

Barbara Wanner: Thanks and for the recording this is Barbara Warner. And Steve you did an excellent job of previewing it. I think, you know, Eva, Jay and I in looking at

these documents particularly with respect to the governance documents kind of doing a side by side comparison we felt that basically for want of a better description there was kind of a copy and paste approach. But we did not feel that was all that bad because of what NTIA had expressed in its IANA transition proposal assessment that the work that was done in developing a conflict of interest policy a board code of conduct expected standards of behavior for ICANN would serve as an excellent model for a developing comparable documents for the PTI. This is what NTIA had said.

So we all went through and kind of did a side by side assessment and we felt that we, you know, it all looked well and good but we felt in the interest of consistency with BC's earlier comments that we reinsert our concerns under the Expected Standards of Conduct section with respect to sexual harassment and how we address that when ICANN put that offer common earlier.

So what I've done basically is just sort of, you know, kind of redraft and adapt what we said with respect to sexual harassment into the PTI Expected Standards of Comment. And then Hibah, God bless her and her side by side picked up an omission in the conflicts of interest policy. I think it was probably just an omission. But again for the interest of consistency and so the documents of the PTI comport with those of ICANN that they address that omission with respect to let's see what is it, the involvement of an independent evaluation expert.

So that in a nutshell is how we approached the governance document. Maybe I'll just stop there and invite my co-drafters to jump in.

Steve DelBianco: Yes, Barbara let's do the three governance documents and then we'll quickly turn to the bylaws. And again folks these three governance documents are the conflict of interest policy for PTI, the board's Code of Conduct and the

Expected Standards of Behavior. And all of this is detailed in the first attachment to the policy calendar email that I sent last night. Hibah and Jay any further comment on that or turn to the bylaws next?

Hibah Hussain: Yes, this is Hibah. I want to just say Barbara I think she did an amazing job drafting the comments and giving an overview so nothing to add.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks Hibah. All right let's turn to bylaws. So Barbara the draft PTI bylaws we have about a, oh, almost a three-page draft and these are due August the 11th so we have more time on the draft PTI bylaws. But give us some highlights of what's in there and then Jay and Hibah you should add as well. Go ahead Barbara.

Barbara Wanner: Thanks so much. What we did with in reviewing the draft PTI bylaws is quite honestly we went to the original request for comment from ICANN. And basically what ICANN staff did is they highlighted three areas which were - where I guess it was ICANN staff had to kind of fill in gaps. There were certain issues there weren't very specifically addressed in the March 10 approved combined package for the IANA transition.

And so what we did is we commented on staff additions if you're will to the PTI bylaws. And the first element was the selection of the PTI chair. The second one was a recommendation for a quorum, what would constitute a quorum for PTI meetings, the third was a higher PTI board voting threshold on certain issues. And then finally thanks to Jay we've added another element concerning limiting the PTI's remit.

Going to the first one selection of the PTI chair again this since this was not vetted by the community when a March 10 proposal was approved ICANN staff felt that this should be brought to everyone's attention. There is a

proposal that the chair be drawn from one of the two nominating committee nominated directors. You may recall that the PTI will be composed of about five members three of which will be ICANN appointed and two would be appointed through the nominating committee process.

ICANN committee staff acknowledged that there had been concerns raised that this suggestion, this proposal that the chair be drawn from a NomCom nominated directors might be challenging. And we basically we agree with that. We felt that it may be very difficult to find the person that has the requisite leadership skills as well as the technical understanding of the IANA process and management of the DNS system.

So what we proposed is maybe that the rather than a mandate that this person be drawn from the NomCom candidates that we propose an aspirational approach that we can certainly have this as a goal that this PTI board share would be drawn from one of the NomCom candidates.

But we suggested that maybe after about a four-month period if that still didn't yield any appropriate candidate that that - that we'd be released from that requirement to be able to draw from one of the ICANN nominated directors to fill that position. And then we also added some language expressing our appreciation that under the additional qualifications outlined that again the prohibition of a national government official serving as a PTI director and similar restrictions on individuals serving on the SO and ACs nominating committee or EC administration to ensure that no one segment of the community enjoys greater influence in PTI governance. So that was one element, shall we say that aspirational goal for this selection of the PTI Board Chairman.

The second one concerned the recommended quorum for the PTI board meetings. This was not specified in the March 10 agreement what a staff has suggested is that quorum be defined as a majority which would be three people and that it include at least one ICANN nominated director and one of the NomCom nominated directors. And basically we felt that was a sound approach that that would ensure legitimacy, perceived legitimacy of the PTI board's work.

The final element concerned the higher threshold for certain issues and we included a footnote that details what those issues would be. Basically we agree what - with ICANN staff by defining super majority as it was referenced throughout the March 10 document that 4/5 formula…

Steve DelBianco: Hang on a second Barbara.

Barbara Wanner: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: Just a second.

Barbara Wanner: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: Chantelle that's usually something you can remedy. Can you look into that please? Go ahead Barbara.

Barbara Wanner: No, no just very briefly that we felt a 4/5 majority would help to - for those high threshold issues, it's very important issues that are detailed in footnote Number 1 on Page 3 that that would help to avoid a scenario in which one, say one director would hold up timely action on an important governance matter. So we basically thought that that was a sound approach also.

Then finally we included language concerning PTI's remit and that giving credit where credit is due was Jay's suggestion. So Jay why don't I turn it over to you?

Jay Sudwoski: Thanks Barbara. So as part of drafting this comment and doing my edits I had gone through and reviewed other comments that the BC had made in regards to PTI. And one of the recurring themes I noticed was that the BC had encouraged that PTI's remit being limited so that it doesn't become a another venue where policies that happen at ICANN could be re-traded or re-litigated. You know, because right now today if something happens at ICANN you're not going to go to, you know, the folks running the IANA functions and say, "Hey I'm really mad about this, let's change something."

So, you know, I felt that the bylaws as they were drafted could have been a little bit more explicit in limiting PTI's, you know, functions to appear operational role and not a policy setting role and that's really where I was coming from.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you Jay, Barbara and Eva. I will separate these two comments there in a combined draft there. I will separate them and send out a last call later today for the PTI governance documents that's due on the 7th of August. And then I'll send out a full review for just the PTI bylaws and everyone will have until August the 11th to get back to us on that.

And thanks again to all that work on that drafting. I don't see any other hands up so let me move to the next item and it has to do with the proposed .com registry agreement. The comments closed the 12th of August so we have some time. And the only amendment to the agreement was to extend the terms of the .com agreement to coincide with the term of the new root zone maintainer agreement that ICANN has negotiated with VeriSign as we transition out of

having NTIA be the contractor with VeriSign. And that expires in 2024 so these were all lined to get to 2024.

And on the last called and since then we've had a little bit of correspondence back and forth. We don't have a volunteer to draft this, yet so it may fall to me to collect comments that others have filed. Phi Corwin I see your hand up. Go ahead.

Philip Corwin: Yes, Steve can you hear me?

Steve DelBianco: We do. I was going to walk through the things…

((Crosstalk))

Philip Corwin: Yes, walk through it. I was just putting my hand up to claim a place in the line. I'll comment when you get

Steve DelBianco: Excellent. Sure, you're first. And speaking of that Marilyn had both in the call in and an email supported this change because it maintains the stability through this transition period. Phil and I know you'll speak for yourself you thought it was reasonable and you did point out the fact that the 2024 date is the same date that I guess VeriSign would've obtained if it did the presumptive renewal of its current contract in 2018. Twenty-eighteen plus six years is 2024. So I think these dates are supposed to sort of align. And Phil did suggest that we ask a question about the cooperative agreement.

Now Denise Michel on the last call said I think it's a great idea we use this as an opportunity to reiterate implementation of Thick Whois in VeriSign's registries, com jobs and net. And we should reiterate that as part of this comment.

I added my own perspective that the current IRT the Implementation Review Team have already committed to early 2018 for .com implementation of Thick Whois. But in Helsinki I noted at the meeting that was held to this IRT that I worry the data privacy laws which prohibit the transfer of data on a citizen to someplace like the United States where VeriSign would hold its registry servers I'd hate for that to become an excuse to further delay implementation of Thick Whois.

So I made the point that we ought to understand the flexibility that Thick Whois functionality at least for some registrars might be done through federated access or centralized access as opposed to moving data across national borders. It shouldn't matter at all to those of us that use Whois that we have a single place to go to get Whois. It shouldn't matter to us whether that data happens to live in servers that VeriSign in Virginia or does it live in Ireland or the Netherlands on the registrar server as long as we get a single way of accessing it through the same protocol.

And then finally Chris Wilson just yesterday suggested that maybe the BC could encourage VeriSign to adopt the safeguards or public interest commitments that are present for new gTLDs and encourage VeriSign to unilaterally I guess voluntarily adopt those in .com. So with that let's take a queue on this. We do need a volunteer and if you don't have one I'll be piecing it together. Phil Corwin your first.

Philip Corwin: Okay thank you Steve. And I would normally volunteer but I'm leaving early tomorrow morning for a week's vacation and just I'm unplugging from the grid completely or completely as possible. On the points on operational stability and Thick Whois no problem with that.

On the stability I would point out - and I'm preparing a comment for ICA so I've been looking at this. One point we might want to raise is that I think Akram makes a good case in his blog for having the terms of the RZMA and the .com already tied together but as he explains it the technical operations are so inexplicably intertwined right now that it's questionable how the new RZMA contains both transition and termination provisions in the event that VeriSign never wants to pull out of the function or the ICANN community wants a different provider or they fail in some technical way. And so we might ask ICANN to look at that how would they ever actually implement that when everything's so tied together right now.

On the termination dates I'd reiterate again with VeriSign's rate of presumptive renewal there is absolutely no question based on their record of performance that they're going to get .com renewed and continued operated in 2018 and we get a six-year extension under the contract. So it's really a distinction without a difference whether it's done now or then.

The one salutary effect that it has and this is something that should please the BC is that by doing this six-year extension by bringing the contract out to 2024 by extension rather than a renewal process in 2018 it removes the process ability for GDD staff to try to impose a URS and other new TLD RPMs by contract negotiations. They did it last year. That was something the BC expressed concern about and leave that policy issues into the Rights Protection Measure Review Working Group which is going to be looking at that. It may well recommend that URS and some other others be applied to legacy domains but that's a decision that should be made by the community. It's a policy decision so this takes it out of the hands of staff, hopefully it should take it out. And those are the main points so I hope that's helpful.

Oh and the last thing Id' mentioned is that this extension has absolutely no effect one way or the other on the current price freeze on .com. That was imposed by NTIA in 2012. It's part of the cooperative agreement which runs through 2018 the current one. The cooperative agreement contains two things basically, the current RZMA between NTIA and VeriSign which is going to be dissolved when the transition happens. It could be dissolved as soon as two months and contains the .com price freeze.

So after the transition the only thing that I'll be left that's operational is the price freeze. VeriSign always has the right under the current cooperative agreement to ask for the relaxation of pricing restrictions if they think that markets conditions have changed to restrict their pricing power.

The decision by NTIA in the next administration whoever's running the country about whether to terminate the cooperative agreement or continue it or - and whether to let the price cap dissolve or keep some form of pricing restriction on .com that's an issue that the government's going to look at in two years. It's not affected by this extension one way or the other.

So I hope that's pretty much all I have to say on this and…

Steve DelBianco: Okay.

Philip Corwin: …if the BC wants to adopt any of those ideas in its comment letter I'd be happy to see them reflected. Thank you.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you Phil. Let's go to Eva and then Chris Wilson.

Hibah Hussain: I this is Hibah Hussain for the record. I just wanted to quickly note I (unintelligible) and we do think that in the interest of fairness it's important

that the adoption of RPMs for .coms is consistent with new gTLDs. So, you know, we're looking forward to discussing the details with this group but the new gTLDs do have the new kind of RPMs that are pretty important. And we don't think it necessarily makes sense for the .com to be totally different from that.

Steve DelBianco: Hibah to be clear then not just Thick Whois but a more general sense of RPMs like you're, talking about trademark clearinghouse for instance or URS?

Hibah Hussain: Yes, exactly. And we do think, you know, it's important to go through the consensus policy process of course but before, you know, mandating anything but trying to…

Steve DelBianco: Well it turns out that if we did RPMs like trademark clearinghouse through a consensus policy they would be binding immediately on every registry old and new. So just so I understand clearly you were suggesting we add to our comment that the new gTLD RPMs once they become consensus policy would be binding upon VeriSign immediately?

Hibah Hussain: I think so. I can double check with Andy but I don't I was not…

Okay.

Hibah Hussain: …aware of that the immediate...

Steve DelBianco: Got it.

Hibah Hussain: …implication.

Steve DelBianco: Okay then I'll try to summarize after this call's over and put this out for general comment and that'll be a chance for you and Andy to clarify. Okay?

Hibah Hussain: Fantastic, thank you.

Steve DelBianco: Got it, Chris Wilson.

Chris Wilson: Yes, so actually maybe this dovetails with my suggestion. So and also try - maybe a little additional color to Phil's comment and certainly keeping consistent with the BCs' position on opposition sort of top-down imposition of policy outside consensus policy on registries.

I think, you know, the BC's also taken the position that obviously if a registry wants on its own volition to adopt any and all safeguards or PICs that would otherwise don't apply to them that would apply to them I think we've been we support that generally. So my suggestion would be if, you know, if it's an opportunity for the BC to sort of suggest maybe to Eva's point I think, you know, there's an interest that there be a more level playing field with legacy and new gTLDs with regard to safeguards and PICs that we are least encourage VeriSign on its own volition to adopt those and not necessarily wait if they feel comfortable to go ahead and do that now and not necessarily wait for a PDP consensus-based policy.

You know, we're not asking ICANN to impose them on VeriSign but simply using it as an opportunity sort of make a point from the BC's perspective that we think, you know, should be a more level playing field and this - these - this comment period is simply an opportunity to make that comment. So that's where I was coming from that. I think that is consistent with the BC approach up to this point but if not I welcome further thoughts.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you Chris. Marilyn Cade and then Phil Corwin. Can't hear you Marilyn? Let's go to Phil Corwin.

Philip Corwin: Well yes I just want to comment on what Chris and Hibah just said. I think if you're going to talk about encouraging VeriSign to adopt something voluntarily you need to think about the legal aspects. .com registrants have agreed to be bound by the UDRP. They have not agreed to be bound by URS or other new TLD's safeguards because they're not, VeriSign's not legally required to be under them which it would be if they become consensus policies which may well be the result for the ones that are applicable as a result of the RPM Review Working Group that's going forward right now.

But you might have a situation where if a registry voluntarily agrees to be covered by something but it's not in the contract that a registrant hit by a URS could say, "Wait a minute I never agreed to that," it creates a legal issue. So I would urge caution on that point.

Steve DelBianco: Phil could you clarify? Let's suppose we did a consensus policy that URS is required in all registry immediately and that contract amendment would be made to the registry contract. You're suggesting that registrants could object because they didn't have it in their…

Philip Corwin: You know, I'd have to look at - there's standard language that's in all registry all registrant agreements with ICANN accredited registrars require them to consent when they register the user servers and obtain domains to be bound by the UDRP. And I believe any other - all existing consensus policies and any future ones. But there's a legal question mark about whether they would be bound to a URS that wasn't opposed through a consensus policy procedure. So that's why I'm urging caution on…

Steve DelBianco: Got it.

Philip Corwin: …that. In…

Steve DelBianco: All right.

Philip Corwin: …the so-called voluntary agreement to URS by (Cat Pro) in travel last year didn't have that impediment because they agreed to have that put in their new contracts.

Steve DelBianco: Right.

Philip Corwin: But it wouldn't be in VeriSign's contract. It would take an amendment to the contract for them to be bound by URS and that's not on the table here.

Steve DelBianco: Unless it's consensus - unless it was consensus policy. Consensus policies…

Philip Corwin: Unless it's consensus policy which might well be the result of the recommendations of the RPM Review Working Group.

Steve DelBianco: Right. And it will take some time and so far at least that's what Andy and Eva made the same point is that anything that the council consensus policy becomes immediately binding.

Philip Corwin: Right. And then there would be…

Steve DelBianco: Okay.

Philip Corwin: …no legal question. The registrants would clearly…

Steve DelBianco: That's right.

Philip Corwin: …be bound if it becomes a consensus policy.

Steve DelBianco: All right. Thank you Phil. Marilyn Cade do we have you yet? Still not hearing Marilyn. All right so thanks everyone for this input. I will try to summarize this and circulate it again prior to the August 12. And I guess at just - go ahead.

Chris Wilson: This is Chris. I just want to - I had my hand up so if I could just throw one more, there. I think I mean Phil your point is well taken. I will simply suggest that if nothing else this is an opportunity for the BC to state a preference for a level playing field notwithstanding understanding that there are nuances there, et cetera. But I think it's, you know, this is an opportunity for the BC to at least make that point and taking into consideration that we don't support top-down imposition but that we would like to see a level playing field here and, you know, just sort of leaving it at least leaving it at that. So thanks.

Steve DelBianco: Okay. Thank you Chris. And I'll try to word it that way and circulate that. And Marilyn I still don't have you on audio so unless you've got something - to correct that we'll just have to take what you have in the chat.

All right we have a handful of other items and I'll quickly go through. Do we have any volunteers interested in doing a comment on Number 4 here which is new operating procedures for GNSO elections? This is something that a number of you who have been on council are very familiar with. It would be outstanding to have one of our counselors be able to help us with this one.

Number five is the new two character measures for two character labels. This is to avoid confusion with country codes, you know, .uk, .de. And those

comments don't close until 17 August but these are measures that a registry would implement in order to release reservations at the second level.

So think about things like that .HP Hewlett-Packard a global provider goes by the two letters HP, QQ is a famous company based in China. Those are examples of letter letter two character labels that would be under this new procedure potentially released by all of the registries in the new gTLD round to suit the needs of a business registrant. And business registrants are among the interests that the mission statement of our BC is there to serve.

So this would be an outstanding opportunity for a BC member who hasn't maybe drafted a comment before to dive into a relatively easy assignment where the BC's comments would be somewhat limited but try to support businesses who may have a two-character name. Looking for a volunteer to take this on. You've got plenty of time to work on it and I can provide a lot of help. It's not due till the 17th of August. Hey, Susan Kawaguchi thanks for signing up for Number 4. Thank you Susan.

Okay let's move to the next one which was Andy Abrams is not on the call today but I'm pretty sure that he'll volunteer to draft a BC comment on the country and territory names within another set of new gTLDs. And Number 7 is the string similarity process review but it's really just for country code ccTLDs. It's not for generic TLDs. I put it in here in case anybody was interested in following it. And if so it'd would be a great opportunity for you to read that and make a comment on it. We only have two others but they're not due until September so I will put those off while noting that Angie Graves has got Number 9 in her capable hands. And she's on that panel and Angie will be drafting a comment for us on that.

And then Arinola, I'll note that you're going to join Susan on Number 4. And do I have any other final volunteers who can sign up on Number 4 or 6 before - 5 or 7 before I move it over to Phil and Susan? All right Phil and Susan under Channel 2 for GNSO all we've got in here is the recap of the resolutions you adopted on the 21st of July but any opportunity for you guys to update us on what council is working on?

Susan Kawaguchi: This is Susan. Actually it's pretty quiet. We're not supposed to have a meeting in August except that we're going to have an email ballot to vote on the CSC, the IANA CSC selection of liaisons, GNSO liaison and CCNSO liaisons. So all of the candidates have been reviewed and even selected by the - we had one position to fill and we only had one candidate. So James Gannon is the candidate and the - but the GNSO will vote on the full selection sometime in the next few days between the 6th and the 9th.

Steve DelBianco: Phil anything to add on council?

Philip Corwin: Yes, not really Steve other than that vote by email coming up. It's very quiet and our next meeting is the first week of September so it's really very little to report from council at the moment.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you.

Philip Corwin: Yes, Steve I did want to raise one issue which I know just to make BC members aware -- and this involves you directly -- there was an email sent two, three days ago about the CWG Accountability meeting in Hyderabad. And I was surprised to see that it's taking place the day before the official start of the meeting. It's already a weeklong meeting and that means that anyone who is not a funded traveler for that group who wants to participate has to come in and spend eight days in Hyderabad and bear their own expenses for

that extra day. I thought the whole aim of this new meeting program was to avoid meetings of groups outside the timeframes for the official meeting.

Steve DelBianco: And Phil that is certainly true. And the last thing I want to do is spend eight days in Hyderabad but CCWG had a pretty strong consensus that we needed a face to face on the Work stream 2 projects many of which are due early in 2017. So I believe this is an exception that was granted to the CCWG based on sort of a bottom-up consensus that we needed an extra day. I don't love the idea either.

Philip Corwin: Yes, neither do I. And seeing I'm trying to be involved in three of those Work stream 2 areas I'm probably going to have to come in and bear the cost of that extra day and spend the eight days in Hyderabad but I was just surprised to see it and wanted to raise it so other BC members were aware of it as well. Thanks Steve.

Steve DelBianco: Yes, I - thank you Phil. So Cheryl Miller is not with us on today's call. I'll skip the CSG liaison. And Channel 3 I recapped at the bottom of Channel 3 some things that we've been working on in the past. I don't have any news on these items other than the Republican Party platform document here in the United States contained some pretty serious rhetoric about the IANA transition. That's - I'm not going to read it out loud but it's at the bottom of Page 4.

And then I also included an update on Work stream 2. We've got superb participation from BC members in Work stream 2. For instance, this morning I attended one of the first calls. It was for the SOAC accountability. And many of these Work stream 2 projects are just beginning to kick off this week and next with either, you know, a 60 or 90-minute phone call leading up to some

drafting documents. So if there are any other questions or comments on policy raise your hand now. I'll turn it back over to you Chris with 22 minutes to go.

Chris Wilson: Thanks Steve. And this is Chris and I will say with regard to at least the transparency subgroup since I'm a co-rapporteur for that group we are having our first call at 1900 UTC today which is 3 o'clock Eastern Time today. So for those that aren't aware that that is the status there. So we'll - we've just begun in our work as well. All right Chantelle if you could go ahead and put the agenda back up. I think we've got Jimson are you still available?

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

Chris Wilson: Great now before I -

((Crosstalk))

Chris Wilson: …with regard to the CSG report I - there will be a CSG ExCom call on August 30. And the purpose of that call will be to begin game planning for Hyderabad and CSG activities at that meeting so we'll probably have more to report maybe in the September 1 September meeting of the BC. But just let folks know there will be a CSG ExCom call at the end of August.

And Cheryl will be on that call. I expect to be on the call too so there is that to report. So Jimson why don't you go ahead and provide your report for us on operations and finance.

Jimson Olufuye: Okay. Thank you Chris. Thank you Steve. Also to note that actually on the jurisdiction as well in the Work stream 2. And now to the finance and operations I would like to begin by appreciating members that paid their dues

and also to yet to paid do so. So at this point about 50% have paid which is commendable.

So the second invoice with the (unintelligible) a fort night likely on August 15. So I'm happy to inform you that we now have a US bank account following the acquisition of (REIN). We have a bank account in Spain already which we've been using, Malaga, specifically. So right now as I said we have one open in the US in Washington DC we will cycle. So in this respect we are currently working on an integrated online payment platform to our Web site so that members wishing to use that option can easily pay their dues.

On operations we continue to engage with member clicks to show that the application we have meets workflow requirements. So we have on that one yesterday we had another one yesterday so we're going to engage them. So we are really hoping that we can tidy up also our (unintelligible) revision and hopefully you can tidy up the (unintelligible) for that we can finalize the membership requisition page because this is supposed to be automated.

Once its automated, once anybody comes in to register on our portal so you can get the data sent to the Credential Community. And once they are done you can be - the perspective member can then be communicated (unintelligible) or accept the approval. So we'll appreciate that we tidy up the (unintelligible) review fairly with the form so that we can finalize the workflow on the registration piece and we'll see what happens this as well.

And then finally as I communicated earlier in the GSNO Council election through two weeks of nomination opens on Monday 15th of August till Friday August 26 and to be followed by one-week discussion period and candidate call on Monday, 29 August. So voting will commence immediately afterwards

till Monday, September 6 and is going to be announced immediately afterwards.

Also noted Chantelle will be conducting the election. So that is all for me now. I don't know if there is any questions?

Chris Wilson: Great thank you Jimson. Thank you very much. So I'll just go ahead and quickly we have some - a few housekeeping items. First I think you all for those that have responded to Chantelle's entreaty in mind to get volunteers to participate on a variety of BC as well as ICANN related committees and working groups. As you know we do have - looking for volunteers for the Nominating Committee. We have received some names which is great, one for the large business and I think three for small business and we'll have to of course have to decide amongst those volunteers who will be our representatives.

But we thank you all very much for putting your names in the hat. We really appreciate it. As Chantelle has noted in the agenda we have until August 12. We asked for a one-week extension. It's supposed to be due tomorrow but we've asked for a one-week extension. So for those that are on this call who have not considered it please do consider certainly for NomCom. If you're interested in NomCom you have a few more days to let us know if you want to throw your hat in the ring for consideration and just let the ExCom or the full DC know. So thank you all for paying attention to that.

Additionally, Credentials Committee we've received again, received some nominees and some candidates for consideration for the Credentials Committee. Welcome to hear more from others as well if there continue to be folks that are interested in that welcome you providing your name to the BC for consideration. I don't think we have a set timeframe deadline I guess for

that as far as I know but we would hope to have that finalized soon as well. So for those that are interested in Credentials Committee please do let the BC no.

And as you I think received yesterday a reminder from Chantelle regarding the survey on particular issues with regard to particular issues in the new charter the new proposed charter. This was a result of our last call and the charter is open to - excuse me, the survey is open until more or less the end of the day August 17. I know we've received some responses so far but I welcome other members who have not yet responded to do so.

As Chantelle notes it's just one representative per member to respond - excuse me, may respond to the survey. And it is open to voting and nonvoting members so as long as you're a member of the BC you're welcome to participate in the survey if you so choose. And as Chantelle notes if you have not received the survey link please let her know and she will send - resend reset it to you so you can complete it by the end of the day August 17.

And then lastly just for planning purposes the next BC, full BC members meeting call will be on August 18 two weeks from today same time. And then the one following that will be three weeks later rather than the normal two weeks because of - at least in the US because of Labor Day. Labor Day weekend is sort of abuts that. That would be the next logical meeting. So we're going to do September 8 will be the next - second - next after the 18th meeting. We'll do the September 8 meeting.

And of course as Jimson has noted we will have a separate BC members call on Monday, August 29, time I guess to be determined with regard to the GNSO councilors elections. So we'll have a candidates call on Monday, August 29 but so in-between the two full BC members calls. But so it's for planning purposes that's what we expect in the next roughly month of BC

activity. Are there any questions, concerns other issues that folks have they want to raise that right now? Phil I see your hand raised.

Philip Corwin: Yes, thanks Chris. Phil for the record. I just want to note I put two links in the chat box, the two articles that came out yesterday about a new IRP decision in which three applicants seeking community status brought an IRP. And the results are very damning for ICANN for lack of transparency, lack of objectivity by the Board Governance Committee interference by ICANN legal staff in what was supposed to be an independent third-party evaluation process.

So I just want to make sure BC members were aware of that. I think it's the Transparency Group and Work stream 2 is going to have to look at that very carefully. But it's a very disturbing report and it's about things that happened a few years ago but all of the players who engaged in that conduct are still there. So I urge BC members to take a look at that as we move into Work stream 2 issues. Thank you.

Chris Wilson: Thank you Phil. Jimson?

Jimson Olufuye: Yes, thank you Chris. (Unintelligible) mentioned something about outreach so I think it's good for me to also inform members about that since Andrew Mack is also not on the call. The BC outreach is planned in conjunction with - I think (unintelligible) meets on October 14 this I'm learning now.

And also the Audit Committee working seriously to have this BC exclusive outreach in Hyderabad in conjunction with the NASSCOM, that is the Indian ICT Industry Association. And also we've had meetings with ICANN business (engagement team). That is, Chris Mendini's group towards more

effective outreach in Hyderabad as well. So I just would like to let you know about this. Thank you.

Chris Wilson: Thank you Jimson. And this is Chris. I should also just add to that I will be attending an event put on by the - this is the Indian equivalent of the US Chamber of Commerce, the Chamber of Commerce in Delhi the day before - day or two before the Hyderabad meeting wearing both my BC chair hat but also of course my own corporate hat but using it as an opportunity for additional BC outreach in Delhi to drum up interest in ICANN matters and issues and if - and perhaps even get attendees at that event to go ahead and take the short flight to Hyderabad for the ICANN meeting. So I will be doing a little bit of outreach on my own just prior to the ICANN meeting.

Any of the thoughts, questions concerns, issues for folks? Okay if not then I will give you ten minutes of your day back. And thank you all very much for being on the call and we will look forward to talking to you in just a couple of weeks. Chantelle I think we can end the recording.

Chantelle Doerksen: Thank you everyone. Operator you may now stop the recording. Please remember to disconnect all remaining lines and enjoy the rest of your day.

<p align="center">END</p>