ICANN

Moderator: Chantelle Doerksen
April 13, 2016
10:00 am CT

Coordinator: Recordings are started. You may now proceed.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening and welcome to the BC Members call on 13 April 2017. On the call today we have Jimson Olufuye, Lawrence Olawale-Roberts, Isabel Rutherfurd, Mark Datysgeld, Tim Chen, Adetola Sogbesan, Kristina Olausson, Marie Pattullo, Steve DelBianco, Susan Kawaguchi, Hibah Kamal-Grayson, Denise Mitchel, Claudia Martinuzzi, Chris Wilson, Barbara Wanner, Paul Mitchell, Beth Allegretti, Phil Corwin, and Jay Sudowski.

Getting in their apologies was Andy Abrams, Cecilia Smith and John Berard. From staff we have myself, Terri Agnew and joining us shortly will be Chantelle Doerksen. I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking not only for transcription purposes but also to mute any lines when not speaking to avoid any background noise. With this I'll turn it back over to her chair Chris Wilson. Please begin.

Chris Wilson: Thanks Terri. Hey it's Chris Wilson here for the record. Thanks everybody for taking the time to dial in and be on the call. Before I turn to Steve for the

policy calendar I thought it'd good for me to go ahead and make a quick announcement to everybody not save it for the end when we get jammed up potentially jammed up for time. But this announcement is to let folks know that I notified actually the BC ExCom earlier this week that due to a change in my job duties at 21st Century Fox I need to step down as chair of the BC. I simply won't have the time and resources that are necessary to devote to being chair for the rest of the year. So I'll remain chair until we have a new election. Hopefully that a new election will occur in the very near future so we can get a new chair in place for the Johannesburg meeting at the end of June.

I won't be able to travel to Johannesburg so I couldn't do it even if I was still chair. So hopefully we'll have somebody in place and time for that meeting. I know Jimson and Chantelle are working on a logistics with regard to the new election so there'll be more to come there. In the meantime I'll remain chair until we get someone in place. But I wanted folks to know that unfortunately I can't serve out the full-term. I wish I could do it but my portfolio has changed enough where I have to devote my time and energy to some other areas.

So I just wanted to let folks know that. They'll be more to come on that I'm sure from Jimson and others about logistics but did want to alert folks to that right off the bat. Obviously happy to take questions now or later off line if folks have them. But again it's been a pleasure being chair, look forward to transitioning to the next chair whoever that person may be or whoever that person is will be great. But again this is also to say that I won't be totally leaving the BC. I'll still remain on the BC and engage with the BC going forward. But I just I can't commit to the time commitment necessary to be chair and the BC deserves someone that can fully be committed timewise and resource-wise to doing that. So I'll leave it at that and then, you know, Steve go ahead and turn to you on policy calendar and get the rest of the call going.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks it's Steve DelBianco. Chris like I said in the chat I think you've been outstanding chair and I'm very grateful for the leadership that you've dedicated to it and the time that it took. And you've become so efficient at chairing the BC that it's probably the - sort of a sad irony that now that you've got it down pat the company has changed, your employer's sort of change their priorities in ways that put ICANN at somewhat lower on the list. That's unfortunate to for us but I hope it turns out to be something really good for you in terms of your career and try to find a way to do what it is you do uniquely best over at Fox. But thank you for your leadership so far and look forward to continued participation.

I hope all of you will look hard at whether your to calendars can accommodate stepping up so that we can have a special election to put someone in place prior to the Johannesburg meeting. We verified that in Johannesburg the BC doesn't have to be the CSG leader. It's the IPC that will do that. So stepping into the chair role won't necessarily be drinking out of a fire hose when we get to Johannesburg. The BC will have a very commonsense focused policy agenda, won't have to do a lot of social and meeting planning and it'd be a great way to ease your way into the job of chair. So let's look for candidates to get involved. Chris would you be able to talk even off-line with people that are interested in what it takes to be chair?

Chris Wilson: Thanks Steve. Absolutely. This is Chris. Yes, happy to talk to anyone that's interested and give them the lay of the land if you will. And to your point to yes they Johannesburg meeting I guess you say a lighter lift if you will for the CSG and certainly the BC chair because to the extent there will be CSG activities it will be led again by the IPC. It really won't be until Abu Dhabi in October when the BC will be in charge of CSG activities. So we have a good ramp-up time between now and then for the next chair to get up to speed I think and get their feet wet, get his or her feet wet before October. And like I

said before I continue to be part of the BC so I'll always be here as a resource in a transition period butt also beyond for that next chair. So if you're interested please do reach out.

Steve DelBianco: All right thanks again Chris. So this is Steve and I'll try to focus tightly on the policy calendar and try to get through it quickly. Channel 1 is comments that we filed. And we filed one comment since our last call. That's at the top of Channel 1. And that's on April 20 Monday of this week we saw the comment on the CCWG's recommendation for improving ICANN's transparency. Now Chris was co-rapporteur of that group. And Chris I'm hoping you'll continue as co-rapporteur as you guys incorporate the comments that come back. Will that be something you'll be able to continue to do?

Chris Wilson: Indeed that yes, I intend to continue to see that through. And just for folk's edification the next transparency sub group call was I think scheduled for April 25, 1900 UTC at which point we'll be reviewing all the comments that have come in. I know a couple with including the PC I think that have yet to file but intend to file some comments. So I'll continue to be engaged with that subgroup until its conclusion.

Steve DelBianco: Chris I'm looking online to see how many were filed and it looks like only about five and if you add one more for the IPC so it looks like you'll have half a dozen comments to deal with right?

Chris Wilson: Yes I think that's right.

Steve DelBianco: Okay. I don't see any in March that were just –no there was one in March. No actually that was just from staff so you've got a half a dozen to do with but thank you Chris. Now let me thank Andrew Harris. John Berard, Jay Sadowski for drafting the BC comment. Jimson thank you for coming in at the

final hour I think with an improvement on making sure that we don't head down false accusations.

So this is an important one on transparency and it contains things that the BC had originally asked for in 2014. So it's great three years later to see things like this make their way into recommendations. These recommendations that come out of the Workstream 2 have a special significance. You're going to see eight more for the next five months. One of them is the one that I'm rapportuering on, SO and AC accountability. That will be published in 24 hours.

These are important because under the new bylaws they'll be adopted as part of the transition. Any recommendation that the community agrees to in Workstream 2 pretty much have to be implemented by the board. The board is allowed to object but it takes 2/3 of a board vote to object to any of these recommendations being implemented. And enter a consultation with a community and then vote again 2/3 to reject any of the recommendations.

So we have a very high bar that the community has more leverage than it had any other form of reviews as part of Workstream 2 recommendations. So this is a time to be bold when it comes to holding the corporation accountable to the community. So thank you all and that comment has been filed. Let me turn to Channel 2 which is the open public comment periods. There are already seven that are open right now and a few are going to close relatively soon. The first is this country and territory names at the top level. And let me sank Andy Abrams, Andrew Harris, Barbara and Nivaldo. Thank you for contributing. We have draft comments. It's first attachment to the BC policy calendar. And this common is due on the 21st of April. And so we've got plenty of time to do the full review. And I would ask BC members to take advantage of this call. If there are any of you that have questions about the recommendations

that have come back great time to bring them to the attention of the drafters we have on the call today. So we'll take a queue on that, just geographical names at the top level, not the second level, the top level.

Andy, Andrew, Barbara, Nivaldo, anything to add to it? My view as your policy coordinator it's a pretty complete comment. And I'm really not expecting a lot of edits to it over the next week and a half. I will note that Nivaldo while he's not on the call Nivaldo had some other ideas about territory names, geographic names for things like regions. And those were not accepted by the Drafting Team. And I support the Drafting Team at adopting some but not all of Nivaldo's recommendations. And I invited Nivaldo to comment on the full list with respect to his views so that all the BC members can get on board. Now the drafting team I believe was right to take just some of Nivaldo's suggestions because we are trying to keep with previous positions the BC has stated that countries and territories are one thing but names of regions, names of rivers, names of areas are not things that should be guarded by any particular sovereign government that has no legitimate or legal claim to those names. So I don't want to speak for Nivaldo but I'm trying to summarize the concerns that he raised and we'll see whether he can contribute to the list.

All right no other comments on that let me go to number two. Number two is the good faith standards. This is another of the Workstream 2 from transition one of the nine projects was to recommend what are the standards that the community would use if we tried to conjure one of our powers of the power to remove a director of the ICANN board whether it's the GNSO director, a NonCom director or even spill the entire board? Workstream 2 and the bylaws said that we should adhere to some standards of good faith in the way in which we characterize our concerns giving the board member who's being challenged an opportunity to respond in trying to make the conduct in good

faith. As I discussed on our last BC call I intend to file a comment endorsing the recommended standards and I've linked them here. I will endorse them on behalf of the BC without providing any extra commentary. I only offer to do that since we didn't have any volunteers that wanted to do something more expansive. These comments close 24 April. Jimson that could be you. Somebody needs to mute their line. I can hear conversations in the background. Thank you.

The comments close the 24th of April so we've got a 24 day review. If there are any volunteers who want to do a more expansive discussion of good faith that now is the time. But come the 24th we're going to endorse it if we don't hear otherwise. Thank you. Number three is one of the most challenging comments we're going to file this year because the competition consumer trust and consumer choice review is a bylaws required review came out of the affirmation of commitments. It was to occur after the last, I should say the round of expansion of new gTLDs. And it looks at whether the expansion of gTLDs contributed to consumer trust, consumer choice and competition. And it also looks at the application and evaluation process for the new gTLDs in order to assess whether those were conducted in a way that promoted competition trust and choice. It's 150 page report of 50 recommendations at a variety of priority levels.

And one of our BC members Waudo Siganga is part of that review team. And Waudo provided some guidance for it. Unfortunately we had several BC members step up to draft. Tim Chen, Tim Smith, Arinola and Susan. Now Tim Chen circulated some initial thoughts just last night among the drafting team but they're not out to the full BC. I think actually Tim did include the full BC on an email he sent yesterday. And this would be a great opportunity to weigh in on whether the direction to Tim is suggesting it's with BC members. So I'll take a queue on that. Tim would you like to start?

Tim Chen: Hey.

Tim Chen: I will say that...

Steve DelBianco: Go ahead.

Tim Chen: Can you hear me?

Steve DelBianco: Yes. Please go ahead.

Tim Chen   Yes sorry yes, sorry to be so late. I didn't see any of the volunteers step up. We haven't materially organized. I think all of us have been individually very busy start of the quarter which Tim Smith confirmed last night as well by email. So I wanted to start it. It's 150 page document with 50 comments.

So, you know, I looked at some of the previous comments we had made and it wasn't clear -- I haven't had a chance to (factor in) any of the offers yet -- if we're looking for a really detailed point by point type of comment or it's more summary in terms and coming then to conclusions that are presented in the executive summary which is only eight or nine pages being in the document. So I focused on the second process just because of my time constraints yesterday but I think with a little guidance if there needs to be more detail certainly happy to be part of the team that goes a little deeper. But I'm sorry for standing the BC. I didn't mean to reply to everybody so apologize.

Steve DelBianco: Tim that's fine. That's completely fine and I appreciate that. For Tim and the drafting team Tim's the Chief Executive Officer of a real business, a real company and it's completely understandable that it takes a lot of time to do

these comments. So Tim don't worry about getting a late start and I appreciate your perspective.

Let me try to give you some perspective on the last two comments we found on this in December 2015 and then in May 2016. It isn't going to be necessary to respond to all 50 detailed recommendations. Instead the BC should return to core principles about the gTLD expansion. The BC has never said we should stop expanding the Internet, we should stop giving new TLD names. We've always believed the Internet is about an innovation, choice and competition. So far be it from the business community to stand in the way of innovation and new TLDs. However we had a lot of concerns as to how the process was going to go. And some of those concerns were addressed in the guidebook and many were not. And now as we look at the expansion of TLDs it's still early. There isn't still sufficient data to say unequivocally there's been across-the-board improvement in choice competition trust but it's sort of self-evident that registrants and the business community and users have more choices than we did before. We know that's true.

We have more choices of TLDs to register in and then users have more choice of which TLDs these they want to trust or go after. But it's clear that there is more competition, definitely not clear that there's more trust. As Tim indicated in his summary comment the CCWG has significant concerns about trust. Trust however is a very qualitative thing that's assessed in surveys. And it's hard to score trust on a numerical scale. One of the things that this CCWG team will do is to come up with multiple surveys of trust to see whether it's beginning to improve over time. And that's not going to be available to us while we're submitting our comment. So maybe we recommend a continued monitoring of the trust situation.

And the other is well how much do we want to say about the evaluation and application process which hasn't been fully explored yet by the group. But finally Tim I would add that we want to use the – there's a lot of pressure from the DNS industry and many corporations who want .brands, many of whom are BC members. There's pressure for them to open the window for more gTLDs. That pressure is our friend in the sense that it can be leveraged for the BC to accomplish certain trust, choice and competition initiatives that we've raised for years that perhaps we'd like to get in before the next round opens up. So I do think a high level comment is the way to go. Since we have a queue I'll go to Chris and then Tim.

Chris Wilson: Thanks Steve. Just real quick, you know, I don't know if Tim and the rest of the Drafting Team have covered this but, you know, Jamie Hedlund ICANN's Chief Contract Compliance Officer just had a blog post I think maybe yesterday or two days ago where he basically sought public input with regard to Req 23 in the CCTRT report which urges ICANN to "Include more detailed information on the subject matter complaints and ICANN publicly available compliance reports." So I don't know you know if that was flagged by the Drafting Team or not but it's something that obviously we've raised with him in the past and an issue that the BC cares a lot about. So the fact that Jamie has sort of open last for community input on this particular recommendation perhaps argues for us to take him up on his offer and offer something there in that to regard. So I just wanted to throw that open for folks if it hasn't already been flagged.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you Chris and Chantelle thanks for putting that blog post in the chat. Tim Chen?

Tim Chen: Yes thanks Steve. I just wanted to add a couple of summary statements that we – since we had the draft. One is I think the CC or (CC) doing a really good

job. I mean I think they're appropriately concerned that there isn't enough data and enough checks on the security side. So I think we can generally support that maybe, you know, maybe we should be hesitating before we release going to another round of gTLDs. And if I didn't – I don't think put in my comments.

But the other point I wanted to make everyone here is, you know, my experience in drafting over the last couple years when I've been able to is that I'm most concerned that, you know, when any individual drafts they're going to have their own biases. And so, you know, the main tools in the security business so we'll just naturally pay more attention to all in security issues in DNS are created by a new gTLDs and what I think is, you know, an incomplete process for launching them. And so that's going to be reflected in my comments. I want to make sure that it was clear that I hope other people specifically the brand representatives will participate. And I specifically wanted to point out I think Steve said this, I focus more on the choice and the trust items. But the third item is the application process. I've never been through it, haven't paid any attention to it but not very motivated to really talk about. So hoping that other people here who are specifically attuned to that point can also contribute to the draft. Thank you.

Steve DelBianco: Tim makes a great point and let's see if we can expand to the volunteers on this team to include somebody that worked on an application for new TLD. We currently don't have anyone in the group who participated in a new gTLD application.

And on the phone I know we have a few who did. Can we get a volunteer to add to this group participate in some way in an application the substantive way? Andrew Mack your hands up. Go ahead. Can't hear you Andrew. Still

not hearing you. Andrew put it in the chat please okay? We're not hearing you.

Chris your company did apply for .Fox and got it. And if there's anyone in Fox who would be willing to help the BC on the application and evaluation process that would be valuable. I turn now to Hibah. Your company submitted 101 applications. Not all of them were brands, most of them were not. They were generics and so you had to deal with the evaluation process and even the contention issue.

So this is an area where someone from Google can shine a lot of light on this. And it might only be reviewing recommendations and sharing with the BC the perspectives of an applicant. Hibah it would be so helpful if you could potentially track that down with the Google. With that be possible? Go ahead Andrew.

Andrew Mack: Sorry that's from before. Yes I'd be happy to be contributing a little bit. And we work – we didn't have our own applications. We worked with some people that did do some applying especially with a focus on the Global South. And so would be happy to add in a little bit of time on that if you'd like. I...

Steve DelBianco: Andy in particular - yes Andy particular one of the recommendations a few of them concern this applicant support so that applicants from lower served or regions would have some either financial or legal support to get of application in. And the BC wants to continue to maintain our outreach initiative for the business community in underserved parts of the world. So Andrew I'd appreciate you contributing on that recommendation as well as the application evaluation process...

((Crosstalk))

Andrew Mack: Absolutely. I represent the BC on that. I was the only BC member on that group I believe. And we went through that and we got a lot of learnings from it, most of them not so pleasant but I think it's definitely something we should contribute in no problem, happy to do it.

Steve DelBianco: And Andrew to your knowledge did any businesses, did any small businesses who needed financial support even apply last time around?

Andrew Mack: There were only three. To the best of my memory there were only three groups that applied and I think one of them was structured as a business. One of the three withdrew and so I'm not entirely sure whether that one withdrew but it was the pickup – there was no knowledge of the program - it's very little knowledge of the program in the business community generally speaking. And many business didn't think who knew about it, didn't realize that it was available to them. And, you know, so there were a whole host of things that we could have done better and we should have done better with that as a community and a lot of learnings from it.

Steve DelBianco: Yes Andy that will be valuable for our recommendations or comment on the recommendations to pick up on that. So please do. Thank you for volunteering to help. And Hibah I know you put into the chat that you'll look into the application side. Beth with you or Chris not having any direct knowledge on that application process for .fox and I understand you guys can't help with that. Are there any other comments or volunteers to help us move this ahead? I will point out that I circulated Waudo Siganga's table where he annotated and made comments on the recommendations as a member of the team that wrote the recommendations. So Waudo was able to say that from a business constituencies perspective here are something about each of the 50 comments that deserves attention from the BC. So I circulated that twice, once in

Copenhagen and then again to the Drafting Team. Tim Chen let me ask you did you have an opportunity to see Waudo's notes as you started to put your own thoughts on paper?

Tim Chen: I did.

Steve DelBianco: Okay.

Tim Chen: And Waudo did a great job highlighting the – appropriately highlighting the points that were more relevant to the BC than others which is helpful because otherwise it just looks like a laundry list of 50 days that bounces around a bit on topic.

Steve DelBianco: Right.

Tim Chen: So had the time to go deeper last night. It looked in my brief review like he did a great job of saying these are the ones that we care about that if we do specific comments it should be on these otherwise find a way to support those recommendations in our comment. And the other comment that I made I think last night was it's a lot or it seems like a lot to me to kind of throw back 50 suggestions because these are all individual efforts that someone would have to make to make progress on and quite important to somebody in this group, it may be a lot but I don't know if we can maybe suggest that we try and cull that list down to a lower number and therefore may be make more material progress on those, I said today 25 more important issues rather than try to make cursory progress on 50. But I don't know if that's relevant but that was...

Steve DelBianco: Tim let me mention this. I think roughly ten or let's just say one fifth of recommendations are about how future's TCG reviews should be conducted

or equipped with data. Let me suggest just lump all those together and say that we support those recommendations since the team itself knows what it needs to do its job better five years from now or ten years from now and don't address those individually at all. How would that sound?

Tim Chen: Yes anything that we can make that list we can address it more logically I think makes sense or...

Steve DelBianco: Okay. Yes numbers two through eight for instance are only future and so is Number 19, Number 20, Number 30. So there are a bunch of them we can categorize as we're going to respond to them with a single sentence as a block. Okay? All right thank you. Andrew Mack your hand is still up. You have something else?

Okay let me move on to Number 4. Four is the ICANN's draft operating plan for fiscal year '18 and the five-year plan. Comments don't close till 28 April but Jimson got a real head start on this. He got some help from Chris Chaplow, Marilyn Cade and Jay Sadowski. It's the second attachment in the policy calendar and we discussed this two weeks ago about the need for us to really call out and focus on the money that's going into the open data initiative. And the BC has really been playing that hard. Denise Michele's been leading a lot of our work on getting access to data. So we are asking for more explicit description of the funding as well as more funding necessary to deliver the ODI initiatives. And we had a few other comments that the members have contributed. Is there anything that the drafters or members want to say on our comment on the budget? It's Attachment Number 2 on the policy calendar.

Jimson Olufuye: Yes this is Jimson.

Steve DelBianco: Go ahead please.

Jimson Olufuye: Steve thank you so much. But today I just want to highlight apart from the ODI point that Steve mentioned, be sure where ICANN is at, which is below 50%, which I like it.

\`   And there's – but a little as a whole and ICANN funding for FY18 – Jay Sudowski mentioned that and that needs to be highlighted as well. So the littlest point to date. Let me also mention quickly again that um about all the other issues raised have to be responded to by ICANN, and if they are not satisfactorily responded to, there could be reason for us to reject the ICANN budjet. As part of the empowered community responsibility.

So it's only based on comments or contents of this comment that the budget could be rejected, unless there is anything else, maybe from the community of IPC or ISPCP, that will also be a reason for rejecting the budget.

So otherwise we adjust what we said from BC perspective to all these points from here so it's - and we all take a look at this because the underlying is the need to reject the budjet but to be based if what we have initially done is not satisfactorily responded to by ICANN. Thank you.

Steve DelBianco: All right, thank you Jimson. Appreciate that very much. The only other three items I wanted to quickly summarize – we already have volunteers: Susan, Waudo and Cecilia working on the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP.

And so please let's try - to circulate a draft probably by April the 20th would be helpful and then we have two more. There's a DNS market study for Africa.

We already have volunteers on that: Andrew Mack, Lawrence, Arinola and Waudo so you're ahead of the curve. At least you were getting together on that.

And then we have a new public comment period on a proposed change to ICANN's fundamental bylaws having to do with how the Board handles reconsideration requests and want to move it to their Board committee.

Those comments don't close until May the 10th so we have a month but the BC has done two reconsideration requests in the last three years. We did one in 2014 along with the Registries and the NCSG having to do with the process ICANN was trying to jam on the community for the transition planning and prevailed there.

Another was done on the URS inclusion on the Dot Travel and Dot Cat TLDs where the NCSG joined the BC to say, "Wait a minute. You shouldn't put a process through that hadn't been a bottom up policy development policy like the URS," and we were unsuccessful in that reconsideration so we have experience on reconsiderations.

And particularly I think Phil Corwin drafted that one so I don't think it will take much to simply review what the Board's proposing and the rationale for why they want to move reconsiderations to a new group and then comment on that.

So I may tap Phil to give me some help with that so that we can respond in a sum way. Susan your hand is up.

Susan Kawaguchi: Thanks Steve. This is Susan Kawaguchi for the record. I just wanted to comment on the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures questionnaire. I finally looked at the - that this week and it's pretty in depth.

I was a bit surprised so there's going to be things that I just don't have any experience with and so unable to answer some of the questions, but I'll try to get a draft out tomorrow of responses.

I think, you know, that I have knowledge about so I'm glad that we have two other volunteers to sort of chime in and add their expertise. And Tim I'll try to get some comments back to you too on the CCT review in the next 24-36 hours too.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks Susan. We had quite a few people who were part – who still are part of the GNSO Subsequent Procedures group and have been really religious to tell us all that we needed to respond to the questionnaire and this was first time around when it was put together.

But it's back on and we need to answer whatever we can. We can't answer all of them. That's understandable but let's answer to whichever ones we can. Thank you very much.

Okay that's it for the policy calendar. I would – happily to turn things over to Susan and to a lesser extent Cheryl to talk about Council. I've included in here in the policy calendar pointers to the last Council meeting as well as the highlights from the agenda that you guys can talk through. Thank you.

Susan Kawaguchi: Thanks Steve. This is Susan again. So we did have a busy meeting last, you know, in Copenhagen and, you know, we do have several things going on for the next meeting.

We will vote on our review and response of the Copenhagen GAC communiqué. I reviewed the draft and it looks fine to me for the most part. We continue – the GNSO Council continues to reiterate that GAC advice is advice and it doesn't mean implementation, but we did agree with several points they made in their latest advice too.

And we will be voting on the process to amend the GNSO policy recommendations relating to the Red Cross at the second level, so that is a vote that is coming up.

I'll have to dig in to that a little bit more. And then I haven't read the comments – GNSO comments on the budget yet but I'll make sure that those align with the draft that the BC is working on right now on the budget.

And then we've had a little bit of challenge with our selection for the RDS Review Team. It looked like there was consensus. I had to recuse myself since I was a candidate and it looked like we had consensus and then the Registrars are pushing back.

So as it is now in the policy calendar, you know, I, Erika and Stephanie are the top three candidates but Tim Chen was also included in the list of seven, so we're hoping that the other SOs and ACs will give us their slots.

But they – there is some discussion on the thread today about removing one of us from the top three so we'll see how that pans out. And then, you know, we just have a discussion on the CCWG on Internet governance and that's about it for the GNSO Council. Any questions? Denise.

Denise Michel: Thank you Susan. Why is there a discussion of removing one of the endorsed candidates for the review team? Is that what you indicated?

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes so – of the top three yes of just moving Volker up and one of us down. That one person indicated that could be Stephanie. I don't know because I'm not part of those discussions – really just seeing what's on the thread.

There had been full consensus but when the representative from the Registrar Stakeholder Group went back to the Registrars I guess there was some pushback on the fact that there was no Registry or Registrar candidates in the top three.

Removing Stephanie would be a little bit problematic in my opinion because the NCUC did not get a slot on the SSR, and so this would be the second review team in a row that, you know, wasn't completely balanced and that's not mandatory for this process but it is something we want to make sure that there's a balance to the – selecting the best candidate is the most important but also ensuring the balance representation between the stakeholder groups.

So the way I can – I see it is there was consensus on the call. Everybody agreed to it and then there was some further thought on it, so they're going to have one more call and decide if – to move up either Marc Anderson or Volker but it seemed to be more of a push to move Volker up to the – into the top three.

Denise Michel: Thank you.

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes. Okay Steve I think that's it. Oh Tim. Sorry. Would you…?

Tim Chen: Hey Susan I just had a question. Do you know if – I wasn't clear if there are only seven people who applied and I'm last out of those seven, or if the second group of four individuals have been selected among the larger set. You know the answer to that?

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes it's definitely a larger set. You were not the last of seven to be picked and I wasn't on that group so, you know, I wasn't part of that deliberation again.

But – so I think we had 14 candidates. I can't remember if it was 11 or 14 so we had quite a few, but there was some preliminary work done by ICANN Staff in ranking based on the criteria that was put out in the application.

And so, you know, I thought we were fairly lucky for the BC to have two candidates in the seven because there's definitely a possibility that we could convince the SOs and ACs to give us their slots.

So to me you being there – you could've been in the top three. That would've been great too but you definitely were not the last candidate and therefore the last – the number seven.

Tim Chen: Okay thanks. I'm just curious. I would add…

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes.

Tim Chen: …so truly that I hope you don't stand down from your spot here. I think it's important to have you on…

Susan Kawaguchi: All right.

Tim Chen: …committee.

Susan Kawaguchi: Well thank you.

Steve DelBianco: Susan Chris' hand is up.

Susan Kawaguchi: Oh Chris?

Christopher Wilson: Thanks Susan. Do – quick question I guess regarding Item 8. Do we know what – what's going to – what the tone I guess of the discussion will be regarding the charter for the CCWG on Internet governance?

I know we had this – I think it was in – I forget where – Helsinki maybe or last year where we had, you know, issues regarding the charter and I know there's – continues to be sort of concerns about it I guess. Do we have any – what – where that discussion's going to go?

Susan Kawaguchi: I – the last discussion as I remember it was favorable in moving forward with the charter for the CCWG. There, you know, a lot of Councilors have a – voiced concern that, you know, it's a Cross Community Working Group and - although it's on Internet governance and that I guess the Council in general is concerned with CCWG is the basic line.

And then this Internet governance group had not been very active or reporting back very often so we didn't know what was going on, and so there was talk a couple of meetings ago about just not re-upping the charter.

So some – I think some changes was made to the charter and to be honest I can't remember it right now. I do need to go back and review the charter. But I think it's going to move forward and that – and with a little bit different

mandate and some requirements to come back to the GNSO and report on what their activity is and what they're doing.

It's always a balance between is this really – should this really be a PDP, whatever they're working on - should that be a PDP or should it be – or can it just be a discussion and a CCWG?

Christopher Wilson: Great. Thanks.

Susan Kawaguchi: And I think that's it for me.

Christopher Wilson: Barbara are you there?

Barbara Wanner: Yes. Yes I am.

Christopher Wilson: Perhaps you could just talk a little bit about CSG stuff and I can supplement if necessary.

Barbara Wanner: Okay great. There really isn't too much to report from our last BC call. We have a BC ExCom teleconference on the 26th of April during which I hope some of these – we'll realize more progress on some of these items, specifically this Board seat Number 14.

But I did want to report to the BC that I followed up both with ICANN Staff, the ICANN Secretariat as well as with the specific Board members who participated and the Non-Commercial Party House intersessional in Iceland about our interest in proactively shaping the terms of reference for the 2019 GNSO review before the RFP is issued.

Rob Hoggarth of ICANN Staff acknowledged that that was discussed in Iceland and received favorably by other participants at the intersessional. So his response was, "Yes we remember this being raised and please keep us apprised of your work on this topic."

So I hope at the CSG – during our CSG teleconference on the 26th we will realize clarity in terms of how we want to take this forward first with – I'm assuming first within the CSG and then reaching out to the other members of the Non-Contracted Party House.

That's kind of where things stand right now. I guess we will seek – determine how we want to solicit volunteers to participate in this working group, and then actually perhaps establishing a framework for how we want to guide the - shaping the terms of the reference – terms of reference for the GNSO review.

So that's kind of where things stand right now. As I said I think we're all awaiting this next ExCom call to determine how we move forward on some of those follow-up items from the intersessional. That's all I have to report. Thanks.

Christopher Wilson: Thanks Barbara. This is Chris. I'll just add with regard to this ICANN59 planning there was a call last week among SO/AC SGC leaders providing sort of an update on where we are with regard to planning that meeting - the policy forum meeting in Johannesburg.

A couple of items of note. The meetings team has preliminarily a plan for out - or sort of allotted time for outreach because you know – as you know this policy forum is also sort of a policy and outreach meeting.

It's meant to engage groups to reach out to various communities where the meeting's held and bring in folks to the ICANN meeting. So there has – the outreach time is now scheduled for every morning at 8:00 am if necessary during that meeting.

So to the extent BC is interested in doing outreach there is time available that, you know, I know the NCSG I think is already planning on using that time. I think ALAC is also planning on using the 8 o'clock to 9 o'clock hour for outreach.

So just wanted to let folks know that if the BC is intending to do something on outreach we – there is time available in the mornings in Johannesburg to do that.

It also was noted that the CCWG accountability will have their plenary meeting that Sunday before the meeting, but all other requests for meetings outside of the scope of the meeting will not be granted.

That is the only exception is the CCWG accountability meeting on the Sunday before. Cross Community topics – really the - only one sort of tangible submission so far and that's from Jeff Neuman with regard to New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group.

I think it's specifically looking at I thought – I think geo names but Jeff has asked for some time for a Cross Community discussion on that. Wise – there really isn't anything that's tangible yet that's been submitted yet.

I think we'll have a better sense in the next week or two if there are other – an exception request may be due in a couple of weeks. The next planning call is April 18.

We expect a block schedule for ICANN59 meeting to be issued on April 21 so we'll have a better sense of scheduling, you know, next week or so. But that's where really where we are on meeting planning.

I think - also I should say I think as far as room sizes I think the conference center – they – we have the entire conference center that we have, unlike Helsinki where some of the rooms were small and limited.

We limited the number of participants in a meeting. I don't expect that to be a problem in Johannesburg based on what the meetings team has indicated. So I think logistically and space wise this meeting will be a little bit better than Helsinki.

But that – just wanted to flag that for folks. After the next planning call I'll – can report back any further information on that. Andrew Mack I see your hand's up.

Andrew Mack: Yes a quick question. Good. We've got a BC outreach event that we're trying to put together for Johannesburg, which is a little bit bigger than would be – it's a lot bigger, that we'd be able to fit into just the 8:00 to 9:00 am slot and are in the process of – we've discussed it a little bit with ICANN to try and figure out if we've got any flexibility for that the day prior to what would be Day 0.

Am I hearing you say – am I hearing you correctly to say that they've already made the determinations that that will not be a possibility?

Christopher Wilson: I think what it – well two things I guess. One, I think if there's an opportunity for additional time for outreach I think it'd – they would just –

they would certainly look within the four day meeting, not additional days outside.

I think that's – that is the goal so while 8:00 am to 9:00 am is clearly a time reserved for that I think – I don't get the impression that that is the only time within those four days that outreach can – could occur.

So if there's a lunch event or something like that I think they'd be open to that and – but we didn't get into the specifics on it. As far as, you know, doing other – spending other days outside those four days on events I think that you would be – it's a tough sell but, you know, you can talk more with ICANN Staff and see what they're thinking.

But my impression is that they're really, really pushing back on doing additional events, meetings et cetera before or, you know, after those four days.

Andrew Mack: Okay because…

Christopher Wilson: But…

Andrew Mack: …one of our goals – because this is – because so many of the events – the meetings recently have been in the global north and we're going to be in Johannesburg and have some nice connectivity in Southern Africa, we were trying to put something together there.

It would be larger than would fit into the small spaces and getting around Johannesburg in the middle of the day is oftentimes very, very challenging. So our hope was to make that happen and to try to take advantage of it so may call on a little bit of support.

I think we've got a good program that we've – we're working up so – and we'll talk about it offline but if you can offer us a little bit of support that might be really helpful.

Christopher Wilson: Okay that's great. Thank you Andrew. Appreciate it. Questions/thoughts/concerns about CSG activities or ICANN59? Okay Jimson we'll turn to you.

Jimson Olufuye: Yes this is Jimson. Let me firstly thank you Chris for your crisp leadership for the BC thus far so really appreciate so your commitment, but it's quite regrettable that you are leaving also to join Steve and others to wish you the best in the future.

Well on finance and operations, invoices will go out from May 1st and I believe we have all noted that we revised the membership dues to be paid from – for FY18 for Category 1 $1000, Category 2 $500, Category 3 $200 and there is adjustment for 70% of discounts for members from developing countries.

So I want to also appreciate Chuck's and Marilyn for their contribution on the need in the application form ExCom approved a verification slide – the verification of the – these application forms include more detailed information about the processes that was put because it's a community and when a potential member becomes a member in good standing.

And in addition we had to add a space for alternate contacts. They only have one for key contacts so there are going to be alternate contacts on the application form.

And by the time our charter is fully approved then we'll have the application online giving so you don't need – you won't need to download the application form and complete it.

Okay so now to operations. The outreach committee which has spoken about the proposed outreach event on the 25th – nothing new. I think as you said we both have goals to reach out to more businesses, business users of the Internet in part of the – so we'll continue to engage.

I believe next week if - we have a call with staff as Chris you also mentioned. So apart from this – and maybe Andrew or myself talk about it. There is an event in Uganda, which one of our members, Arinola, will be speaking as a guest speaking about business result for the new empowered community so – of ICANN and the necessity for business users to play their own role in the new Internet ecosystem after the IANA transition.

So that will be on the April 27. I hope that's correct – our first meeting 27th and Arinola will be in Uganda to participate in the conference. They will be speaking on behalf of BC and doing some outreach and marketing communication materials. Then I would like to welcome a new member on board. Adetola Sogbesan from Chace Systems are based in Abuja is on this call so you're most welcome. So that is all for me for now. Back to you Chris. Thank you.

Christopher Wilson: Thank you Jimson and thank you Arinola for participating in that event in Uganda. Look forward to hearing how it went if not our next call then the – certainly the call after that so thank you all for your efforts on the outreach. Much appreciated. Andrew Mack I see your hand raised.

Andrew Mack: Yes just a quick thing to jump in Chris which is that I've spent a bunch of time on the phone recently with Gabi and Daniel Fink from ICANN. We know that Latin America is another area of focus for us in the coming year and that there will be two – likely two ICANN events coming up in 2018 in Puerto Rico and someplace else in Latin America.

And so we're getting sorted out for that and if there are other people who are on the BC call that have a particular footprint in Latin America or a particular connectivity or interests and would like to join in that conversation, please reach out to me afterwards offline. Thanks very much.

Christopher Wilson: Thank you. Okay if there aren't any issues or questions on that we can move AOB. Our next meeting is April 27 two weeks from today, same time. I know it says BC charter update.

I don't – that may be just legacy from last meeting. I don't think we have an update on the charter Steve unless you think – unless we have new information.

I think we're still in – where we are – where we were just a couple of weeks ago on charter.

Steve DelBianco: That's right. That's right.

Christopher Wilson: Yes. So I don't have anything else on AOB. Anyone else have any issues or concerns or thoughts they want to raise? I don't see any hands raised so I will say – so that's no.

So in the meantime as Chantelle notes the chair election timeline will be sent around on the list, and I'll be sending a note to the entire BC on the list as well

regarding my update but otherwise look forward to talking to everybody in a couple of – if not online. Thanks so much. Chantelle we can end the call.

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

Operator: Thank you. That concludes today's call. Thank you all for participating. You may now disconnect.

END