

**ICANN**

**Moderator: Chantelle Doerksen  
December 15, 2016  
10:00 am CT**

Coordinator: Recordings are started.

Chantelle Doerksen: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Welcome to the BC Members Call on Thursday December 15, 2016.

On today's call we have Chris Wilson, Geoffery Noakes, Steve DelBianco, Claudia Martinuzzi, Marie Pattullo, Isabel Rutherford, Arinola Akinyemi, Andy Abrams, Alex Deacon, Andrew Harris, Jay Sadowski, Hibah Kamal-Grayson, Philip Corwin, Paul Mitchell, Denise Michel, and Jimson Olufuye. We have apologies from Cecilia Smith, Andrew Mack, Beth Allegretti, and Barbara Wanner. From staff we have myself, Chantelle Doerksen.

I'd like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you ever so much, and over to you, Chris.

Chris Wilson: Thanks, Chantelle. Thanks everyone for joining. For those that were at the IGF in Mexico last week, welcome back. I hope your travels home were painless.

Because, you know, this will be our - likely our last call of 2016, we've got a fair amount to talk about. So why don't I go ahead and turn to Steve DelBianco for our review of the policy calendar, and then we can move on from there. Steve?

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Chris. This is Steve DelBianco, your vice chair for policy. I sent a policy calendar out yesterday and Chantelle has displayed in the Adobe chat. The first channel is on public comment processes. There have been two comments filed since our last call.

On the 10th of December we commented on the fiscal year '18 budget that ICANN put together for the PTI operations. We used to call it post transition ICANN, and now it's now it's permanent technical identifiers. Jimson, thank you very much for putting that together. And we filed that on the 10th.

On the 5th of December we filed an actually very detailed and I think analytical comment on a report that ICANN contracted from an outside party to do a phase two assessment of the competitive effects of this expansion of the gTLD space. And those economists believe they've discovered some interesting conclusions.

They were unable to make other conclusions for lack of data. And strangely enough, they were underwhelmed by the fact that a third of the new domains in the last two years came from the new gTLDs. They didn't seem to think that was a significant competitive effect. But the BC is among many who thought was pretty remarkable and said so in our comments. So those comments went in already. And let me thank Hibah for leading that effort as well.

All right, turning to the current set of ICANN public comments, they don't have too many open at this time of the year, thankfully, but there are a few

that we need to approve today. Thanks to Susan Kawaguchi and Claudia Martinuzzi. They put together a joint comment covering two comment periods, one that closed two days ago but I obtained a delay from ICANN so that they know that we'll be submitting our today. And that was on the implementation proposal for the consistent labeling and display of thick Whois, more of a technical consideration.

The second is an implementation element, which is our long battle to try to bring the functionality of Whois to a single centralized place for the huge legacy gTLDs com and net and the sponsor TLD .jobs. As you know, they're not new gTLDs, they didn't have thick Whois from day one, and that migration has been one that has been dragging on since, well, there's 8 or 900 registrars who hold the data for .com and .net and many of them are claiming they will not simply hand their data over to a bunch of servers in the United States for VeriSign to hold a thick Whois copy because they fear concern over their domestic privacy laws as well as data migration, data transfer laws.

That's created a dilemma, and I'm not sure we have an easy path out. But the comment that's attached to the policy calendar encourages urgency on the part of ICANN to implement the consensus policy. For those of you who are new to the BC, consensus policy is immediately binding upon all of the contract parties if it fits within the picket fence, and this does. So this is the way that we in the community force the contract parties to change what they do. We do it through the development of consensus policies. But there's always a fine line between a policy and an implementation of that policy.

We are now at the implementation stage as to how do we implement and transition thick Whois functionality for com, net, and jobs. Jay Sadowski was very helpful on coming up with sort of a counterpoint to what Susan and Claudia and I had drafted and then went back and forth a few times. And I

think what we have now is some pretty solid comments. I'm happy to take a queue on that. Please understand that if I don't hear from you on this call, I need to submit these comments in about an hour, and both will go in together.

Any comments? All right. Thanks again, Claudia and Susan. Appreciate your help on that.

The third in the list of current comments is something that Denise Michel, who's on the call, is going to help with. Denise and Angie had drafted a comment in February of this year on the topic of this continuous analysis of the root server system stability, and now they've moved from a study report to a draft report. And those comments close the 22nd of December.

Denise, I wanted to turn to you to hear your current thoughts on whether and when you may be able to get a first draft circulated. But I also have encouraged other BC members to pitch in if they can on this one for fear that we won't get to it and perhaps won't be able to submit. Denise, did you want to comment on that? Please go ahead.

Denise Michel: Yes I do, Steve. Thank you. My apologies for being late with this comment. The good news is that the authors of the draft report found no observed degradation of security and stability of the root DNS system currently and recommended ongoing monitoring analysis. Our - the draft comments I'll send out this morning, I promise, are short and acknowledge that the report seems to have been done very well. It's clear, concise, very well written. The data points seem to include all of the previous recommendations that the BC asked for, save for one. That's noted in this report -- in our comments rather -- along with a simple endorsement of the recommendation for continuous monitoring. So I'll get that out this morning. Thanks.

Steve DelBianco: Denise, thank you for volunteering for that and carrying the water on another comment period. So appreciate it. When that comes around, I'm happy to circulate that to the BC if you like.

All right, moving to the next one. It's number four. We talked about this two weeks ago. It's a new initiative by ICANN under this whole rubric of health of the gTLD space. They want to come up with diseases or sicknesses that would undermine that health. And to be clever about it, they came up with several names of new diseases. I have them in red in the policy calendar. And they want to try to help identify what those diseases' symptoms are as well as what the treatment mechanisms are.

So it's a bit whimsical and clever, but there is some substance here, trying to assess what - for instance what abuse is in the context of health indicators for the identifiers, which are both names and numbers. Here they're focusing pretty exclusively on the naming system, and this is an area the BC has been really active in before.

On the last call we have John Berard and, once again, Denise Michel volunteering to draft BC comments. That's not due until the 9th of January. We have a little time there, but that's a perfect opportunity for some of you who might have a little bit of a slowdown on the holidays to please pitch in and help us to analyze these comments and come up with a BC draft. We did comment on health indicators in the gTLD space in September of this year, and I have a link to that in the comment.

Let me ask now whether we can get a couple of extra volunteers to help John Berard and Denise Michel. You can just signify in the chat, if you wish. Hm, this is not the right way forward to rely on the same folks all the time to do the drafting, so we really need some additional participation. Last year was a great

year for participation of new people. And given that there are already two experienced BC members on this one, it'd be a great opportunity for somebody who hasn't contributed to get involved.

All right, Denise, seeing none, I'll move on to the next one, number five, supplemental procedures for the independent review process, or IRP. Now this came out of the cross-community working group on the IANA transition for ICANN accountability. And in the reports, many of which the BC suggested and then approved, the IRP is going to be made available to the community to bring an IRP against ICANN's management or board for action or inaction of the corporation. And if the community as a whole supports an IRP then ICANN has to pay the legal costs.

These are new elements along with several procedural changes to the way the IRP works, and a subgroup coming out of the CCWG, the cross-community working group, came up with an implementation suggestion. One of those suggestions, which I have in red in the policy calendar, has generated some controversy and it was discussed last week in Mexico at the Internet governance forum. And it is the statute of limitations, if you will, the amount of time that can pass that still allows an aggrieved party to bring an IRP.

In this case, it suggests that an IRP cannot be brought more than a year after the date of incident or action or inaction that is at fault here. Chris Wilson, I know you mentioned that we wanted to have a short discussion on that on today's call. We're doing fine on time. So let's hear some pros and cons as to whether the statute of limitations such as one year makes sense. Should it be longer than one year and should there be a statute of limitations at all with respect to bringing an IRP against the corporation? I'll take a queue on that.

Denise, your hand is up.

Denise Michel: Sorry, that's old.

Chris Wilson: Steve, this is Chris, why don't I go ahead?

Steve DelBianco: Yes please go ahead.

Chris Wilson: So real quick, just I - this is not an issue that I've followed terribly closely because I've been working on other things. But I know that, you know, from the ISPCP standpoint I think there's a desire to have a longer time period. It's sort of not entirely clear in conversations with folks from that constituency group as to how long they want. I think obviously I guess they feel that one year is not sufficient. But I think also that the thought would be that maybe the CSG as a whole would sort of come together and find agreement as to time and timeframe.

Personally speaking, I don't think it should be open ended. I think that would be problematic, and I know the ICANN board in particular has raised concerns about having sort of an open-ended statute of limitations I guess or no statute of limitations, if you will. But, you know, whether it's a one year or two years, you know, I don't think there's that much of a difference, to be honest. I mean I think, you know, we should be able to find agreement there.

But the biggest question is well I guess whether there should be a threshold question is whether there should be any statute of limitations or not, and I'm inclined to think there should be something just so - for the entire community to have some sort of clarity as to what, you know, how this process will work. But that's just where - in my brief conversations with folks, that's where I've sort of gleaned the issues coming from. So I obviously welcome other thoughts from folks too on what they think - how they think this should look.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Chris. I pasted into the chat the full text from the proposal, and the proposal is linked in comment five. It suggests that the claim's got to be filed within 45 days after the claimant first learns of the action or inaction that gives rise to the dispute. But if they learned about it more than a year after it happened, they would not be able to file. And so there's a two-part test. There's the time in which you learned of it but there's an absolute shot clock of one year on the event.

Chris, do you have a sense as to whether the Internet service providers are interested in it being longer or shorter?

Chris Wilson: Thanks, Steve. This is Chris. Yes, I think it's - they would prefer a longer window. And - but again, they're not - I don't know if they have a specific timeframe in mind, at least best I can tell. But I think they think - they feel like one year is not sufficient.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Chris. Phil Corwin, your hand is up.

Phil Corwin: Yes thanks, Steve. Phil for the record. A couple comments on this. As a general principle, I think the notion of laches or a statute of limitations based on the principle that if you sit on your rights too long you'll lose them is a sound principle. But with that as a starting point, I have some concerns about this text as a matter of first order.

First of all, they've used the word affect when it should be effect. But aside from that grammatical problem, I think 45 days in which you first become aware seems to be a two-part test here. I'm not sure how they correspond of the material effect of the action. Sometimes it can take awhile for the effect of an action to become clear.



I also think there's generally that 12 months - particularly there's going to be some ambiguity. And what all this means is too short. I think something like at least two years would be more reasonable. I'm not opposed to the notion of, you know, some time limitation on bringing the action, but I think the current language is problematic.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Phil. Anyone else in the queue on this? We need a volunteer from the BC. This is a very brief and easy to digest report. The one I'm speaking of in the IRP is only five pages long. This is a relatively, digestible set of issues, and it is one where the BC has an opportunity to team up with the ISPs and the IPC and perhaps put in a unified comment. A great opportunity for a BC member to dive into something, especially if the BC member has some experience with arbitration. That would be outstanding in this case.

Let's have a volunteer who's got some experience with arbitration to lead the way on this. This comment isn't due until the 10th of January, so plenty of time, and I'll be able to provide lots of assistance to get it going. But we do need a BC member on this. All right, sorry to see none. Phil, your hand is still up? Okay thanks.

The only other one on our list is 12th of January there's a comment due on the new anti-harassment policy for the ICANN community. This first arose at the Marrakesh meeting and the BC has already commented on it. And now we see what the proposal is. We need to understand whether the BC comments were followed and whether we have further comments before it's adopted. We have plenty of time on that, so we'll probably circulate something else in the intervening period of time.

All right. I wanted to turn next to the concept of the - let's see, the call for volunteers, and Denise Michel, I'd like to turn to you on this. This is the CSG letter that would support public access to data, and this is an issue that you've led for us in the BC and was discussed extensively when we were together in Hyderabad. So, Denise, you want to talk a little bit more about volunteers to work on that letter?

Denise Michel: Sure. We actually don't need volunteers, but the draft letter was sent to the list, the BC list and the ISP and the IP constituency I don't know what the date was, sometime ago. We have deadline of Friday, before Friday, so kind of close of business tomorrow. It would be great if there are any comments on that.

This flowed from a discussion that the three constituencies had in Hyderabad for the need for ICANN to provide - to put data in the public domain on an ongoing basis on the basic kind of general public data that they collect. So the ISP constituency has approved the draft letter. If people had any comments or proposed changes, it would be great to get those so we can make sure and sync with the other two constituencies. Thanks.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you. Denise, I will circulate that letter as soon as we finish this call and I'll circulate the draft comment that you've already just now completed, the one on the continuous analysis of the root server system stability. And I'll circulate those in separate emails as soon as this call is over in the hopes that we can get some answers back. And I think you said that this CSG letter supporting public data access that tomorrow would be the last day to offer suggestions. Did I hear that right?

Denise Michel: So we - our goal was to have all comments in before Friday, if I remember correctly, so we can sync with the rest of constituencies and finalize the letter.

Steve DelBianco: Okay. Thank you, Denise. Appreciate that. The next item is I wanted to make all of you aware that there's a call for volunteers on one of these affirmation of commitments reviews that have now been brought into the bylaws. Susan Kawaguchi for instance represented the BC and the entire GNSO on a previous affirmation review of what we then called Whois and are now calling registration directory services.

There was some interest in the GNSO to delay this review because one is required under the old bylaws. One was required every three years. They wanted to delay the review pending new work on registration directory services. But the BC insisted on doing the review now to examine whether there is adherence to the policies in effect today as well as whether there's been follow through on the recommendations from the review team that was Susan was on four years ago.

So we are - we're not going to have to discuss it on this call, but by the 13th of January, those of you who are interested in representing the BC can put forth your names, similar to what several of you did. Jay Sadowski, (Scott McCormick), and Denise Michel all put their names in for the Security, Stability, and Resiliency Review Team. This is the same kind of process but on a new subject. And it will probably take the better part of a year for this review team to do its work. Any questions on that? Great thank you.

All right I'll skip over the special project of analyzing comment, we're still waiting on another draft for that, and turn to channel two, which Phil Corwin and Susan, if she's joined by phone yet, can talk about what happened on the council call that occurred earlier today. I have the highlights from the agenda here but it'd be great to hear from Phil Corwin on specifically what went down. Phil, over to you.

Phil Corwin: Yes, Steve. And there was an e-mail from Susan. She had to go pick up her husband for a medical procedure, so she's not on today's BC call. During the council call today - and were you monitoring that as well, Steve?

Steve DelBianco: I was not, Phil. Please help us understand.

Phil Corwin: Okay. Well it was early this morning, 7 am Eastern, on the - let me see the items. We did adopt the council response to the board regarding gTLD issues in the GAC Hyderabad communiqué. Susan had highlighted to Steve and I an issue where there was some language that could have been read as put in the council on record as in some way limiting access of the community ICANN data. In her - she - for the same reason, she was absent from the first part of the call.

I raised that on her behalf and we had a good dialogue for about five minutes, in which it was made clear that the language only went to the view that both the ICANN and contracted parties had to agree through the contract negotiation process on defining abuse but that it was not meant to state a council position that there should be limitations on data access, that that was a separate issue. So we resolved that in the dialogue.

We - and I have to say my memory's failing. There were a number of items here. We did - I believe we voted to approve the implementation plan regarding GNSO review. We certainly approved the appointment of members to the new gTLDs Auction Proceeds CCWG, where the GNSO designee is Jonathan Robinson. And I believe we agreed to complete on the list the council response on the RDS services.

And aside from that, we had a good discussion of proposed election process for a - appointing GNSO representatives or suggesting GNSO representatives for various review teams. That was - and we also had a - let me see. I'm going to back. I'm going to get off - just refer to the e-mail that was sent out on the council agenda so - which is a little more detail. Yes, and that proposed council plan for appointing GNSO representatives, that was a plan put together by Susan in conjunction with Ed Morris of the non-commercial group and it got a good reception. We're going to continue discussion but it was viewed as a sound start for adopting a procedure. And then we had some discussion about planning for ICANN 58 and about setting up standard blocks of time for consistent GNSO activities that would be worked into each meeting plan so that things wouldn't be scrambled at the last minute as they were to some extent in Hyderabad.

So I'll stop there. It was a non-contentious council meeting. No controversial items. The other surprise event was at the end of the meeting, Glen DeSaintgery, who has been the head of the GNSO Secretariat and with ICANN since 1999 announced that she is retiring at the end of the year, that she'll have a role with ICANN as a consultant for at least part of next year but she's stepping down and someone new will be replacing Glen in running the GNSO Secretariat.

I think those that have dealt with Glen would agree that nobody can really replace her. And she was a bit teary in telling us of this event and there was very warm appreciation expressed by members of the council of all the great work that she's done over the years for the GNSO. So I'll stop there and let's see if there's any questions. I don't see any hands up or hear anyone. So I'll presume that that report was satisfactory.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you Phil. Anyone have any comments or questions? Comments or questions on the policy portion of the calendar? And if not, we could go back to Chris to move it on. We don't have Cheryl Miller on the call who is our current CSG liaison. But we do have Barbara Warren recently winning the election as the upcoming business constituency representative or liaison to the commercial stakeholders group. I noted in the agenda that we had two opportunities, two ideas that need to be handled by the CSG liaison and one is planning for our priorities at the intercessional, which is coming up in mid-February and likely to be in Iceland. I'm sure Chris will want to talk about that.

And we also have a process for electing the new board seat that Markus Kummer holds today and Markus' term ends at the end of December 2017. So we want to work with our colleagues in the other paths of the non-contract party house to come up with a process for selecting either a mutually agreeable candidate or take turns naming candidates that have significant experience and passion for the job.

Chris, I'll turn it back over to you then.

Chris Wilson: Thanks, Steve. So with regard to the intercessional, we do have dates. I would say it's almost finalized. It will be -- should be the exact meeting dates, et cetera, and locations should be finalized later today or tomorrow but that barring any major change it looks like we will have the intercessional taking place on February 14th and February 15th in Reykjavik, Iceland. ICANN is finalizing the contract with the Hilton Hotel there in Reykjavik for meeting space and there will also be sort of a half day or morning slot available on the February 16th for folks too if they want to have additional meetings. The CSG may perhaps may want to have its own meeting, et cetera. That would be available for folks too the morning of the 16th.

Again, hopefully either later today or tomorrow, we'll know for sure that those dates are locked in but that-- I think it's safe to say that's where and when it will be. There will be robust remote participation available so for members that obviously aren't attending the intercessional, because our delegation will be our ex-com as well as Lawrence all the way to Robert who will be our additional delegate to attend the intercessional.

For those that obviously won't be participating in person, there will be remote participation available, we are told. So all BC members can participate that way and watch and take part over those two days. We expect that ICANN staff and leadership that will be determining who will be participating will also probably be participating though not likely in person, but that will be sorted out as the agenda becomes more clear.

We just an hour before this call had the NCPH intercessional planning call where we started laying out initial thoughts about topics of interest that we want to talk about. Obviously, the GNSO NCPH board member's slot is a topic of interest that will be on the agenda. I had mentioned to folks that both Steve Crocker and Cherine Chalaby who are current board members have indicated an interest in providing feedback, if you will, to the non-contracting party house about filling the board seats and what they sort of criteria and other things they think are important to think about.

So it's quite possible that we'll have Steve and/or Cherine participate in the meeting, probably remotely, but participate in the meeting and provide that feedback that they would like to provide. So that's one topic. I think a GNSO review will be on the agenda. It was also suggested that perhaps the non-contracting party house councilors who were present perhaps have a side

meeting amongst themselves to talk about issues of interest with regard to council.

It was noted, however, by Greg Shatan that the IPC Councilors will not be there in person but would probably be participating remotely. So they could still perhaps do that, but that was suggested. And then also it suggested the discussion of policy issues that there was mutual interest in and agreement on. And it was thrown out that an example was of course the BC NCSG letter regarding dot pro dot cat, the reconsideration request, use that as an example of the two sides of a non-contracting party house getting together and finding an area of mutual interest and agreement.

So I think the hope is that there may be other issues out there that could be vetted and discussed for 2017. So that's sort of where we are preliminarily. There will be another planning call next Thursday where we can start drilling down a little bit more into topics. I think it was also suggested that if Goren Marby could participate either in person or remotely that would be great and we could have an engagement with him. And also it was suggested that if the new chief contract compliance officer has been hired by mid-February that he or she could also engage with us either remotely or in person, sort of having an initial meeting and greet with that person.

So it's unclear whether that hire will be done by then but if it is that would be someone that we would like to have there or engaged in as well. So I think what we hope to next week have a little bit better understanding of what the agenda is going to look like. I think also people were interested in doing a little more planning ahead of this meeting that was done ahead of the meeting last year for L.A. So we can really hit the ground running when we get to Reykjavik in mid-February. But that's where we are right now on the intercessional and we'll -- as soon as we -- everything is finalized on location



and time, I'll send that out but also, once the agenda starts becoming more clear, we'll put that out. I see Steve has a suggestion in the chat regarding defining terms of reference for the next GNSO review. And so I'll pass that along. I think that would be certainly part of the discussion.

If there are other topics that we at the BC via the CSG would like to raise -- have raised in this intercessional, please say so now or certainly let me know and Cheryl, and I guess Barbara as well, know so we can relay that to the rest of the planning team going forward. Steve, I see your hand raised.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Chris. I wanted to mention that the example you cited of cooperation between the BC and the non-contract, sorry, the non-commercial stakeholders group, while I agree with everything you said and it's a remarkable example of standing on the principle of process, it would probably not be the best example to bring up at an intercessional with the IPC in the room. The IPC was extremely upset that we were challenging that process because they wanted the URS to be implemented wherever and whenever and however it could.

So that is a bone of contention between the BC and the IPC. So if we go there, I realize there's upside to talking about that cooperation on process, but there's somewhat of a downside at dealing with the IPC. Now, some of that depends on which officers of the IPC are there to represent them, right. If it's not the councilors and if it's, for instance, it's Greg Shatan or Mr. Zuck, we probably could have a great conversation about that kind of cooperation. But let's just be alert that when you bring it up, a lot depends on who's on the call for the IPC. Thank you.

Chris Wilson: Thanks Steve and I'll provide a little more clarity. So Ed Morris was the one who suggested this on the call today as simply an example of, if you will,

strange bedfellows working together collectively. I don't think the intention was to have a fulsome discussion about that specific issue, that policy issue during the intercessional. It was simply used as an example of where -- the CSG constituency work together with an NCSG group and came together on something. To be sure, Greg, even on today's call, Greg Shatan was -- raised -- noted that that was obviously -- that particular issue was not -- was a BC shared issue, not necessarily a CSG shared issue.

So I don't think -- I don't want to leave people with the impression that that was going to be -- that particular issue was going to be discussed during the course of the intercessional. I think it was used as an example of where there was a meeting of the minds within at least some stakeholder groups within the NCPH. So the point being if there are other areas, other issues where we could collaboratively work together that that would be worth discussing, et cetera.

So hope that clarifies for folks in that regard. Anything else regarding intercessional before I let Steve wrap up the policy calendar? Okay, great. Steve, why don't I go ahead and turn it back to you so you can wrap up policy.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Chris. The very last item I noted on the policy calendar is something I circulated to all of you on December 1 and it was a response from the business consistency to questions that came to all of the ACs, and SOs and stakeholder groups, and constituencies a little over a month ago. And they were questions to help ascertain how the BC is accountable to the designated community that we were set up to serve, how people can challenge decisions and elections, how the BC does outreach to gain new members, how the BC handles transparency about its meetings and deliberations.

And Chantelle was a fantastic asset by doing a first draft on that. And I've done several hours of edits and circulated at least our first response to the

SOACs a few days ago. It was discussed earlier this morning on a call we had with that group. I've attached it as I believe the second attachment to today's policy calendar. And it is fine for us to provide supplemental responses. If any of you think I've missed anything or that Chantelle and I have missed anything in the response that we've already submitted.

I think the BC will compare rather well to other ACs, SOs, and constituencies because of our work on the charter, both the existing charter and the one that we've just approved, as well as the policies and procedures that we've implemented over the years.

So I hope that we'll compare well to the others and maybe serve as an example to some constituencies that could do a better job describing their processes. Any questions on that? Hearing none, back to you, Chris. Thank you.

Chris Wilson: Thanks Steve. Jimson, why don't we go ahead and turn to you for your portion of the call? You there?

Jimson Olufuye: Yes, I'm here. Thank you, Chris and good day to everyone. Well, let me first say thank you to all for the confidence you put in us to continue to administer our BC. Thanks for the (votes). Well, at this time is going to be my last time, and so I want to use the opportunity to let all those that are interested in taking this office to link up with me so you can begin the process of coaching because at the same aspect of operations that we have on boarded now.

So I will say that. I want to move onto outreach. I want to thank BC members. The idea of 2016 in Mexico where we had excellent (number) of BC members and you all engaged very constructively. I think BC made a good mark of itself with regard to these strong book of (unintelligible) and again, thanks to the ex-com for meeting in this regard. And also thanks for Marilyn, Andrew

Mack. They made sure that the newsletter was available, Marilyn carried quite a number. So, the newsletters were available for interested business people to pick and maybe put a (big) number of them, which is good.

But I think we (could make) progress concerning our presence going forward. Fortunately, we could not have the specific BC outreach but the idea of a Mexico but I think going forward, we could have a booth or so. We could plan to have a booth at IGF 2017. That could also give more prominence, as we saw the non-commercial stakeholder groups, they had a booth there. So, I think I work towards that. So, I think have something for the Outreach Committee to take note of.

We continue to have people apply to be members and the Credentials Committee have been doing a good job (reviewing) all the necessary requests to join BC. So, we still continue to attract new people. As the (pay) there will be a role into membership lists. So, this is all for me for now. The other things were being in the background which would (will result) to more policy, process of payment. As I told you, PayPal -- working to onboard PayPal payment mechanism or process and then we'll also improve on the social media of member clicks. So we'll more information about that maybe in the new year for data of members, data use and so on and so forth.

So on these notes, this will be the last meeting this year. I want to appreciate everyone and also (unintelligible) have been fantastic. Thank you very much for your support. And I don't know for Glen, it would be a good thing maybe at ex-com level we could pick this up to appreciate Glen De Saint Gery. She also has been incredibly supportive to (the BC Excom) I think that we could see how we could appreciate Glen for a good work as well. Thank you very much. Chris, back to you.

Chris Wilson: Thank you Jimson and I'd also echo your thanks to Marilyn, and Andrew Mack, and of course to yourself for your efforts and outreach at the IGF. I should say this IGF it was -- and I think in other ones as well, there's far more from the non-commercial side of the community that attend the IGF than the business side. I think it was true at this IGF where I think over 50% of attendees were from sort of "civil society" and the non-commercial side of thing while about I think 17 or so percent were from business.

So we're working at a disadvantage, to some extent, just in and of itself there with attendees. But I think it's important that we obviously continue to use that as an opportunity. I think next year's IGF will most likely be in Geneva so we can focus on that as well. But also thanks to Marilyn. She's not on the call right now but thank you to Marilyn for hauling the brochures over in her luggage to Mexico so we can distribute hard copies, which is nice.

Steve, I see your hand raised.

Steve DelBianco: Steve DelBianco. The internet governance forum, you're right, the business community in general was not as adequately represented but the BC was the voice of business between Jimson and all the rest of the BC participants, I believe we had somebody on practically every session and in many cases on the panel. And at a featured session on Tuesday called the post-transition ICANN, the BC was cited several times as real leader in the transition.

And the transition in general brought gratitude and amazement from civil society and governments who dominate the IGF. They were frankly amazed that the multi-stakeholder community could have come together over the course of two years and produced such a remarkably detailed accountability plan. And they were also amazed that the U.S. government, when it came to the final hour, really did let go of the IANA contract. A lot of us who worked

on it realized that it was anything but certain on September 30th, especially with the court case pending. But we certainly earned a good deal of respect from governments who never thought it would happen.

Now, that respect and about \$2 will buy you a taxi ride in Guadalajara but not much more. So we'll have to continue to work closely with governments to find areas of common ground and push back where we think that they're overreaching. I will say this too. The city of Guadalajara was a perfect climate, easy to get around in it, and so fantastic food and incredibly friendly people and a great venue. So I personally recommended it to Chairman Crocker and Nick Tomasso to consider as a hub for ICANN meetings if we're looking for something in Central America. And I wouldn't mind going back there at all.

Thanks Chris.

Chris Wilson: Thanks (Steve). I would echo that. It was a nice venue for a variety of reasons. Okay, great. Well, we'll go ahead and wrap up any other business. As you'll quickly see, our next meeting will be January 5. I thought it best not to do a call two weeks from today, which would be December 29, since a lot of people, frankly including myself, will be on vacation that week, the sort of Christmas week if you will. So I think perhaps just the better part of valor, we'll go ahead and wait an additional week and do the call on January 5 when folks are back from holiday, et cetera.

One thing I didn't note here on the agenda but just real quick. Chantelle had sent around a note to everybody that the CCWG for new GTLD auction proceeds are now -- is now open to folks to participate. We had a -- as we discussed on our last call, we were looking for the CSG rep. That turned out to be Tony Harris from the ISPCP. He'll be the CSG representative on that

CCWG. But for open -- as I mentioned before, it was open to all other participants and so that call has been put out. So for folks to go ahead and look at Chantelle's email I think from yesterday or the other day. So if folks are interested in participating on that CCWG, please go ahead and sign up.

That is it for me on any other business. Is there anything else that folks want to raise before we sign off for 2016, at least officially on the call? Okay, great. Well, seeing nothing, I wish everyone a happy holidays. Safe travels if you're traveling and look forward to talking to you all in the new year. So thanks very much. Go ahead and end the recording.

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

END