ICANN

Moderator: Chantelle Doerksen
August 18, 2016
10:00 am CT

Coordinator: Your recording has started. Speakers you may speak.

Chantelle Doerksen: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome
                      to the BC members call on August 18, 2016.

                      On the call today we have Paul Mitchell, Cheryl Miller, Lawrence Olawale-
                      Roberts, Alissa Cooper, Susan Kawaguchi, Marie Pattullo, Kevin Audritt,
                      Gabriela Szlak, Angie Graves, Andy Abrams, Hibah Hussain, Tim Chen,
                      Andrew Harris, Barbara Wanner, Jimson Olufuye, Philip Corwin, Isabel
                      Rutherford, Steve DelBianco, Alex Deacon, Denise Michel, Jay Sudowski,
                      Ben Lee, and Chris Wilson.

                      We have apologies from Beth Allegretti. From staff we have myself,
                      Chantelle Doerksen. I would like to remind all participants to please state your
                      name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you ever so much and
                      over to you Chris.

Chris Wilson: Thank you Chantelle. Thanks everybody for joining today's call. A fair
                      amount to talk about per usual. And I know there's sort of a development that

Phil raised already with regard to the policy calendar and issues regarding new gTLD, next round of new gTLDs.

Why don't we go ahead and turn to Steve and he can dive into what we filed and what we intend to file going forward. And then we can talk about the outstanding issue that Phil has raised. So Steve perhaps can I turn to you?

Steve DelBianco: Great, thank you Chris. Chantelle thank you for putting up the policy calendar. I circulated it yesterday. I'll start at the top with the recap of the four filings we've done since our last call on August the - I guess it was August the 4th.

So over the past four weeks we've filed a comment in support of the new procedures in GNSO for electing the chair and vice chair. Susan, Arinola and Angie helped with that, thank you. And Phil Corwin circulated today a council motion along those lines.

On the 12th of August we did a comment on the proposed amendment to extend the expiration of the dotCom registry agreement that extends the registry agreement to 2024 to coincide with the expiration of the root zone maintainer agreement that Verisign has negotiated with ICANN.

We had a lively discussion on that from Denise, Chris Wilson, Hibah, Marilyn, Phil Corwin. I appreciate all of your help in coming up with our comments which we submitted on time.

On the 11th of August we commented on the new bylaws for post-transition IANA or PTI. Thanks to Barbara, Hibah and Jay for that. And then Barbara, Hibah and Jay also did a nice set of comments on the draft governance

documents for PTI which we filed on August the 7th. So thanks to all of you volunteers for coming through on that.

Let me turn to the current set of comments. You can scroll down to the bottom here. You can see there's quite a few. We've got a handful of things we're going to have to take care of.

The first one is relatively easy because Andy Abrams was good enough to draft a BC comment on the release of geo names at the second level in three new gTLDs - SOFTBANK, Dot ART, and Dot Caravan. Unfortunately, ICANN nixed the batch here because a couple of those are brands and Dot ART is a generic TLD.

Nonetheless Andy came up with a comment that combined our concerns about generic versus brand, and that's attachment number 1. That's due the 31st of August. It's before our next call but well within our 14-day review period. Are there any comments or questions from BC members with respect to this first public comment in draft number 1? Andy thanks again for doing that.

Number two, we have guidelines for ccTLDs on their second string similarity review process. Now this is the ccNSO; it isn't the GNSO. But I'm aware that while we're in the GNSO there are BC members that probably have a good number of properties that exist at the second level in ccTLDs.

So this also closes the 31st of August. But since it's in the cc space, I guess it's of questionable priority for us. Are there BC members that feel strongly about the string similarity guidelines at the second level now, second string similarity review process? It's not second level. I meant to say that it's their second review.

If there's nobody that's concerned about it, we'll skip over this one. Any concerns about number two? Thanks everyone.

Let me move to number three, and this one I am positive that BC members will be concerned because when the GAC itself came up with its advice way back in 2011, the advice on the new gTLD program, they insisted that there be an independent review done by an outside party of the Trademark Clearinghouse.

And it needed to be done one year after the 75th new gTLD was launched. And there's no clarity about whether launch meant delegation, signing of contracts, actually lighting it up. But nonetheless, ICANN has made the arrangements to do what the GAC asks them to do.

These comments close 3 September and I have a link there to the actual page where the report is in there. There's quite a bit of material here. They are in the middle of publishing and delivering revised results to the GAC. But right now we have an opportunity to review the draft report on the public comment.

And since a number of BC members are big users of trademark clearinghouse services with respect to new gTLDs and we're also considering recommending adoption for legacy gTLDs, this would be a great time to weigh in, try to re-establish great relationships with the GAC and align ourselves with a rigorous trademark clearinghouse.

So I see Phil's hand up but I am going to ask for a volunteer to help draft BC comments on number 3. Phil Corwin, go ahead.

Philip Corwin: Yes, thanks Steve and Phil for the record. I'm willing to volunteer. I don't think it would be appropriate for me to take the lead on this, because of my

role as co-chair of the working group that's going to be reviewing the trademark clearinghouse. But I have read the report. I have written something publicly about the report and I'd be happy to be a contributor to the BC comment.

I also wanted to make clear to BC members that in regard to the RPM review working group, which both J. Scott and I are co-chairs of, while we are taking this report into consideration for our work it's not going to determine what we do on trademark clearinghouse, any recommendations we might make for change.

In fact, right now even as we continue to complete our review with a post-delegation dispute resolution process which is the first item we're reviewing, we already have a subteam looking at gathering all the data on trademark clearinghouse. That subteam has engaged in a phone conversation with the Analysis Group that prepared this report.

So it's going to be something we take into consideration but it's not going to be determinative of where we come out. So happy to contribute to the comment. Thank you.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you Phil. Andy Abrams?

Andy Abrams: I'm happy to work on this, and I can work with you Phil on this.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks Andy. And when Phil Corwin mentioned Analysis Group, Analysis Group was one of the vendors who contributed to this. Another was Wharton Business School and another at Stanford University Law School. Any other volunteers on the BC?

Chris Wilson is noting he will flag it for Cecilia to help on it as well. Thank you Chris. So Andy, Phil and Cecilia. All right, thank you very much. Appreciate it. We'll look to circulate something in about a week to give our members two weeks to review.

The fourth one up here I'm going to turn to Angie Graves to discuss a little bit more. This is the gTLD Marketplace Health Index. And Angie is on the panel and had circulated an e-mail that I pushed out yesterday. It's the second attachment to the policy calendar.

And that's where Angie laid out some thoughts for the BC's draft comment. So this would be an appropriate time for BC members to ask or make requests of Angie to polish that draft for submission. Angie, why don't you walk us through that, give us some of the highlights of what you've got in your draft BC comments.

Angie Graves: Sure. Thank you Steve. This is Angie Graves and I am leading the drafting on this comment. And I serve on the advisory committee for gTLD marketplace Health on behalf of the BC.

Before addressing the report, I would like to note that the advisory committee for this report is still accepting new members. For information on joining you can see Steve's e-mail from August 1, with the subject line, Positions In Need of Volunteers. Or you can sign up at this page that I've just posted into the chat.

You're also welcome to contact me if you have questions. So I would like to take just a couple of minutes to share with you some perspectives on this report and context for it and also to pinpoint some specific opportunities for you to contribute.

First the context. This report is - the report that was published by ICANN on July 19 is called the gTLD Marketplace Health Index Beta. It's intended to be published at regular intervals going forward but it is just being created now.

So the July 19 report is the first attempt at presenting the correct metrics and measures. It originated from ICANN's KPI dashboard to further the goal of supporting the evolution of the gTLD marketplace to be robust and stable and trusted.

So the index is intended to analyze the overall health and diversity of the global gTLD marketplace. If you've not yet seen it, it provides a mostly visual performance overview of the registry/registrar/registrant landscape specific to issues of robustness, stability and trust.

So, moving on to why this report is important, the health of the marketplace I think we all can agree is imperative to ICANN and to the BC on many levels. The report gives visibility for the first time and in one place of the registry/registrar/registrant ecosystem.

And just to explain the significance of this and why it's critical to have a view of the performance of the marketplaces, it maps back to ICANN's mission. It maps back to two of the three points of BC's mission. The marketplace's performance is the financial fuel for the engine that makes ICANN go.

So having visibility into performance metrics and being able to gauge, have some gauge to inform decisions made here at the BC and within our own companies can be of great value for informing strategic decision-making.

I think its value and significance will increase over time as its history builds but only if we're using the right metrics. And it's imperative to get these metrics right. And now is the time that we can.

So, if anybody can look at it, see if we're missing something pertinent, are we using all the right measures. This report is intended to be published regularly indefinitely as a status report on the gTLD market. And one issue as I see it so far there have been no eyes from any statisticians or economists on this.

So there may be resources inside one of your companies who could review it. Maybe an (unintelligible) of this report for all of us.

Lastly if you'd like to contribute and are short on time -- I've just sent a link to the report itself as well - there are two ways you can contribute if you're short on time.

One is review the BC comments draft that was sent in e-mail by me on August 9 with the subject line "gTLD Marketplace Index Beta." And secondly you could read the last two pages of the beta report itself.

You'll find a list of other things there that could be measured and you're welcome to send me an e-mail with any of your picks from the list and the reasoning behind including them.

So - and I just posted that into the chat. So comments close in 19 days on September 6. I'd like to thank you in advance for contributing to this important new tool for us all. Denise Michel is already working on this comment as well.

And as I close, Denise, I don't know if I have time but if you'd like to add anything, thank you.

Denise Michel: Thanks Angie. No I just wanted to indicate that I would volunteer to help complete the draft with you as you and I have discussed surfacing some of the additional issues or I guess emphasizing some of the issues that the staff had ignored in the BC's previous comments. And thanks so much for this great draft. I look forward to working with you on this.

Angie Graves: Thanks, me too.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks Denise.

Angie Graves: Thank you Steve.

Steve DelBianco: Angie, thanks again for a great walk-through on the report. And I wanted to note that there are a number of measures in the health index that can be used later on or even soon to justify another round.

For instance, if there are indicators about diversity and geographic diversity that are low, that would feed the fire to say wow we need another round to increase geographic diversity of the registry operators.

If some of the health index indicators reveal that it's always better to have more in terms of robust competition, so more gTLDs are always better than less, that could be used as another justification to rush into another round or an open round of new gTLDs.

Statistics can be used in any way that the person making an argument chooses to use them. And we can't necessarily eliminate statistics that don't speak to

the BC view. But let's please understand that there needs to be a balanced basket of KPIs here.

And we also want to try to avoid the community drawing conclusions from the metrics that might justify what they otherwise want to do. And that's going to be a challenge that plays into the item coming up on the additional new gTLD rounds.

So Angie, thank you, and thank you Denise for contributing. Are there any other questions or volunteers that want to look at this comment over the next two weeks? Thanks.

Let me go to number five. There's only two more here. And these are in September. Those are not as urgent as are the rest of ours.

There's a new agreement proposed between ICANN and post-transition IANA or PTI, and that's an agreement that was requested by the community proposal whereby PTI, employees in PTI then, would perform the IANA naming functions at the root level.

I have not reviewed this one yet. I attached it. It closes September the 9th. This is root level work. So for BC members who were particularly active during the CWG process on the IANA proposal, this should be an easy opportunity to check whether those have been implemented. Let me turn to Barbara.

Barbara Wanner: Hi Steve and everyone. I tried to take a look at it yesterday. I went through it very quickly. And there are two parts of it. One part - or a couple different aspects of it.

The aspects that seem purely administrative in terms of criteria for the manager and how to staff the organization and the separation of policy and technical functions and so forth seems to me very straightforward and not at all - you know, sort of consistent with the work that was done in developing the ITC proposal.

However, I personally lack the sort of very technical knowledge to evaluate what appears in the annex which is basically detailing the service level agreements. So perhaps there are others here on the call who do possess that technical expertise. And they may just want to home in on that annex.

Steve DelBianco: Barbara, thank you. I would love to take advantage of the work you've already done here and ask you to perhaps draft your thoughts with respect to the business and services elements. And I'll take note that the service level agreement with regard to the technical annex is something we'll need to find another volunteer to help with. Would you be willing to do that part, Barbara?

Barbara Wanner: I'll give it a shot. I'll give it a shot. You know, as I said, my initial reading of it didn't seem to be problematic so I think it would - sort of the administrative elements of it would be kind of a higher level endorsement that it seems consistent…

Steve DelBianco: Right.

Barbara Wanner: …with blah, blah, blah. If people are okay with that I'll try and develop some text around that. But I really don't feel comfortable at all about the service level agreements.

Steve DelBianco: Got it.

Angie Graves: This is Angie.

Barbara Wanner: Mm-hm.

Steve DelBianco: Go ahead Angie.

Angie Graves: Yes, as a network architect and then designer for corporations for 20 years I don't know if this would scale to this level but I'm more than happy to take a look.

Barbara Wanner: Great.

Steve DelBianco: Angie, thank you. You guys would make a great team and as usual I'll assist at all the formatting and distribution for circulation. The previous comments the BC submitted did emphasize something Barbara mentioned a moment ago - the separation of policy from the operational execution of publishing the root in the IANA function.

So let's emphasize that BC comments previously pointed that out. And I think that Barbara you indicated there is an appropriate separation in the agreement that you reviewed.

Barbara Wanner: Right, yes. Yes, that sort of was apparent even to me.

Steve DelBianco: Okay. Angie, thank you for helping out on that too. Go ahead.

Barbara Wanner: Steve I'd be grateful if you could just reforward those comments to me. I'm sure I have them, but they're buried.

Steve DelBianco: I will do that. I'll send them to you and Angie.

Barbara Wanner: Thanks so much.

Steve DelBianco: All right, the final that's on the queue closes the 13th of September and it's for the proposed renewal of the sponsored TLD dotTel as in dotTelephone. That registry agreement is up for renewal, and the renewal is a mixed bag.

It picks up some elements from the new gTLD registry agreement or RyA but it also inherits the sponsored TLD provisions from 2006. And I wanted to note for all of you that dotTel would not be required under this proposal to adopt the minimum rights protection mechanisms that are in Spec 7.

So ICANN did not bring over the full gTLD registry agreement. And I don't know to what extend BC members have had concerns and issues with respect to cybersquatting or concerns in the dotTel TLD.

But I do know that as a matter of principle, the BC has just recently filed comments on dotCom where we call for a level playing field, consistency across all the registry agreements. This particular renewal is in no way consistent with the new gTLDs and in fact does inherit a lot of the sponsored TLD aspects.

Now sponsored TLDs don't exist in the new vocabulary. They're called community TLDs from now on. And those communities can have special provisions and rules about who registrants need to be, whether registrants have to be part of a certain class. So it is appropriate to carry a lot of that over.

I don't mean to imply that dotTel should strip away all of their community based sponsorship aspects. So I'll take a queue with regard to BC members that are interested in diving into this even just to evaluate whether it's of

sufficient interest to the BC to prepare a comment. Any of you have experience - your companies have experience with dotTel domain names?

Okay, seeing none, this comment is not going to be on the queue for the BC. I'll bring it up again on our next call since they don't close until the 13th of September. All right, with that, that concludes a walk-through of the public comments.

There are still several open items that are listed in the policy calendar on page 2, the first of which I'm going to turn to Phil Corwin to talk a little bit more about, is the letter from August the 5th by ICANN chairman Steve Crocker. He sends this letter to the GNSO Council Chair, James Bladel.

And it's a letter asking about the timelines of these reviews we're doing for the new gTLD applications. And he asks the question about whether some aspect of the gTLD applications could be opened for future new gTLDs before reviews are complete. And I've pasted into the policy calendar Phil Corwin's summary of that question.

There's no public comment on this topic yet but it's going to be a hot topic at Council. And it would be great to devote five to ten minutes of BC members' time to walk through that. Phil Corwin would you go first please?

Philip Corwin: Yes. Thanks Steve. Phil for the record. Yes, there's council members got a copy of this letter from Council Chair James Bladel. The letter was sent on August 5th. And the operative question in the letter I've sent this morning the entire letter to BC members.

It says, "For example, assuming all other review activities are completed," and that's an important caveat there. I think we have to specify what those are. "It

would be helpful to know whether the GNSO believes the entirety of the current subsequent procedures PDP must be completed prior to advancing a new application process under the current policy recommendations."

So basically what Crocker is asking and what has now surfaced in discussions on the e-mail list for the Subsequent Procedures Working Group -- which I'm participating in primarily because the RPM review working group which I co-chair along with J. Scott has to coordinate with that group - is whether essentially there can be a Work Stream 1 and 2 approach for that PDP where they prioritize things that must be resolved prior to a new round of applications and then complete it.

I would note that Crocker's letter doesn't reference the other very important working group for the next round which is the RPM review. I know it's important to us and the IPC among others and while J. Scott is not on the call this morning I can tell you my personal view is that we can't do a Work Stream 1 or 2 approach. Everything we're doing on reviewing the new TLD RPMs is important. I don't know how we prioritize them and our procedure that we've set for going forward as we've started with the PDDRP.

We're going to begin discussion to trademark clearinghouse in September. And then later in the year the two things that gives rights to the sunrise registrations and the claims notice. And then we're going to finish up next spring with a review of uniform rapid suspension, which will set the stage for UDRP.

But before we get to UDRP in 2018, early 2018 -- and I don't think our next round of applications has to wait on UDRP review - we're going to be preparing an initial draft report and recommendations in the second half of

next year which if we're on target we'll take community comments and submit a final report and recommendations in late 2017.

So that's the situation. My view is that the next round shouldn't proceed until the Subsequent Procedures Working Group has completed its work, the RPM review and the competition choice and trust review under the AoC. And I think that's a previous BC position set in writing.

But because it's coming up for council discussion on September 1 and because it's being discussed in the e-mail list of the subsequent procedures working group, I haven't said too much there yet.

But I want to get a sense of the consensus within the BC on this question of basically can there be a Work Stream 1 and 2 and should there be one to accelerate the opening of the window for the next round of applications?

That assumes there will be a next round and that's a core issue that the Subsequent Procedure Working Group hasn't reached a position on yet. So I'll stop talking and open it up there.

Steve DelBianco: Phil, first question for you. Do you believe counsel will have a motion at your September 1 meeting or just a discussion on this topic?

Philip Corwin: I think we're far away from a motion and, you know, I see Susan raised her hand. I think we're just starting a discussion on September 1. I haven't seen any motion and we're approaching the deadline for motion submission. I see Susan's hand up. Why don't we hear from here?

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes and thank you Phil for, you know, sending this on to the BC and starting the discussion because I think it's a really important one.

No we haven't seen a motion and I would be, you know -- depending on what the BC decides - inclined to really make sure that the GNSO is very thoughtful and take all of this into consideration and so even if there was a motion I think, you know, it would be hard put to, you know, get anything past and voted on in the next - this meeting or the following meeting. I really think this is a discussion for India. But, you know, there's a lot of issues we should really think about. You know, maybe there's a possibility of creating two work streams but, you know, to me that would have to - we'd really have to look into this and decide, you know, sort of look at each of the issues and decide no, this could, you know, this could be done as a the new round was launched.

The other issue is, is we have a lot about standing things that do not pertain just to the new gTLD launches and how that went, you know, like thick Whois that has been sitting around for, what, five years now, or three or four years now, and is probably not going to be fully implemented till 2019 because VeriSign's not going to do what they're supposed to do until 2017 and then the registrars have 18 months minimum to transition, and that is if they do it. And we've seen how registrars act sometimes.

So, you know, are there issues? I'm not advocating one way or the other on the thick Whois, but that is just an example that, you know, should we look at other issues in the community and use this as leverage to speed up things that we've been waiting for and that we think are very important.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Susan. I will send around a summary of previous BC comments on the subject of reviews prior to the next round. You can trust me when I say that the BC was firm in the position the review should be done and the revisions to the guidebook made prior to the next round, and that was the

same notion of trying to use that leverage. And you all recall that we did some motions on this in Dublin and definitely encountered a lot of resistance.

So the BC has a strong position on the completion of reviews and the implementation of reforms and improvements that are indicated by the reviews. You can say that with confidence. With regard to a Work Stream 1 and Work Stream 2 split, I think we have to wait, as you say, for staff to describe what would be part of a Work Stream 1 before we rule it out immediately. The BC has gone on record as suggesting that the dot brands, because many BC members either prior applied for dot brands or would like to in the next round, that we wanted to bifurcate or split the process.

I don't have any idea if that's what they have in mind for Work Stream 1 and 2. But remember this, that if the BC and IPC talk about the importance of dot-brands, well that creates leverage about the full round. So those who want the next round of generic and open gTLDs will seize upon the desire to do dot-brands and suggest that that should drive everything forward. So leverage cuts both ways.

Let me also mention one other item is that years ago in the Kenya meeting, there was a proposal for expressions of interest. Maybe that's what they have in mind for Work Stream 1, I don't know, but let's be open minded about what they proposed of Work Stream 1. And I would encourage you and Phil to ask staff in their report to you on September 1 ask them to describe and tee up for discussion what they have in mind for Work Stream 1 and 2 and therefore we can react appropriately.

In the queue, Lawrence, are you looking to get in the queue? I don't see your hand raised but go ahead if you wish. Not hearing that. Any other people in the queue?

Chris Wilson: Steve, this is Chris. I just posed a quick question in the chat but I just, you
know, I know Phil referenced, you know, this sort of seems like a
choreographed effort underway as evidenced by Steve's letter. And I'm just
curious whether or not we think this is - whether this effort was borne before
the .WEB auction or after the .WEB auction, considering the amount of
money that was raised. I don't know, just curious if others had thoughts on
that. Maybe Phil or others. I'm sorry, I see Denise's hand, so I didn't mean to
jump the queue, Denise. But I just - I'm just curious about folks if they…

Steve DelBianco: Chris, before I turn to Denise, do keep in mind though there was tremendous
pressure for subsequent rounds long before the auction, and right up till the
last minute in July that auction could have gone private. There could have
been a simple payout and the money would never have gone to ICANN to
begin with. So I don't believe we have to look at this auction as the
justification for the urgency. ICANN has been led by Brett Fausett and a few
others is anxious for the next round to open up. Go ahead, Denise.

Denise Michel: Thanks, Steve. I had a comment on both process and substance. In terms of
process, I'd like to suggest -- really it's more of request -- that our
representatives on the GNSO Council have as a goal for the September 1
council meeting clarity and agreement on the process that will be used to
formally respond to Steve's letter. I think it's very important that the
constituencies and stakeholder groups are appropriately involved in providing
input and helping to shape the GNSO's response to Steve's letter. So I'd like to
see clarity on what the process and timing will be in terms of how the GNSO
responds to this letter.

And then second on substance, for well over a year now there has been in the
public domain a list of what staff previously viewed as critical path actions

prior to the next round. So I think and I suspect Steve that some of the historical BC positions may pick up on some of that. So I think it would be useful to review that, including things like the CR root stability report that it has - is far from completion.

But then I also wanted to underscore I think a point that Susan made where also historic BC positions come into play. I think it's important to of course comment on the role that subsequent procedures and RPM PDPs play in the decision and timing to move forward with the second round, but I think it's also incumbent on the BC and really the GNSO overall to also use this as an opportunity to underscore the importance of ICANN having the appropriate infrastructure and processes in place to deal with the current new gTLDs prior to launching the second round.

And this is where the historic position of the BC on things like appropriate compliance resources and processes come into play. And I think there's other things in that vein that would be useful for the BC and the GNSO overall to reinforce. I think that disturbing decisions, to cite another example that's not a PDP and is wholly within the staff's realm to address, I think the disturbing decisions that have recently come out of arbitration regarding the application process are also things that need to be addressed before a second round is launched.

So to sum up, I think it would be useful for the BC to address non-PDP actions that need to be taken before the second round is launched with a real focus on things that are within staff's ability to improve and roll out. Thanks.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Denise. I indicated that Angie the work you're doing on the gTLD health index, and Denise you're helping with that as well, let's see if any of

those indicators can reveal whether ICANN is truly operationally ready for new rounds, whether at the application or evaluation or delegation phase.

I only had one other item to highlight in the policy calendar and then I'll turn it over to Susan and Phil to the extent they want to discuss the upcoming council meeting, and that is that the ICANN staff several months ago offered to hire a consultant to assist constituencies in GNSO with the research, analysis, and writing. We are a pilot project. We've decided to launch a pilot project that was suggested by Denise Michel, thank you, Denise.

And she described in earlier correspondence as a research report on the disposition of public comments that we filed over the last two years to indicate the extent to which there was follow through, acknowledgment, relevant links, give a spreadsheet that would reveal the extent to which our comments have made a difference at all.

ICANN has hired an independent consultant. They had two of them teed up for us and we selected one that several of us knew, Pam Covington. So that research is presumably underway and I look forward to some calls. Denise, I hope you'll help us to lead that where we talk to the consultant about the elements of that research. And as soon as we have anything in writing, of course we'll circulate it to everyone.

So that's all I had for channel one. And Phil and Susan, do you want to add anything more on channel two for council? Thank you.

Susan Kawaguchi: We don't have the - I mean I guess there was one motion, Phil. There's not much going on for this next call yet. We'll know more next week. Was there anything you wanted to highlight, Phil?

Philip Corwin: No that's it. That's a motion just filed and seconded to approve the new procedures for the chair and vice chair elections, and I believe the procedures are consistent with the policy - with the change the BC already endorsed. So I don't see any controversy there. We don't have the full agenda for September 1 other than knowing that this issue of timing of the next round of new TLD applications will be discussed at council.

And I had one comment to make about - just wrapping up on that. But, Susan, let me defer to you if there's anything else on council meeting.

Susan Kawaguchi: No, I think we're set.

Philip Corwin: Okay. Yes, I just want to say in regard to .WEB, many of you may be aware that since the conclusion of the auction and the revelation that VeriSign has an agreement with the winning bidder to have it seek to assign its rights to .WEB to VeriSign that Donuts has revised its lawsuit against ICANN, questioning the way the auction and whether ICANN complied with its own procedures. Affilias has filed a letter with ICANN asking for an investigation and they've also filed a complaint with the ombudsmen.

So it may be quite a while before .WEB is actually delegated, given the legal things that are going on now. And or course if anything would ever happen to take (New Dotco), the winning bidder, out of the auction, that 135 million would disappear because the other applicants other than (New Dotco) all wanted a private auction where one of them would win and the others would be paid to walk away as the losers.

The last thing I wanted to say about the next round is I don't think it's related to .WEB, I think it's related to the transition. There's clearly to me a coordinated effort and the proponents - and the most articulate one in the

subsequent procedures working group has been Kurt Pritz, who we all know from the first round, who's now in the private sector. He laid out an argument the other day that it would be an embarrassment for ICANN if there was a six-year wait between rounds since the first round opened in 2012.

It looks like the proponents of a round want to accept applications sometime next year, which is pretty soon after the transition. So I think it's more tied to the transition timing to .WEB, but that's just a personal view. That's all I have. Thanks.

Steve DelBianco: Phil, Susan, thank you very much. Cheryl Miller, are you on the line to talk to us about CSG?

Cheryl Miller: Yes, I am, and my apologies, I'm having an Internet issue so I actually can't see you guys online. So if you have a hand up or something like that, just, you know, just know that I can't see it.

So the next CSG meeting has been scheduled for August 30, and we have a few action items that we're already considering whether or not the meeting will be open or closed. As you'll recall, we did a joint meeting with the CPH last time and so whether or not we do that again, whether or not we have breakfast with the board. And so if anyone has any very strong feelings about any of those, you know, it would be great to get your input on that.

It's looking as though we will be able to do a GAC-CSG breakfast, and I think the timing will likely be that Sunday November 6 or Monday the 7th. The ISPCP leadership is going to have the lead in putting all of this together this time around for ICANN 57. And one thing that came up in the chat, Marilyn actually raised it, was to have some sort of a commemoration for Bruce Tonkin. And it would be great for anyone who has any ideas on that.

A couple ideas that have - were floated was a plaque. I think Tony Holmes mentioned something about a plaque. Marilyn mentioned putting together some type of a book with different photos where individuals could write memories or, you know, funny stories and things to Bruce, write little notes. And I think something similar to that was done for Markus Kummer and it was very well received.

Greg Shatan thought we could buy brucetonkin.sucks or brucetonkin.rocks. I think the latter is actually cheaper. So these are just some of the ideas that are floating around, and while I don't have the closest relationship with Bruce, I know many of you do and so if you have any great ideas on this, I would definitely love to hear them. And I'll pause there. I don't know if Marilyn's on the line and she wanted to say anything on that or if anyone else wanted to chime in on any of those topics. No? Okay.

So then I guess just with respect to, you know, the different actions that we're considering, if any of you have any input or, you know, any thoughts on whether or not the meeting should definitely be closed or open, you know, please let me know and I'll make sure that I adequately represent any of the thoughts that you guys have going into it. Thanks so much.

Steve DelBianco: Hey, Chris, over to you.

Denise Michel: Hey this is Denise. Sorry, I was late in raising my hand. Just in response to Cheryl, personally I would like to have a closed CSG meeting and my preference also is to make a more substantive discussion. I think it would be quite beneficial to a number of the things that the BC is trying to accomplish to identify where we strongly align with the BC and the ISP on some of these

substantive issues. I think it would be quite valuable and a closed session would help support that. Thanks.

Cheryl Miller: Thank you.

Chris Wilson: Thanks, Denise. Jimson, can I turn to you real quick and maybe give just a quick update on the GNSO councilor election and then I can go ahead and finish it up from there.

Jimson Olufuye: Okay thank you, Chris. This is Jimson. I'd like to first and foremost appreciate all the members with their responsiveness concerning membership dues. Seventy percent of members have paid. So members that have yet to pay, they have 14 days from the date of the second invoice to new members to remain in good standing. And according to the charter, after 30 days you have to reapply. But the overall the responsiveness has been very good.

As I mentioned at our last meeting, we now have a U.S. bank account following the acquisition of an EIN. So we are working on - to get the online payment platform to hopefully by FY '18 members will be able to pay online through a secured environment. In that operation, and as Chris mentioned, the GNSO Council election is already on, as the initial nominations opened on Monday and will remain open until next Friday. Then, will followed by a discussion period and a candidate call. So it will be Monday or another day to determine but tentatively it's Monday August 27.

Voting will commence immediately afterwards until Monday September 5 and the results to be announced at a later period. Chantelle, will be running the elections as you may be fully aware. On the NomCom, I think Chris will provide up-to-date information with regard to ExCom decision and also on the

large business (rep) and also from the small business (rep), so we'll provide more information later.

A reminder we have some BC outreaches planned, one in Africa at the summit AfICTA Summit and also at ICANN57. So if you're on the call, Andy, you can also chime in here. So, Chris, that's all from me for now. Over to you.

Chris Wilson: Thank you, Jimson. So in the last remaining ten minutes, let me quickly turn to some of our other business. As Jimson mentioned, we do have an update on our NomCom reps. First thank you all for those who volunteered to serve in that capacity. Paul Mitchell from Microsoft was the lone nominee for the large business rep and obviously we're happy to have Paul serve in that capacity as our large business representative on the NomCom and we've notified ICANN of Paul's willingness to serve.

With regard to the small business reps, we have two candidates. We have Jay Sudowski and Lawrence Olawale-Roberts. Based on past BC precedent, we would - we'll be holding an election with the fact that we have two candidates who volunteered. ExCom is determining, hopefully very soon, the timing of that. Obviously we'll do it soon, very soon rather than later. But the exact timing of the election will be sort officially determined hopefully today, later today and then we'll let everyone know when exactly that will occur.

But the expectation is that we'll have sort of a one-week election for the BC to determine whether they want Jay or Lawrence to serve as the small business representative on the NomCom. And maybe Jay and Lawrence can provide the BC a short candidate statement as to why they would want to serve, how they fit the criteria, et cetera, and then we can let the BC determine who they want.

But we'll - the ExCom will finalize those election plans, if you will, and let everyone know soon as to how we proceed there. But I just wanted to give folks and update on that on the NomCom rep situation. Are there any questions about that? Also thanks Paul, for serving. I look forward to your representation on the NomCom.

Moving right along, we - the credentials committee is still open to folks if they're interested in volunteering on the credentials committee. We do have two - I have two and a half volunteers, John Berard and Arinola Akinyemi have volunteered to serve. I know Andrew Mack has also volunteered to serve if needed, but we'll probably be closing the window on seeking volunteers here in the next week or so. But if - I wanted to keep it open in case people were on vacation or not paying close attention. But if folks, other folks are interested in serving on the BC's credentials committee, please let all know and we will add you to the mix, but we'll hopefully finalize that in the next week or so.

Let's go ahead and quickly turn it to the charter and charter survey. Chantelle, could you put up the results? These came in just last night for us. I just took a look at it this morning. But we have the results from our survey that was sent out a few weeks ago with regard to certain outstanding issues of the - concerning the new charter.

Folks can see the results that are on Adobe can see the results now in the chat room. But for those that are just on the line only, I'll quickly just say with regard to question one, what do you prefer as the new revenue threshold, we had only 19 members voting, three abstained, and of the 16 that actually voted, six would like to keep the threshold at 50% as it currently is, two voted for 40%, three voted for 30%, three voted for 25%, and two voted for 10% as proposed in the new charter.

And then moving quite along to question two, what percentage of your revenue is made from registry and registrar-related services, it was determined that of those that - of the companies and members that voted, none had revenue above 30%. So there were two members that had revenue from registry, registrar-related services between 10 and 30%, four that had between, you know, 0 and 10%, and then ten that had none, three abstained. So.

And moving right along, regarding the definition of macro and micro enterprises, this was the determination of whether or not we should keep the current definition of ten or more employees or annual revenue of at least $500,000 versus the change of 10 or more employees and annual revenue of at least 500,000, we had a fairly even split on whether to keep the definition as is or change it. You know, seven responding that it should reflect the change as proposed in the new charter, and eight members suggesting we keep it as is.

And that is similar to the same - similar with regard to micro enterprises. You've got eight members who voted to keep it as is, seven to change it. And then lastly should the BC generally reform or revise the concept of weighted voting, a pretty even split with those that have voted. Eight members said yes, seven that says no, three that have abstained, and 18 total voting in that category.

So that's the raw numbers we have right now. Having just received these late this evening and really taking a look at them this morning, I think the ExCom will need to digest this a little bit and determine how best to proceed with regard to these questions. But I wanted to give folks just the initial snapshot of the results and then, you know, the ExCom will be in touch soon about how we'll proceed in light of this.

Any questions on the results? Okay. I see Denise has a question. Was the category of survey respondents recorded? (Unintelligible) is responding right now to that. In the meantime, why don't I go ahead and move along? We'll do the next call will occur on September 8, three weeks from today, not the normal two weeks but it will be three weeks from today at regular time.

But with Thursday September 1 at least in the United States being - abutting against a three-week - excuse me, a three-day holiday, it made sense to go ahead and move the call I think an additional week to ensure we have critical mass attendance. So the next call will be on September 8.

That is all I have for now. Are there any other questions, concerns, thoughts from members? Okay. I don't see any. So we'll just leave it at that and we'll certainly be in touch with regard to the NomCom election and then final path forward on the new charter. But I certainly appreciate everyone's time and attention on all these issues and we look forward to talking to folks in the coming days.

All right? Thank you all very much. Chantelle, we can stop recording.

Chantelle Doerksen: Operator, we may now stop the recording.

END