

ICANN

**Moderator: Terri Agnew
January 12, 2016
10:00 am CT**

Chantelle Doerksen: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the BC Members call on January 7, 2016. On the call today we have Cheryl Miller, Paul Mitchell, Jimson Olufuye, Chris Wilson, Philip Corwin, Steve DelBianco, Angie Graves, Lawrence Olawale-Roberts, Kevin Audritt, Alex Deacon, Andy Abrams, Barbara Wanner, Aparna Sridhar, Geoffrey Noakes, Tim Chen, Ellen Blackler, Andrew Harris, Nat Cohen, Susan Kawaguchi, Laura Covington, and Denise Michel. We have no apologies. And I would like - and 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. This is Chris Wilson. Thanks, everybody. Happy new year to all. It should be an interesting 2016 to say the least. And I look forward to working with everyone in this new year on a variety of important issues.

As of January 4, the new Executive Committee is now in place so that really includes myself and Cheryl Miller who is now our CWG rep and of course includes Phil Corwin and Susan Kawaguchi, our GNSO Council reps, Steve DelBianco, our Policy Chair and Jimson Olufuye who is our Finance Chair. So we are all happy to be part of the team and look forward to working with everyone going forward.

So we've got a relatively full agenda today since we haven't been in touch for a few weeks since the holidays. I know there's a variety of different discussion points so I wanted to go ahead and move on maybe in the next minute or two to Steve, Steve will handle the policy discussion. I know there's a variety of things circulating and Steve have circulated the policy calendar so everyone should have that.

But I think it'd be great to talk about what's coming up, Steve, and what we can expect in the coming months. So unless anyone else from the Executive Committee wants to say something I'm happy to turn it over to Steve right now. Great, Steve, why don't you go ahead and kick it off.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks, Chris. And, Chantelle, thank you very much for loading the updated policy calendar. And I send an updated one last night since a number of you provided extra elements of input and ICANN agreed to extend the comment period pursuant to our request.

So there's only one new comment filed since our last BC call and that was on 21 December. We filed really started a detailed analysis of the CCWG, the Cross Community Working Group on Accountability's third draft proposal. And we looked at all 12 of the recommendations and we had varying levels of support. For two of the recommendations we supported them out right that the BC added qualifications and critical concerns to 10 of the 12 recommendations.

That means that a superficial analysis says the BC supported all 12 but we were much like the other 90 other public commenters who indicated qualifications and concerns on almost all of the supports that they gave. So it now falls to the cross community working group to work through those 90 comments over the next 3 to 4 weeks. And somewhere along the way the most

important comments of all will come through and those are the resolutions coming out of three of the six chartering organizations, and they are the big three; the GNSO, the ccNSO and the GAC.

We expect, you know, Council will meet on it on January 14; ccNSO about the same time and we hope to get a definitive set of comments from GAC because after all, the CCWG is working on a charter and needs to pay attention to chartering organizations. So the good news there is that Phil Corwin is leading the drafting within GNSO Council on the resolution the Council is going to put forth.

And I do hope that, Phil, you are able to use some of the raw material that we created in the BC. And we are going to turn that over to you when we discuss Channel 2 on the policy calendar, which is about the Council resolution that will be discussed on the 14th.

So thanks again to help from all of you from Amazon, Disney, Facebook, Google, Microsoft, Verizon, Yahoo and Marilyn Cade, all of you provided great help on getting the BC comments in.

Let me turn to the bottom of the first page on current ICANN public comments. And I'm going to turn it over to Cheryl Miller and Barbara Wanner and Tim Chen in just a minute. The first two public comments that were due...

Woman: Hello?

Woman: Hello?

Woman: I think my audio may have dropped.

Man: I've lost Steve.

Woman: I've lost audio...

Woman: Yeah, me too.

Woman: Can't hear Steve. Everybody else I can.

Chris Wilson: So it looks like we've lost - this is Chris - looks like we've lost Steve. We will...

Chantelle Doerksen: Chris?

Chris Wilson: Yeah.

Chantelle Doerksen: Hi - this is Chantelle. It looks like his phone line dropped and the operator is calling him back now.

Chris Wilson: Give him one minute to get back on. Thanks.

Tim Chen: Hey, Chris, this is Tim Chen. Can you hear me?

Chris Wilson: Yes.

Tim Chen: Okay great. Just testing a new microphone for the first time and I think Steve's going to call on me so.

Chris Wilson: Great, yeah. You're good. Thank you. Chantelle, this is Chris. Are we still having trouble I guess getting him on?

Chantelle Doerksen: Hi, Steve. Sorry, hi Chris. It looks like he's on hold right now. Oh no, he's connected. Steve, are you back?

Steve DelBianco: I'm here. I am.

Chris Wilson: Great.

Steve DelBianco: Oh that is embarrassing. I am so sorry. When I deep dive into those policy items sometimes I lose you all entirely. Can somebody just tell me where we left off?

Chris Wilson: I think, Steve, you were just wrapping up the discussion regarding the accountability stuff. And I think you are going to top it with the assistance of Barbara and Cheryl and Tim Chen on another item.

Steve DelBianco: Great. Thank you very much. And I'm so sorry everyone. I'll pay closer attention to the chat if something like that happens again. So Barbara Wanner and Cheryl Miller took on the task on trying to rationalize some very complex and conflicting initiatives on Whois. And there are three of them. There's a brand new PDP on the next generation registration directory services. That grows out of the work that Susan Kawaguchi did for us on the expert working group. That PDP just started.

At the same time the IETF has developed new protocols for remote access to Whois information. And that's the public comment period that was initially set to end on 18 January. We made a request two days ago asking ICANN staff if they could extend that. And they have extended it by two weeks to February 1.

And the third element is thick Whois, something the BC has pushed for long and hard. But truth is that phase 3 of thick Whois is still in the cards for the

next several months where they would finally bring thick Whois to the dotCom registry. And along the way there are new data fields, registration abuse contact as well as some additional Whois information. And all that sort of collides with the effort on the brand new RDAP protocol or the remote data access protocol.

So with that I want to thank Susan and Cheryl - sorry for Cheryl and Barbara for taking on a really complex task, and they're not experts in Whois. But they've prepared a little two-page framework for what the BC comments could look like. And for that I wanted to turn -- that's the first attachment on the policy calendar. So Cheryl and Barbara, would you like to walk us through what you are thinking for how the VC could do a combined comment on numbers one and two. Thank you.

Barbara Wanner: Okay. This is Barbara. Can everybody hear me? Okay, I will take that as a yes and then to Cheryl, please jump in. Well, as Steve said what we tried to do is look at the elements -- the issues that are common to those requests for comments. And we went back and drew heavily upon the BC's earlier comments, for example, with respect to differentiated, or the BC referred to it as gated access.

So essentially there were three key elements we felt common to both sets of - both requests for comments and it's the importance of gated access, data accuracy and the importance of thick Whois and centralized access. And we welcome - absolutely welcome further elaboration on those points from the true experts on Whois.

Then, as Steve was saying, what we found very very helpful was a report produced by the ICANN staff that included a very detailed assessment impact. And we felt that it offered a very useful - potentially useful synchronized

approach to pursuing both the RDAP, the thick Whois, even the work of the new GNSO PDP Working Group that would be more efficient, that hopefully would not lead to further delays in thick Whois migration, and that would preserve all the efforts that have been undertaken so far to update the Whois system while new systems required by the RDAP are being developed.

So that was kind of our preliminary thinking. You know, I will tell you in all candor that, you know, the best way to learn about something is to dive in, and that's what I did. But I defer to the Whois experts, Susan Kawaguchi and some of the other folks on the BC that have worked on these issues for many years. And I welcome - welcome your expertise in terms of understanding best how we can elaborate further on these comments.

Cheryl, please jump in. And Tim.

Cheryl Miller: Thank you, Barbara. First huge kudos to Barbara for taking the lead on this first stab. As Steve mentioned, for those of us who aren't the Whois experts it was quite an interesting dive.

But I will say, for anyone who is not an expert, the report by ICANN staff that both Barbara and Steve mentioned is actually really helpful. There are some charts that are very easy to kind of follow. And so if you're looking to get up to speed as well very useful. And agree with Barbara wholeheartedly, for those of you who are the experts please come in.

We just thought that this first sort of a outline draft would help us get the ball rolling since, you know, there are so many other items that we're trying to move forward at the beginning of January this year. So thank you so much, Barbara and Steve and everyone else, Susan, thank you.

Tim Chen: Hey this is Tim. So, yeah, thank you both of you for doing all of the work. I didn't - I didn't do anything on this one and the reason is because while I have some familiarity with Whois, I know how complex the issues are and the weight of the task that's in front of us with this kind of combined comment. And quite frankly, I just knew I didn't have the time taking off the new year with all the admin that I have to do at my company. So really appreciate the heavy lifting that's already been done.

Steve, what's the deadline on this again?

Steve DelBianco: Hey, Tim. This is Steve. We requested an extension. And ICANN staff got back to us yesterday to extend by two weeks both the first and the second comment. So the RDAP and the thick Whois will both be extended to the 1st of February. That's not reflected on the Website for public comment but they confirmed by email yesterday.

Tim Chen: Okay. So, yeah, I should have time to help out, which is hopefully going to be my role on this one in particular. And apologies I didn't have time before. But I should be able to add my perspective to this so - and I look forward to doing so, it'll be easier with the extension.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you. And, Barbara and Cheryl sort of captured this notion that privacy laws and the focus on privacy is meaning that more registrars are obtaining exemptions or waivers from the contractual provision for Whois access. I'm hearing a little bit of an echo. Is it possible somebody has unmute on - could put mute on their phone? I just heard a click so maybe that'll work. Is the echo still there? Am I still audible?

Chris Wilson: Yes, Steve.

Chris Wilson: Echo is gone. You sound good.

Steve DelBianco: All right fantastic, thank you. Sorry for that diversion. So what Cheryl and Barbara recognized is that with the increased sensibility to the display of private information of individual registrants we are likely to accelerate the move to gated access, something the BC anticipated when we evaluated potential RDAP and EWG. Gated access would be where you'd have to be authenticated as a user to be able to obtain the personal information of a registrant.

And it seems to me that the IETF has made progress most of the way but they haven't finished the work on a protocol for this gated access, the authentication of users. Part of what our combined or synchronized comment would do is to seek to accelerate that process so that we could put that into place at the same time the other protocols are put into place along with the additional fields for Whois in the migration to thick.

So there's a lot of moving parts. And we desperately need some help from those of you that are experienced. But let's please try to look at it in a holistic way as opposed to separating each of these initiatives. I believe we can file a combined comment on 1 and 2 and address both issues.

Are there any other questions or comments on this from the BC members on the call? I don't see any other hands so thanks again to Cheryl and Barbara for kicking that off.

The next item is Item 3 on the policy calendar here. It's the new gTLD marketplace health index proposal. This was a proposal from ICANN to try to come up with a measurement of the marketplace health for the industry that ICANN serves, the gTLD marketplace.

They ask for volunteers and comments. And early on Angie Graves volunteered to participate. Thank you, Angie. And then on the heels of that Angie and then Paul Mitchell of Microsoft volunteered to draft a BC comment on the proposal that ICANN put out. That was circulated on Monday of this week.

And then after that Andy Abrams offered some significant edits. And then Olga Yaguez of eBay came along with additional edits. I combined those edits and published them as the second attachment last night and where Olga's edits are in purple. So I would be glad to defer to Andy or to Angie or to Paul, if you want to discuss some of the key elements here.

This comment period closes the 22nd of January so we still have plenty of time in our 14-day walk-up for review. So, Angie, Paul or Andy, anything you'd like to add?

Paul Mitchell: Okay, this is Paul Mitchell for the record. Just a quick note on what I was trying to accomplish with the first draft, and then I haven't seen Olga's - had opportunity to read Olga's comments but the other comments I think from Andy, you know, I'm fully in agreement with.

What I was trying to do was basically focus on the idea of the data being objectively measurable and without creating metrics that in and of themselves have the potential to skew the process for how the metrics are created. So you, you know, great self-fulfilling prophecies. And to also try to put an additional proposal in for something related to the vast bucket of cyber security and cybercrime which is really a big trust issue or potentially a trust issue.

And just on that one what I had proposed was that this new metric - and I don't know the specifics of what it should actually be but that a, you know, it becomes a work item for the SSAC to create the new metric and to define the various bits and pieces that need to be defined as to what constitutes kind of cybercrime or cyber threat instances that we would want to measure.

But that was basically, you know, sort of the thrust of the direction that I was taking. I also put something in there on pricing. And I think Angie accurately caught that pricing is probably the wrong terminology but because it's really sales we want to capture in such a metric, not just price lists of actual transactions that happen so I think that language is clarified a bit.

Other than that certainly welcome any discussion on any of the points. The rest of the metrics that - for the most part have been proposed I - from Microsoft perspective would agree with. I think they're generally useful from the broader perspective as well.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Paul. Angie, anything to add or Andy?

Angie Graves: Yeah, this is Angie. And it's - well I can offer it up as a comment on the list if it's more appropriate there. But I put some thought into - I think and Paul really I want to thank him because he deserves the credit for the majority of drafting this. But the cybercrime metrics, I just want to say that's a highly sensitive topic. And because I've thought about, it maybe could be deemed in some geographies to be subjective as well. And I think about a nation state's reports of economic espionage or governmental spying by another and non-state entities acting in the interest of a nation state for certain questionable cross border activities.

So I don't know if that should be up for discussion or additional comment but I just thought this metric could maybe exist with a weight until the international legal system is successful in holding actors accountable for their actions through an international criminal court, which would be an objective counts. That's all.

Steve DelBianco: Well thanks, Angie and Paul and Andy for stepping up on that. I don't see any other hands up so I'll assume that folks will comment on list for the gTLD marketplace health index proposal.

Let me jump to the fourth item on this list, there's just two more on the current. There's a supplemental registration proxy service application for several gTLDs that are operated by company xyz.com. Those comments close 22nd of January as well. And the BC has made comments on proxy services but as Tim identified - Tim Chen - this one is a real wild hare.

Late last night Tim circulated some initial thoughts to the other drafters on that team, Phil Corwin, Andy Abrams, and Aparna, and Tim is identifying the fact that this amendment is supposed to allow xyz.com to do proxy fulfillment on all of its registry services by using its affiliates in China. So a lot of this has to do with geographical and legal restrictions on registrants in some Chinese gTLDs.

And we didn't circulate Tim's initial draft last night since we still have some time for him to perfect that with the rest of his drafters. But, Tim, I wanted to turn over to you to give a little color as to what is this one all about? Go ahead, Tim.

Tim Chen: Sure thing. Everybody hear me?

Steve DelBianco: Yes, sir.

Chris Wilson: Yeah.

Tim Chen: Yeah, great. I'll try and be brief because I think we're early in this. So much like Barbara and Cheryl on the other Whois stuff, this is a little bit outside of my expertise because this is really more about registry - really the technical aspects of registry operations.

And so at the end of my comments that I wrote last night I invited people on the constituency who are applicants or operators of new gTLDs to perhaps bring to bear either themselves or the folks on their teams that may be actually doing more of the technical operations to comment on any of the risks that this potential solution might introduce. And I've asked one of the guys on my team to comment as well. And once I get that feedback I'll blend it in.

The summary here is as follows. One, you have to understand - we have to understand the concept that's actually being introduced here. I read through it in detail once or twice but it's - for me at least it's a little obtuse so I want to make sure that we actually are interpreting this correctly, and that's where I can probably use another set of eyes to make sure that I'm not reading this wrong. But as Steve said, it looks to be the ability due to - apparently due to Chinese law for a registry to operate their new gTLD for what are more or less called Chinese users and in this XYZ is doing so through affiliates in China.

So the summary might - from my perspective is if you don't already, quote unquote, operate in China because the document references 10 or so gTLDs that are allowed operate in China but appears to refer to the company itself doing the operations actually has I don't know if an office or some kind of an operation in China where XYZ does not. So this is a solution to allow

someone who doesn't have feet on the ground in China to actually operate a registry in China for Chinese users and have China allow those domain names to be operable. So that's the high level concept if I understand it correctly.

The specific technical operations appear to be EPP which I believe is kind of the awareness that the domain is registered or not, Whois would under a different name, they call it supplemental, something or other, registry information services. The escrow of Whois data has to be copied and stored in China. And DNS - the initial authoritative DNS requests have to be serviced by DNS servers actually physically in China.

And so, you know, that's - we have to think about those concepts when thinking about the BC's position on this. I will say that this is very different in my mind than what we know as privacy and proxy which I believe Steve references some additional documents to refer to. To the extent that, you know, privacy and proxy is about, you know, the ability to get actual information on registrants for the law enforcement and other purposes when necessary and privacy laws.

This really is the proxy of an entire registry service in another country. So in my mind it's somewhat - it's very different in terms of the effect on the BC's perspective building in parallel is ICANN has gotten comfortable with proxy services in general before having used them for domain registration in the way that we're familiar and this is a different way of using a proxy service. That's the only thing that you could probably refer to that's parallel.

I will also point out that ICANN review apparently found no issues with this as stated in the application. I don't know how relevant that review is because I've never really seen that comment before. But I'll throw that out there as

well; ICANN reviewed this and it passed their muster therefore we're looking at it.

Steve DelBianco: Great, Tim.

Tim Chen: Go ahead.

Steve DelBianco: Tim, I was going to say wanted to quickly pick up on raised hands from two of the other drafters who will take at your initial work that would be Phil and Andy Abrams. And then we'll have to move on because we're going to run out of time on the policy section. So, Andy, your hand was up first and then Phil.

Andy Abrams: Thanks, Steve. This is Andy. Real quick question on the XYZ, yeah, I agree with Tim's assessment, I don't see anything wrong with this RCEP on its face. You know, our issue and the reason that we volunteered is their October 15 RCEP stated that XYZ will reserve names prohibited for registration by the Chinese government at the registry level internationally which raised significant concerns about censorship and particular censorship of Internet content for political purposes with sort of an extra-territorial bent.

And so I don't see of that language here. And I don't know if, Steve, if you know what the connection is between that RCEP and this one and why we were not able to comment on the previous one.

Steve DelBianco: Good question, Andy. We're going to have research that. But it doesn't look like this RCEP touches that at all. So we'll have to...

Andy Abrams: Right.

Steve DelBianco: ...take a look as to whether they're combined. That's great.

Andy Abrams: Yeah, the main question is whether this is an appropriate venue for raising those sort of higher level issues about censorship which is sort of, you know, my main reason for volunteering as opposed to sort of the technical aspect.

Steve DelBianco: Well, Andy, let's by all means raise those issues. And even if this isn't the appropriate place to raise them we'll be able to do so in general comments, we'll be able to do so in Marrakesh so by all means, you know, please address that perspective.

Phil Corwin.

Phil Corwin: I'll be brief, Steve. We clearly need to understand this better and how it differs from the previous RCEP. But it seems to pose a potential issue of whether are we dealing here with compliance with the nation's laws in order to operate with it or complying with a censorship regime, which - and, you know, let's get more into the details and we'll get back to the BC on this. But it's I think a significant one to ponder.

Steve DelBianco: Right, because censorship occurs at nation's borders; they fully control their conduct and content that reaches their citizens. But that's at the edge of the Internet and we don't want to do anything to try to bring censorship more into the core of the Internet. So let's try to resist that trend in the comment we put together.

Tim thanks again for the initial draft. And look forward to circulating a draft after the four of you, and that includes Aparna, Andy and Phil, can put this together into a single comment. Even if there has to be asterisk that will address the censorship piece a little later it might be good to circulate based on

Tim's draft the technical aspects of a proxy entity within China with respect to EPP and RDDS and get that out while we're also considering the censorship one.

Okay, Andy, your hand is still up.

Andy Abrams: No, it's not. I'll put it down.

Steve DelBianco: Okay. Well the next and final one on this list is something I want to thank Andy Abrams for doing. This is yet another RCEP request for a batch of new gTLDs who want to release their country and territory names. And there's a handful of them that are generic TLDs like dotStudy and dotCourses. But there are brand TLDs in there for Lamborghini, Volkswagen, Bugatti and Audi.

So, Andy, thank you once again, by taking previous comments you've drafted for us and that we've approved, and then adapting them to this new mix batch. So, Andy, if you needed to add anything to that you can but the rest of you should have seen it when I circulated it along with the policy calendar last night. Any questions for Andy? And, Andy, thanks again for that.

The last two comments aren't due until further out in the future so I won't address them at this point. I'll give you a 30 second update on our reconsideration request.

You recall this summer the BC was really concerned that when ICANN renewed .travel and .cat, they imposed the uniform rapid suspension or URS. And that's a very valuable -- we think -- a very valuable rights protection mechanism but it's never been subject to a PDP or any bottom up policy development.

So the BC objected to the process of imposing mechanisms that had never been part of a PDP. ICANN persisted and then approved all three registry agreements for cat, pro and travel.

And so the BC joined the Non-Commercial Stakeholders Group, which is quite rare, in filing a reconsideration request. Reconsideration request went in the middle of October and ICANN is supposed to respond. The Board is supposed to respond roughly a month later.

I just checked in recently and they claim that they'll take this up in early January of 2016. So we're watching closely to try to ensure that ICANN doesn't take any action to repeat this mistake. But we are anxious to get our answer to our reconsideration request. And I'll give an update as soon as one comes in.

And then let me turn now to Channel 2, which is support for what happens in Council. What I have here on the screen in the policy calendar is I'm going to turn it over to Phil and Susan as our Councilors and I have a link there to the previous Council meeting, which was December 17. And I have a link to the agenda and motions for the upcoming Council meeting on the 14th.

And the main topic - in fact other than all other business is practically the only topic for this Council meeting is this resolution I discussed earlier where GNSO will come up with its endorsement, support, opposition or concern on the CCWG for Accountability's third draft proposal.

So Phil, I'll go to you first.

Phil Corwin: Yes. Thanks Steve. A couple comments here and then we'll let Susan chime in. First of all, on the sub team - the GNSO sub team you referred to that's developing the pieces of the draft resolution to be considered on the CCWG Accountability proposal on - at the meeting on the 14th.

I'm not the head of that. I'm one of the few participants. It's the Council Chair James Bladel, Vice Chair Donna Austin, Ed Morris from the NCSG, Paul McGrady from the IPC and Keith Drasek from the registries.

And we've divvied up the recommendations. Our process is we're looking at the statements filed by all the constituent parts of the GNSO seeing, you know, where their support was full, conditional, requiring significant change. And we're trying to put that together.

Each of us have been assigned to two pieces and we're supposed to put drafts, get drafts in by the end of the week. We have a follow up call of that sub team next Monday and then the full Council meeting to consider a draft resolution stating our position as a chartering organization.

We'll be on Thursday. I would anticipate that at least for a number of the recommendations there will be, you know, we will want some significant changes before we're ready to completely sign off. And we're doing this in the expectation that there will be a supplemental version of that proposal and that these are meaningful comments that can influence the shape of that.

I also will give a warning that at least on some things, particularly the NCSG, they are very much opposed to making the advisory committees and particularly that GAC part of the empowered community. And depending on how the NomCom rep votes on our side of the house, we may not be able to

get approval for - at least for Recommendation 11 involving the GAC and Stress Test 18.

I don't want to predict that but I just want to give people a heads up that that may occur. Let me stop there and see if there's any questions about the GNSO approach to putting a resolution together before I address some of the other stuff here.

All right. Not seeing, getting hands or hearing anything, let me forge on. At the December meeting we adopted a number of resolutions. One was endorsement of the applicants for the CCT Review Team. I under- you know, and I am aware of the BC efforts to add one additional person to that.

We adopted the resolution on the PDP for new gTLD subsequent procedures. I think we still have the charter for that group ahead of us. Is that correct Susan? And I right on this?

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes.

Phil Corwin: Right. So yes, so in terms of what's coming up, the meeting of the 14th will be devoted entirely to considering our draft resolution and on the accountability proposal.

I think on the 21st we'll probably be taking up the actual charter for that subsequent round PDP. We've also been advised by staff that around the 11th we can expect a final staff report on the review of all RPM for all TLDs.

It's my personal view, and we'll see how other members at Council feel that that's such an important issue and so complex just in terms of how it's going to be structured where the BC is among a number of groups that requested a two

part sequential approach to that with the new TLD RPMs being reviewed first and UDRPs second.

I'm just very dubious that we can - maybe we can start a discussion of that on the - at the meeting of the 21st. But I don't see how we can finish it. I think that's one that's going to lay over till February at the earliest. And I'll stop there and defer to Susan for further comments on work of the Council.

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes. There does seem to be some confusion on the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group and then the RPM Review Working Group. And obviously anything to do with the new gTLDs would be discussed in that first - the Subsequent Working Group.

But I really feel that RPMs deserve their own deep review. And so we should not - there was some discussion at the last Council meeting about the new gTLD RPMs be discussed only in the Subsequent Procedures Working Group.

And I think we should - they can discuss them but really it needs to be a deep dive in the RPM Review Working Group. So I had proposed some, you know, some thoughts on that at the meeting. And Phil and I were going back and forth with that.

And Steve Chan has proposed language for the charter that clarifies that also. So unless the BC has a different stance and I'm just not seeing this correct, that's something we need the BC to weigh in on. How does everybody else feel about that?

Steve DelBianco: Hey Susan, its Steve. If Steve Chan gives you new language, it'd be great to circulate that via the BC list so we can get you some feedback prior to the next Council meeting.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay. Will do that.

Phil Corwin: Yes. And just chiming in, I took a quick look at that language yesterday. It does seem to make clear that the subsequent round PDP is not supposed to get into the RPMs. That is for the RPM review PDP.

You know, we don't want two different groups coming up with different ideas for what those RPMs should look like for the second round. And so, you know, the subsequent procedures would deal with everything but the RPMs. But let's see how it goes within Council on that.

Susan Kawaguchi: Right.

Steve DelBianco: Yes. This is similar to those Whois initiatives that we discussed earlier on the call where we have related parallel processes with a lot of overlap. Phil and Susan, thank you very much for that. We'll now pop over to Channel 3, the CSG and the topic of the intersessional, which I think Cheryl, you and Chris were going to walk us through the logistics as well as topical selections for the intersessional.

Cheryl Miller: Sure. Yes. The intersessional planning is ongoing and I think it's moving along well. We had a call this morning. And so I just want to highlight a couple key items particular for those who are attending.

First, if there have been any issues with respect to your travel, Rob had requested that you keep both he and Benedetta in the loop because there are some things that they may be able to help change for you such as extra overnight stays depending on, you know, when your flight leaves and any issues related to that.

So if you do have any of those issues, please don't feel that there's no resolution for that. We can move forward and try to make sure that you've got good accommodation there.

They're also working on Board participation and possibility the participation of the new CEO. They should know more about the Board participation next week. I think they've received some positive responses from Carlos, Wolfe and Marcos.

Also with respect to - I know we've been having a little bit of a discussion on a possible CSG dinner and possibly a BC meeting. Rob just requests that we let them know ASAP if - especially if we need any sort of a room arrangement with respect to the ICANN offices.

I think they're planning for perhaps one to two activities to actually take place at ICANN's offices. There's a discussion of a possible reception on the evening of the 3rd. They would sort of time that with the understanding that folks may want to go to dinner so possibly do a reception before the dinner that evening.

With respect to the schedule, Steve has very kindly included some of the topics that are currently being under review for discussion that are on the schedule right now.

And as you can see, those include the different process for selecting the GNSO Board member, GNSO review, et cetera. In addition to each of those topics, Rob mentioned that there is room for four additional slots to be discussed.

And one of the items that came up that seemed to get some positive feedback was the new format for the meeting in Panama. So perhaps something around that; a discussion including sort of public meeting matters.

So to the extent that there are other topics that we feel that should definitely be in one of those four slots, let's please get some input on that so we can help to finish shaping that.

Another item was the discussion of a possible output, perhaps a communique of some sort or some expression of goals. And so I did mention it could be good for us to just take a quick peak back and see what it was that we thought our goal - at least within the BC what we thought our goals were in the last intersessional and figure out whether or not we feel we reached those or if, you know, there's something that we still need some follow up on there.

In addition, for the different sessions that will be ongoing Rob would like to have a similar arrangement as we had last year where three - if - for those who attended, you may remember there were co-Chairs who sort of pushed forward the policy - the different discussions, made sure that there was an adequate balance between presentation and opportunity for interaction and dialog and discussion.

And so for those who are attending, if anyone is interested in being a co-Chair, please let me know. And if there's a specific topic that you'd particularly like to be a co-Chair for, please let us know and we can make sure that that gets through to Rob.

Phil and Marilyn were also on the call. Thanks so much for your participation. Please jump in. I don't - I'm not sure if there's anything that I've left out. But please feel free to add your thoughts as well. Thank you.

Phil Corwin: Phil here. Cheryl, that is a great report. I don't have anything of substance to add. I'm not eager to be a co-Chair but if there's a suitable slot where my presence as a co-Chair would be useful, I'd be happy to volunteer for that as we further develop the schedule.

Cheryl Miller: Great. Thank you. The last thing I would just mention, I now that Rob mentioned with respect to how we schedule the dinner that night; I think it's just important that we know the restaurants will not be in walking distance. The hotel itself is just a few blocks from ICANN offices. But we just need to factor that in in terms of timing for that evening. So thanks.

Chris Wilson: Good. This is Chris. I know Denise has her hand raised. So Denise, you want to go ahead and ask your question?

Denise Michel: Thank you. It would be great if you let ICANN staff know to make arrangements or reservations now for a CSG dinner. I think we all agree that that would be a good use of the night of February 3 after the reception. And I think they need a little bit of lead time to find a place that allows us to have good conversation in addition to dinner.

I would also suggest that we act now to identify the key ICANN staff that we want engaged with these two days and try and nail that down as soon as possible.

In addition, and I - I'm happy to resend the notice if you want on that email thread. This seems to be a very packed agenda. And so time management in a discussion will be important.

But it would be great also if we put out issue of that facilitated progress on the email list so if there are issues for example such as process for selecting the Vice Chairs or issues like that that we could, you know, potentially reach closure on and not face-to-face time addressing. I don't know if that's feasible but that would be great as well. Thanks.

Chris Wilson: Great. Thank you. This is Chris. Thank you Denise. I appreciate that. And we'll, you know, we'll - those that will be attending the intersessional we can start having offline conversations about the logistical minutia going forward.

But I think for purposes of the BC or At Large, let's - if there are topics that aren't listed there that you think are worthy of raising from a BC's perspective, then please let me, let the Executive Committee know and we can see what we can do to push it forward.

So should be a productive meeting. And we'll of course keep everyone in the loop as to what is discussed and so forth. So thanks very much. Phil, Susan, we wrapped - we've finished Council stuff I presume. Is there anything else we want to talk about that hasn't been covered already?

Susan Kawaguchi: Thanks Chris. This is Susan. I did want to bring up the letter that - and language that Denise proposed for sending to the selectors of the CCT review and make sure that we all are on board with sort of - at least I was outraged at the gender diversity that was not selected on the CCT review.

And ensure that the BC is on board in general with sending that letter to the selectors. I'm not sure I - and to be honest, I haven't followed the last couple of days of the drafting and the revisions. But is that - are other people on board with sending that?

Denise Michel: And this is Denise just to elaborate. We did have a few very good comments on the list. They were incorporated in the second draft, which was sent to the list yesterday. That around names to select.

Chris Wilson: Great. Thanks. This is Chris. Thank you Denise and Susan for that. I think, you know, I happen to think the letter is worthwhile. Whether it gets us anywhere or not, you know, obviously is to be determined. But I think it's - I think it's worth at least making it clear our angst with the process and how it played out.

So but if others feel differently, now would be the time to say so. But I think taking into the consideration the edits that have been - that have been offered, yes, I think the letter makes sense to send. But do we want to set a deadline for folks to provide final feedback on this? What do you all want to do in terms of sending it; what timeframe? We looking to send it I guess obviously sooner rather than later.

Denise Michel: Yes. This is Denise. I think expediency is important. In this case there are member reporting making arrangements. So if we - I think it's important to do it this week and choose what I would say. And then I think - I don't know if there's a protocol in the BC in terms of how the structure of the letter or how it's signed. I would just note that as well.

Also, jump in one more time. If the BC is comfortable with sending this letter, then I would after its sent I think we would informally follow up to discuss this further with the appropriate ICANN people.

Chris Wilson: So this is Chris. I think and I send a notice to Steve's comment in the chat. I think I agree. I think getting this out as soon as possible makes sense. Maybe

we - you know, I think people had a chance to look at the letter the last couple days. I think - again, my - I feel comfortable that the BC is okay with it.

So I think we should go ahead and finalize it and get it ready for me to send, you know, maybe by tomorrow morning if that's doable for you all. And we can - we'll circulate the final copy to everybody so they can have it as well. But I think that to me makes the most sense. Other thoughts on that?

Cecilia Smith: And so this is Cecilia.

Chris Wilson: Of course.

Cecilia Smith: Hi. Hi - sorry. I'm in transit right now. I just want to say a thank you to everyone who's supporting this letter for, you know, all the different reasons that this - again, thank you for the support.

Chris Wilson: Great. Okay. Not hearing any - Denise, you still have you hand up. Is that an old hand?

Denise Michel: Yes it is.

Chris Wilson: Okay. Not seeing - and Jennifer, thank you. I noticed in the chat you made some comments and I think we'll work on that. So I think we're good to go on that. We'll finalize the letter and have it - and I will send it out tomorrow - by tomorrow morning. And we'll keep folks posted on developments in that regard.

We're running really close to the top of the hour or the bottom of the hour to say. You know, I draw people's attention real quickly to what emails I sent out recently on the - with regard to the GNSO Review Team. We do need the two

BC reps or at least one BC rep ideally to replace Ron Andruff and Stephane who left. So people please think about that.

And also lastly, the PDP - we need participants and volunteers on the PDPs that are coming out including the one on the new Whois stuff. And I know I've got a couple folks that have said they're going to be at least observers to that and maybe at least a participant or two.

But just keeping people tuned into that. I think that's open until the end of January for folks to volunteer to be on that. So please look at my emails from earlier this week on those issues. Susan, Phil, anything else left on Council?

Phil Corwin: Nothing for me Chris. It's not timely yet but when that RPM review PDP gets started, I'd be happy to - I plan to be quite involved anyway so I'd be happy to, you know, watch that and participate on behalf of the BC.

Chris Wilson: Great. Thank you Phil. Okay. Let's move on. Cheryl, you've already - I think we've covered CSG for - let's go ahead. And Jimson, perhaps you can spend a minute or two and provide update on operations and finance.

Jimson Olufuye: Okay. Thank you Chris. And Happy New Year everyone. This is Jimson Olufuye from Operations. Let me first welcome a new member, Microboss from Nigeria, and...

Chris Wilson: Jimson, you there?

Jimson Olufuye: Okay. Hello.

Chris Wilson: Yes. Okay. We hear you now. We lost you for a second.

Jimson Olufuye: Yes. Yes. I have to speak to the Adobe room.

Chris Wilson: Okay.

Jimson Olufuye: Okay. So I just welcoming Microboss and Symantec, and from Nigeria our new members. There are a number of resources available on the BC Web site so for you to review especially on policy position of the BC.

In addition, I'd like to request members to take a look at our new BC Web site and provide feedback to me. We need volunteers to tell us a catch phrase or sentence why they're a member of the BC. I would like to place about two to three of these phrases on the Web site. So if you'd like to be part of that, we suggest just let us know. Just a brief sentence or catch phrase why you remain a member of the BC. We'll post it on the Web site.

The process of securing employee tax ID numbers, EIN, for the BC is still ongoing. We're having a little challenge because happily it is that the petition clause needs embedded in the charter. So the ExCom is picking this up. I will then have a meeting after this call and we will continue to respond or resolving the matter, the case may be. I also thank Jimson and Chris the Chair for the effort this regard.

I now take up plan for ICANN 55 just to let us now and Mark will be providing more details at the next meeting. Then also on FY16 budget requests, you know, we did requested for - we did request for policy assistance. For this policy assistance is guide member.

So I had a call with Rob today and there's a framework already in place but they got to get back to us concerning that policy assistance. That will help us clean up policy, documentation and review.

Then the last part of my brief presentation is on finance and I would like to proceed all members - members that are on the list now, they are fully paid and BC accounts plans about 109 733 euro - 109 733 euro.

The process of completing budget requests for FY17 has started. And I'm happy to inform you that our last public intervention, at ICANN 54 in Dublin, articulated the need for more funding have yielded very positive results. Because the proposal is for FY17, none of our outreach proposal will be rejected or we going to have to make a choice of the two being outreach efforts we try to make.

That is five CROPP- finance support for for five travelers. It is something we're doing for outreach. And two, one of the things drawing support for outreach. So those two main outreach options. We'll have to decide out of either of the two. But right now they will be available in FY17. We want to do more outreach inside developing countries.

So I will say that. Thank you for listening and over - back to you Chris.

Chris Wilson: Thank you very much Jimson. I appreciate that report. In the final minute I will simply say real quickly I'm going to have lunch on Monday with Chris Mondini who's Vice President for Stakeholder Engagement in North America.

And if there are any issues - I intend to talk to him hopefully if he can provide any insight on the next CEO. That would be helpful. But if there are any other issues that folks want me to raise in my capacity as BC Chair with him, please email me cwilson@21cf.com and I'm happy to do so.

But other than that, I thank everybody for their time. And will next have our next call on January 21, same time. And look forward to further engagement with everybody. So thanks very much.

END