

ICANN

**Moderator: Chantelle Doerksen
May 11, 2017
10:00 am CT**

Coordinator: This conference call is now being recorded. Thank you.

Chantelle Doerksen: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the BC Members call on Thursday, May 11, 2017. On today's call we have Adetola Sogbesan, Cheryl Miller, Steve DelBianco, Philip Corwin, Jimson Olufuye, Lawrence Olawale-Roberts, Andy Abrams, Jay Sudowski, Beth Allegretti, Isabel Rutherford, Allison Simpson, Chris Wilson, Hibah Kamal-Grayson, Andrew Harris, Susan Kawaguchi and Andrew Mack.

We have apologies from Barbara Wanner and Marie Pattulo. From staff we have myself Chantelle Doerksen. I'd like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you ever so much and over to you Chris.

Christopher Wilson: Thanks Chantelle. Thanks every – for taking the time to be on today's call. Per usual we've got a pretty robust policy calendar and other items to discuss.

So I will go ahead and turn it right immediately to Steve to dive into the policy calendar. Steve.

Steve DelBianco: Hey thank you Chris. It is a very full one. Unfortunately in the run up to an ICANN meeting we typically get a flood of public comment opportunities and this is no exception.

Thank you Chantelle for loading the updated policy calendar. For those of you following along in your own browser or your email I just – this update about an hour ago and it includes a new attachment so that's the one you'll want to have with you.

First I'll acknowledge two comments we've filed since our last BC Member call. On May the 5th we filed a comment on the DNS market study for Africa and let me thank Waudo Siganga for starting it off, Andy Mack and then Lawrence Olawale-Roberts also helped.

I pitched in to keep it consistent with the BC position that we're not about – we're not a trade association for registrars and registries and I think that the comments came out very strong.

Thanks again for the help on that. On the 28th of April we did a comment on ICANN's draft FY18 op plan and their budget and Jimson led the way on this with help from Chris and Marilyn Cade, Jay Sudowski, Denise Michel.

I think that those comments were part of why ICANN wanted to have a conference call to discuss the questions that were raised, and I'll look for those who were on that call to report at some point later on in today's BC call.

So now let me jump to the current open public comment period because there are several we need action on. The first, Number 1, is a proposed change to ICANN's bylaws indicating which committee of the board reviews a reconsideration request that comes into the board.

Reconsideration requests are situations where management or board made a decision, and a community member wishes to challenge that decision and give new facts or new arguments and have the decision reconsidered.

The BC has been part of two reconsideration requests in the last several years. In neither case were we granted but I know in the case of the accountability our reconsideration request definitely shaped the process.

So sometimes you don't get your way on a reconsideration request but you can often alter the path/alter the trajectory of where ICANN is going. Phil Corwin did the lion's share of the work on examining this bylaws request and Phil's on the line and could pitch in.

But first I'll suggest that Phil and I uniformly agree that the BC should support the bylaws amendment to indicate which committee of the board handles reconsideration requests or setting up a special committee for this.

If anything this will enhance the focused attention that would be given a reconsideration request and even perhaps expand the capacity for more of these requests to come in.

Now the BC as part of the GNSO is part of the five ACs and SOs that are in the Empowered Community, and since this bylaw is in the fundamental part of the brand new ICANN bylaws it requires majority support of the Empowered Community to approve this.

So the BC is only one part of the GNSO and the GNSO is only 1/5 of the Empowered Community, and it remains to be seen how we'll convene the Empowered Community and indicate preferences so that we can have this ratified.

Now in addition - and this is part of Attachment Number 5, the email I circulated. In addition the ICANN Board is going to set up a charter for the new committee.

Now I don't think anybody believes that the charter for a board committee is something that's in the bylaws of ICANN and subject to a review of the Empowered Community.

And I think that ICANN has just indicated the charter in order to invite comments, and to that end I think Phil has done an excellent job coming up with five specific questions slash comments that we believe we could submit but they don't affect the fundamental answer, which is that we do support the bylaws amendment.

So I want Phil to talk a little bit about the five questions but first are there any BC members who disagree with the view that we should support the bylaws amendment?

I'll turn to you in just a second there Phil - see if anybody has any questions about the bylaws amendment. All right, hearing none Phil please take over.

Philip Corwin: Yes thanks Steve. And to reiterate I certainly agree with you that the BC - my recommendation is the BC support the basic change, which is to put the

reconsideration requests into a dedicated subgroup of the board where they will receive better attention than they have in some past instances.

In going through – the only issue is whether the BC should embellish that basic support with some additional comments relating to the proposed draft charter for this working group.

And I don't have specific recommendations for BC positions but identified five areas in the charter where a comment would be appropriate if we want to go there.

The first is whether – there's a place in the draft charter to put in additional purposes to be defined by the board as appropriate. I raised the questions of whether – and I think we probably would want to say that any additional purposes should be minimized so the committee can focus pretty much exclusively on reconsideration request review.

That's the whole purpose of setting up this separate committee so giving it a lot of additional purposes would dilute the whole aim of that, so I think that's an area the BC might want to weigh in.

Then in related not additional purpose but additional responsibilities again I don't know if we have any suggestions on additional responsibilities, but I think again the BC would want to say keep them to a minimum because the more additional responsibilities you pile on the more you dilute the focus of this group, which is supposed to be focused just on reconsideration requests.

Then there's a provision on the range of – the size of voting directors and number of liaison non-voting directors. I don't know if we want to – a small or somewhat a larger committee.

I don't know if BC thinks there should be some minimum ratio of voting directors to non-voting liaison directors but that's an issue for consideration. Fourth is it gives the committee the ability to set up subcommittees and to appoint consultants and advisors to assist in its work as deemed necessary.

And there we might want to say we're not sure if there's any need for subcommittees to be set up although one might – I guess the only place would be to focus on a particular reconsideration request but you'd kind of what this whole committee, which is already a subset of board to be focused on the request.

And I also raised the question whether standards or limits should be set on the use of consultants and advisor. We don't want this board group contracting out a lot of its work and we might want – request more explanation of what role is envisioned for these advisors and consultants in reconsideration request review.

That seems to be pretty much a board function and you have to wonder what an advisor or consultant would bring to that and again whether the board would be offloading its responsibilities.

Finally, whether we want to suggest a minimum number of meetings per year and whether they should be solely in response to a submitted reconsideration request or whether the subcommittee can meet – the committee can meet for other purposes.

So that's it other than I think weighing in for the committee to not dilute its function with additional responsibilities and purposes. I leave the other three issues for BC member consideration.

Steve DelBianco: Phil thank you very much. So I've noted in the chat and I'll repeat them the three comments that Phil and I are proposing we submit in addition to support are, one, we believe the committee should minimize its additional work so that it can focus on reconsideration requests.

Number 2, on the composition of this board committee we suggest a 2-to-1 ratio of voting to non-voting directors. Number 3, we're going to ask for an explanation of why subcommittees or external consultants are anticipated to be needed.

Have I got that right Phil? I'll just see if there's any objections from BC members to those three.

Philip Corwin: Yes that's right Steve. The – personally that I might add would be to at least ask a question inquiring what role they would see for consultants or advisors. I'm a little puzzled by that since this is a – it's really the board's responsibility to review reconsideration requests, and I'm not sure what role that outside contract parties would play in that but I think we should ask that question.

Steve DelBianco: Good. So I'll make it ask for an explanation of the anticipated role of consultants and advisors. Okay? All right, seeing no objections that one is going to be filed today.

Yesterday was the deadline. I let ICANN Legal know that we'd be filing today and so they're on board with that. Great. Let's go to the next one in our list.

It's Number 2. This is a draft report that ICANN has issued for this Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review Committee.

This is a review under the Affirmation of Commitments and now baked into the bylaws, but after an expansion of the gTLD space that ICANN needed to allow the community to conduct a review of whether the expansion increased or promoted competition, consumer trust and consumer choice and a review of the application and evaluation process.

These comments are due in eight days. These are extensive. Jonathan Zuck led the review team and they built significantly on the work that many BC members, myself included, had done for three years prior to that to come up with a lot of metrics on how do you measure competition, consumer trust and consumer choice?

So you'll see a lot of the recommendations pick up on the things that the BC planted into this, but it means that it's a very extensive comment and difficult to review.

Fortunately Waudo Siganga is part of the review team. Waudo circulated two months ago some guidance for our comments. Now we have a handful of other volunteers, Tim Chen, Tim Smith, Arinola and Susan Kawaguchi who pulled together an initial draft.

It's Attachment Number 6 to the policy calendar that was circulated an hour ago. That's – that was the recent attachment. I think it needs a good bit of work but I am grateful for the volunteers for finally turning to that, and over the next eight days I do anticipate sending another draft to the entire BC to review.

I'll stop now to see if any of the members of this drafting team want to speak up about things you're considering or ideas that you'd like to run by the BC membership.

I'll also acknowledge that Andy Abrams and Hibah also contributed some perspective from the point of view of a company that applied so that we can add their views on the application evaluation process, and also Cecilia Smith from Fox contributed some of that.

Now those contributions came on another comment we're submitting on the new gTLD subsequent procedures, but I think they're relevant to the point of application and evaluation.

So anybody on that review team wish to ask questions or explain where you're going? I see Tim Chen is in chat.

Susan Kawaguchi: Steve this is Susan.

Steve DelBianco: Hey Susan.

Susan Kawaguchi: ...would wait – oh.

Steve DelBianco: I'm sorry. Tim with respect to the question the extensive work part is the last paragraph of the comment speaks to the 50 recommendation. And I do believe that the extensive work that I spoke of is suggestion that with respect to these recommendations here's what we feel or with respect to these recommendations we support and perhaps we won't even get to them all.

I didn't think for instance we needed to comment on all the recommendations regarding what to do in the next review. I feel like that is something we don't need to deal with now.

We'll deal with that later on but of the 50 recommendations at least 40 of them deal with things that the BC cares about. That's all. Susan please go ahead.

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes I would just urge other BC members if they have time to look at Waudo's document. That was really helpful and – because he's outlined, you know, he's listed all of the 50 recommendation.

It's a really quick document to look at and if you have questions or concerns or comments that it would be helpful to hear them per recommendation. I pulled out multiple recommendations and commented on them, but I'm sure there's others that have experience that I don't have that might.

Another one of the recommendations may have hit home somewhere for them.

Steve DelBianco: Yes Susan this is Steve. You're absolutely right and I'll recirculate Waudo's original. And what I'm anxious to see is that we – I should say that of the recommendations here's what we feel because we've covered them in a patchwork fashion...

Susan Kawaguchi: Right.

Steve DelBianco: ...as we go through. And it might be better to have a single list at some point in the document, maybe even an appendix where we indicate whether we're commenting on each of the 50.

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes I would agree with that.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks for your work.

Susan Kawaguchi: And I just didn't get that so...

Steve DelBianco: I understand. And you've got a lot to do and I appreciate the drafting that you've done so far. Any other questions or comments on this one? All right, thanks again for those who drafted.

The third element up is a questionnaire that was developed by a working group doing a PDP, and they were trying to evaluate changes and additions to the new gTLD policy recommendations.

In other words what did we learn from the last expansion of the gTLD space, and what do we want to do to change for subsequent expansion? Susan once again handling so much of the work in the BC, you and Waudo and Cecilia Smith, you did volunteer to draft a BC comment and you circulated your draft back on the 24th of April.

I reattached that with – as Attachment 1 after incorporating edits from Andy Abrams and Cecilia Smith regarding the application evaluation process. We put a call out for that and I appreciate Google and Fox for responding so quickly.

So the latest draft is Attachment 1. This - comments close the 22nd of May and we have time to finish the review. But Susan anyone else, you and Cecilia, anybody interested in commenting on what you've got so far and are there questions from any BC members?

Let's be sure - Susan since you're our primary author and I'll review them both let's be sure to be consistent in the things that we are suggesting for subsequent procedures, the third comment, are consistent with how we react

to the recommendations of the CCT in Number 2. We ought to be able to double-check that since we're both doing it.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay. Yes I'll take a look at that. One question I did have is did you feel that we should submit the sort of comments in line since it was more of a survey and not a – and not draft of formal comments or would you prefer those pulled out and placed – the – that - our responses pulled out and drafted into it – more of a formal comment.

Steve DelBianco: Susan in the past when they've given us a template we've typically put together a Word doc and make it into a formal PDF comment, and we'll show both their question and then our answer right underneath it and I think that's what we'll do here. Is that okay with you?

Susan Kawaguchi: I'll reformat the document then. And so sorry for the questions this morning. What about the questions we just don't have an answer or response to?

Steve DelBianco: We can say no response at this time...

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay.

Steve DelBianco: ...would be my guess and it's fine to introduce at the initial some sort of an overview or (shapo) comment.

Susan Kawaguchi: Right.

Steve DelBianco: It's completely appropriate and then we'll control what we do since we control the format of what we submit. Okay? Susan thanks again for taking the lead on both these drafts. Appreciate that.

Susan Kawaguchi: No problem at all.

Steve DelBianco: All right. Number 4 are recommendations from the Cross-Community Working Group coming out of Workstream 2. Workstream 2 was a series of a dozen projects that came out of the IANA transition.

When we came up with the new bylaws there were some things that were going to take longer to develop and the community would lead that. So the bylaws provided for Workstream 2 and the recommendations coming out of Workstream 2 have to be approved by all of the chartering organizations, which include all of the ACs and SOs.

And if they are approved those recommendations carry a very high bar for the board to do anything but implement. In other words the board would have to do a 2/3 vote to reject any recommendations of something coming out of Workstream 2, and then have a consultation and another 2/3 vote if they didn't want to implement it.

So it carries a lot more strength of implementation than typical recommendations that come out of anything else in ICANN. For that reason I know it's difficult but we do have – pay attention to these Workstream 2 items.

Earlier we had submitted comments on the Workstream 2 work that Chris Wilson had led on transparency. This particular one, Number 4 here, is one that I had led on how to improve the accountability of the SOs and ACs to the communities they are designated to serve, and I can tell you that this started in completely the wrong direction.

During the actual transition for IANA accountability a number of board members, ICANN Legal and even some community members were worried that the SOs and ACs were not properly accountable to each other or accountable to the greater public interest.

I led an effort to say that isn't appropriate at all. The GNSO is accountable to the Generic Name Supporting Organization like the BC is accountable to business users and business registrants.

We are not a – technically accountable to the GAC or the ccNSO or vice versa. So these draft recommendations reflect that the – that SOs and ACs and subgroups like the BC are accountable to the groups we were established to represent.

And the BC provided a lot of input to this where we came up with 25 recommendations of best practices. As a rapporteur on that group it's not appropriate for me to be sort of composing the BC comments but I am happy to help but I do need a volunteer.

This is not a big lift. It's a set of 25 recommendations that can be dealt with in total since they are about things like transparency and accountability of what the BC or ccNSO does, how we evaluate new member applications, how we'd allow challenges to elections or challenges to decisions that are made and also how we do outreach, which is an area I'm very proud of the BC's leadership on.

Can I get a volunteer to help with the Number 4? This is the SO and AC accountability. These comments are due 26th of May and the BC may well suggest that these comments are – the recommendations are acceptable to the BC.

I don't anticipate we'll be doing too much detail work but I will want to include the names of other BC members as drafters. Can I get a name? Chris Wilson please.

Christopher Wilson: Steve feel free to put my name down as support.

Steve DelBianco: Okay. Thank you Chris. Any others? All right thank you Chris. Number 5, our proposed renewal of the Dot Net Registry Agreement. These comments close the 30th of May.

Earlier we had anticipated that this might result in a change of ICANN fees. It does not. We were concerned that it might implement URS before it was approved through the GNSO bottom up process. It did not.

There was some question as to whether price caps would still be in place for Dot Net second-level domains. The price caps are still there with a 10% annual cap on increases.

So I don't know that there's much we will say about it, and I do note that Dot Net and Com are already implementing their transitions to Thick WHOIS subject to the time it takes for the registrars to schlep all their registrant data to VeriSign.

But we need some assistance in the BC to lead the way on commenting on this Dot Net renewal. Can we have a few volunteers? When you look at this renewal you'll note there are very few things changing from the existing Dot Net Agreement.

And it's not as if the BC has to dive into the URS, Thick WHOIS or the pricing because I don't believe that any of that has changed. Can I get at least one volunteer? Denise Michel please.

Denise Michel: Hi. I'm not volunteering. I just have a quick question. What – so that someone on the call may know, what standard does the staff use in bringing some legacy TLDs up to the sort of same requirement that other TLDs have and not doing that in some cases?

I know that the BC has been actively commenting on J adoption of, you know, implementing URS as an example. But I – I'm wondering if anyone on the call knows why staff insists that some TLDs include additional requirements when they're renegotiating for contracts and others they don't. Is there like some guidance or bylaws that they're following? Thanks.

Steve DelBianco: Denise when you read the way they set up the public comment page on this, the indication is that Dot Net was brought very close to Dot Org contract. On the other hand things like Dot Cat, Dot Pro, Dot Job – those sponsored TLDs ended up getting lumped together and brought on board to something closer to the new Registry Agreement.

So it looks as if staff bifurcated the world between the smaller sponsored TLDs, which they took in one direction, and the larger generic TLDs like Net, which it is trying to match to the most recent renewal which was for the Dot Org contract.

I'm not sure that – I think I'm explaining and answering your question as to what they did but I'm not positive on...

Denise Michel: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: ...explaining why they did it if you know what I'm talking about.

Denise Michel: Yes. Yes I do. That was actually the heart of my question. I was just curious as to what the basis is for the...

Steve DelBianco: Right and some of it has to do with where the registry operator feels it has leverage or is seeking something. If they're seeking a certain kind of a change then they get into a quid pro quo with ICANN staff and a bilateral negotiation.

But as you know Denise we said in Copenhagen that GDD, the staff of ICANN, is supposed to solicit what are the priorities of the community before it enters a renegotiation process.

If we can't be in the room to negotiate we need our intentions and priorities to have been in ICANN's mind before it gets in there to represent the community in a bilateral negotiation.

And you assisted me at beating that into Akram's head when we got together in Copenhagen so let's continue to work that angle. Phil Corwin?

Phil Corwin: Yes, and Steve, I'm prefacing my remarks. Neither I nor anybody else other than the GDD staff and VeriSign know what went on in those closed door negotiations. Originally, when URF started appearing in legacy TLD renewal agreements. GDD put out a statement that they were encouraging the adoption of relevant new TLD RPMs for the sake of consistency as that stance was debated. They also said further on that there were no quid pro quos and that any TLD operator was free to reject that suggestion and not volunteer.

So I don't know what happened, but they don't have authority to impose anything that's not consensus policy and the new URS and new TLD RPMs are not yet consensus policy. The RPM review working group, of which I'm one of three co-chairs along with J. Scott Evans, another co-chair from the BC, is charged with making a recommendation on that exact point during the course of our work. So that's the best explanation I can give. I presume that GDD staff may have suggested it but it wasn't in the final mix even though the new renewal agreement continues and a lot of technical changes, which bring it closer to dot org and other new TLD provisions other than the RPMs.

So far as the comment, I cannot take the lead on this. I am leaving the country for ten days a week from today and I'm jammed up before I leave with other things I have to get done. But I'd be happy to chime in on it but I can't take the lead on drafting a BC comment. But as you pointed out, Steve, I don't think there's a lot to comment on here.

Steve DelBianco: Okay, thank you. Mark Datysgeld then Nivaldo Cleto, thank you for volunteering on the dot net number five. I appreciate that. And Phil, thanks for being available to help with that. Okay, I'll move things along quickly here. The next one is WHOIS conflicts with privacy law. This one isn't due until the 12th of June and the final two are all do on an extended timeframe. I will do this though. I'll ask whether last time around, Cheryl Miller, Ellen Blackler, and Marie Pattullo contributed to the BC comment on WHOIS conflicts with privacy law. You guys did an outstanding job on that and looking to see who's on the line today. I don't think any of you are on the line today but I will go back to Cheryl, Ellen, and Marie to see if they will lead.

Cheryl Miller: I'm on the line. This is Cheryl. I'm happy to help as long as some others will volunteer with me.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Cheryl. Appreciate it. You guys did a great job on this comment last time. So Cheryl, I will write to you and Ellen, and Marie to see if we can get the band back together. Denise Michel, go ahead.

Cheryl Miller: Sounds good. Thank you.

Denise Michel: I'd like to assist as well.

Steve DelBianco: Great. Thank you, Denise. The framework of interpretation on human rights is another of the work stream two items coming out of the IANA transition. This is number seven on my list. And we had many BC members who were participants and observers. I listed your names there in that block. But we have some time on this one, but I'll be looking to those who were participants and observers to lead the way for the BC on that comment.

And finally, the release of geo names in six brands TLDs. Andy Abrams, I'm looking at you. You've been our leader on this. Can I look at you to modify our prior comment and submit a draft for BC consideration?

Andy Abrams: Sure, of course.

Steve DelBianco: Andy, thank you very much. Okay, I would quickly move up to say that ICANN is now looking for the third review of accountability and transparency, known as the ATRT. This used to be an affirmation of commitments review and then it was moved into the bylaws as a result of the transition.

This will be a limited scope review or it can be a limited scope review since so many of the accountability projects are baked into those work stream two items that I keep discussing. Now, the applicants that have asked so far are

only nine. Only nine names have come in so far and that is surprising. There will be up to 21 people on this review team and we usually have an oversubscription of folks that are interested. The application guideline isn't until the second of June, but this is a good time to think about whether you want to be involved on a limited scope review of ICANN's accountability and transparency.

The limited scope aspect would be that the review team will primarily look at prior recommendations of ATRT 2 and try to assess the extent to which ICANN has properly implemented this recommendation.

Now, I'd like to turn it over to Phil and Susan for Channel 2 on Council.

Phil Corwin: Yes, Steve, can I suggest that Susan start with the report on the past last meeting, which I was not able to attend because of family obligations. And then I can talk a little bit about the upcoming meeting.

Susan Kawaguchi: We actually covered that last meeting.

Phil Corwin: Oh, okay.

Susan Kawaguchi: Go back over it with my memory, but why don't we just deal with the next meeting?

Phil Corwin: Okay, I'm bringing up my copy of the draft agenda.

Steve DelBianco: Phil, you can just refer to the policy calendar. I've got that pretty much lined up, but we did cover what happened on the 20th of April.

Phil Corwin: Sorry, I forgot that.

Steve DelBianco: Yes, and we do have the motions.

Phil Corwin: Again, I wasn't on the BC call on the 20th so wasn't aware of it.

Steve DelBianco: So on the 7th of May, Council voted by email to approve that motion regarding the PDP on Red Cross and Red Crescent. You circulated a note to BC indicating you thought that was a really sensible way to diffuse a lot of GAC concerns. So that happened already on 7th of May in between Council meetings, correct?

Phil Corwin: Correct.

Steve DelBianco: Okay. And there are two motions noticed here for the upcoming meeting on the 18th of May. You and Susan can discuss those two motions.

Phil Corwin: Right now, those two motions are on the consent agenda so they're not controversial unless someone wants an extended discussion and separate vote, and you can see why they're not -- the first simply acknowledges the selection of Matthew Shears for Seat 14 on the ICANN Board after Matthew has won the election to represent the non-contracted parties house. And the second one is GNSO validation of the request of the CCWG accountability work stream two for extension of its mandate and funding into fiscal year 2018. Without that approval, some of these work stream two groups would have to end their work before they had delivered final recommendations. So there's good support for letting them continue into the next fiscal year within Council.

And then we're going to have a Council vote on the review of the GAC communique from Copenhagen where -- particularly on the GAC's request on two character names for ICANN to engage in bilateral negotiations with

separate GAC members. The GNSO response is not favorable towards that. We also weigh in somewhat on the IGO issues that are ongoing and that the subject of another working group that I co-chair, acknowledging the work of the discussion group and which relates to that Red Cross recommendation that was just adopted.

Then we're just going to have an update on the CCWG accountability work stream two status of its work and delivery. And then we're going to discuss the updated charter for the cross community working group on internet governance and what continuing role that will have within ICANN. And then we're going to have confirmation of voting on the GNSO's process for amending approved GNSO policy recommendations relating to certain Red Cross movement names. That's the follow-up to the motion we passed by email recently.

And then we're going to have a presentation from the MSSI on different specific reviews that are now ongoing. But that will be a 20 minute discussion and then we're going to plan for ICANN 59 in Johannesburg. So no really controversial items in this upcoming GNSO Council agenda.

Steve DelBianco: Great. Thanks, Phil. Susan, anything to add?

Susan Kawaguchi: I actually had a question for you, Steve. As part of the standing inflection committee for the GNSO Council, the committee is being asked to develop criteria and then select a candidate for the GNSO rep to the Empowered Community and I was wondering if there is -- and I'm sure staff will provide this to us if there is -- but I was wondering from your viewpoint, was there criteria already established for that position?

Steve DelBianco: Thanks, Susan. I did lead the drafting team on how we would change policies, and procedures, and bylaws so that the GNSO could participate in the Empowered Community. We did not develop criteria for this rep, but we did significantly constrain what the rep can do. The rep is only there to sort of translate decisions and opinions from the GNSO that have been arrived at through properly approved resolutions and then pipe them into the Empowered community.

So the rep is not a decision maker. They're more of a conduit, a representative of properly constructed positions in the GNSO. To that end, I would say that the main criteria is the person should be on Council and should be intimate with the Council mailing list and the Council procedures since all that they will be conveying to the Empowered Community are things that came through the Council process.

Is that helpful?

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay. So we should limit the candidate to Council members then?

Steve DelBianco: Or, a former Council member who is familiar with the processes, I would say. We could probably broaden that in case we couldn't find a council member. James Bladel, the Council Chair, serves as the current GNSO rep to the Empowered Community. So it possibly could be the chair but the chair has to do quite a bit of work. It might be something that the Vice Chair of Council could take on.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay, well that's good to know. So we have a meeting next week and then we'll -- I'm assuming people will be nominated or volunteer for the position. But I'll talk to James about it some more too before we actually (make) a decision.

Steve DelBianco: And I will send you the current draft report from the bylaws drafting team so you'll see where the rep is mentioned. Okay?

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay, thank you.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you and Phil. Chris, I was going to turn it over to you to take us through the Channel 3 because Barbara was unable to join today.

Christopher Wilson: Thanks, Steve and thanks for running through that extensive calendar. That was a lot to deal with. Just real quick, you'll see on your channel three, Barbara and I think -- I hope some other BC members, I unfortunately was not able to participate. But on Monday, there was an ICANN call with the CSG folks regarding the FY 2017 operating plan and budget. Was anyone else on that Monday call that may want to speak to -- as you can see, there are a variety of topics discussed. But was anyone on that call that wants to speak on what was discussed on the call?

Jimson Olufuye: Hi, this is Jimson. I was on the call and it was a call to get clarification on the responses of the FY ICANN budget proposal. So the ICANN staff did ask some questions, clarifying questions, and some of them included the issue of the reserve fund, which IPC was quite strong about. And BC also expressed that it was very strong issue for us as well. We talk about the reserve fund and that there is a need for ICANN to show commitment to bring it up to the standard level.

Currently, this is the (unintelligible) of ICANN and budgetary operation operating cost. So they need to bring it up to 100%. So we did ask for the reserve policy (unintelligible) the reserve policy and action plan to rectify this. Then we (focused on) the BC, they asked for clarity on request for (a request

for a) executive summary, which we responded that we (unintelligible) an executive summary for business to have a quick overview of the budget proposal. Currently, it's not there. We did differ on what we expect should be there, like how the previous budget performed and expectations with the current budget proposal. It's some little graph (to show trends).

And also information about the PTI budget proposal 2. So that would be (helpful). Then we raised the Issue of the ODI project that we didn't see the budget (line) and David in Copenhagen showed us 200k earmarked. So they kind of showed the budget line with general little compliance (200K). But the (position) is declared there is no specific budget line for the (Open Data) Initiative and they agree that it need to break it down.

So that is briefly about the call. Just a clarifying call with respect to the comments provided. Thank you.

Christopher Wilson: Thank you, Jimson. Thank you very much and I know Barbara couldn't be on the call today so if folks have additional questions about the call, please feel free to email Jimson and Barbara. I'm sure they'd be happy to answer your questions. Moving right along, a couple of attachments to the policy calendar. Attachment two provides you with some latest notes on planning for ICANN 59. I know Chantelle, I think you were able to put those notes together. I think the last call that occurred on this, this week, really focused primarily on the cross community discussion topics, otherwise known as high interest topics. I believe there's six of them now planned, but I think they -- my understanding is they are truly sort of community accepted topics and none terribly far afield from what is due to be discussed at the policy forum.

Chantelle, maybe I'll just turn to you real quick, if you wanted to go over those notes, just over -- just spend 60 seconds what was discussed that would be great.

Chantelle Doerksen: Sure. Thanks, Chris. This is Chantelle. So really quickly, the ICANN CNI meeting focused on finding volunteers for the high interest topic sessions. So they're still being sought, if anyone is interested in volunteering to help plan them, please email Barbara and myself and we'll pass your name onto the meeting scene. The other note to highlight is that one new session was added, which is called the process flow and impasse resolution project, which Steve noted in the chat is also referred to as the hubba bubba project. This is Goran Marby's project to create more transparency, providing the various steps that the groups take in regards to policy development.

So some of you may have seen the flow charts that were up in Goran's office during ICANN 58 and this session is a follow-up to that and to allow the community to comment on the process documents. Thanks and that's all for me.

Christopher Wilson: Thanks, Chantelle and please do take a look at those attachments that Steve circulated, the policy calendar, including attachment four, which talks about some -- it gives you a sense of the scheduling, block schedule for ICANN 59, but particular note of course is the BC will have one open meeting during the ICANN 59 gathering. That will be Thursday, that Thursday at 12:30 until 1:30. So it will be over the launch period. So it will be on Thursday. So for planning purposes know that that's when the BC will be having its sort of normal, open, public meeting. Unfortunately, it's only an hour but that's just the nature of scheduling during the course of the policy forum meeting because time is condensed with all the other activities going on.

And of course, we want to minimize conflicts with our meetings and other CSG related meetings with all the different policy discussions going on. So please note that for this Thursday, we'll be having the BC meeting. I think that is all I have for CSG activities.

I do see -- Denise, I can't recall if we discussed your CSG call with David Conrad in our last call or no. is that something we want to talk about now? Did we cover that in the last call?

Denise Michel: Yes, we did.

Christopher Wilson: Okay, great. Thank you. Okay, that's it for CSG. Could maybe turn to Jimson if we want to turn to you real quick for finance and operations.

Jimson Olufuye: Yes, thank you very much. This is Jimson. Well, (invoices went out) on May 1st to all members and we'd like to thank members that have already paid, using the platform. The platform (sends) notes provides private and secure means of paying our dues using the credit cards or debit cards. And (the feedback promptly) provided but if BC name the cities required, please do (and let the invoicing secretariat know). Members can also wire their dues to the number on the account that is provided on the invoice.

Then on outreach, they announced this plan for ICANN 59. That is outreach for the local businesses and that is some business leaders across the region by the outreach committee. And it's settled for June 25 2017 and specifically at Radisson Blue. So the members may be approached shortly with regard to speaking at the outreach, but this won't come until the outreach committee finalizes the details. I'm happy that Andy is on the line so he may also weigh in, but let me also mention that the outreach committee is also looking at

participating (in AFRINIC) Internet Summit from Nairobi later this month. Waudo will be attending the event that is (under consideration) by outreach committee for additional (BC) member participation at the event.

Well, I (see Arinola) on this call so maybe it will also weigh in with regard to the Ugandan outreach from what was successful. So Andy, are you there? Can you want to speak on this?

Andrew Mack: Sure, really quickly to everybody because I know we're short on time, in terms of the Johannesburg outreach, we are -- despite the fact that we weren't able to get direct ICANN support for the initial plan that we had, we were able to work with Chris to get some support and actually I think that that's gone very nicely. They've been very, very helpful, basically saying that this was a BC driven event. They gave us some additional flexibility. So they will be supporting part of our outreach effort. We would love to know who from the BC will be there by, say, 11:00 on the 25th, which is the day before things start, so that we could be potentially involving you as a speaker.

But that's definitely going to go forward and thank you, Jimson, for the work that you're doing on that and for the work that you're doing with AFICTA. As Jimson mentioned, we've got recent BC outreach that's taken place in Afghanistan and Uganda, and we've got one coming up in Kenya. And we've also got a number of things that Gabby is working on -- spearheading in Latin America, which look very good.

So we're moving things forward a fair amount. Wherever possible, we are trying to leverage funds from other sources like ICANN so that we can get the absolute maximum amount out of our BC funding. And we will keep you in touch with all of the things that are going on. That's it. Thank you.

Jimson Olufuye: Okay, thank you Andy and Arinola will be only on listening platform and it will be sending the report from the Ugandan outreach shortly. So over to you, Chris. Thank you.

Christopher Wilson: Thank you, Jimson and thank you Andy Mack for that update on outreach. I'm sure that event will be a great one to kick off the ICANN 59 meeting. So thank you for working on that. Just two quick items on AOB. I guess folks know, we will have our BC candidate call for chair of the BC on May 16. Andy Mack has been nominated to be chair and everyone should have received not too long ago Andy's candidate statement. So if you haven't seen it yet, please do look in your email for that and that call again will be on May 16. So we look forward to everyone's participation on that call.

And then our next meeting is now scheduled for two weeks from today on May 25 and welcome your participation on that call. And hope we'll get further progress going on the policy calendar by then. Any questions, or concerns from folks before we sign off?

Andrew Mack: Chris, just one quick thing, I received this morning some questions from Marilyn about the candidate statement and about the plans that we have and I appreciate that and wanted to encourage anybody else who had questions, suggestions, advice, to send them our way because we'll have plenty of time on that candidate call. I'm going to try and address everything at that point and look forward to getting everyone's thoughts.

Christopher Wilson: Thanks. Great. Thank you, Andy, that's right and Marilyn did send out an email I think today or yesterday with a variety of questions for Andy. So please we do hope folks can participate on that call on the 16th. Any other questions, concerns, thoughts for folks? Okay, seeing none then I thank everybody for taking the time to be on the call and look forward to everyone's

participation in a couple of weeks. Thanks so much. We can stop the recording.

Chantelle Doerksen: Thanks, Chris. Operator, you may now stop the recording. Please remember to disconnect.

END