ICANN

Moderator: Terri Agnew
February 8, 2018
10:00 am CT

Coordinator: Recordings have started. Thank you.

Andrea Glandon: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is the BC members call on the 8th of February 2018. In the interest of time there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Adobe Connect room. If you are only on the audio bridge could you please let yourselves be known now?

Susan Kawaguchi: Susan Kawaguchi

((Crosstalk))

Adetola Sogbesan: Adetola

Andrea Glandon: And Adetola Sogbesan. We also have Marcus Eke.

Marcus Eke: Okay this is Marcus.

Andrea Glandon: Thank you. I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise.

With this I will turn it over to Claudia Selli. Please begin.

Claudia Selli: Hi (Andrea). Thank you very much for opening the call and thank you everybody for being present. I just wanted to remind everyone that I sent out information about the possible white boarding session at ICANN61.

For now I have just Marilyn are interested in the session. Please let us know by tonight if possible whether you are interested and we will proceed towards organizing it. For the rest we have quite a busy agenda. So we will start with (Barbara) I think because she has a commitment so she can give out the update on the CSCG.

(Barbara) the floor is yours.

Barbara Wanner: Thank you very much (Claudia). I appreciate everyone's flexibility. You have my report which provided highlights of what we discussed at the intercessional.

I would say on balance it served its purpose of helping us to get to know the other side of the house better and begin to build bridges overall. And I invite others to comment though. I might give us a B- though. We had one eruption that we were chastised about that was not our fault. The eruption was caused by the other side.

But in general, I would say a cooperative spirit prevailed in terms of discussing the issues that we did. In particular the coming as it did

immediately after ICANN's Webinar on GDPR who has enabled a more fulsome discussion of that topic Steve led very masterfully.

And again a topic on which the two sides of the house weren't in total agreement in terms of the longer term picture. But I defer to Steve. He can provide a far more authoritative summary of that discussion.

We also were able to precipitate further action related to the transparency subgroups report which Steve also has detailed at the very end of the policy calendar.

Basically we pressed ICANN legal concerning a proposal by the transparency subgroup via a set of minority views to develop guidelines that would be very clear about when attorney client privilege would be invoked.

So Steve made very clear at the meeting that while we felt that the BC was inclined to support these minority views we still had not followed our process and thoroughly vetted these views with all of you.

So we invite you to read through the minority views which are attached and let us know how you feel. We should come down on this because ICANN legal is waiting to hear what the BC has to say about this.

I will just let you know, give you a heads up that one participant of the transparency group, one of the registries they are assigned is reluctant to support the minority views unless ICANN legal is on board.

So you know it is not sort of a done deal which is why I think it would be important for the BC to make clear how we feel on that.

I am happy to take any specific questions on the intercessional now or I can just move right into ICANN61. Whatever you folks prefer.

I will just move into ICANN61 now. Again this is as I said in our earlier BC meeting this will pretty much follow the schedule that we had at ICANN60.

The CSG will have 90 minutes with the board and we have - you know in terms of discussing this as to what we want to focus on among the ExComm we certainly again raise the importance of engaging with the board on GDPR.

Whois this will come of course after ICANN makes clear what intramodel they will adopt. And I also propose that sort of in the interest of not seeming to complain all the time that we ask the board how the BC, the CSG might make our exchanges with them both at ICANN meetings and intercessional meetings more useful and informative.

The goal would be to give more context to better understand our policy positions and hopefully respond more favorably. So (Claudia) was supportive of adding that to the agenda and I welcome every one of you to just feel free to let me know what other individual topics you would like to raise with the board during our 90 meeting as part of the CSG.

If the other two CSG constituencies also want to explore GDPR Whois again I would like to propose and I welcome feedback that we follow what we did back in Abu Dhabi.

And maybe do a joint or a collaborative intervention at the very beginning of our session so that all constituencies, you know, expressing a common view concerning their concerns about GDPR Whois.

And then maybe each individual constituency can explore one or two topics on their own with the board. So again it is just an idea from me and I welcome your feedback.

Also, (Claudia) raised the express of interest by the strategic group on having a white boarding discussion with us. And Steve has provided information on that in the chat.

My only concern at this point is that and maybe - if the BC wants to pursue this separately with the MSSI. I mean that is great we can follow through with that.

But I think the MSSI is approaching every single constituency and SO and AC. So that, you know, for example they have also approached the CSG concerning participating in this exercise.

So I don't know whether - if the CSG is able to get a sessions with MSSI squeezed into the agenda I don't know if the BC would feel this would be a duplicative undertaking. But I welcome your input on that.

Perhaps if the CSG can't squeeze it into our schedule the BC could pursue it independently something like that.

So I take any questions or concerns you all may have?

Steve DelBianco: (Barbara)?

Barbara Wanner: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: Hey (Barbara) it is Steve DelBianco with respect to the white boarding. If CSG did a white boarding session much of it would be to hammer into ICANN's head that the BC, IPC and ISPC are different.

Barbara Wanner: Are different okay.

Steve DelBianco: CSG is not an entity. I know we would hammer them on that.

Barbara Wanner: Okay.

Steve DelBianco: And I doubt it would have much more that it could cover. So if we did a CSG white boarding we would still need to do a BC white boarding to cover BC priorities.

Barbara Wanner: Very good.

Steve DelBianco: But I wouldn't mind doing both.

Barbara Wanner: Okay.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you.

Barbara Wanner: That is great. Great feedback. I will have a CSG ExComm call on Monday so this is all very helpful input for me.

Claudia Selli: Okay thank you (Barbara). If there are no other questions I would leave the floor to Steve.

Steve DelBianco: (Claudia)?

Claudia Selli: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: Yes (Claudia), thank you. It is Steven. While we still have (Barbara),
because I know she needs to jump to a call, I would ask everyone to just scroll
to the very end of the policy calendar, the very last bit, is what (Barbara) was
discussing with regard to the Workstream 2 transparency recommendations.

This was covered in the intercessional and what (Barbara) and I have done
here is to summarize the three ICANN legal transparency requirements that
we would like you all to consider for having them not just in the minority
report but in the main recommendations that are currently under consideration
in transparency group.

These are transparency standards or requirements for ICANN legal when
ICANN legal decides they want to invoke attorney client privilege or some
other kind of confidentiality provision in order to not reveal a document that
they have in the course of independent review process or IRP or a document
discovery request that could come from anyone in the community.

So it would be great to have a discussion now on whether the BC would
support taking these three elements and moving them from a minority report
into the main report of transparency.

So (Barbara) and I would like to have that conversation now if we can. It was
circulated two days ago. Any comments from BC members?

I will remind you that ICANN and ICANN legal are not part of the
empowered community. They are not one of the chartering organizations or
the CCWG.

So I guess it is important to know what the board and ICANN legal have to say but they are not part of the group that determines whether there is a consensus. It is the five chartering organizations that we use during the transition.

I don't see any hands up. Are there any objections to the BC recommending that these three items on the screen be moved from the minority report to the main report?

(Barbara) I don't see any objections so I think we can let them know. I have already reached out to the ISPs and the IPC to ask them their opinions since I represent the CSG at the CCWG plenary. Boy that is a lot of initials and acronyms.

Barbara Wanner: Okay and then if it is okay with you Steve I will reach out then to Michael Karanicolas who was my co-lead for that transparency discussion. And convey that to him copying Sam Eisner. Would that work?

Steve DelBianco: I think so. And please convey the text that I used to summarize what they did. Because they may say that I didn't summarize it properly but we did attach the entire minority report which is only a little over a page long. So you can just cut and paste from the email.

(Ben) has his hand up. Go ahead (Ben).

Ben Milam: I apologize I was a little slow getting my hand up. Is there any - has there been any request or suggestion for (unintelligible). You mentioned documents specifically being withheld on attorney/client privilege. Has there been any request for privilege log at all with regard to documents?

Steve DelBianco: Yes this is a - when you said is there a request there is no specific instance under which we are pointing to. This is our last chance through the transition than when we have a certain amount of leverage to force accountability and transparency improvements on ICANN. That is our last chance.

So this is a theoretical not a specific case involved. We are trying to raise the bar so that ICANN legal has a high bar to reach before it decides to deny access to documents on the basis of privilege. I don't even know if that answered your question.

Ben Milam: That is okay. I would just respectfully suggest that at privilege log is one of the best ways to keep them accountable for what they claim are attorney/client privilege documents which generally is a pretty narrow category of documents.

So I would respectfully suggest that you might want to think about adding a fourth point which is that if they are going to withhold documents on attorney/client privilege that they have to be required to provide a log.

Steve DelBianco: Let's check the - that's a great idea (Ben). But I believe that the earlier document, the main body of the recommendations may include a requirement for them to document instances where they state privilege. But let's check on that. (Barbara) and I will do that. Thank you (Ben).

Any other hands?

Okay let's scroll to the top of the policy calendar. We only have two open public comment periods so this will go rather quickly today. I simply wanted to acknowledge and thank the BC volunteers who made it possible for the BC

to crank out six comments since our last call. And they are the first six you see on the screen.

Starting on the 18th of January we did questions to ICANN legal on their GDPR process and selection methods. And let me thank Tim Chen, Alex Deacon, (Mary Ellen Callahan), Margie Milam and (Faisal Shah).

And then on the 28th of January we requested ICANN to extend the comment period. They did not. On the 29th of January on the deadline we did comment on ICANN's proposed interim models and Alex Deacon, Margie Milam, (Mary Ellen Callahan), Tim Chen and David Fares contributed to those comments.

Where we said we preferred Model 1 but could live with Model 2 once there is a standardized, centralized means of authenticating Whois access.

And on February 1st when we were out at the intercessional, that morning the BC and the IPC sent a joint letter to the Article 19 working party where we laid out a story, a narrative if you will of why Whois is necessary for legitimate purposes and it was written to help DPAs understand of businesses use Whois to protect consumers and towards cybersecurity threats.

Many thanks to Tim Chen for adding the cybersecurity angle. BC members will recall that we have been working on this for months but this was an opportunity to give a clean, simple narrative to the DPAs in the working parties.

There is no reason to suspect that staff members of the working party DPAs would drill into ICANN's reading list, the BC's comments to find things. We

have to spoon feed these things in a way that is digestible and that is what we did.

On February 1st as well we did another comment which is on ICANN's proposed changes for the meetings strategy. These are changes ICANN had in mind for adding a day or changing the configuration of two of the three ICANN meetings.

Marilyn Cade, (Michelle Chaplow), Arinola, Christian Bope and Tola all contributed to that and then I did some significant editing. Thanks for your help.

And finally, on February 2nd we filed comment on ICANN's changes to the operating standards from those specific reviews. Those were things like the review the new gTLD program. The review of Whois and RDS. The review of accountability and transparency and finally the security stability and resiliency reviews.

(Faisal Shah) led that effort. Susan and I helped along with Marilyn Cade and Lawrence. So great work by the BC. We again go over the top with respect to how many we crank out.

Turning to the comment periods that are open right now. I will just scroll down a little bit here to the channel the bottom here. There are two open public comments that I wanted to bring to your attention. The first is on the FY19 operating plan and budget and a five year update to the operating plan.

These comments close the 8th of March so we have some time. About a month. Jimson I know you have been our fearless leader on budget analysis

and comment and I certainly want to first turn to see whether Jimson would like to lead the way on drafting one for ICANN.

In fact Jimson has already begun as he says in the chat. Let me try to solicit a couple of volunteers who would help Jimson in drafting the BC comment on the budget.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Steve DelBianco: Could not hear that.

Adetola Sogbesan: Adetola.

Steve DelBianco: Okay Tola. Thank you. And Tola you need to start by actually reading the ICANN operating plan and it is long. It is 190 pages. So Jimson could help point you to the executive summary of that document. And parts of it where Jimson could use some assistance at figuring out the BC's commentary.

And finance committee. Thank you Jimson for reminding me. The finance committee will help. And thank you Tola.

All right the other open public comment period is Number 2 in the screen in front of you. Is that ICANN plans to restart the process. They are doing the rollover for the key signing key. This is for a cryptographic key that is on the roots table, the top level root table that is distributed around the world.

And it has a key signing key that enables that table to be secured through DNSSEC. That is DNS Security Extensions. Every several years that key itself needs to be rolled over and changed. And they delayed that last fall for reasons that are explained in ICANN's postponement.

They got acceptable criteria comments and then their new plan is now is now open for public comment. So this is a comment we would file on ICANN's new plan for the key signing key rollover.

Let me ask BC volunteers to see if they can help to understand that. It is a relatively brief plan and shouldn't be very difficult at all.

Denise Michel: This is Denise. I would be happy to help.

Susan Kawaguchi: And this is Susan. I would be happy to help too.

Steve DelBianco: Great and Denise and Susan end up being - carrying way too much of the load on public comments and leadership both at council and on review teams. So let's have at least one more BC member volunteer to help Susan and Denise please.

Hey (Stephanie) fantastic. See if somebody on Google's technology side can help. Thank you (Stephanie).

All right I want to turn things over to Marie Pattullo and Susan Kawaguchi to cover Channel 2 which is the GNSO Council. Before I do that I will remind all of you that I prepared a Google Doc summarizing all of the key documents for GDPR and Whois.

And the link to that document is right there on the top of the policy calendar. It is a Google shared doc. If you see things that are missing please let me know and I will add them. But I have got graphics in there from the timeline we proposed.

ICANN's chart of models. I put in the slides we presented at the intercessional on GDPR. And I actually added Tim Chen's comments on the latest European Commission letter that came over two days ago.

So I found that it was rather cumbersome to jam all that into the policy calendar. So now we will have a live document that any of you can reach on any event with internet access. If you see that I need to make changes let me know.

And again that is a document that is available all the time and it is a Google Doc.

Susan I will turn it over to you and to Marie.

Susan Kawaguchi: Thanks very much Steve. And Marie jump in anytime you - if I leave anything out or you just want to comment.

So Marie and I were in ICANN offices last week for three days for a GNSO Council strategic planning meeting which was extremely timely. You know this was a special request for funding last year and James Bladel proposed this.

Usually the GNSO Council only has a day after the fall meeting where we get to know the new counselors or the new counselors get to know us. And they will - sorry somebody ringing my doorbell.

But James realized that we needed more planning to be done because of the IANA transition. And so we received funding for - from ICANN for three solid days. We used every minute of it. And I think some good work came out of it.

A lot of follow up will be done. One of the key areas was the Empowered Community has now - GNSO Council has new roles and responsibilities that we're trying to define and understand. And an example of that is the review team selection. So the SOs and ACs all get together as part of the Empowered Community and - in my opinion, personal opinion - this isn't working so well.

So refining how we work with the SOs and ACs was a large topic of discussion. The other that we spent a lot of time on was the role of the liaison from the GNSO Council to the PDPs. Each PDP is assigned a liaison from the Council. This has been very lightweight, sort of checking in, you know, let us know if you have any problems or concerns.

And I'm sure - as you - as you're all so involved with PDPs - you have seen issues with several of the PDPs. And people having a hard time sort of getting along and then agreeing. And so the Curative Rights PDP right now - which I happen to be the liaison for - is actually - we have one of the members invoking part of 3.7 of the bylaws - or the GNSO rules - to have actions of the co-chairs reviewed.

So that has not happened in a long while, so we're going through that process. But even the RPN, the RDS, and I think the Sub-Pro group have had issues with (ombudsman) needs to come in. So this is - we're seeing a different level of interaction. Larger groups sometimes make it harder to, you know, we're lucky that we have a lot in the community that participate. But that also brings a larger management role to those GNSOs. So we spent a lot of time on those two subjects.

Also just sort of getting along with our - the other sides of the house. And - of both houses. And you know, going over what we were planning for the next year. Marie, is there anything to add?

((Crosstalk))

Maria Pattullo: Thanks Susan. So...

Susan Kawaguchi: Go ahead.

Maria Pattullo: Okay, thank you. I suppose the main thing that I would add to what you said would be to extend a bit about the comment on PDPs beyond the liaison.

There have been a number of issues with timelines. A number of issues with certain working group members choosing to obfuscate and filibuster and fill up mail streams with not so much inappropriate but useless comments. So there's been a discussion as to how Council can talk with the leadership of the PDPs to see maybe if we can develop some kind of white paper, some sort of guidelines.

Obviously this is not - and I underscore that - Council taking over. It's Council trying to work with leadership to manage the process. To make it more effective, more transparent, more efficient. And above all, to make it more rapid when that's possible. When it's appropriate.

Another discussion we had at some length - which was picked off by (Goran) when he came to speak with us - was the infamous budget. Gone are the days of (unintelligible) out of the ICANN offices. We have to watch what we're spending. We have to make sure it's being spent correctly.

There were a couple side discussions on that. There are some relatively simple ways to ensure correct budget management - one of them I put in the chat already - in that there are seven programs that are almost blanket funded. But we don't come back to revisit them a year later, 18 months later, to find out if the money was well-spent, where are their KPIs, if they're a decent return on the investment.

So again, a high level management - if you like - to make sure that we're keeping an eye - in realistic terms - as to how finance is being dealt with. (Holly), (out of here). Think that's all, unless I've missed something Susan.

Susan Kawaguchi: No, I think that was good review. The agenda for the Council meeting won't be out until Monday. For the next one.

Claudia Selli: Thank you Susan and Marie. If there are no hands up or no comments, I will call on Jimson to give your update.

Jimson Olufuye: Thank you very much (Claudia). And let me use opportunity to really thank Steve for all the hard work which really taking us up on the GDPR and all the processes. And also to our (councilors) and the chair. Thank you very much, especially (keen) regard to all the inputs leading to the success of the intersessional. So well done all.

And I also would like to add my voice to need to get briefing on the MSSI Wide Body. So I think it's a good thing for us to brainstorm on those initiatives. Now to my report.

We have submitted four budget requests to ICANN as the Chair (Claudia) (for committed) members from the list I will say this week. BC Officers travel for

three officers. And you can recall that the fourth officer we have to take care of the funding for the fourth officer. You approved that earlier.

And the - another request we made was for ICANN to continue to support our outreach efforts regard to printing of outreach materials. Like they've always been helping printing our newsletters. Currently we are preparing the newsletters for ICANN61 to be in English and also with translation to Spanish.

So if there's any last minute articles that anyone wants to contribute we could still take it now - between now and tomorrow. So we submitted a budget request on that. So that in FY19 ICANN will commit to print our newsletters while we do the design. BC pays for the design.

So and the thought about this request is on leadership development, especially for potential leaders from developing countries. This particular request is to further strengthening the onboarding of business leaders from developing countries in particular.

Then the last budget request is with respect to the need for BC to increase its engagement at the IGF. A number of BC members usually attend IGF, but it would be good for us to have a workshop and then offer opportunity for outreach at the IGF as well. So we're putting a request in that regard.

Currently the NCSG, I think (NCUC) they have - as published - a booth at IGF every year. And also they do have some workshop they conduct themselves. So those are the four budget requests. On BC Officers travel, three officers. Outreach material printing. Leadership development. And IGF 2019 workshop and engagement.

Well the others regard to CROP. That is already in the main ICANN budget. CROP is the Community Regional Outreach Program. So that one is already in the budget. And we'll be talking more about the outreach, I believe maybe Andrew here on the call so that he can talk more about the outreach plan for San Juan.

Next is on Reserve Fund. You can recall that Reserve fund was (really) concern to everyone. And the - Marie mentioned something in that regard. Not (too many) go. So we placed - we put in our comment when ICANN published the policy on the Reserve Fund. And the summary of all the inputs have been polished.

We – push for 17 months. That should be 17 months' result, basically. Between 12 and 17 months. But from what I could gather, NCSG suggested a minimum of 24 months. A minimum of 24 months. And just for your information as well, a number of ideas were proposed in regard to how the Reserve Fund could be replenished.

This stems from the use of the auction proceeds, okay. And also with the New gTLD funding course would be used. And so on and so forth. So but the final decision is yet to be taken on these. But all those that are on (unintelligible) on this call that there's need for ICANN to have sufficient fund in the Reserve to mitigate any risk.

Next I want to just mention about the RFP sent to the list, just to provide more clarity on that. We do not want to be (unintelligible) on our ways, regard to our data - our website - so that's why we're looking at ways of having a backup plan.

Backup - a backup plan is to have a contractor take care of our possible risk in (unintelligible) with (which side) and differ with member clicks. So if there's any question with regard to that, please ready to take it. But feel the (unintelligible) is necessary for also have the backup plan for our data.

And I'm happy to inform us that we've filing our tax compliance requirement as a non-profit organization. So legal counsel - you can recall that we have a legal counsel - so he's been quite forthcoming and has been very responsive to done the filing to ensure that we are in full compliance. Okay. That is all about what I have to report to you.

There's a plan - as I mentioned - for outreach in San Juan, ICANN 61. And Andrew Mack is leading that. I don't know if Andrew Mack is on the call or anyone in the Outreach Committee to - that will speak on that. So while I wait for input on that, maybe if there's any question? Is there any questions concerning this report?

Claudia Selli: Jimson, I don't see hands up.

Jimson Olufuye: Okay. So maybe we'll have that report at the next meeting. Andrew could provide an update for us on the plans for outreach in San Juan. So on that note I'll...

((Crosstalk))

Claudia Selli: I can reach out to Andrew and ask him.

Jimson Olufuye: Okay.

Claudia Selli: Thank you Jimson. I'll try to reach out to Andrew and see whether he can provide a report either to the next call or in written so that we can distribute it to members. I don't know if there are any other points or anyone that wants to share something with the group? Please raise your hand now.

So it seems there's no one. The next meeting will be on the 22nd of - yes, I have Steve. Steve, please.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you (Claudia). Hey, I've become aware that the US Commerce Department - NTIA - they represent the US government on the GAC. That is their only special relationship - there's no different than any other government any more - but they are convening a new Notice of Inquiry - they call it NOI in the US - a Notice of Inquiry where the Commerce Department is going to be asking the public for ideas on initiatives they might undertake.

And those initiatives are broad-ranging. They were discussed by (David Rittle) - the NTIA Administrator - at State of the Net last Monday. And they include things like cyber security, the multi-stakeholder model itself, IGF, artificial intelligence, Whois and GDPR.

And it will also include a question in reaction to some members of the US Congress who wanted to see whether the IANA arrangement could be pulled back. There's very little prospects that ICANN would ever enter a brand new arrangement in a voluntary way, and yet you never know what kind of ideas somebody might came up with.

So that will - that question will be in the NOI - the Notice of Inquiry - it'll be one of 20 or 30 questions. It should come out probably next week. It's a 45-day public comment process where anyone from anywhere in the world can submit a comment. So I wanted to make sure people knew that was coming.

I'm not particularly concerned about it, but I didn't want everybody to be blindsided by it. Thank you.

Claudia Selli: Thank you Steve. And also as an information point - because I forgot before - but the Whois GDPR was discussed during the (Permission) Society dialogue between the European Commission and the US Government when they came to Brussels last week on the 31st, 1st of February and 2nd of February.

I don't have yet the reading of the meetings, but I - the US mission should reach out to others - American Chamber of Commerce - and they should tell us what it was said in the meeting. So if I find out anything I will of course let you know. And Jimson, you had the hand up as well. Jimson, are you there?

Jimson Olufuye: Oh yes. Yes. This is Jimson. I also wanted to update members with regard to the outcome of the last meeting of the United Nations Commission for Science and Technology working group on Enhanced Cooperation. International Public Policy Matters Pertaining to the Internet.

Marilyn and I we're members of the working group where (talk of) the five sort of business representatives in that working group. The working group was to see how the (unintelligible) agenda can be realized respect to government having opportunity to make policy and determine policy direction concerning the internet.

Unfortunately, the group could not come to consensus on the (actual) goal because some governments feel that there should be new United Nation institutions. New mechanism entirely to govern the internet public policy issues. But same time, a number for that government and business we do not favor a new institution mechanism like the ITU. So the whole session was deadlocked.

So as it were, the second working group was (unintelligible) recording its success regard to what is expected the working group to come up with. So we could not have any consensus. So just to let you know that was a deadlock. Thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Claudia Selli: Thank you Jimson. Steve, if you...

Steve DelBianco: Yes...

Claudia Selli: ...I see your hand up.

Steve DelBianco: ...thank you. Thank you (Claudia). During the call I did a bunch of research. And the actual recommendations of the Work Stream Two Transparency Report don't include things like a ten-day limit on DIDP requests, nor do they include a log, a privilege log.

So they - these were not items that were in the report. And unfortunately - many weeks ago - the BC missed the chance to add those items to the report when we commented on it. So I'm very grateful for (Ben) coming up with something at this point, but we are late at coming up with these comments.

So it will have to be something we tie to an earlier thread to suggest that we're clarifying or slightly expanding on something. So (Ben) - if you're still with us - I would like you to follow that link I did to the Transparency main report please. It's on the bottom of the chat.

And (Ben) if you can find a way we can work your ten-day DIDP request in as something that's a clarification and a slight expansion, then we'll have a chance of pushing for it. But that comment period finished. And we are now in a state where we're trying to assemble all nine of the Work Stream Two threads into a giant report that would then be approved by all of the chartering organizations in ICANN.

And we were trying to get that done during 2018. So that is not a place where a small one-off add can be done very easily. So (Ben), I'll appreciate your feedback. And thank you for letting me know in the chat that you'll do that. That's all I have, (Claudia).

Claudia Selli: Thank you Steve. Any other points from other participants? Okay. If there is nothing else, we'll close the call and just remind you that the next call is on 22nd of February. And thank you everybody for participating.

END