

ICANN

**Moderator: Chantelle Doerksen
March 30, 2017
10:00 am CT**

Ash: The recordings have started.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, Ash. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody. And welcome to the BC call on the 30th of March 2017.

On the call today we have Nivaldo Cleto, Chris Wilson, Steve DelBianco, Jimson Olufuye, Cheryl Miller, Susan Kawaguchi, Barbara Wanner, Andy Abrams, Alison Simpson, John Berard, Andrew Harris, Marie Pattullo, Phil Corwin, Hibah Kamal-Grayson and Isabel Rutherford.

We received apologies from Paul Mitchell, Tim Chen, Marilyn Cade, Jay Sudowski and Claudia Martinuzzi.

From staff we have Chantelle Doerksen who will be joining us very shortly and myself, Nathalie Peregrine.

I would like to remind you all to please remember to state your names before speaking for purposes of the transcript. Thank you ever so much.

And over to you, Chris.

Chris Wilson: Thank you, Nathalie. And thanks, everyone, for taking the time to be on the call today. Hopefully those that were traveling from Copenhagen had safe travels back to your respective homes.

I think we had a good meeting in Copenhagen, some good interactions with ICANN staff and others and look forward to building upon that - those engagements the rest of the year. So why don't I go ahead and turn to Steve to discuss the policy calendar and we can move from there?

Steve DelBianco: Thanks, Chris. It's Steve DelBianco here. I only have a couple of updates since the last meeting we held in Copenhagen on filings. And that is that on the 24th of March we filed a comment on the independent review of the ALAC, the At-Large Community.

And we thank Ari and Gail from Internet Association, Tim Smith, Lawrence, Hibah for the drafting that we've done on that. I think it's really a constructive set of comments about the ALAC review.

And we took the great opportunity to point out that ALAC ought to cooperate with the commercial stakeholders as opposed to what the recommendation was which was cooperation with the non-commercial stakeholders.

And I think we're going to need to continue to build relationships with ALAC. They're not going away. And I think this review will probably cause some turnover in the leadership ranks of the ALAC so we need to build those relationships over time.

And then we turn to the current ICANN public comments. This is right here on the bottom of page one on the screen in front of you. This is also in the policy calendar I circulated two days ago and then an update I sent around yesterday.

The first one is on improvements to ICANN's transparency. And these are recommendations which came out of Work Stream 2, the Cross-Community Working Group on ICANN accountability. Chris Wilson was Co-Rapporteur of that group and fortunately, Andrew Harris, John Berard, Jay Sudowski all volunteered and drafted a BC comment.

It's the fourth attachment to the policy calendar. If you wish, you can bring it up.

And since we have - certainly we have John, Andrew on the call, I think Jay is on vacation and Chris is on the call of course, this would be a great opportunity to discuss that because the comment is due on April the 10th. So we have an adequate review period but this is probably our last chance to discuss it live.

Again, it's the fourth attachment. I thought that John, Andrew and Jay did a fine set of recommendations. Chris, please.

Chris Wilson: Thanks, Steve. This is Chris. I took a quick look at the draft comment and thought it was great and appreciate the support I think the BC is willing to put behind those recommendations.

I know there was one I think, one particular recommendation that I think the BC may want changed. And I don't think it's, you know, terribly controversial. But I - you know, that - I can reach out to my co-rapporteur

with regard to that particular recommendation and see what - you know, what we can work on there. There may be others in the public sphere who have comment about that as well.

But I thought - overall I thought it was a good comment and just appreciate the support for those recommendations that were highlighted.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks, Chris. I want to note that Michael Karanicolas, the Co-Rapporteur with you on the CCWG group, have provided five exclusive reasons that a meeting could be closed. And it's possible that those same reasons could be imported into the discussion of the recommendation on DIDP. And since they came from Michael, he ought to be very receptive to that.

Do you think that those five specific reasons -- and I can relay all of this to the drafters -- do you think those five specific reasons belong in the report someplace?

Chris Wilson: Yes, that's a good suggestion, Steve. And I thought - maybe we should suggest that. You know, I could do it obviously offline to him. But maybe if the BC wants to suggest that, I see nothing wrong with that. And I can put that forward to him. You know, I see no reason why not.

Steve DelBianco: For any of you want to see the reasons, they're on page six on the attachment that I sent you in the policy calendar. It's the third attachment which was the SO and AC accountability report. I'll just quickly recap them.

These would be reasons: trade secrets or sensitive commercial information where the disclosure would cause harm to legitimate commercial interests; strategic planning whose disclosure would compromise the efficacy of the chosen course; information whose disclosure would constitute an invasion of

personal privacy such as medical records; the fourth is information whose disclosure has the potential to harm the security and stability of the Internet; and finally, information that if disclosed would be likely to endanger the life, health or safety of any individual or prejudice the administration of justice.

Those are the reasons given. And Michael Karanicolas would probably be amenable to that. So I would ask John and Andrew, do you have an interest in maybe adding those to the comment as well?

Andrew, go ahead.

Andrew Harris: Hey, Steve. Yes, thanks, Steve. It's Andrew. I mean, from my perspective, almost all of those are no-brainers and so I think they make sense.

My only question was on the second, about the strategic planning. I - to me that was a bit of an outlier and I don't really see how it fit in with the others. So if others have thoughts on that and why it's appropriate, I think that makes sense. I'm a little curious about that one. The others I think are obvious and I would be supportive of including them in the draft.

Steve DelBianco: Great. And when Michael gave us those comments, those were used as justification to close the BC meeting, justification to close a meeting of the BC.

So I can see where the strategic positioning of the BC is something we won't want to close, for instance our strategic positioning on a policy matter or the election of board seat 14. So it's probably appropriate for that, Andrew, but not appropriate for ICANN as an entity.

So I would say, ICANN and John, if you'll look at the third attachment page six, you can pick and choose from among those five, having a lot of confidence that Michael Karanicolas, Chris' Co-Rapporteur, would be agreeable to them since those are things that he offered to the CCWG just last week.

Andrew and John, thanks again for the drafting and, Chris, for being the Rapporteur.

Any other comments from BC members? Great.

So John and Andrew, probably look for a revised draft over the next few days but we ought to be on schedule to get this filed by the 10th of April.

All right, the second item on our list is internationalized domain name implementation. These are guidelines, go to the board for approval. So it's very late in the game. The board will be likely to approve it.

And it's only covering GTLDs who offer IDN domains at the second level. And it's only offered as a best practice for CCTLDs because, well, ICANN can never tell the CCs what to do.

Now keep in mind that IDN domains are not just the IDN GTLDs. There are several GTLDs that have Latin script at the end like .com that do permit IDNs left of the dot. It's rather awkward for an end user, a business user, to type that in, you know, Arabic characters to the left of the dot and .com to the right or Chinese characters. So it's not very practical but it does happen. There were as many as a million IDN domains in .com two years ago.

Do we have a level of interest in the BC to advise the board on these IDN guidelines?

If we have no volunteers, we won't be commenting on this one. The comments close the 17th of April.

Denise Michel, you had mentioned that perhaps one of your contacts at Apple would be interested in getting engaged in this. I believe that's something you mentioned when we were together in Copenhagen. Did I hear that right?

Denise Michel: Hi, Steve. I did not follow up on that but I will contact them today and get back to you on the list.

Steve DelBianco: Oh, fantastic. Thanks, Denise. All right, I see no other comments. We may not be participating on this one.

The third one up is an interim report on country and territory names at the top level.

And this is a controversial clash between I guess the business community, the GTLD community and governments or GAC where governments want to have significantly greater power than they had in the last round on being able to block geo names at the top level.

And again, it's not just country and territories. I think the GAC has a broader proposal.

And we in the BC objected to that back in 2014 when the GAC was coming up with their proposal.

So territories, regions, names of rivers, all of these things could fall within what the GAC has in mind. So I think that we ought to be filing a comment on this. Now they close the 21st of April.

We have some time but we do need some volunteers that will work on that. And this would be a great opportunity for volunteers who haven't been engaged on BC comment drafting before.

This is a relatively easy one to get your arms around and it's really only with respect to what are we going to do in future rounds about the use of country and territory names to the right of the dot with new GTLDs. This would be a great time to step up and volunteer. You'll get lots of assistance from me and others who have drafted BC comments before.

Andy Abrams: Hi, Steve. This is Andy Abrams. I'm happy to volunteer to be the drafter here.

Steve DelBianco: Grateful for that, Andy, but it would be great to get some new people involved since you're the drafter of so many of our comments. Andrew Harris, do you want to get in the queue or are you also volunteering?

Andrew Harris: Yes, just volunteering, thanks.

Steve DelBianco: All right. And both of you are consistent volunteers of the BC. Let's have somebody new join Andy and Andrew. It'll be a great learning experience.

Barbara, you're in the queue?

Barbara Wanner: Yes. No, I'm happy to join forces with Andy and Andrew on this, if that helps.

Steve DelBianco: Great. Do we have members from Latin America that could also join since a good deal of this is coming from Latin American governments? It would be great to have that sensitivity in the group of drafters.

Nivaldo, perhaps your phone is on mute? I'm putting the pressure on to get a volunteer.

All right, at least we have three. And Nivaldo is typing into the chat. So I'll wait for that. Okay, the next comment then... Okay great, thank you, Nivaldo. We'll include you, Barbara, Andrew and Andy. Thank you.

The next one is a set of draft recommendations -- this is a relatively easy one - - on good faith standards. This is number four on the policy calendar.

And what is this about? Well part of the new bylaws gave the community, us, the ability to remove directors of ICANN's board. And Work Stream 2 of the transition said that the community should develop some standards for acting in good faith if we were to step up and say it's time to remove a board member.

This is a very brief comment. It's very easy to look at the good faith guidelines and say they make sense. And I think the BC should comment on them to - I think that - to show support for the idea that the community has a consciousness of what it is in good faith to spill a board member or even the whole board.

The point of this was to avoid having a personal dislike be the driver behind removing a board member. So I think that they made eminently good sense. And I would recommend that the BC endorse the good faith standards they

came up with. And I have a link to them right there if anybody wants to review.

So as your Policy Coordinator, I will circulate a one-line comment to say that we would endorse it in time for the - April 24. I'll give you all a chance to object or amend and I'll do that.

All right, next one is the draft report of the Review Team established under the bylaws to assess competition, consumer trust and consumer choice in the new GTLD expansion. This is a significant, 50-recommendation, very long report.

And our own Waudo Siganga was on that review team and Waudo was good enough to circulate some guidance for BC comments that I circulated again today.

While we were in Copenhagen, Tim Chen, Tim Smith, Aaron Olla and Susan, you all volunteered to draft a BC comment. We have some time. But I want to alert you of the fact that there's a Webinar conducted by ICANN on Monday, the 3rd of April.

And I included a link to the announcement of that Webinar in an e-mail I sent out this morning. I circulated it to all of BC in the hopes that others would volunteer to help as well.

So are there any questions for the drafters or comments and additional volunteers?

All right, seeing none, I have just a couple more. The ICANN fiscal year '18 and five-year budget op plan has been circulated for comment. They're not

due until the 28th of April. But Jimson already circulated an initial draft to Marilyn Cade, Chris Chaplow and I this morning. And he did include the BC's priority that funding for the open data initiative be adequate.

Now Jimson, I wanted to note that in your draft we said we could not find the identification of that funding. And I trust your judgment on that. If it were there, you'd find it.

But I'd like to see if other BC members recall that David Conrad told us that the amount is about \$200,000. Do you recall him telling us that on Tuesday in Copenhagen? Anybody else recall that number?

Jimson Olufuye: Yes, I do, Steve, but I couldn't trace it in the budget.

Steve DelBianco: Jimson, I would - thank you. Jimson, I would ask then that in that paragraph of your draft that we indicate that we heard in Copenhagen from David Conrad that it was roughly \$200,000.

First of all, we don't see that in the budget. And second, we're not sure that's adequate to meet the community's expectations on the rollout of open data initiative which is a point you already have in your draft.

So let's go ahead and cite the numbers since it will provoke ICANN to be a little more transparent. I mean, if David knows the number, Jimson, it ought to be part of the budget somewhere that everyone else can see.

Jimson Olufuye: Yes...

Steve DelBianco: And thank you, Chantelle, if you can find it. Chantelle is going to find the exact part of the transcript when David spoke to us and that'll be very helpful.

And then one other question, Jimson. You note that ICANN's reserves are only half or even less than half of their 12-month operating cost and you note that it ought to be higher according to like industry standards and corporate practices and maybe even ICANN's own funding policy. You note there that - recommend that this should be higher consideration in the disbursement of the auction proceeds.

But let me ask you, how is there any interaction between auction proceeds that are on reserve and ICANN's operating funding? Do you see those funds as being mixable?

Jimson Olufuye: Well, like when we're talking about ICANN as an organization in terms of its financial stability, so auction proceeds is in the hand of the community, as we know, there's a charter to - for the group to determine the future of that.

So if we, the community, will make decisions about our auction proceeds will be involved, then I think we need to pick up difference of the greater need of the organization, the reserve fund before any major pending consideration. So there's join - there's a nexus.

Steve DelBianco: Yes. I could agree with that. But in the chat I was going to make a statement to see whether you would agree. I think that the auction proceeds should be reserved pending the community's decision on how to use those funds which is pretty much what you just said.

Jimson Olufuye: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: I added the statement that the auction proceeds should not be considered as being available for ICANN's operating costs. Would you agree with that, Jimson?

Jimson Olufuye: Well, yes, that's okay. But of course, with our fund it's a form of - is part of the operation fund for the organization itself. There is no real part of the basic operation fund, yes, that's okay.

But let me also add this that with respect to operational costs or a percent fund, that is quite stable. They have enough operating funds for the next three months so - which is the requirement. So that is okay. That is covered. But for the 4.9 million USD...

Steve DelBianco: Yes, I understood. But if you agree with the statement that I have in the chat, I think we would need to revise your draft so that we're not implying that auction proceeds have any relevance to the adequacy of ICANN's reserve. You good with that?

Jimson Olufuye: Okay.

Steve DelBianco: Okay, fantastic. Thank you, Jimson. And I appreciate your drafting on that. The rest of you will see that draft in the next week as our Drafting Team finishes it up.

We only have two other items on this list -- the new GTLDs' subsequent procedures. And this is the procedures the GNSO wants to use for the new - the next round or the next window that we open on new GTLDs. The comments close May 1st so we have over a month.

But the Working Group is seeking input on a questionnaire circulated. So this is relatively easy for the BC to address since the questionnaire guides how we react to it. There's an explicit set of questions we'll be able to come up with.

So it would be fantastic to get a few volunteers who want to help participate in guidance on that questionnaire for the next round of GTLDs. Do we have any volunteers on here whose companies are interested in the next round, for instance, whether you're interested for a brand or for the purpose of building out second-level domains or even for protecting your brand?

Is there anyone on the BC call who's got a lot of familiarity with the new GTLD subsequent procedures? Phil Corwin has done most of the work in the BC with regard to that working group.

Phil Corwin: Steve, this is Phil. I'd be happy to participate in this group. I'm just too - spread too thin right now to take the lead on this but I have been participating in most of the calls.

As Co-Chair of the RPM Review Working Group, we have to coordinate with the Subsequent Procedures Working Group. So I'd be happy to participate but I don't want to take the lead responsibility on the drafting here. But I'd be happy to work with someone else.

Steve DelBianco: Yes. Thank you, Phil. And that's a much better way to proceed. It's like Waudu is doing with the CTT and Chris Wilson with the transparency, is that it's a perfect opportunity to get some help.

And I see that Susan Kawaguchi has volunteered. That's wonderful. Thank you.

Phil Corwin: Great.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you. All right, the last one on here was the DNS market study for Africa, a report that was put out by ICANN. Again this is a carryover of Fadi Chehadé's view that ICANN should promote the establishment of registrars and registries in every part of the globe. It was a geographical spread of the businesses and it's not been the BC's view that that was appropriate for ICANN.

Our view had been that registrants and users from all over the planet ought to be able to get access to domain name services in any script, any language, anywhere in the world. But it doesn't really mean you have to do an economic development program to plant registrars in every region of the world.

So with that perspective in mind, we have over a month to get this done. And I'm so glad that Lawrence, Arinola, Waudo, all of you have volunteered already to draft that BC comment. And we've commented on similar market development studies in the past and I'll send you a setup on that so you'll see the previous comments that we've done.

All right, that's it for the BC policy calendar.

I did circulate something after Copenhagen, something that Denise led us on which was showing a lot of concern that the ICANN board will soon be asked to approve the base new GTLD registry agreement.

And we have some concerns that weren't addressed that may have been in scope and we're wondering whether the board of ICANN could be convinced to reconsider some things that were not addressed before they simply rubberstamp or approve the registries' new base agreement.

And it's attachment one to the policy calendar where I did my best to lay out for you the BC's concerns and how they might be addressed.

Since many of them didn't fit with the scope of what was suggested in this round, we can make a concern known to the board but immediately upon the approval of this base registry agreement, we can pressure ICANN to open another round of edits to the base registry agreement.

And we can actually, I wouldn't say dictate, but we can actually suggest what are the contract revisions that we'd like to be addressed. So there's no action item on there right now.

Phil Corwin, your hand is up.

Phil Corwin: Yes, Steve. I just want to note and I think I've sent a note to the BC list but I believe just after Copenhagen, Paul Diaz, the Head of the Registry Stakeholder Group, sent a proposal to (Akro Metel) asking that the - that a portion of the application fees for new TLDs be returned to the new TLD registry operators, basically slashing their registry fees by 75% for at least the next year. And this proposed base agreement is the contractual basis for that request.

So now that's the actual - we had the proposal, you know, in the proposed registry agreement for a process by which registries could ask for a fee reduction. We didn't know what the substance would be but now we know the substance of the ask from the Registry Stakeholder Group.

So I just wanted everyone on BC to be aware of those - how those two things tie together.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Phil. I recall that you circulated that last Tuesday, the 21st. And when I read it, I did not see any connection to the base new registry agreement. It looks to be that their proposal would exist whether or not there's a new base agreement. I do see the tie-in but they're not linking it to the new base agreement.

Phil Corwin: Well I was told by someone associated with a major new TLD operation that there is a tie. That's the basis for my belief.

Steve DelBianco: Okay.

Phil Corwin: I know it's not in the letter but I think there's some relationship. We should at least look into it.

Steve DelBianco: Okay. That letter itself went to ICANN, the GDD. It does not go through council but it is something that we would want to comment on.

What will be the policy development process, what would be the process that's used to respond to the letter from the registries? Any idea?

Phil Corwin: Personally, I have no idea what the proper process would be for that. Knowing the contracted parties, they'd probably take the position that it's not anyone else's business. That's their general position on everything like this.

Steve DelBianco: It is. It might be something that you and Susan can explore on the council call which is to just ask what happens next to that letter.

Phil Corwin: Okay.

Steve DelBianco: Denise Michel, your hand is up. Denise?

Denise Michel: Thanks, Steve. So the - there's a very well-established history of fees being addressed unilaterally by ICANN staff.

In noting the question of a policy issue, there has - there were comments in Copenhagen on various issues about something not being a policy issue therefore perhaps the constituencies or GNSO not having standing to be involved which is an erroneous way to address these issues.

There's a whole - of course a whole host of issues - that are not policy issues for which it's BC's right to indeed -- I think responsibility -- to be involved. The budget is not a policy issue. The IANA transition is not a policy issue.

When we're addressing template agreements like the RAA or of the base agreement for registries, those also aren't policy agreements but it's appropriate for the BC and indeed the GNSO to provide comments and guidance and to have a position.

So at the - fees are a little bit of a gray area, and I think the base agreement seeks to clarify the broad latitude staff has in reducing fees. And I think the issue that our previous letter on the base registry agreement raised was not at all to oppose the reductions but rather to ensure that just some minimum standards for abuse mitigation, security, stability were applied in considering a reduction of fees for new gTLD registries. So I think that's the issue that we're continuing to consider here. Thanks.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks Denise. All of you should read that link that Phil had circulated. And I have put it in the chat. It doesn't relate to the base new registry agreement. It relates to new gTLD operators who paid in to a fund where ICANN has an

excess. And they're seeking rebates or refunds of a lot of that as well as adjustments going forward.

But it's not part of the new base registry agreement and it's not clear how the community is going to be able to weigh in. So it's really a brief letter. It's only like four pages long. Let me encourage all of you to look at that.

And we look to Phil and Susan to give us some understanding about how that is going to be circulated. It looks as if the letter went from Paul Diaz only to ICANN staff. Has it been circulated on any of the council lists Susan and Phil?

Susan Kawaguchi: Not that I've seen.

Phil Corwin: Yes I don't recall it being circulated on council lists.

Steve DelBianco: All right, so it may not even be appropriate to bring up at council.

Susan Kawaguchi: We'll reach out to Marika.

Steve DelBianco: Mm-hm.

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes we can reach out before the council meeting and just on some of the process issues with it.

Steve DelBianco: Right, asking a couple...

Susan Kawaguchi: And then bring it up.

Steve DelBianco: ...process questions would be very helpful. Okay.

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you. Thank you. All right, that's it for what I had. Let me turn it over to Phil and Susan to discuss (Channel 2) on council.

Susan Kawaguchi: So this is Susan. Not much going on right now. We don't have the agenda for the next meeting. We did - we passed the motion to create the selection standing committee for review teams and GNSO positions. And that actually starts - the committee starts today.

And Phil I didn't check my e-mail but I volunteered but then I have to step out of it after this first meeting because I'm actually - I, you know, had applied for the WHOIS or the RDS review team. So I'm hoping that you can stand in for me on that selection process.

But what I do think is important about this committee is that we now have a standard process that'll be, you know - we'll modify it and review it after a few rounds of selecting candidates. But before, it to me was very ad hoc and not always transparent. And now we have a clear process on how roles are filled like the GAC rep from the GNSO and the review team candidates.

So hopefully we'll have more input on all of those selections than we've had in the past. And that's all I have. How about you Phil?

Steve DelBianco: Susan I think - Susan I wanted to clarify that I don't believe that I don't believe that - I believe staff has already verified it doesn't need to be a counselor who sits on that standing committee. So if there's need...

Susan Kawaguchi: Right.

Steve DelBianco: ...for stand-ins, we can actually tap into any BC member.

Susan Kawaguchi: That's true. That is true. I just sort of - Phil was in the room I think when you and I - we were all talking about it in Copenhagen, so...

Phil Corwin: Phil here. I'd be happy to have someone else - I'll replace Susan on that, but I'd be happy to have someone else take that over given the many other hats I'm wearing within ICANN at the moment.

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: Yes for BC members that think they could volunteer, this is a very - I think a very lightweight task. It's described in the motion, which is right at the bottom of the second page in the policy calendar. It was Susan's motion. Council passed it.

And it included an interim charter for this new standing selection committee. The committee will only have to convene when there's an opportunity to nominate GNSO reps on a review team, and there are only a few review teams each year that one would have to get involved in. So please consider that and let us know if other BC members are interested.

Phil Corwin: Yes and...

Steve DelBianco: Since I guess we're done with the council section we can turn it over (unintelligible).

Phil Corwin: Well just let me - very quick Steve - you know, we don't have the agenda for the next meeting on April 20. A couple other things had happened on March

15 in Copenhagen. There was a significant concern raised over the new EU general data protection regulation and how that might impact ICANN contracts with members of the Contracted Party House.

So Council's going to be looking into that. If BC members have background in that it would be helpful to have that input.

We replaced Jonathan Robinson with Erika Mann on the working group that's looking at the use of gTLD auction proceeds. He took himself out because of perceived conflict and see if there was anything else of significant importance.

Just a lot of discussion items and a meeting with Global Domain Division. But it wasn't a heavy duty meeting. That was the only vote, the one we already covered, and we don't have the agenda for the next meeting on April 20, so we can discuss that on the next BC call.

Steve DelBianco: Great. Barbara, Channel 3 on CSG.

Barbara Wanner: Okay, as Steve very kindly circulated my report of CSG meetings at ICANN 58 to you, so I won't go through it. You know, I invite you to go through it and offer any comments or questions that you have for me. I will say that overnight I received an important refinement from Jimson to the section that discusses our briefing with the ICANN CFO.

So I didn't want to create further confusion by circulating yet another revised copy of this report. So I will do so after this call. So the copy that you receive from me includes Jimson's revision to the section about our conversation with the CFO.

But I would say in general our meetings with the board and with board members sort of teed up a lot of the issues that we discussed on this call today, specifically our concerns about changes to the base registry agreement and our need for improved metrics and a sufficiently funded ODI project.

It was my first experience with a meeting between the CSG and the Contracted Party House and the registries and registrars. I felt like just kind of as an outsider coming in for the first time that there were great efforts made to try and find common ground.

And I think there were some issues on which there was common ground. The Contracted Party House for example shares many of our frustrations concerning the planning process for ICANN meetings. And I think they also provided Steve with some helpful feedback for the SO/AC accountability work stream that he's involved in.

But I'll just leave it there and invite any questions or comments for folks based on your reading of the report. Thanks.

Steve DelBianco: Barbara this is Steve. One quick question is regarding something that came out of the intersessional was the standing committee or a drafting team was in the Non-Contract Party House to focus on budget issues. You know, and we noted earlier that Jimson's already put together a draft.

Is there a way to stitch together the rest of the Non-Contract Party House in a way that we can have a comprehensive comment on the budget and (off plan)?

Barbara Wanner: Okay, shall I reach out to them and explore that? Is that what you're asking?

Steve DelBianco: Since it came out of a - it was an action item that came out of the intersessional. And I'm just wondering if we could politely inquire as to whether anything is going to be happening on that. Jimson you worked on this along with Ed Morris. Is there any update that you can provide, Jimson?

Jimson Olufuye: Yes thank you Steve. That's a very valid question. Let me – yes you recall Ed Morris and I chaired the budget discussion. And I did produce a draft report which I asked him to review before we send it to all stakeholders.

Up to this moment there's been no comment on that and the whole idea it makes sense for us to have a collaborative drafting team (if there were) issues.

But since there has been no response from Ed Morris even at the Copenhagen meeting, they said they wanted to invite me to their meeting so I can brief them on what we do in BC. But the invitation did not come, and it was nowhere discussed again after that time we (met) (sic) for the planned event.

So it was based on Ed Morris at least for budget. I don't think they are very (keen). But let's (keep our fingers crossed) and we are ready any time they want to work with us.

Barbara Wanner: Steve this is Barbara. I just wanted to offer one final update if we're finished with the budget item that you just raised.

Steve DelBianco: Yes thank you.

Barbara Wanner: No just concerning ICANN 59 travel support, Andrew Mack will be helping to represent the BC in Johannesburg. So I just wanted to update everybody on that.

Regrettably I have conflicts both personal and professional that will not enable me to attend, so Andrew Mack gets my travel support. I think we'll all be pleased with that because of his extensive experience in Africa when he worked in the development community. And that's it from me.

Chris Wilson: Thanks Barbara. This is Chris. Let me just – while we had the chance – you know, I was looking at number 1 there with regard to board seat 14. The CSG ExComm did have a call on March 21 right after Copenhagen to sort of have a meeting of the minds with regard to that board seat and in particular Matthew Shears.

At the time, Greg Shatan from the IPC mentioned that they had - the IPC had not - though strongly leaning I guess towards supporting Matthew they hadn't come to a definitive conclusion yet. And I think the expectation was that they were going to have one within the week or so from that call.

I have not heard from Greg. He hasn't sent out any note to the CSG ExComm list I guess on this matter so I might go ahead and ping him and see what the deal is.

I know he mentioned that the IPC wasn't going to have any formal meeting or call until well into April I think he said. So they were going to have to do it via e-mail. But I think the thought was - and you know I expressed on our call based on the feedback I received from members in Copenhagen after our CSG interaction with Matthew that the BC was supporting Matthew as the candidate above Markus.

And so that's where I think our position is going to be, and that's what I've told them, told both Wolf-Ulrich from the IFPCP and Greg Shatan from the IPC.

So I think we're waiting to get confirmation right now from the IPC as to whether they're fully supporting Matthew. And then of course we still need to work on process and that needs to be hammered out a little bit too with regard - A, certainly with regard to this particular board seat but then going forward as well.

You know, I had mentioned on that call that, you know, the bigger picture issue is what Steve has mentioned before is that we need to think about - strongly think about coming together with a plan for the next few years about working on increasing the GNSO board seats and getting - frankly getting the CSG its own board seat.

So that I think is going to have to be the overarching goal but in the meantime in the next few years while presumably Matthew is serving his term, his first term, you know, we'll need to work on that.

But I think it probably behooves the CSG ExComm to have set up another call in the near future to at least put out - think of an outline of a process that we can then circulate to the constituencies and get feedback from them on how to proceed.

In the meantime of course if people have thoughts based on what we've discussed in Copenhagen, it would be good to express them now or via e-mail to me and Steve and others as we sort of move forward on this. But I wanted to flag that for folks. Are there - I see Barbara, did you have your hand up?

Barbara Wanner: Yes. No thank you for providing that update Chris of that call that we were on. I guess I have a question for Steve and for you and for others that have

more experience with the CSG process in terms of this drafting terms of reference for the 2019 GNSO review.

I guess, you know, there was a lot of interest at the intersessional in sort of a collaborative approach to that, perhaps even reaching out to the Contracted Party House. But I guess we have to actually wait for that to be announced, right, the request for comment?

Steve DelBianco: Barbara, there won't be a request for comment. ICANN staff will undertake the review late 2018 and the board will put out an RFP, a request for proposal, for consultants.

Barbara Wanner: Okay.

Steve DelBianco: And we want to intervene so that our suggestions make their way into the RFP so that the terms of service, terms of reference, are dictated then. So that is not a public process.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr told me while we were in Copenhagen that ICANN staff and the Operational Effectiveness Committee on the board are trying to be more open about how they do that in the future. But I think the follow-up would be to go back to Rinalia...

Barbara Wanner: Okay.

Steve DelBianco: Markus and George Sadowsky, those are the three board members who were at the intersessional. And to be sure that they are aware – and maybe Rob Hoggarth as well – and make sure that they're aware that before the RFP is issued that they're on notice that the GNSO, the NCPH want to have something to say about the terms of reference.

Barbara Wanner: Okay, will do. Thank you for that clarification.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you.

Chris Wilson: So this is Chris, real quick before we move on to Jimson. I'll also say with regard to Barbara's announcement regarding travel funding for Andrew Mack, this is the BC ExComm had received a variety of different requests from BC members. And in some cases, those members were able to get funding elsewhere and so forth.

But I think in this case that the ExComm decided on Andrew Mack because of his strong volunteering work with the BC and the fact that he hadn't received funding for some time, I think maybe since last March in Marrakesh. So I just wanted the folks to know the process was a BC ExComm decision there.

And then quickly because sort of we've already discussed briefly I guess ICANN 59, I should say there is an SO/AC leadership call scheduled for next Wednesday, April 5 to further discuss planning and scheduling for ICANN 59. I think as folks may remember that there was an initial meeting in Copenhagen.

Steve was able to I think attend in lieu of me because I could not be there, (the ICANN59) meeting, and then there's going to be a follow-up meeting now on April 5 to further discuss planning for that meeting. So I will be on that call and will be able to report back to the BC about what transpired, this far scheduling is concerned for ICANN 59, so just be on the lookout for that. Any questions about that Barbara? I see your hand raised.

Barbara Wanner: Oh I'm sorry, that's old. I'll put it down.

Chris Wilson: Okay. Jimson, why don't we go ahead and turn to you?

Jimson Olufuye: Okay thank you very much Chris. As you know, the FY17 fiscal year for BC is gradually winding down, intend by 28th of June. And as we look forward to FY18, we need to begin to prepare invoices for members.

The finance committee met and made some recommendations to ExComm and recommendations with respect to like the fees paid by members and handling fees and a number for the administrative things that we do in BC.

So the ExComm will be meeting and decide on that either later today or in the course of the week. But once a decision has been made it will be communicated to all members. It will be at the meeting of April 15 or before then.

Invoices will be going out May 4 so that members could have about 60 days before we need to conclude that memberships renewed or not. So I know this will be true (an alternate form) respect to be true (to the Moolah payment) platform that's been integrated to MemberClicks that host our Web site.

For those members that still need special invoice to be sent to them, let us know once you receive the electric invoice. Some members would like to do wire transfer. It would be from their company policy, accounting policy and processes who have made that. By and large, members can readily pay online in a secure version at their own convenience.

Secondly, regard to outreach, we have an outreach currently going on in Kabul, Afghanistan. Want to thank the Outreach Committee led by Andrew Mack for their diligence in looking at this thoroughly. (And that's looking at

some) very important questions. So this has provided both for that event in Afghanistan. Its an IGF event. (Unintelligible) from the first one in Afghanistan.

And along with that event there is an outreach to businesses in Afghanistan (unintelligible) by BC. (Marilyn Cade) as we all know with member and with technician. Omar Ansari is our member and (facilitating) in Kabul. So I can actually speak now. I was supposed to speak there but - well I sent my presentation to them so (I need) to be here.

So secondly we also plan this outreach for Uganda. And there is an arrange also there in which one of us has been invited and can use the opportunity to create awareness and encourage business leaders to be part of what we do in ICANN.

And number 3, in respect to ICANN 59, we are looking at the BC outreach event in Jo-burg, plan for 25th to the outreach committee. I've started consultation on it. And in collaboration with AfICTA, we plan that we will invite the local business people in Jo-burg and across South Africa, also bringing some people from Southern Africa, even business support so that we can have a rich event in collaboration also with Mondini, Christopher Mondini and (unintelligible) you know.

So all this (is going on) and we couldn't believe at the end of it all we work to increase our membership and develop (necessary) support for policy work. So this is what I have for now. I don't know if there are questions. Thank you.

Chris Wilson: Thank you Jimson. Appreciate the update. I'm trying to get us to AOB. You'll see we have a gold notation for the BC charter update. Maybe Steve I'll turn to you. I think we've submitted our response to Rob in response to

comments that were filed. Additionally we approved, the BC approved some of those minor amendments to the charter I believe and notified Rob of that. Is there anything else we have as far as process goes on the charter Steve or Andy?

Steve DelBianco: Thanks Chris. Robert Hoggarth, we notified him that the BC had approved those small adjustments to the proposed charter. He wrote back saying thank you very much. He will incorporate this information into the staff report to the board's organizational effectiveness committee for the consideration at their next board meeting.

And then that committee will make the decision about whether to approve the proposed BC charter changes. He said they will work to update the publicly shared document to reflect the new amendments that we approved last week and they will keep us apprised as the board moves forward. Thank you.

Chris Wilson: Thanks Steve. Do we know when the next board meeting is?

Steve DelBianco: We can go online. I'll figure that out while you move on.

Chris Wilson: That's fine, just if you knew off the top of our head just to give us a sense of time, but that's fine. But I think we're making good progress there, so thanks to everyone who has been engaged on that. And thank you to those BC members who voted to approve those changes that were discussed in Copenhagen. Again, any other questions about that issue?

All right are there any - our next meeting will be April 13, two weeks from now. Are there any other issues though that haven't come up yet that folks want to raise before we close?

Okay seeing nothing then I thank everyone for their time and look forward to reaching out and discussing policy work between now and the 13th on our next call. So thank you all. Chantelle we can end the recording.

Chantelle Doerksen: Thank you Chris. Operator you may now stop the recording and BC ExComm members please stand by for your lines to be transferred. Thank you.

END