

**ICANN**

**Moderator: Chantelle Doerksen  
October 20, 2016  
10:00 am CT**

Operator: Recordings have started.

Chantelle Doerksen: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the BC members call on October 20, 2016. On the call today we have Barbara Wanner, Steve DelBianco, Marie Pattullo, Isabel Rutherford, Chris Wilson, Susan Kawaguchi, Hibah Kamal-Grayson, Beth Allegretti, Marilyn Cade, Jay Sudowski, Tim Smith, Jimson Olufuye, Angie Graves, Andy Abrams, Philp Corwin, Lawrence Olawale-Roberts, Ariola Aukenyemi, Alex Decon, Kevin Audritt, and Cecilia Smith.

We also have Denise Michel on the phone bridge and we have apologies from Tim Chen. 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 taking the time to be on today's call. This will be our last member call before Hyderabad before ICANN 57 in just -- I guess less than two weeks from now.

So a lot to talk about. I know the policy calendar has got some interesting stuff in it and with that some other interesting discussions about leading up to the ICANN meeting. So I'll turn it over to Steve to dive into the calendar and then we can move on from there, Steve.

Steve DelBianco: Hey thank you Chris. This is Steve DelBianco. Thank you Chantell for displaying the policy calendar. At the very top our recent filings -- we haven't done anything in October and we haven't done any new filings since our last call so skip past that and get right to the three open public comments that we need to get on the table.

The first is a study of the Latin American Caribbean DNS Market Place and on the last call Isabel Rutherford - and that's Rutherford with F U R D. I'm sorry for misspelling it on the last policy calendar - but Isabel worked with Andrew Mack and they came up with an excellent couple of pages for the BC draft comment. I attached that to the policy calendar.

Isabel is on the line and can be available to answer any questions or take suggestions from those of you who have them on today's call. If you don't want to do it on today's call we can always do it via e-mail through a "reply all" to what I circulated with an intent of marking it up. It isn't as helpful -- the new BC members -- it isn't as helpful to simply pose some questions when we have a 14-day review period like this.

It's far better for you to have thought things through to the point where you want to make a suggested edit or a comment on an alternate way for the BC to present its position. And if you do that I will work closely with Isabel and Andy at trying to come up with a response to accommodate other BC members' views.

So this is the opportunity for anyone who wants to ask a question of Isabel with respect to that proposal and the kind of recommendations that they want to come back with. I'll take a queue if we have one? Isabel anything that you wanted to add about the draft that you circulated this week?

Isabel Rutherford: You know I don't think I have anything to add but I'm happy to answer questions. I think high level overview the main thing that we tried to focus on were adding components that would provide specific recommendation for ICANN and other GNSO stakeholders to make this report more actionable.

Steve Delianco: That's very helpful Isabel thank you very much. Marilyn Cade you're in the queue.

Marilyn can't hear you. Go ahead Marilyn Not hearing Marilyn so thank you Isabel appreciate that very much.

I'm dialing back into the Adobe so if I'm an -- if somebody else has their hand up please just speak up.

The second one is proposed changes that have been posted for public comment. These are changes to the XXX - the Dot XXX Registry Agreement - these are -- I'm going to ask Phil Corwin to comment a little bit more about the context.

This is a situation where the registry operator for Dot XXX - this is one of the sponsored TLD's not one of the ones of last rounds of new gTLDs -- they had a significant fee baked in to pay to ICANN for every registration in XXX. I think that the registry operator's thought to reduce those fees and their method of doing so was to negotiate that reduction with ICANN.

So they do a bilateral negotiation -- they come up with some sort of quick pro poll where they'll take on certain rights protection mechanisms - maybe even a little public interest commitments - and then propose to the public comment period otherwise it'll be approved. Those comments close the 24th of November. So we will have time to discuss that when we are together in Hyderabad.

The comment I brought up earlier -- that Isabel drafted -- we do not have the opportunity to talk about it in Hyderabad because those comments close on the 1st of November. So on this one I'd really like to turn to Phil first to add a little color about the process and the context for XXX's proposed registry change.

Phil Corwin: Yes thanks Steve -- Phil for the record. What's happened here is that when XXX was first delegated they were subjected to a very unusually high per domain fee (unintelligible) - \$2.00 per domain registered rather than the normal \$0.25 - in anticipation that ICANN might be sucked into a lot of litigation concerning XXX.

That did not occur and now XXX has initiated a request to reduce its fee to the normal fee of \$0.25. That's going to be done in stages in the proposed Revised Registry Agreement. But what they've done in return is that they've accepted certain new commitments including the PD-DRP and the URS.

So we've seen this before back last year when Cat Pro and Traveled renewals were approved where GDD staff introduced an issue that's in -- being considered for policy right now in the RPM review working group. Which I -- should the new TLD right protection mechanism - at least the ones that are applicable -- become consensus policy for gTLD's that proceeded that.

I'm not suggesting that we raise the same level of concern as last year because we saw what happened, it went all the way to board reconsideration and the board basically signed off saying it would be wrong to impose these but it's okay to volunteer.

In this case there's no -- on the three last year there was at least an explanation that staff thought that those RPMs should become part of the revised agreement for the sake of consistency. In this one there's no transparency about anything happen. So you know the RPM review working group is chugging along -- I expect we're going to deal with the consensus policy issue at the end of phase one of our work which is going to be mid-2017.

So it's likely coming to legacy TLD's - but be seeing the past has said we like the idea of URS at the legacy TLD's but we think it should be done through the proper process - not through contract negotiations. That's all I have to say to it -- again I'd want the -- would urge the BC comment to reflect the past positions but certainly not suggest in taking anything to reconsideration or anything like that because we've been down that road and we know what happens. Thank you.

Steve DelBianco: Thank -- thank you Phil I appreciate that. We're going to go to Denise next -- but this portion of the call -- the real goal - is to recruit a few volunteers from among the BC members and I'll lead the draft here on our proposed comment on the XXX-change, Denise.

Denise Michel: Thanks Steve. I'm happy to assist but don't actually have time in the next several weeks to hold the pen as a lead drafter on comments. I wanted just say a couple of things about the Dot XXX proposed change. I appreciate Phil's point - and points that have been raised in the past - about staff imposing additional changes to legacy gTLD's to align them with - more with new

gTLD's and staff making policy is an important point I think to reiterate - but I also think it's important to continue to reiterate the BC's strong support for working collectively with the community to ensure we have proper abuse medication measures and enforcement measures in all of the gTLD's.

And I'm noting in particular that - I'm confused actually and practice is something we can raise with staff or explore in Hyderabad - why staff is unilaterally making changes to a legacy gTLD contract for Dot XXX but could not make any changes even requiring implementation when the Verisign contract was renewed. It seems that their - they have two different standards and they're applying different measures to different gTLD's which is concerning for a number of reasons.

And then finally we have finally gotten all of the information I think that we're going to get from staff on the nature of the (RSEP) program over the last decade. I think that's something that we should put on our agenda to discuss in Hyderabad. Spoiler alert -- very, very few if any public comments were ever addressed by the staff when these types of RSTEP changes have been posted. Thanks bye.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you Denise. So still looking for a volunteer. Denise has been great at volunteering on other comments and is working with me on a project for one of ICANN's consultants -- so it would be great to broaden the pool of BC members who take this on. Please don't be concerned about significant impact at this time I'll key it up nicely for you by providing prior comments that the BC has filed on XXX, prior comments on the URS being implemented through contract - which is Phil's point - I'll bring up Denise's point about the RSTEP impact. So we actually need someone to step up as a volunteer and if we don't get one the BC will not be able to comment on this

one – and I tempt somebody's who's relatively new to the BC to help take this on.

Phil Corwin: Yes Steve, Phil here, I'd be glad to assist I'm just not ready to comment to taking the lead on this - just because with co-Chairing two working groups and Council getting ready for counseling activities on Hyderabad - I'm just not sure I can take the lead role on this one. I'd be happy to participate.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks for that Phil but I don't think it'd be appropriate for you to try to take the pen. You do more than enough and it's too much to ask. Alright, so if we don't get a volunteer I'll continue to bring this up when we get together in Hyderabad – and Chris I'll go back and look at the pro and cat comment that we put in and see if we can move those ahead.

But there are parts of those comments Chris that we'll be able to pull in – I think that was the essence of Phil's point – that makes the drafting of this comment a little bit easier. The BC will register that we don't think that these bilateral contract negotiations are the right way to implement - let's say rights protection mechanisms - that have never been the subject of a bottom-up policy development process and the prime example is the URS. I appreciate that.

All right let me move to the next one -- it has to do with number three on here is the assessment of competitive effects. This is an independent study done by an outside vendor and it was done at the request of the competition consumer trust consumer choice review team. BC participated on that – I was one of the co-Chairs – and we came up with all of these metrics that would be used for the aforementioned commitments review of the new gTLD expansion. And that is probably the keystone of all the reviews of the new gTLD expansion whose

findings would contribute to the design and contours of the next round or the opening of infinite rounds of gTLD's expansions.

So this is a carefully scoped study to try to understand whether the data support conclusions about the competitive effects of the new gTLD. And when you look at the effects of competition you look at things like the volume of registration and where they're happening and you look at the pricing, both the wholesale prices that the registry charges the registrar, and the retail prices that are paid by those of us out here in the real world who do registrations.

So those findings in this study - are perhaps not entirely justified by the data underneath - but they do include a decline in registration prices at the wholesale and retail level in the legacy and new gTLD's relative to what they were before the expansion, and that they say that the new gTLD's registrations are 9% of all gTLD registrations.

These are a rich set of findings and the BC would be well served to comment on this and explain why. This is - like I said - only one of the keystone studies of the new gTLD program but other studies - other efforts to try to rush into the next round will also quote the data that comes from this study. So if the BC puts a little careful time into assessing how we feel about the findings and conclusions, that will pay dividends for us in the next two years. So at this point if there's no comments I would look for volunteers to help analyze that particular study and the new gTLD program.

Cecilia Smith thank you for volunteering to help on this I appreciate it - and oh Hibah fantastic thank you very much. All right if no further comments on that I'll move on.



We have one special project update it's at the bottom of page one on your policy calendar. I can hire a consultant Pam Covington is the individual who's been helping us to analyze the impact of BC comments over the past two years on subsequent recommendations, or findings, or votes that came out of ICANN staff or the board.

That study is substantially complete if the contractor has had a bit of a health incident – which is requiring ICANN to finish it off over the next week or two and the ICANN consultant Dan O'Neill is helping with that. Denise and I are in frequent touch with them and as soon as we have a draft - that's suitable for BC member review - we'll circulate that and I look forward to discussing with all of you when we are together in Hyderabad. Denise, anything you'd like to add on that?

Denise Michel: No I'm good thanks.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you Denise I appreciate it. Alright, now I'm going to turn things over to Phil Corwin and Susan. Simply the bulk of what we need to discuss today probably has to do with what's going on with Council and then it's CSG. Phil over to you.

Phil Corwin: Okay Steve I'll be happy to start and then Susan can chime in. As you noticed on our last Council call of the 13th – one week ago – we approved the proposed final framework for future cross-community working groups -- I have one personal comment on this - this resolution was passed by unanimous voice vote - I have one concern when I actually looked at the document. The framework document - without getting into the weeds – it's not – a cross-community working group is not supposed to intrude on policy matters within the specific remit of an SO or AC - and of course we wouldn't want any CCWG to intrude on the GNSO's policy role for gTLDs - but at the same time

the framework allowed CCWD's to go forward if they were intended to inform and enhance or supplement policy development work and may proceed policy development work but not replace it. So I just think we all need to watch how this is actually used and be on guard for any attempt by other members of the community to get into -- provide advice that may place pressure on the GNSO in regard to issues that are strictly policy issues for gTLD's. Other than that I think that the rest of the framework is fine.

Coming up in Hyderabad we've got a busy schedule -- and Council as you'll note there will be a -- there's a drafting team report on changes needed to respond to new accountability powers. There's the CSG constituencies are not particularly pleased with what is in here and the Council's will be talking with the CSG's representative and the Ex Com as we approach Hyderabad to discuss voting strategy on this in Hyderabad.

As you'll also note Council got a letter from Steve Crocker in August basically asking whether to be a work stream one and two approach for the subsequent procedures working group. A letter has been prepared responding for Council pointing out that of those not everyone has responded within the Council groups but those who have responded the majority of you have been that the subsequent procedures RPM Review Working Groups and the CCTRT Affirmation of Commitment Review all need to be completed and fully considered before there's any subsequent round.

I'm going to leave the RDS one to Susan, I defer to her expertise on there. There's one other thing going on that's not on here which is that Council got a letter from the board conveying recommendation - proposals from the so called IGO small group - on both preventative measures for IGO names and acronyms in new TLD's and that's a conflict between a past working group and gave advice -- and then piggy-back on that IGO proposal for curative

rights protections which is both directly within the province of the working groups that I co-Chair and is also quite contrary as the IGO's note to what we're coming out within our preliminary report recommendations, and this is a working group they've basically declined to participate in, in any meaningful way, so the letter is being prepared from Council back to the board raising some real questions and this draft isn't circulating widely yet but it really – the board didn't follow its own procedures on the proceeding conflict on preventative measures where there supposed to within a time certain either adopt the GNSO recommendations or reject them. Instead, they've been in a state of limbo for several years now with the board kind of looking for Council to work things out with the gaks. So this is a problem that has to be addressed and there will likely be a letter going from Council to the board on this subject shortly before Hyderabad. So I just wanted to put that on everybody's radar and now I'll step back and let's hear from Susan on the RDS and anything else she'd like to say about Council activities. Thanks.

Susan Crawford: Thanks Phil. So RDS is plugging along were hoping to start deliberating in India. So hopefully that will work there's been a lot of prep work and we've finally gotten through most of that. So now it's to the hard part. On the "Who is Conflicts of Law" issue with you know – we differed the Motion and a small team was created to rethink and draft a new Motion. James asked for additional volunteers this week and because each arconspituancy – you know the CSG was not represented so I stepped up and said "Sure I'd help" and then Paul McGrady did too but we're talking about Paul asked for to differ that work until after Hyderabad so we will not address the recommendations most likely in Hyderabad. Hopefully, we'll talk about them. The only other thing – it's not completely Council, but I thought it was interesting – the PPSAI IRT had its first meeting on Tuesday, I joined and staff has created a timeline that they're calling aggressive to implement the recommendations. This gives – their estimating it'll take until January 2019 to come up with all the

implementation details and then give the registrars until January 2020 to actually implement – the registrars are already rumbling about a way to aggressive timeline. I made the point that I felt like this could be a gating factor for new gTLD's to roll out the next application period. So I think we need to keep our eye on this because it may become like the Thick Whois implementation and take five plus years or longer. But, I'm sure the registrars would agree to open up the application period tomorrow. So I think we need to balance the work. I think that's it.

Steve DelBianco: Susan and Phil thanks, this is Steve. There was one item that Phil highlighted for you - for Council - is that the resolution Council will take up with respect to how the GNSO itself handles the rights and responsibilities it gets under the brand new ICANN by-law. Things like the empowered community and document inspection and investigation rights - a lot of good powers - the ability to block by-laws or budgets, the ability to name people to the review teams. In other words the new post-transition by-laws give GNSO new rights and responsibilities and it's unknown how GNSO would act to them. The default looks an awful lot like a majority of each of the houses in Council itself that share the drafting team that spent several weeks trying to explore alternatives. That was the report which is cited right there on the policy calendar and I've tried to keep all of you informed along the way. Over the past several days Denise Michel, Phil Corwin, and a few others and Cheryl have reacted to that and it's going to come to a head when we gather in Hydrobond. In the chat I posted the key paragraph that indicated that the drafting team members – three of the nine – from the CSG did not support the idea that the Council speaks for the GNSO. We would have preferred something else – either the constituencies in stakeholder groups making their own decisions and votes, or letting Council vote – not necessarily each house to achieve majorities since that sticks to a house structure that was designed for policy development and the powers that were speaking of here really don't

have anything to do with policy. So I included the conclusion that we had only strong support but opposition to the question of who speaks for the GNSO, but we did have consensus in that drafting team members – even from CSG – contributed to recommendations.

And I can summarize it this way – the GNSO Council would require majority of each house for nearly all of the power in the new by-laws for GNSO, but there are a dozen for which GNSO super majority – a higher threshold – would be required. And all that explained in detail in the links that I provided under the GNSO drafting team item under channel two.

As Phil indicated we probably need to work out a voting strategy with our colleagues in the commercial stakeholders group. We'll have I think several days in Hyderabad to do so in person, prior to Council having to vote. But it's important for the commercial stakeholders group to talk about the minority report we submit suggesting that the constituencies and stakeholders group ought to be able to speak for themselves as opposed to channeling everything through Council I'm happy to take the queue on that with other points of view and advice about how to strategize to do so.

Okay not seeing any in the queue. Go ahead Chris Wilson.

Chris Wilson: Yes, thanks Steve – and I just wanted – I just wanted to provide more – so obviously Cheryl can speak more about the broader CSG interactions we've had the last couple days because there was a couple of calls yesterday with the CSG Excomm and this issue was part of the broader discussion. And just to suggest – just to say that there's clearly concern and discontent within the IPC and the ISPCP with how things are playing out – sort of the future of the GNSO with regard to the empowered community. And certainly clearly

they're frustrated and upset and notwithstanding all of the hard work that was done by you and others on the drafting team to try to get to a good place.

So just a long way of saying we expect that this will continue to be discussed and be a top point of a top issue for the other two constituencies within the Commercial Stakeholder Group including the desire to raise it with the board during the 90-minute or so session or hour long session we have, the CSG has with the broader board and including I think trying to provide a unified voice for, you know, ten or 15 minutes with the board from with all three constituencies raising the similar sort of unified concerns with how things are playing out.

So obviously we'll have to - we'll have more conversations amongst ourselves in Hyderabad CSG meetings in preparation for that board discussion but just to let folks know that this is a top of mind for our fellow constituencies within the Commercial Stakeholder Group so expect that we'll have more discussion on this.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you Chris. I noted in the chat there - the grim reality of how things are voted on one Council with respect to this report. In this - the strategy of the Commercial Stakeholders Group is more about sending a clear message than it is on prevailing in the votes because I don't think it's likely we could prevail. Any other comments? Great. That's it then for the policy section on Council and I would turn it over to Cheryl Miller for CSG.

Cheryl Miller: Thank you so much Steve. And just to continue where we sort of left off with CSG certainly want to thank you Steve for all your work on the minority report and on these issues. It's much appreciated. I think, you know, I couldn't have said it better myself. Chris's explanation that those two constituencies are quite irritated is spot on. I - they definitely feel that there's been increased

marginalization within the GNSO structure and so it is very likely that - well this topic is going to be one of the topics that we will tackle in that particular session.

I sent around yesterday in the interest of time I know everyone's very busy but and I can send it again, a tentative list of the different CSG meetings. We - it is still tentative. We have some logistical back and forth in terms of timing and making sure that everything fits. If you haven't taken a look at it please do take a look at it. We still have to really flush out strong topics for agenda items in each of the different breakout sessions. And so what I'd like to do I'd like to spend at least a couple of minutes. I know you all are very involved in different projects and areas of expertise throughout to think about some of the things that have come up in terms of what you're working on and have a conversation as to what we could possibly add to the agenda.

I know for example for the CPH meeting we'll definitely there's a high likelihood that the role of groups and exercising GNSO powers post transition will be addressed. That's something that the other constituencies had raised. And I know that we also are working on a possible meeting with Goran and the CSG. It's looking like it will be a closed session.

Due to the overall - we're still trying to get information on the room. And so I know the last meeting we had some sessions that were sort of open to all and some that were closed. And that actually might have caused a little bit of confusion. And so we're trying to nail down which sessions will be sort of closed sessions or for leadership only and which will be more open. You know, to the extent that we can keep them open and we have the room we will try to make sure that everyone who wants to participate or has a role to participate. But I just want to flag that for you. So if we can go ahead and just

touch on some of the key topics that we need to flush out that would be great.

Thank you.

Chris Wilson: Thank Cheryl. And this is Chris. Let me just let me piggyback on that. If you can look at Cheryl's email from yesterday you'll see that there's a variety of CSG meetings scheduled. She mentioned obviously there's a session right now it's looking like it will be just leadership, but CSG leadership with contracting party house leadership. And each constituency within the CSG is reaching out to its members to determine if there are any top level topics that we should be raising with our contracting party house colleagues.

So if there are particular issues that we can - that are worth raising there then, you know, we - please let Cheryl know, please let me know, please let the whole BC know and we can feed that into the agenda formation. There's is also going to be a CSG meeting with - and as of now I think it's just leadership as well with the ALAC leadership. And so if there are issues that we think are worthy of broaching with ALAC of mutual interest, et cetera, then those should be brought forward as soon as possible though I ask members to start thinking about...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Chris Wilson: ...that. I'm hearing some other - if everyone could mute their phones that would be great. Thank you. Folks could just mute - please mute their phone. So please - those are two sessions.

Obviously we also have CSG session with our, the business board members so Markus, Bruce, and Becky. So we need ideas and things that we want to raise with them in particular. And of course not to mention when we - of course we'll discuss this amongst ourselves in Hyderabad but also particular issues



we have as the BC wants to raise with the broader board with Steve Crocker and others during that particular session.

So it's - this is really crunch time for us for the BC to start thinking about these things. Obviously the ExCom can do some brainstorming as well but it's really incumbent upon the membership to come up with some agenda items if they're so inclined so we can start feeding that into the process because we really are having to nail down agendas I think no later than the end of next week ideally so we can have finalized that stuff now before we all get on airplanes to India.

So please take Cheryl's call to arms to heart so we can start getting feedback to the - to our fellow constituencies and start putting pen to paper there. And to her point on currently the CSG open meeting is scheduled right now for 11 o'clock on Sunday, November 6. That meeting may move to earlier in the day to allow some more time to talk and also free up opportunities for people to get lunch, et cetera. So that particular meeting may yet move. And to Cheryl's point we are trying to confirm room sizes. So if some of these leadership only meetings can - happen to take place in larger rooms then we can allow for all of the members to attend too. That's ideally what we want to do but sometimes - in some cases we just are limited by room size so we're hoping to get clarity on that in the near term.

And obviously we also have the CSG GAC lunch on the calendar. That is open to all so certainly want people to be able to attend that if they can and we'll - that should be - should have been on the calendar that Chantelle sent around with regard to CSG activities but we'll send that out again. Once times are certainly firmly finalized we'll send that out to everybody to look at so they can plan around - plan their schedules around those engagements. But I think that the other two other issues I think that Cheryl I don't know if you

want to talk about them or not but if you - we had a brief discussion about Council Chair, vice Chair and non-contracting party house board seat. Did you want to go ahead and speak to that a little bit?

Cheryl Miller: Sure. I mean I know that there's no - there's been no sort of decision or final decision that's been made. The issues are definitely still being discussed. I think we are trying to reach out within our constituencies and come back and have a dialogue from my understanding on email to kind of continue to move the ball forward. I don't know if you wanted to highlight any specific points Chris?

Chris Wilson: Yes so what I - I can do that. So we - the CSG had a call yesterday with the NCSG to sort of try to nail down where we are on two issues, one in particular where we are with regard to Heather Forrest as putting her up again for vice Chair for another year and also seeing if we can get clarity from them on sort of the process going forward for - the broader process for Council Chair, vice Chair elections but also whether they have any thoughts, et cetera, with regard to filling Markus Kummer's seat in the future for board.

With regard to Heather and process for Chair, vice Chair I think they are still in the process of figuring out. I think they support Heather, they like Heather but - and would be willing to support Heather as vice Chair contingent upon getting agreement with our side on the commercial side on the Chair, vice Chair sort of rotation election process generally speaking. And I think Tapani from their side will be sending out an email to the Commercial Stakeholder Group ExCom providing some thoughts and points on that and sort of response to what Steve Metalitz and Tony Holmes have put together and others and Wolf-Ulrich.

So I hope that we in the next coming days there can be a meeting of the minds on process for Chair vice Chair which would then allow sort of break the contingency and allow them to support along with the CSG support Heather for vice Chair for another term. So hopefully we'll know - we'll have better clarity on that ideally before Hyderabad but we'll see. And as for a process for electing the GNSO non-contracting party house ICANN board seat they have not - the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group has not really put much time and thought into that right now so there's still - that's still under deliberation so we don't really have any clarity on that as of now but hopefully we will have some more clarity in the future.

And to that point there is going to - there is discussion now for doing intercession of meeting sometime early next year. Time and place, et cetera, have not been set but there's going to be a call tomorrow morning here in the US with the non-contracting party house to sort of start the thinking about logistics for an intersessional. And maybe I would expect that some of these issues may come up as agenda items for discussion when and if that intersessional occurs. But once we know more about that we can - we'll report back to folks but there is an interest in having intersessional sometime next year, early next year. But I think that's it. Cheryl is there anything else I forgot or need to add?

Cheryl Miller: No I don't think so. I'm trying to think, you know, I just put it to the group does anyone have any questions? I know that, you know, the deadline for us all to get of flights pretty soon is coming up but any questions on scheduling or anything related that we've discussed on any of the calls? No, okay. So Chris I don't know if we want to get input via just via email for the agendas if folks can take a look at that and send it in to us. It would be great if we could have a turnaround and get something back to the CSG maybe early next week so we can, you know, have a little bit of in-between time.

Chris Wilson: Yes. I think that's right. I think you folks can get back to us - get back to, you know, via email that would be really helpful so we can start feeding that into the process because I know ALAC and contracting party house and others are anxious to know what we want to talk about. So please give that consideration. So I think we're - I think we're done with CSG report. Steve anything else from your end before we turn to Jimson?

Steve DelBianco: No Chris.

Chris Wilson: Okay great thanks. Jimson we'll give you just a couple minutes to go over operations finance and then we can turn to AOB and the charter discussion so Jimson?

Jimson Olufuye: Okay thank you Chris. And let me apologize if you hear some form of background noise. I'm still in Dubai (unintelligible) back in my groups. Here some members are (yet) to pay up. We have reached out to them. That is the Finance Committee, primarily, and within ExCom did approve a (40-day) extra grace for them to pay their dues. So, that extension will end by the end of this month and that's (the end of) our extension their record will be released from our list.

So, starting for members we have the (new member) as I announced last meeting. And there are some others on that (are pending). Then on number two on the outreach, they started to fix new outreach. I'd like to thank Andrew Mack, and Marilyn Cade. Actually (James) was there as well. Lawrence (Folk) and (Arinola) was there. So as I said (unintelligible) and the senior director (of ICANN government) was also there.

So it's an opportunity to break the news for the IANA transition before (unintelligible). Many (unintelligible) find it difficult to believe that the (the US) are actually allows us to do (unintelligible) to you all in BC (unintelligible). So, we need to continue to provide the right message to the people to the community so that all community be fully engaged in the - in ICANN itself.

So I think maybe Lawrence and (Arinola) may provide more comment afterwards. But I did advising (unintelligible) about three potential members to respond to (respond) for to be members so I'll take that (unintelligible). And then I don't know if the members get some information email from Memberclicks. If you got an email from Memberclicks do not click the links there until you hear from the Secretariat, or from me. So, I think that's a good (unintelligible) that we try to (cover) and we are reaching out to members (to sort that out).

So, and this may perhaps maybe the question but the outcome is very perceptive and we put really to (have) something similar in (Myanmar) towards the end of November through or member (ASOCIO). Thank you. So Lawrence did you want to say something on (unintelligible) mailing?

Chris Wilson: Thanks, Jimson for that. And I don't know Lawrence could hear you or not but I appreciate your giving us a little bit of a report back on what the outreach activities from your end and also thanks for let - flagging the Memberclicks issue. For some folks maybe receive some test emails from Memberclicks today in their email box. I think Jimson's point was to go ahead and ignore them. And we're trying to work with Memberclicks to find out why those emails were sent and to get them to stop. So we're working on that but thank you very much jimson.

It looks like Lawrence's mic is not working so maybe Lawrence if you want to type in the chat some of your thoughts and feedback on the AfICTA Summit, et cetera, that would be great or send an email the list.

Any questions or comments for Jimson or with regards to operation and finance? Okay if not then maybe let me just quickly start turn to Rob Hoggarth real fast. Obviously a precursor to Rob speaking let everybody know and hopefully you saw via email that the BC overwhelmingly approved its revised charter. Obviously there were a few votes against approving it and some comments as well but really it was lonely support for it nonetheless. So having done that we now there's still further work to be done to finalize this. And Rob if I could turn to you to provide just a quick overview of the process going forward for the members and then we can close out the call.

Robert Hoggarth: Great thanks very much Chris. I note that I have ten minutes on the agenda. I don't think I will need all those so you may be able to end a bit early.

I shared with the ExCom the overall process the approval of community charter changes yesterday. Any of you can find it on the [gnso.icann.org](http://gnso.icann.org) Web site. It's a fairly simple one. There are four phases. And it sounds Chris that you have all just completed Phase I which is the actual amendment preparation and that you've now approve that as your community.

The good news is that the heavy lifting for all of you guys is essentially done now. The remaining phases as outlined by the board process are staff review, public comments and then the board review. And generally that process has been taking for the last couple of years about six months. The reason why it takes a period of time is that the public comment period obviously takes a big chunk of the time. But basically what will happen next now that you've got that approved is Chris you or your designee will send the formal email to the

policy staff list with a CC to me just saying, "Hey, we're done, here's the material. This shows our new charter."

Then staff has a ten day period to "formally review and determine if there are any fiscal reliability concerns for the overall ICANN organization." That's a fairly routine effort. And in particular because you all had so much staff support in supporting your deliberations and working with you to pull everything together that's not likely to raise any concerns at all. So that's a short ten day period.

And then the charter goes to the board's Organizational Effectiveness Committee. So members of the board take a first look at the document, authorize staff to post it for public comment. And then we've got the standard 40 day or so public comment period after which time, you know, staff summarizes any comments that come in. There may be comments from your community. There may be comments from other communities and those then go to the full board for assessment and review.

The board process is generally supervised by the Organizational Effectiveness Committee. Rinalia Abdul Rahim is the Chair of that group. And I'd imagine that they would have some substantive conversations about the charter prior to or in the period between the Hyderabad and Copenhagen meetings. And so we can work out all the timings and everything like that effectively. We may be able to see board approval at the Copenhagen meeting early next year. It could happen before that timeframe. A lot will depend on whether any comments come in, whether there are any concerns but I don't, you know, based upon what I've seen in terms of the fantastic work that you and your drafting team did I don't think that there should be any great delays to that timeframe.

Chris I'm happy to answer any questions that anybody has. As you note from that overview there's really not a lot of work that you all have to do now going forward. You've done all the heavy lifting. And it's really just a matter of the board implementing the process that's been in place now for about three years and so far has seemed to work fairly routinely and quite effectively. I'll stop there and see if there's any questions or clarifications that any of you would like to make. Thanks.

Chris Wilson: Thanks Rob. And I take - this is Chris speaking. I take very little credit for the hard work that was done on this. The Charter Drafting Team did great work and this is - obviously this a - an interactive process that began years ago so a lot of hands on this, BC hands on this. And so kudos to all of them for their hard work on that.

So and I appreciate the summary or where we are and what we need to do and we'll certainly get that ball initiated very soon and then look forward to moving this process along over the coming months. So does anyone have any quick questions for Rob on this issue? Okay good. I don't see any Rob so thanks very much for our time and we'll certainly be in touch on this soon.

Robert Hoggarth: Great, thank you.

Chris Wilson: Thank you. Okay great. Well we've got just a few minutes left so let's wrap up with any other business. We've obviously just discussed the charter referencing again the At-large community survey that we've talked about the last couple meetings, referenced the last couple meetings that there was - survey closes I guess tomorrow. So if you haven't already participated please consider doing so.



As far as scheduling purposes again this is - the next meeting will be in Hyderabad. First we'll have a BC private meeting on Thursday November 3 at 1515 local time and then of course we'll have our open meeting I'm planning November 6 at 1515, both meetings occurring for 90 minutes. I did attempt to see if we could get Goran Marby to speak to the BC specifically at one of those meetings. His schedule wouldn't allow it but we are trying to get him to speak to the CSG - one - at one of the CSG meetings as Cheryl references earlier. So and that it - we're cautiously optimistic that we can get him plugged in to one of the CSG, either the open meeting or the private meeting, one of the two and speak to the full CSGs to have some engagement there. So we are working on that and hopefully that can - we can have him participate at least in one of the CSG meetings.

But look forward to have some fulsome discussions at our BC meetings as well and hopefully the timings work - times work for folks. I know there's a lot going on that week but I think we try to minimize conflicts as best as possible. And thanks to Chantelle for her hard work on scheduling, problem scheduling all this madness.

But do we have any questions or concerns about meeting schedules or anything else that we need to raise now before Hyderabad? Okay not seeing any then I wish all that are traveling - I should say if you haven't gotten back to Chantelle I know she put out an APV for folks to let her know that they were going to be in India and their arrivals and departures, et cetera, and hotels. If you haven't already done that and you are planning on going to India please do email Chantelle with that information so we sort of all have all the better sense of where people are staying and who - and when they're going to be there for planning purposes.

Otherwise I look forward to seeing those that are traveling look forward to seeing you in India. And those that aren't look forward to connecting with you remotely in India. So thank you all very much. Chantelle you can stop the recording.

Chantelle Doerksen: Thanks everyone. Operator you may now stop the recording.

END