

**ICANN**

**Moderator: Chantelle Doerksen  
January 21, 2016  
10:00 am CT**

Coordinator: Okay the recordings have been started. Speakers you may begin.

Chantelle Doerksen: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the BC Members Call on January 21, 2016.

On the call today we have Jay Chapman, Gabriella Szlak, Geoffrey Noakes, Paul Mitchell, Angie Graves, Jay Sudoski, Aparna Sridhar, Chris Wilson, Steve DelBianco, Alex Deacon, Andrew Harris, Angie Grave, Barbara Warner, Lawrence Olawale, Tim Chen. We have apologies from Andy Abram, Andrew Mack, Steve Coates and Cheryl Miller. 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: Thanks Chantelle. I do notice there's an echo so if folks could mute their phones or their microphones on their computer that would be very helpful.

Great. Thank you everybody, welcome. Welcome from here soon to be very snowy Washington DC in the coming day or two. I hope for those of us that are here will survive it appropriately.

But thank you all for joining us. If you just joined as well, that's great.

Let's go ahead and we got a full to - full plate of things to talk about. And I'd like a little bit of time at the end to speak about other business.

So perhaps Steve you're on. Maybe we can go ahead and turn to you. I know you just wrapped up a CCWG accountability call about an hour ago. So welcome feedback on that but obviously guiding a deeper dive into the general policy calendar. So Steve perhaps you can take it from here. Thanks.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks Chris. And I think that Chantelle is loading the policy calendar. I circulated it yesterday afternoon.

And you're right Chris. I have the small blessing that today's CCWG call lasted two hours instead of three like the last ten calls. So I had a sound hour before this call.

All right everyone this will be a relatively deep dive since we have two comments that are due tomorrow that we want to get closure on during today's call if we can.

There isn't much to review at the top half of the policy calendar because there haven't been any comment periods closed since our last call and none of these were submitted.

There would have been public comments on the 18th of January but the BC requested that ICANN extend the public comment period for Numbers 4 and 5 on today's agenda. And those were extended till the end of January.

So the first item up under current ICANN public comment Number 1 is the gTLD Marketplace Health Index proposal. That's due tomorrow.

Angie Graves, you volunteered to participate on that advisory panel, thank you. And then Lindsay and Paul Mitchell did a great job drafting comments to the BC on ICANN's proposal.

Andy Abrams, Olga and Denise all offered edits. And that's the first attachment to the policy calendar. It is due tomorrow afternoon so, this would be a great time to hear any last edits, suggestions or questions for the drafters and I on this comment.

I'll take a queue and if there's none after a minute or so we'll move on.

Okay, fantastic and thanks again for all the work you did on that, Paul, Angie. I'll send that tomorrow afternoon.

The second one is the supplement registration proxy services. This is not privacy proxy but proxy registration services.

For multiple gTLDs that are going to be operated by XYZ.com this is the second one here and it is also due tomorrow.

So this is a supplemental proxy service so that they can do gateway access to several services that occur between registrars and registries and Whois via Port 43.

Now we had had discussions about this before. Tim Chen focused on a lot of the ambiguities and uncertainties in this RSEP, Registries Services Extended Part of the call.

And Aparna and Andy from Google pointed out concern about censorship for domain names at the second level which might well be strengthened. The censorship could be strengthened by location of a lot of these proxy registration services under Chinese law.

So that is the second attachment to today's policy calendar. It is also due tomorrow. So this would be a great time to take questions or comments from the drafters.

Go ahead Phil Corwin.

Phil Corwin: Yes good morning all or whatever time it is where you are. I just - I've meant to weigh in on this but it's been so busy.

I just want to make sure that our letter is quite clear that we recognize that contracted parties operating within a particular political jurisdiction have to comply with applicable law but that, nonetheless we want a very tight definition of who is subject to the restrictions on domain registrations.

We don't want any - we don't want ICANN being in the business of helping to export censorship regimes beyond the citizens of the geographic boundaries of any particular nation.

So that's my main concern with this letter and I defer to the authors on whether that's been sufficiently addressed in it.

Steve DelBianco: Okay, so while I'm waiting for one of the authors to speak up I did want to indicate that an edit that was made just yesterday and approved by Karen, and edit by Aparna and Andy raises that very question.

It's the bottom of Page 1 where it says does this mean for example that any person whether of Chinese nationality or not that registers a domain covered by this RSEP would have the registry data stored in secondary escrow in China getting to this notion of us asking questions.

And what I pointed out to the list is that in an RSEP we are very unlikely to get staff to require that the registry answer all these questions before they approve the RSEP that it usually isn't the way staff works.

And so it's - if it's at all possible the BC should raise a question or concern and then couch it in terms of suggestion that if the answer to that question isn't of a certain nature that the BC would not then therefore support the RSEP.

And if it's possible let's try to phrase things that way than just simply asking questions that frankly won't get answered. Aparna - I'm sorry...

Aparna Sridhar: Yes, I see...

Steve DelBianco: ...did you have something to add to that before Aparna, Phil...

Phil Corwin: Well yes just before she speaks particularly based on recent news events I think we should be asking about whether this policy's going to apply in Hong Kong which is supposed to have a separate system from mainland China but that separation is increasingly in doubt with recent developments.

Steve DelBianco: So Phil please work with me on this. Just asking...

Phil Corwin: Okay.

Steve DelBianco: ...is of no use at all. What would we say as the BC? Would we say that if this is intended to work in Hong Kong the BC would not support the application? Do we feel that strongly?

Phil Corwin: I would hope that'd be our position, yes.

Steve DelBianco: Okay, so the rest of you - Aparna, you're next. And the rest of you on the call as well as the drafters, please try to respond to that. And thank you Phil for trying to phrase...

Phil Corwin: You're welcome.

Steve DelBianco: ...an objection. Thank you. Aparna?

Aparna Sridhar: Yes I think that we should - one way to sort of go around all these question is to simply say something like the BC recommends that the definition of registration under this RSEP be as narrow as possible so as to ensure that there's limited to no extra territorial effect of these - of the use of these methods I guess.

I mean that's maybe not the exact perfect wording but that's the idea right, is that we want the term registrant to be narrow and we don't want Chinese requirements exported elsewhere.

Steve DelBianco: Aparna that really sounds helpful. Not to wordsmith on this call but if possible could you think that over this afternoon, maybe send us a sentence or two to the list?

Aparna Sridhar: Sure, happy to.

Steve DelBianco: If possible, yes. And if it is possible you can put it into the latest draft. The one I attached concludes the change that you made yesterday that Tim accepted. So you can work off of the one...

Aparna Sridhar: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: ...that's the second attachment. That's fantastic.

Aparna Sridhar: I'll do that.

Steve DelBianco: And this kind of things we need and the extra territorial line. I mean you can even say for example Chinese nationals may well be residing in Hong Kong and yet that shouldn't extend Chinese law to those that reside there.

I mean that's a bold and controversial thing to say. But, if it's what we mean this is the time to say it or forever hold our piece as they say. Tim Chen you're in the queue.

Tim Chen: Yes hey guys. Steve can you hear me?

Steve DelBianco: We do.

Tim Chen: Okay, I just wanted to point out and this is if you read the current comment you can pull this out. I know it's kind of an obtuse document. But there are

two places where they specially refer to registrations from Chinese registrars which is very specific. It's the third case of what I've called Item A. So the third time they talk about the same topic they're more specific. And it specifically says on Page 8 for registrations coming from Chinese registrars.

And then for Item B it says there under Number 1 Whois data for registrations coming from Chinese registrars. So, in one of the three areas where Item A comes into play they're very specific. In Item B they are more specific.

And so, a potential solution here if this is what XYZ intended -- I'm not sure it is - you could say, you know, the BC wants to clarify that every time the terms Chinese registrant or Chinese Internet user is used and that - the second term is used in the data case which is ever more obtuse but it means specifically registrations from Chinese registrars.

And if that's what they're trying to get at, then they can clean up the document very quickly by just saying every time we use the term Chinese registrant we mean domains that are registered through a Chinese registrar because that may be what they're getting at. And they may have just been loose with the language in other cases.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks Tim. I'm now displaying document.

Tim Chen: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: Okay I'm displaying the document now. But that's precisely the kind of phrasing that I think would be helpful.

What we've got right now it's not a obtuse document. I think you folks have done a great job on this. It's just that staff doesn't have to do anything with our question.

And we want to prompt them to say there's no support for this app unless it worked at - have the following clarification or qualification.

Denise Michel: This is Denise if you could put me in the queue please.

Steve DelBianco: Tim anything more to add? We'll go to D.

Tim Chen: No I'll put my hand down once I figure out how to do that.

Steve DelBianco: Okay. Go ahead Denise.

Denise Michel: Yes sorry, I'm not online.

You know, something else to consider is - and I agree with Steve that historically staff hasn't really made many changes or demands in the RSEP process nor given it appears much weight to public comments.

But this is an issue feel that rises to the level of, you know, of priority its - we should consider just having a phone call, conference call, with relevant staff- who are - with the staff who are responsible for coming to closure on this, on this RSEP I think can - and then that will - I think that will add more value to the work that you guys are doing with this comment.

And I'm happy to...

Steve DelBianco: You could...

Denise Michel: I'm happy to...

Steve DelBianco: ...facilitate that.

Denise Michel: ...facilitate that if you guys want to.

Steve DelBianco: Tim, Aparna and Andy would there be some benefit you as the chief drafters to get on the call with Krista?

Aparna Sridhar: Let me check with Andy. It's a little delicate for us because we have a relationship with that XYZ. So yes, let me check with Andy.

Steve DelBianco: Tim?

Tim Chen: Yes, this is Tim. I don't have a long history with ICANN or with I'll call the politics of ICANN and nor do I have a strong interest on being on a call with this. I like - prefer to keep my comments to the document to the BC.

Steve DelBianco: Okay, and Denise does have a long history with ICANN staff having worked there for a decade. So it's entirely possible that Denise could shepherd that call with Krista.

Denise Michel: I'm just offering it as an option to...

Steve DelBianco: Right.

Denise Michel: ...some of you, especially those who are know, you know, may not be aware that you also have the option to have an informal or off the record call really on any topic with...

Steve DelBianco: Right.

Denise Michel: ...staff, staff decision makers involved. So...

Steve DelBianco: You know, that's a great reminder because a few days ago that might have been just the thing we needed. But, this comment is due tomorrow, puts us in a tough situation.

If we were to have that call with Krista even today it's - I wonder whether the answer she could give us would be authoritative because XYZ is the one who would interpret, you know, what their RSEP is, not necessarily staff.

So Denise...

Denise Michel: Yes, and she's not...

Steve DelBianco: ...here's what I would ask. If you wish you could give Krista a call. And I believe it's completely fine to share with her the concerns in our draft.

And if Krista has something really revealing to share with us like she's saying, oh, don't worry about that, that's not the way it's meant, anything she had that she could share let's put it back on the list and it might in the next 24 hours give us the change to modify our comment.

But I think we need to do that in parallel with the edits that Aparna's going to make this afternoon, don't you?

Denise Michel: Yes. And Krista isn't the decision-maker here but if it's in the interest of just getting more insight, how they're handling it I'm happy to make the call.

Steve DelBianco: Yes, and without objection from anybody I'm going to take Denise up on the offer to call Krista and see whether we can get a few preliminary answer, authoritative answers, right? It's not much good if Krista just has an opinion about how it's interpreted. We need to know what the applicant, XYZ.com intends to do. That would be great. Thank you Denise.

Okay, the third one is a little simpler. I'm going to - let me thank Andy Abrams for preparing a draft of the release of country and territory names, geo names at the second level and a handful of new gTLDs.

And it's a batch that includes both .brand and open gLTDs that BC has a long history of commenting on these. And Andy was able to repurpose our comment.

Are there any questions about that one? That's not due till the 27th of January?

Fantastic. The next two are together, Numbers 4 and 5 in the policy calendar.

A big thank you to Cheryl Miller and Barbara Warner for working on this pair of very complex comments on proposals that are coming from ICANN on Thick Whois implementation and the replacement for Whois in the future, the Registration Data Access Protocol or the RDAP as it's called.

Those comments were originally closed the 18th of Jan. We asked for an extension to the 31st of January and they gave it to us on both comments.

And the attachment to today's - Attachment Number 4 to today's policy calendar is the current draft of that. And I worked with Cheryl and Barbara to

give substantive answers where we could and cited the Internet Architecture Board as authority for one of our comments.

But again we're trying to rationalize and be realistic about the implementation of things like a Thick Whois for - well, for TLDs that don't matter really as much as common then which are further down the road and at the same time trying to set the table for implementation of a replacement to Whois that will accommodate gated access which Susan suggests we call it authenticated access. And I think that's a much better way to say it.

So Cheryl and Barbara or others take a queue on this one. It's due the 31st of January. We'll have some time on list to have further discussions.

Cheryl, Barbara.

Barbara Warner: Hi. This is Barbara. Can you hear me?

Steve DelBianco: We do.

Barbara Warner: Okay, great. No, I just thanks Steve very much for his guidance in terms of drafting this comments. I think at this point we would welcome input and feedback from those of you in the BC who have extensive expertise and experience in dealing with Whois.

I welcome your read of this and your inputs to this as I know Cheryl does too.

We muscled through some of the background documents that ICANN sent us. And at the end of the day we felt that the approach that we worked out in consultation with Steve I think best address the BC's position on this.

Cheryl did you have anything you wanted to add?

Steve DelBianco: Cheryl if you're speaking you might be on mute. All right we'll go to Susan. And Susan I did just mention that we'll change the word gated to authenticated for purposes of the document. Let me go to you next Susan.

Susan Kawaguchi Thank you very much. I think - I just think authenticated is a little more - people just are a little more comfortable with that I think.

And I apologize, I thought today was the date it was due for comments. So I sort of left it as just changing the authenticated.

I'll take one more look at it. I thought it - the draft has evolved very well and we're making the right comments so thank you to all the drafters.

But I will take one more look based on Scott's Circle ID. And I'm completely flaking on his last name but he was part of the EWG and helped develop the RDAP.

He made some valid comments in his Circle ID blog. And so I just want to take another look at that and maybe add some comments based on that because he's, you know, he was - he's the technical person.

Steve DelBianco: Yes Susan we have till the 31st of January. You are our expert on this new RDAP and RDS to replace Whois. So please give it a good look, the sooner the better...

Susan Kawaguchi Okay.

Steve DelBianco: ...so we can circulate it back to the drafters and everyone else.

Susan Kawaguchi Yes, I'll try to do that tomorrow. And it's just been a crazy month already.

Steve DelBianco: Oh, I know. I know. And it's great that you've got Denise to help out too at Facebook. That's great.

All right, the last two items on here aren't due for quite some time, February 3rd on the continuous data driven analysis of the root service system to study the technical impact of the new gTLD program.

This notion of expanding the number of records in the root, does it really affect the technical function of the root server system stability?

It's a draft plan for a study that's going to be done by a third party vendor. Unless someone in the BC expresses a significant interest with the technical skills to understand it the BC would probably not comment on that. That's Number 6. Any volunteers?

Denise Michel: Yes. This is Denise. I'll draft some high level that you might - for your guys to consider.

Steve DelBianco: Hey fantastic. Thanks Denise - appreciate it. Anyone else?

Okay Number 7 on here isn't due until the 24th of April. That's on the new geographic regions and we'll talk about that today.

I'm going to update you on the reconsideration request. That's the next thing on the policy calendar and then turn things over to Susan and Phil to talk about the agenda for council.

And then Cheryl when we get to the CSG I've got all of your items that are in the policy calendar as well.

So the reconsideration request that we filed was back in mid-October. We joined the Non-Commercial Stakeholder's Group and asked ICANN to reconsider its decision to unilaterally impose contract changes on some legacy sponsored TLDs, Cat and Pro and .travel where they imposed the uniform registrations, sorry, uniform wrap - wait a minute, URS, Uniform Rapid Suspension.

And we believed that that needed to be a gTLD policy from a bottom up policy development process and shouldn't be just imposed by ICANN. They were supposed to reply a month later.

ICANN is claiming that holiday schedules and the public meeting of ICANN at the yearend intervened and have led to a delay.

So they did not get to it. As of the report they just filed on January the 15. And I don't know when ICANN is going to meet next to work that out. Phil Corwin?

Phil Corwin: Steve I'm reminded of the seeing justice delayed is justice denied.

I think as we consider the accountability proposal and strengthening the accountability measures this is supposed to be one of them under the present regime is generally trotted out by ICANN's board to say what strong accountability we have now.

And here's a situation where a constituency in a stakeholder group joined together and were now passed the 90 day mark when they're target is 30 days.

So I think at a certain point we ought to consider sending a short note asking if we're ever going to hear from them.

Because, you know, I don't know what new excuse they have for not providing some response. But, when we're already passed a 90-day point when it's supposed to be a 30 day reply it starts to show the total inadequacy of the current implementation of these accountability measures.

That's all I have to say. I don't know what we can do but it's extremely frustration that it just seems to have dropped off their radar screen. I guess soon they'll be telling us they're too busy getting ready for Marrakesh.

Steve DelBianco: Phil I did want to note there are 27 reconsideration requests in the queue for the Board Governance Committee 27. We're in that mix right in the middle.

And for many of them it says that the end of year meeting and holiday schedule are contributing to delay in responding.

So we haven't been signaled out for justice delayed or justice deferred in this case. We're part of a big batch of reconsideration requests.

Phil Corwin: Oh I realize that and not to belabor the point but I think of those 27 probably the majority are far past the 30-day mark. And it just shows the lack of adequate, you know, accountability by the board in response to valid requests. If they're going to say yes or no they should do it.

But to have 27 pending with most of them past the 30-day target mark is very disturbing. And I'll be quiet after saying that.

Steve DelBianco: No, I appreciate if Phil. Let's be vigilant then because if ICANN were to begin negotiating another legacy TLD registry contract we'd want to be sure that until this reconsideration request is addressed they should not be imposing contract provisions that were not the subject of a bottom-up policy development process.

All right, seeing no other hands Phil I'd like to turn it over to you and Susan to discuss Channel 2 here on the policy calendar, the GNSO Council which is later today. Go ahead Phil.

Phil Corwin: Just give me one second to pull up the agenda for today for the council.

Steve DelBianco: Phil I excerpted the relevant parts of the agenda. It's right there in the policy calendar on the screen.

Phil Corwin: Okay.

Susan Kawaguchi Well Phil let me cover a couple things and I...

Phil Corwin: Yes I'm not seeing it on the screen.

Susan Kawaguchi But you should cover the CCWG.

So the final report for the privacy and proxy services accreditation PDP is up for vote. A motion is up for vote. And it hasn't been seconded yet but I will - I'll do that today before the meeting. We'll second that.

And then that will unless there's opposition from other groups on the GNSO that - I'm sure that will be approved and go to a PDP.

On the PDP charter on the new gTLD subsequent procedures we have some discussions because they're at the last meeting about clarity on the charter on who - on which PDP the RTM review or the new gTLD sequent procedures should really be - take the lead on reviewing the URS or any RPMs associated and so we clarified the language and as long as in the charter.

And as long as the - you know, nobody objects to that language I didn't see any discussion objecting to that than that we'll approve that motion today.

There's also a motion to initiate the PDP's review, the RPMs in all gTLDs, which would include the UDRP, which is where the URS should be reviewed and but that motion was withdrawn. The report was just sent out this week and no one's had time to read the charter nor the report. So anything on the CCWG, Phil?

Phil Corwin: Well, that will be, in my view, the main topic of discussion today. We have a draft cover letter and attached positions on the recommendations. The Council decided on its special call last Thursday not to vote on a motion at this time given the assurances from Steve and others that we're going to be looking at a supplemental proposal based on the - about 90 public comments on the third proposal and the ongoing developments within the CCWG Accountability group.

So it's basically a compilation of consensus views or strongly held views within the Council designed to influence changes in the supplemental proposal. I have - working with Steve I've now gone on record on the Council list suggesting a slight wording change. The current language of the cover letter seems to suggest that we favor another full round of public comment.

And if we were to do that and have it at even 21 days there's no way we could deliver this to the board a final supplemental proposal by the end of February and NTIA is pretty strongly on record that they need it by then if we're going to have a decent shot at a transition this year.

So I've circulated that on Council. It'll be discussed this afternoon. The call is from 4:00 to 6:00 pm Eastern Time. I've shared the documents with all the BC members. Haven't gotten much feedback but if anyone has feedback for Susan and I should get it to us before 4:00 pm Eastern today so we can take that into account for the discussion.

I think we'll be able to, as Council, to approve that cover letter and compilation of positions on the 12 recommendations today and transmit it late today to the Accountability group where it will be - receive whatever consideration they want to give it. I think it will get strong consideration. Everyone, frankly, has been waiting on GNSO for its feedback and now we're finally delivering it, which is not to say that we're late. I think we're - given our responsibility for all gTLDs and the many groups we represent with very different perspectives I think everyone anticipated we'd be the final ones to chime in on the proposal.

So other than that, as Susan said, the RPM motion was withdrawn. If it hadn't been withdrawn, I was strongly considering asking for deferral. It's a very important issue. I think deferring it will give us a chance next month perhaps to vote on a motion and a draft charter together.

I quickly surveyed the final staff issues report when it was released last week and they seem to have adopted the BC position which is that the RPM review should proceed in two parts; the first addressing whether there should be any adjustment of the RPMs for new TLDs and then moving on after that's

completed to review of the UDRP, which will be a very lengthy review. So it basically came out the way we suggested it should but there's going to be a lot of nuance in drafting a motion and charter to carry that out. And it's going to be a major issue for the community over the next few years.

And other than that I don't see anything else on the Council agenda that hasn't been addressed yet.

Susan Kawaguchi One more note. One of the councilors did comment on our letter about gender diversity for the CCT. Agreed with the need for gender diversity; didn't necessarily agree with endorsing our candidate for that. But so I'm going to send a letter - or send an email with draft language based on the letter that Denise and I drafted.

And with the suggestion to the GNSO that this is a serious issue and that we as the GNSO need to weigh in together. So I doubt there will be time on the - in the meeting today but at least we could probably work on that through emails. And we still haven't - I don't think we've heard from - gotten a response at all.

Steve DelBianco: Phil, this is Steve. I could add one small item on the Cross Community Working Group on Accountability. Knowing that Council is not going to reply until the final supplemental, the news here is that anybody from GNSO Council submitted comments and that includes us in the BC, the NCSG, the IPC and others. Our comments have been individually been dealt with in this final supplemental in these three-hour calls we've been having two days a week.

So the extent that Council is bundling the concerns of the GNSO constituencies and stakeholder groups, you can rest assured that those are the

things we spend all this time talking about. So it won't be necessary to have a long debate at Council today other than to make the edit that you're suggesting to the cover letter. But the underlying attachment has been the subject of our discussion since early January.

Phil Corwin: Yeah, that's very useful feedback, Steve. Thanks.

Steve DelBianco: Okay.

Chris Wilson: This is Chris. Before we move off of the CCWG can I ask was there an updated timeline given on today's call? I think Leon suggested there might be but I don't know if there was or not on - when they expect things to start finalizing.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks for the question, Chris. We displayed a potential work plan for how we would take all of these adjusted documents, have them reviewed by the attorneys, incorporate the attorneys' feedback and then publish a final supplemental so that the chartering orgs could get back to it. So we walked through that process. It took about 20 minutes to discuss and debate. It doesn't look like there's any support to intervene there with a long public comment period so it would go right back to the chartering orgs.

Then the question came up of what is the timeline, what is the expected date. And the cochairs were careful not to answer that until we got more approval on the process. And there is some discussion how long will it take to digest what comes back from the attorneys. Chris, I'll give you an estimate, though, I would suggest that it would be mid-February before we have something going back to the chartering organizations, let's say February 10 or so.

And then we give the documents to the chartering orgs and then the chartering orgs will each take their own due time to formulate an oppose or support position on the recommendations in the revised final supplemental. And that's where we have another bite through GNSO at that approval. If that gets done by the end of February we'd be lucky. The soonest it could possibly go to ICANN then would be the end of February, early March, and ICANN might turn it around to NTIA in a week or two.

So I'm giving you the most aggressive timeline, Chris. But it may well be that the chartering orgs, when they receive the supplemental, some of those chartering orgs will say we'd like to do our approval at the face to face meeting in Marrakesh. So on the other end of the spectrum we could be until mid-March before the chartering orgs have approved the final supplemental that we are going to try to generate in the second half of February. So I'm giving you a range of answers because that's probably the best we can say.

Chris Wilson: Thanks. Phil, I know your hand is raised.

Phil Corwin: Yeah, I raised it and then Steve kind of confirmed what I was going to note which is that given that potential timeline the board might receive it just before Marrakesh and we might be spending a lot of time in Marrakesh talking about the final proposal rather than our other matters and not delivering it to NTIA until mid-March. So - so be it.

Steve DelBianco: That's right. All right if there's no other questions let me jump to one other item before we got off of Channel 2. Right at the top of Page 2 in the policy calendar I have noted that GNSO has a standing committee that looks at the implementation of improvements. It's called the SCI and there's a hyperlink to it.

They had two meetings this week and Angie Graves, who's not on the call right now, has been representing the BC on the SCI. Ron Andruff, at one point, was...

Angie Graves: Angie is here. Angie is here, just not on the chat, sorry.

Steve DelBianco: ...on the Adobe. So, Angie, give us a quick little report on that. And we'll talk about the need for another BC member to help out. Go ahead.

Angie Graves: Okay, very good. This is Angie Graves for the transcript. The Standing Committee on Improvements Implementation exists to inform GNSO Council on policy matters. And you can see the work in progress and work history using the link that Steve provided. Our work in 2015 resulted in GNSO procedures being updated regarding submissions of motions and for 2016 GNSO Council has asked us to give more definition to conditions around GNSO officer elections and treatment motions and amendments to motions.

Unlike the BC, where we're spending a lot of time writing and drafting and editing comments, the SCI does most of its work during the course of the phone call. And then staff generally does any documentation that's required.

So we have, on average, two phone calls a month. They last 30 minutes to an hour each. And that's about the extent of the participation required. But your mind and your perspectives would be much appreciated. We are the only constituency that does not have an alternative representative. We're not - we're the only constituency in the GNSO that's not fully staffed in SCI.

So I'd like to encourage anybody who has even questions about it to send me an email at [angie@webgroup](mailto:angie@webgroup) and I'd love to get a volunteer or two to be the alternate for the SCI. thank you.

Steve DelBianco: Okay thank you, Angie. This would be a great time for any of the members on the BC call to ask a question or two, or better still to volunteer on this SCI. it's a great way to actually meet the leaders of the other constituencies in the GNSO since all of them are represented by leaders within their respective groups. All right, not seeing any hand right away but, Angie, we'll keep working on this. Thank you, Angie, for your service on that. And back to you, Chris.

Chris Wilson: Thanks, Steve. So I think we've touched on GNSO, I think, Phil and Susan, so why don't we go ahead and move - and, Cheryl, give you very quick timeline on the intercessional meeting, just very briefly?

Cheryl Miller: Sure. Thank you. So we had our last planning call this morning. And very briefly, everything has gone quite well. Steve has highlighted in the policy calendar all the main areas of focus that will be the topics for the different discussions that are ongoing.

The one thing that I did want to highlight is that there is going to be a reception on the night of Thursday the 4th. And ICANN staff has said that we are able to invite whomever we would like from, you know, the community. And so if there are any BC members or, you know, anyone within the area, you know, the greater Los Angeles area, that you think would be interested in attending, please send me their names and I'll make sure that they receive invitations to the event.

It's a great way for them to meet some of the ICANN staff. I think they're trying to have some of the board members and other folks there. And I'll just stop there. And if anyone has any questions please feel free to ask me. Thank you so much.

Chris Wilson: Thank you, Cheryl. Jimson, turning to you for a little brief overview of finance and operations. I know we've just begun launching the Memberclicks work so perhaps you could talk about that briefly.

Jimson Olufuye: Okay. Thank you. This is Jimson. Let me first thank Steve and Phil and Susan for the good work you're doing.

I had once reported about Memberclicks, a member management application that would enhance member management, database, profile, invoicing and payment processing and record management. The on-boarding of the application is still on-going and I'll update you at the next meeting.

On the General Counsel issue on indemnity, discussion is still on-going to find a resolution acceptable to us.

Finally, I'd like to thank members for their feedbacks on the new BC website. Please continue to feed me back if you detect anything that need improvement.

That's all for now. Chris. Thank you.

Chris Wilson: Great. Thank you, Jimson. Just real quickly with regard to the general counsel, EIN issue for us. We are still hoping to get an answer from the IPC. The IPC has its own EIN and I'm trying to determine exactly how they got that and what was entailed in getting that. And perhaps using that as a lesson for us going forward. And so hopefully we'll get an answer soon. It's been a little bit frustrating, not being able to get in touch with the IPC treasurer but we'll hopefully have an answer on that and just really put this issue to rest one way

or the other in the near future. So I just want to make the members clear on that. Okay thanks, Jimson.

So real quick turning on other business. I thought it'd be helpful because the charter working group has been doing so much work on updating the charter in the last - certainly last few months - I thought it would be helpful to get a very quick status report on that. And, Phil, perhaps you can just give - spend a minute or two on where we are on updating the charter and steps going forward.

Phil Corwin: Yeah, hear me okay?

Chris Wilson: Yes, thanks.

Phil Corwin: Yeah, we had another very productive call on Tuesday where - we're very close to completion but it's very painstaking detailed work. But I would think that perhaps before Marrakesh but certainly by early spring we will have a completely revised draft charter for BC members to review. And then we'll decide on a process internally I guess to decide how we're going to discuss that. But we've put a tremendous amount of work into it. There's been a lot of people working on this over the years. But we're really very close to the end.

We keep thinking we're there but on the remaining issues it's - we'll spend 15-20 minutes sometimes discussing whether it should this word or that word and the reasons why. So we're close. And you'll have something to look at I would guess in the next two months based on our progress so far. Perhaps sooner but I don't want to overpromise.

Chris Wilson: Great. Thank you very much, Phil. That's helpful. Two of the remaining things, quick, wanted to bring to the attention of BC members the upcoming

12th annual State of the Net conference. This is an annual conference held in Washington DC. It's a one-day event covering a variety of policy issues of importance with regard to the Internet.

There are two panels of notes on this year's conference. One - and I should this - I don't believe it's live-streamed, but so those that are in Washington maybe - may want to attend. It's all day at the museum down on Pennsylvania Avenue, not far from the Capitol. Those that aren't, I believe the program will be archived at some point and you can then perhaps look at it after it's occurred.

But there are two panels of note in the afternoon session, one on international perspectives of the state of governance of the Internet. And that will really will be looking at Internet governance generally. There'll be a keynote from Larry Strickling of NTIA. And the BC's Cheryl Miller will be one of the panelists on that. And I'm sure how ICANN comes into play with regard to general Internet governance will be a topic obviously of discussion.

And then later in the afternoon there'll be another panel discussion on - entitled High Noon for the IANA Transition. That will - that panel will include Steve DelBianco, Steve Crocker from the ICANN Board, and myself, among others to just sort of discuss the state of play with the transition and what it means for the Internet going forward and just general policymaking and Internet governance.

So for those, again, that are in town and don't already have in this on the calendar perhaps it's something you might want to think about attending because we do have a lot of - some good important voices from ICANN and from the BC specifically participating.

Steve, Cheryl, do you want to chime in on that at all?

Cheryl Miller: No, only to say, you know, for those members that feel that there's anything really specific that I should focus on or raise I'm always open, you know, to collaboration whenever I speak on a panel on any of these topics. And so I'm always happy to take your input and reflect those so thank you.

Chris Wilson: And to that point, I should say, so I'm participating wearing primarily my hat as a representative of 21st Century Fox, but to the extent that there's opportunities for me to provide a BC perspective on if there's a question asked, etcetera, then I will most certainly do so. But I'm not there primarily as the chair of the BC, I'm there as - in my own capacity for my company. But I will do my best to tout the BC and its positions when I can.

Phil Corwin: Yeah, Chris. Phil here.

Cheryl Miller: Yeah, same for me, Chris. I mean, I'm there mostly as Verizon but, you know, to the extent that there's anything important that you guys really feel you want to put out there I'm always happy to do that.

Chris Wilson: Phil.

Phil Corwin: Yeah, Chris, I'm planning to attend as well just in my individual capacity. I just wanted to note for those not in the Mid Atlantic region, the current weather forecast is for a blizzard to start tomorrow afternoon and not finish until sometime on Sunday with the Washington Baltimore area receiving perhaps two feet or more of snow. If that occurs there's probably a strong possibility that it'll be -it will have to be postponed and not take place on Monday. We'll just have to stand by and see.

Chris Wilson: Indeed.

Steve DelBianco: Chris, if there's time I wanted to mention one thing. On our panel this is primarily a Washington DC audience, very Hill-focused. And on the panel that Chris is on we are also going to have David Reynolds, a staffer with the House Commerce Committee. And thus far Congress has been inclined to back the community on this transition insisting that ICANN accept the community's proposal for the transition as a condition of giving up IANA. And that's been very helpful to have Congress stand behind the community.

We'll play that same line on Monday's panel if we have the chance, or certainly I would. But I will also say this is that there's a broader audience than just Congress. Remember, that the United Nations, ITU, the IGF, they are all watching as well. And in this transition we've got to be respectful that governments do have a role - it's not a preeminent role - but they do have a role as a community member as part of the global Internet stakeholders. And that's the GAC at ICANN.

And on today's CCWG call members of the Non Commercial Stakeholders Group were insisting that the GAC not be part of the community and not be allowed to participate in decision making on blocking a bylaw, blocking a budget, spilling the board. And that will create an awful lot of blowback from the United Nations, General Assembly, ITU and the governments that, let's say, that if ICANN doesn't have a place for governments well then I guess the United Nations needs to assert itself so the governments do a voice.

And I certainly will echo that message on Monday. It's consistent with the BC's position on the first three iterations of the CCWG proposal. So be aware of that. And, Cheryl, this may come up on your panel as well.

Cheryl Miller: Yeah, I think that's right, Steve. And we were just actually talking about it internally. I think you're spot on, it definitely will come up. My panel is going to be a little broader as well since it's looking at, you know, future issues, 2016, so it's going to tie in IGF with this, you know, ITU, etcetera. So I think that's right.

Chris Wilson: Phil, you still have your hand up. Is that an old hand?

Phil Corwin: Sorry, old hand.

Chris Wilson: Okay thanks. Quickly, Chantelle, you mentioned something in the chat regarding the new mentorship program. You want to spend 30 seconds on that?

Chantelle Doerksen: Hi, Chris. This is Chantelle. Sorry, I was coming off mute. Yes, so this is a new program that Janice has rolled out. And Glen and Nathalie from the GNSO Secretariat team have asked that I approach the BC to see if there are any names to put forward. For every mentee there would need to be a mentor so we're also looking for members of the BC to act as mentors. And if you have any interest please follow up with me via email and I will be in touch with more information. Thanks.

Chris Wilson: Thanks, Chantelle. And then lastly the proposed next BC meeting I think we're looking at February 11. It would otherwise normally be scheduled for February 4 if we're going on the two week - every two week schedule. But with the Executive Committee tied up with the intercessional meeting in LA that day I think it makes sense just to postpone that the next BC meeting one more week to February 11. So same time but just a week later than otherwise would have been scheduled. So hopefully that coordinates with folks' calendars but I think it makes the most sense.

That's it from my end. Anyone else have any other thoughts, concerns, questions? Okay great. Well thank you all very much for joining. I give you six minutes back of your hour. And we look forward to being in touch on email and talking to you all in a few weeks. Thank you.

Man: Thanks, everyone.

Chris Wilson: ...the line please.

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

END