ICANN

Moderator: Benedetta Rossi
March 6, 2014
10:00 am CT

Coordinator: Excuse me, the record lines are in at the time.

Benedetta Rossi: Thank you very much, (Carol). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the BC members call taking place of the 6th of March, 2014.

On the call today we have Elisa Cooper, Stéphane Duchesneau, Janet O'Callaghan, Marilyn Cade, Andy Abrams, Ron Andruff, Steve DelBianco and Marie Pattullo. On the Adobe Connect we have Alex Deacon, Gabriella Szlak and Jimson Olufuye.

We have apologies from John Berard, Laura Covington and (unintelligible). I would like to remind all participants to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes.

Thank you very much and over to you, Elisa.

Elisa Cooper: Thanks, Bennie. So I think Bennie was - I really wanted to spend a fair amount of time today going over our planned agenda for the upcoming meeting in Singapore. And I sent out a draft agenda for our BC meetings and our meeting that we are participating in with the full CSG, Commercial Stakeholders Group, which also includes the Intellectual Property Constituency and the ISPs.

This is our turn to coordinate those meetings in terms of trying to help get the schedules coordinated and so forth. But we're still kind of finalizing the agendas. And what we have right now are basically some draft agendas that I kind of want to talk through with you and get any feedback from you in terms of things that you don't want to bother talking about or things that you want to make sure that we're covering.

And so Bennie, on the Adobe Connect, has posted the draft agendas. And our first meeting will be on the Sunday morning as we typically have with Bruce and Bill who are essentially representatives on the Board. And that's an opportunity for us to discuss with them things that we're thinking about and to try to really give information to them.

They are never really able to speak on behalf of the Board but this is an opportunity for us to communicate to them along with the other CSG groups to basically, you know, give them and feed them information.

Now there's one other topic that's being proposed that we add, and I think it's probably a good one, and it's around making the CEO accountable. So we'll probably be adding that bullet as well.

But right now I think there is a desire to talk about some of the outstanding new gTLD issues. There's still a number of things, I think, that are of concern

to companies and to brand owners around some of the rights protection mechanisms, around some of the things that are happening with blocking, around pre registrations that some registries are offering. So I think we have some - there are some things there to definitely discuss.

There's definitely a desire to talk about Internet governance activities, the budget, to talk a little bit more about name collisions. And I think, you know, since Fadi's big focus is on ICANN globalization I think we want to make sure that whatever - to try to maybe understand that a little bit and get some further clarification.

But are there other things that we would also like to be discussing with Bruce and Bill when we meet with them on Sunday morning?

Marilyn Cade: Elisa, it's Marilyn. The only comment I'm going to make is I know we've got a limited turnout today so maybe we want to also post the question to BC members and give them a short turnaround...

((Crosstalk))

Elisa Cooper: Yeah, actually - right, that's a great idea. I actually did send this information out so all members already have this and I believe it went out on Monday. So I'm just trying to do some clarification.

We actually have - I think we have about 17 or so participants so I think we're not too bad. But I agree, people should definitely feel free to contact me via email if they have other things or think about things later. But I thought I'd use this opportunity to open up any discussion and ask if there are any other things we want to bring to Bruce and Bill.

Marilyn Cade: Right. And it's Marilyn again. I think if we could ask members to just post to the ExComm that would be very helpful if they could do that.

Elisa Cooper: Yeah, actually I would just ask you to probably send it to the full list because if, you know, basically then everyone can be aware of the questions...

Marilyn Cade: Right, right.

Elisa Cooper: ...and comments. Steve.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks, Elisa. The list of topics - this is an 8:00-9:00 - a one hour. And if you remember prior interactions with Bruce and with Bill Graham if we just add more and more topics to the list you have that doesn't prioritize them. And prioritizing ends up being really important because no single topic can really be covered in less than 15 minutes.

Elisa Cooper: Yeah.

Steve DelBianco: Which seems to be really enough time for about four topics. We can always list for them a comprehensive list of areas where we have concerns. We may decide that - to focus the one-hour discussion productively that we devote as much as 15 minutes each to four major topics. And that would require that we prioritize. So when people weigh in on things to talk about it would be important for them to rank their top three topics for discussion.

Elisa Cooper: Yeah, that's an excellent point. Thanks, Steve.

Marilyn Cade: Great.

Elisa Cooper: Right now we've got five and we probably should try to pare back to four. So, you know, if these are the right five let's try to figure out what the top four are.

Marilyn Cade: Elisa, it's Marilyn. Another idea would be that we prioritize those we talk about but just note for informational purposes to the Board - to the two Board members - that these are additional areas of concern. And that way we get it on the radar screen but to Steve's point, we prioritize what we talk about.

Elisa Cooper: Okay.

Steve DelBianco: Elisa, could I follow up on that please?

Elisa Cooper: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: And so my priority - my priority vote probably goes to the squeeze problem where top down panels presenting their recommendations directly to the Board and bottom up crowd sourcing put the squeeze on the entire advisory committee and stakeholder organization structure we have at ICANN. Why are we working so hard when the most we can do is lob comments in on what the experts are telling the Board they should do? And that's not among the list here.

Elisa Cooper: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: ...there's a chance we could fire up Bruce Tonkin and Bill Graham, who have a long history of working within, especially Bruce does, a long history of working within the experts in an AC SO to come up with policy and they

ought to stand with us on this. So given the audience of those two Board members I believe that should be in the top three. Thanks.

Elisa Cooper: Okay. That's a great suggestion. I'll put that down as strategy panel recommendation. And I think we'll probably all know what that means.

Steve DelBianco: Yeah, top down and crowd sourcing, finding a way to also cover that. Because one of the top down recommendations is to let the staff manage disparate regional crowd sourcing on policy and therein puts all the power in the hands of the staff and takes the power away from us.

Elisa Cooper: Okay. Great idea. So moving on any other thoughts about what we might have an interest in discussing with Bruce and Bill? Jimson. Oh, Jimson, I think you're on mute like I can see your microphone has got a red bar across it so we're not able to hear you. There you go.

Jimson Olufuye: Okay can you hear me now?

Elisa Cooper: Yes but very faintly.

Jimson Olufuye: Okay. Thank you very much, Elisa. Well, just a follow up to the (unintelligible) that Steve raised I'm also interested in the feedback mechanism from our Board representatives. How often they feed us back - I'm interested in getting to having the information (unintelligible) that. And regard to the Board activities, etcetera, etcetera. Thank you.

Elisa Cooper: Okay. So a topic around Board feedback mechanisms. Okay so what I'll do is I'll update this and I'll add these other items and then if you can - if members can help me prioritize what you're most interested in that would be helpful.

So moving down the list so we're - we've got our first meeting with the CSG.
It will occur on Sunday. And I believe the timing will be 4:30-6:30. Now
we've already discussed, at the CSG level, the topics. And I think, as I
mentioned, one additional one that might be added here is something around
CEO accountability.

But I see, you know, maybe the topic that Steve just mentioned would also be
something the CSG would be interested in raising. The purpose of this CSG
meeting, it's a closed meeting and it's a two-hour meeting - I believe that's
what it's scheduled for - is for us to really talk about what it is that we want to
bring to the Board.

So I think there'll be some flexibility in, you know, in terms of kind of
discussing these things and rank ordering them in this meeting because we
haven't, obviously there are too many topics here to bring to the Board in a
one-hour meeting. But this is an opportunity for us to meet as a group to
discuss these things.

Any - Ron.

Ron Andruff: Thank you very much, Chair. I wanted to just ask a question. I know that John
Berard has been promoting the idea of a crowd sourced review of the CEO
within the Council. I'm not sure where that stands. I wonder if you have any
information on that because it certainly is something that many of us support
and I just - if the GNSO Council is going to lead the way on that it'd be good
to know. Do you have any information on that, by chance?

Elisa Cooper: I've seen some information that he's prepared but this topic around CEO
accountability is kind of going to that topic.

Ron Andruff: Perfect, thank you.

Elisa Cooper: So I think, yeah, so that's what that topic of sort of CEO accountability is like what mechanism do we put in place or how could we go about doing that.

Ron Andruff: Thank you.

Elisa Cooper: Yeah.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Elisa, this is Stéphane.

Elisa Cooper: Yeah, oh hi.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Hi. Hi. Can I just ask just a small point to whoever's manning the Adobe to let me in the room because I've been waiting for 10 minutes to get in and I can't raise my hand to participate.

Andrew Mack: I'm also - Stéphane, this is Andrew, I'm also in the same position.

((Crosstalk))

Benedetta Rossi: Are you trying to join from mobile apps or are you using your computer?

Stéphane Van Gelder: From my computer.

Andrew Mack: And I'm calling from my phone.

((Crosstalk))

Benedetta Rossi: I don't actually see your request.

Marilyn Cade: Bennie. Bennie, I'm having...

Stéphane Van Gelder: My request is pending.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

((Crosstalk))

Stéphane Van Gelder: So just to let you know.

Marilyn Cade: And I'm having the same problem so maybe the - did you send out a new conference number? Because I can't - it's Marilyn - I can't get into it either. I don't want to hold this up but neither can I.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Elisa, if I can just...

Elisa Cooper: Yeah, yeah, yeah go ahead, Stéphane.

((Crosstalk))

Stéphane Van Gelder: ...crowd sourcing.

Elisa Cooper: Yeah, Stéphane, then Gabby then Phil.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thank you. Just a follow up on Ron's points I'd actually be - I don't know if John's on the call - but I'd actually be interested to know - I've been following the discussions there on the GNSO Council list. And I'm actually unclear as to exactly what the state of the initiative is as well at the moment.

And if John could give a quick update that might be useful because my understanding is that John kind of spurred the idea on, kick started it and it's become a more general discussion about the role of the Council within the - as part of, you know, is it appropriate for the Council to question the leadership? And if so in what capacity and in what way?

So I'm curious to know if there's any further developments there that we might have missed. Thanks.

Elisa Cooper: Yeah, so John actually sent his regret and was unable to make this call. But we do have a pre-Council call scheduled for a week from today so hopefully we can hear from him on this topic then.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Okay thanks.

Marilyn Cade: Elisa, it's Marilyn. I can't get into Adobe Connect but I'd like to raise my hand on this topic.

Elisa Cooper: Okay, but I do want to make sure that we get through these topics because I'm sure that you have an update on the CSG that you want to get to. So, Gabby, then Phil then Marilyn. Let's try to stay focused on the agenda for the upcoming meeting in Singapore. Gabby.

Gabriela Szlak: Yes. Just to give the impression that I have that this discussion is still ongoing in the Council. And we haven't got any specific decision about this issue that we are talking about right now. And I think this is going to be discussed in our meeting in Singapore probably - probably in the weekend.

I'm going to check this out and give you more information. John can be able - also give you more information on this. But the discussion is still open and as

Stéphane as said, there has been a discussion about this. This is something that we should do how we're going to do it, who is going to be involved and how process and everything. So this is on the discussion. So this is (unintelligible) actually.

Elisa Cooper: Thanks, Gabby. Phil.

Phillip Sheppard: Yeah, thank you, Elisa. Following up on this issue of CEO accountability I think we need to bring up with these Board members to get the issue of Board accountability. Frankly, the secret resolution in September that authorized Fadi to do some of the things he did, we're not sure how much the Board really knew about what he was up to, was a new low point for the ICANN Board.

It showed a complete distrust of the community. The excuse that if somehow they told other people that the 1net organizations were going to discuss further evolution of Internet governance that would have scuttled it. I don't find that credible. The Board has no public meetings anymore. The minutes are a joke.

If you read those minutes you would think that every decision from the Board is unanimous and there's no debate at all. There's never a vote count. So I think we need to be frank with the Board. The Board has become completely opaque in its actions. There is no transparency and without transparency there's no accountability.

Elisa Cooper: Okay great. I will bring that back to the CSG or Marilyn can do that, that we would like to expand the topic to be beyond just focusing on the CEO but the Board. Any other...

((Crosstalk))

Phil Corwin: ...I think that secret resolution last September can't go without comment.

Elisa Cooper: Yeah, okay. Got it.

Phil Corwin: Thank you.

Elisa Cooper: So moving down the list so we've got our first...

Marilyn Cade: Elisa?

Elisa Cooper: Yeah, go ahead.

Marilyn Cade: Sorry. I think I was in the queue on this. Let me just quickly say that as the
                 CSG rep I've captured this. And why don't Elisa and I bring this up with the
                 CSG Executive Committee? But I think this is a kind of discussion and maybe
                 we could come back for our next call after we've heard from others in the
                 CSG ExComm. Would that be okay?

Elisa Cooper: Thanks, Marilyn. So moving on to our closed meeting, which will be on
                 Monday so this is typically, you know, we grab lunch, we go into this
                 meeting. We've got an hour and a half.

                 I know there's a lot of interest from members around sort of this upcoming
                 NETmundial and Internet governance in general. The other thing that seems -
                 I think will probably take center stage and basically Steve wanted to have a
                 little bit of discussion with Bruce and Bill about, you know, these strategy
                 panel recommendations. But I think that we should also, you know, we need
                 to have, I think, further discussion on these strategy panel recommendations
                 an what we think about them.

But are there other things that we want to discuss in a closed session on that Monday? So we will have heard, in the morning, from Fadi and from his executive team so there may be things that we'll want to discuss, you know, based on what has happened in that Monday morning opening session. But are there other things that we want to have in here during our closed session?

Because this is really our - this is kind of really our only opportunity before, you know, we meet Tuesday and before we speak with the Board where we can speak amongst ourselves in a closed session.

Marilyn Cade: Elisa, it's Marilyn. I'm not able to see - this is my fault - I'm not able to see if David and Bill and Aparna are on the (unintelligible). The timing of the CCWG session, which we're representing the BC on, might be relevant here.

And it will either be - we have recently thought it would be right after Fadi's comments but now there's a negotiation going on and it may be right after lunch. But in either case I think it's really important for the BC members and maybe David or Aparna or Phil would want to - I'm the designated rep in helping to plan what the format will be but we're coming back to everyone to ask them for input. But the timing I think is critical for it as the BC.

Elisa Cooper: Okay and so you believe that that CCWG meeting will be after Fadi's opening but before lunch?

Marilyn Cade: We asked to have it after Fadi's opening and before lunch but right now that was not accepted. And one of Fadi's panels is in the morning and the CCWG is in the afternoon. It's right up against name collision. The CCWG program committee is writing a letter advising that that's not useful, name collision has to be moved so that everyone can participate.

But it will either be in the morning or right after lunch. And I can't - I doubt very much if the ICANN staff will allow us to have it right after Fadi which will mean the lunch event would be right before the CCWG public forum - the public session, sorry.

Elisa Cooper: Okay well probably in either instance we'll either want to discuss what we've just heard or discuss what you're planning on proposing or saying in that meeting.

Marilyn Cade: Right. Right.

Elisa Cooper: Jimson, I see your have your hand raised and I see you're also on mute again still.

Jimson Olufuye: Yes, thank you Elisa. Well, I could see that we have a meeting with the GAC on Tuesday so I'm thinking perhaps we can have some little feedback on the CSTD Working Group meeting that took place in Geneva at our closed meeting. There are a number of governments that did not show up during the CSTD meeting in Geneva so perhaps when we're talking about cooperation it would be important to bring it up.

So maybe we could discuss CSTD meeting because there are a lot of things that many governments are not aware that ICANN does - so that ICANN is involved in so maybe we can have some little discussion on the - on the CSTD activities and the globalization of the Internet.

Elisa Cooper: So you're proposing now we would discuss that in our Monday meeting in preparation for our Tuesday breakfast so we can have those discussions on Tuesday, is that what you're recommending?

Jimson Olufuye: Yes.

Elisa Cooper: Okay. And can you just send me a bullet point about what that topic is for the
                   - that you would want to consider on the Monday lunch meeting?

Jimson Olufuye: Yes, I'll do that.

Elisa Cooper: Okay great. Okay so moving on so we've already - these topics - so we're
                   scheduled to meet with the GAC. These topics are - they're very sort of wide
                   ranging and loose and we kind of always recommend that there are a couple of
                   topics that we want to discuss with the GAC. And, you know, one is going to
                   be around how can we improve communication between the GNSO and the
                   GAC?

                   And the other one is a very open ended discussion point about Internet
                   governance. And so those are set and I believe that's what's been provided by
                   Marilyn to the GAC so I don't - there's no much to negotiate or discuss there.

                   Then we've got, moving on, we've got our CSG meeting. This is really an
                   opportunity for us to meet just before we meet with the Board. So the bulk of
                   that session will be really prepping for the Board but we'll also have an
                   opportunity to spend 30 minutes with the SSAC. And that's an opportunity for
                   us to hear from them updates on a couple of recent reports that they've
                   published and I'm sure we'll be able to also address any other security kinds of
                   questions that we have.

                   Then we've got our meeting with the Board and then we move into our open
                   BC meeting. And, you know, I've, you know, based on topics, based on what
                   I'm hearing, you know, this is my set of recommendations. What I'd really like

everyone to do is take a look at these. I think these strategy panel recommendations deserve some time and focus.

And, you know, what I've, you know, the thought that I had was if there were some volunteers that would be willing to take a look at each of the strategy panel recommendations and help us talk through them as a group to figure out how we might comment on them I think that would be tremendously helpful. I'm not sure what others feel about that.

And I'm not - so actually I'd like to ask Steve if you think that's a worthwhile endeavor from a policy perspective?

Steve DelBianco: Yeah, it's not only worthwhile but it's essential. It's the eighth item listed on my policy calendar because we have public comments due by April 30 on all four of the strat panels. I included in my policy calendar a link to the strat panels' preliminary reports. And, you're right, we need volunteers and we need to divide and conquer so that one volunteer might take the identifier technology, another on ICANN's role in the ecosystem, multistakeholder innovation and public responsibility.

And, Elisa, so I was going to try to get to that in the policy section but now that we're here can we have a few volunteers for those four? And, Bennie, if you're able to put the policy calendar up and we'll show those four groups so people can pick one.

Marilyn Cade: Elisa, it's Marilyn. Can I support the importance of this and say that maybe actually might even want to - so this is an hour and 15 minutes, is that right?

Elisa Cooper: That's right.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah. I think this is very important because the first hearing - the first - the panel documents will be posted but the first opportunity to hear from the panels will be Monday, I believe, from the agenda. And they're going to be overlapping.

And I think this is - this is a very unique opportunity for us. It's going to be after we meet with the Board. And maybe we might also add to the CSG discussion in the morning just agreement on a statement about the importance of allowing the community to fully engage and understand and consider these recommendations. So I really support this. I think we might want to just add that statement back in.

And I'm happy to raise that with the CSG ExComm. So in the morning - because when we go meet with the Board we will have - we will have had that meeting with the Board from the CSG. And we probably ought to send a strong message then that the communities need time to digest, understand and debate and consider blah, blah, blah.

Elisa Cooper: Thanks, Marilyn. Okay so I see there are quite a few people that are in the queue. But I'd like to take this opportunity now to ask for volunteers to sort of take the leadership - basically take the lead on each of these different recommendations to help kind of talk through the key points of the recommendations from each of these panels at our meeting in Singapore when we meet on the Tuesday.

So is there somebody that would be willing to take on the topic around identifier technology innovation? Is there somebody that will be attending or attending remotely that would be willing to take us through the key recommendations and your thoughts as to how the BC might respond?

Steve DelBianco: Yeah, and Elisa, even if they can't attend remotely or in person a simple outline on the key elements that are relevant to the BC could be provided in writing before the meeting.

Elisa Cooper: Okay great idea.

Gabriela Szlak: Okay so this is Gabby. I think I can volunteer for the multistakeholder innovation panel because actually at the Council we're focusing on that a lot. And so I think we are going to even have a meeting during Singapore with the members of that panel. So...

Elisa Cooper: Okay great.

Gabriela Szlak: ...I would be willing to go - okay.

Elisa Cooper: Awesome. Okay and I see Angie would go for - would take on two or three. So...

Gabriela Szlak: So is anyone - this is Gabby again - if anyone wants to join me with this work I'm happy to have other volunteers as well with me.

Elisa Cooper: Okay. So, Angie, if you want to take the second one, ICANN's role in the Internet governance ecosystem.

Steve DelBianco: I can work on Angie - with Angie on that. This is Steve.

Elisa Cooper: Okay. Okay so we need somebody still to do identifier technology innovation.

Chris Chaplow: Elisa, Chris here. The one that I'm closest to is the multistakeholder innovation so happy to join Gabby on that. Just on that - the identifier one you

just mentioned, I mean, that's is a techy one and we might get help from the ISPs on that one as well, you know, people like Mikey and so on.

Elisa Cooper: Yeah.

Steve DelBianco: And Jim Baskin - is Jim on the call today as well?

Elisa Cooper: Okay so I can probably take that first one because I may be closest to that actually. And then we just need one person who can take us through and help us go through these panel recommendations for public responsibility framework. So is there somebody that would be able to take us through those recommendations? I know there's somebody.

Doesn't have to be perfect but somebody that could sort of take us through the high level summary recommendations so at least we understand whether or not this is even something that we want to be commenting on and understand what this is all about.

Jimson Olufuye: Hi, Elisa.

Elisa Cooper: Yes.

Jimson Olufuye: I could give it a shot.

Elisa Cooper: Thank you, Jimson. Okay I think we've got - so let me just make sure I have everyone. So I will do the first one.

Marilyn Cade: And, I'm sorry, which one is that, Elisa?

Elisa Cooper: The identifier technology innovation.

Marilyn Cade: Identifier technology, thanks. Isn't there actually a fifth one and that is that...

Elisa Cooper: Those recommendations are not yet released, I don't believe.

Steve DelBianco: That's right. These are the only four posted for public comment right now.

Marilyn Cade: Right. But maybe we should just park that issue of that fifth panel in case it gets released before. We would want to comment on that as well if it does get released.

Elisa Cooper: Okay. Well I don't know what the exact...

((Crosstalk))

Elisa Cooper: ...title of that - that's the strategy panel on Internet governance, I think.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah, yeah.

Steve DelBianco: And so, Elisa, to finish your list up then we have Angie and Steve on the role in the Internet governance ecosystem; Chris and Gabby on ICANN multistakeholder innovation; and Jimson to take the first shot at public responsibility framework. And be happy to help any of you with any of those but thanks for volunteering.

Andrew Mack: And, Steve, this is Andrew. I'll join Gabby and Chris.

Angie Graves: And Aparna volunteered also to help out with us, Steve, you and I. Great.

Elisa Cooper: Excellent, thank you so much. I think this will be an excellent session for us and I think we'll probably all get a lot of out it. And I think it's great that each of us are volunteering.

The next session - there are a number of issues around new gTLDs that businesses are facing so I wanted to spend a good amount of time on that. Then I think there's still interest on Internet governance issues and a review of sort of where we're at with that. Is there somebody who would be willing to sort of take the lead on that discussion?

And I know, Phil, you're very active and have been following that very closely. Is that something that you might be willing to kind of lead us through?

Phil Corwin: Well, what's the topic? I mean...

Elisa Cooper: Like around Internet governance and kind of where things are at and how things are shaping up.

Phil Corwin: Well, I'll give a very brief report. I'm trying to follow the 1net list and participate in the CCWG. I was on yesterday's call for most of it but not in the Adobe room so I was just on mute. I was in my car. The - I find the 1net discussion list almost impossible to follow. There's - it's very disjointed.

The latest thing that happened was that someone, and it's not clear who, posted a Monkey Survey, I believe that's the company to basically - they were trying to create a statement from 1net participants to submit to the NETmundial meeting.

And even George Sadowsky weighed in that it was completely inappropriate and ridiculous. No one knew where it came from. And basically it gave the points covered in the Montevideo statement and you got a choice of agree, agree but or disagree. And out of that they were going to try to construct a purported consensus statement. So 1net...

Elisa Cooper: Yeah, and so if you can just - I mean, in terms of - so at the Singapore meeting if you can sort of help to start off that discussion at the Singapore meeting...

Phil Corwin: Okay, I thought you wanted me to discuss it now.

Elisa Cooper: No, sorry. No, yeah, no just at the Singapore meeting because I know you've been closely following it.

Phil Corwin: Sure, sure. I'd be happy to. We'll see what happens. The deadline for submission of statements to NETmundial is this Saturday the 8th. I know the CCWG is struggling to come up with something and there's many, many statements already filed at the NETmundial Website. But we'll know more by the time the Singapore...

((Crosstalk))

Elisa Cooper: And I see also Aparna said that she would also be happy to facilitate. So maybe if the two of you together can kind of facilitate that discussion that would be excellent.

Phil Corwin: Sure, happy to.

Elisa Cooper: Because I know you both are participating on the CCWG. Then finally there was a lot of feedback around, you know, how ICANN should be engaging

with the business community, At Large, and, you know, basically what they should and should not be doing. And so I thought, you know, maybe 15 minutes for BC members to provide guidance to ICANN, not for us to hear from ICANN but for us to provide feedback to ICANN, would make sense.

And if, you know, again I'd ask you to take a look at this agenda. If, you know, you don't want to do that let me know because we clearly have a lot of, you know, important issues to cover. But there was kind of outpouring of thought on, you know, what ICANN should be doing. So I think the best thing to do is to give that information directly to ICANN about that they should do.

And then I'll leave a little bit of time at the end so, you know, if there are things that we need to discuss. Now the one question that I do have, the NomComm has reached out to us and they would like to meet with us. I asked, you know, whether or not we could schedule a webinar prior to Singapore so that we're not, you know, doing something that we could just do via Webinar; we're not using, you know, our valuable face to face time. But they were not amenable to that.

So they're insistent upon having a face to face meeting. So I think one option would be to, you know, meet with them for, say, 15 minutes after we're fully prepared for the public comments. We have that time on Wednesday at lunch when we usually prepare for public comments.

But we have an hour and a half scheduled for that which is - we don't ever use that much time. But would folks be okay with giving 15 minutes to the NomComm after we're done preparing for the public forum? Are people okay with that? Or would you prefer not to meet with them at all? I see, Gabby, you have your hand raised and then Stéphane. I think, Gabby, you're on mute. Let's go ahead with - okay I see on Gabby's unmuted.

Gabriela Szlak: Old hand.

Elisa Cooper: Stéphane.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Yeah, thanks Elisa. Actually it's probably best to wait for people to answer your question before I say anything. If people don't want to meet with the NomComm there's not much to say.

Elisa Cooper: Okay, it doesn't seem like people are against meeting with them.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Okay. I do think there is value in - I mean, the points of the exercise, just to make it clear for everyone, this why the NomComm leadership reaches out to all groups with the GNSO to find a 15 minute slot at some point during the ICANN meeting to talk to them is it's part of the NomComm's mandate to seek feedback and information from groups on what they see as priorities for NomComm selections.

And the other selections, apart from the Board, are often overlooked in those discussions. I think personally there's a lot of value in thinking about that for groups like ours. And thinking about what we feel is important, for example, the GNSO NCAs, NomComm Appointees, because in the past we've had a wide variety of different experiences with the choices that have been made.

So I think it's a good opportunity, you know, taking 15 minutes if there is the possibility. Elisa, you suggested just so that all members are aware of the discussion that went on with the NomComm, that the NomComm meets with the full CSG in one go. And it's true that the current chair declined that offer. I think because the NomComm has to be seen to be fair to all groups. So just to provide everyone with a little bit of context...

Elisa Cooper: Oh okay.

Stéphane Van Gelder: And I do think that if there's not, you know, any real appetite to meet with them it's probably better to say no than waste 15 minutes but I don't think it would be 15 minutes wasted. Thank you.

Elisa Cooper: Okay. So it sounds like we should give 15 minutes. And I will see if that works for them to do that on the Wednesday. Let's see if there are any other - I think we're clear in the queue.

Now we've spent more time than we had scheduled but I'm glad that we had this opportunity to go through the agendas so people know what to expect. And, again, what I'm going to do is I'm going to send out a revised agenda.

And if people can just let me know especially - I think especially for the Sunday morning meeting with Bruce and Bill because that will be the first time that we meet a prioritization of those topics so that we can first focus on the issues that are of greatest importance but if you can do that for all of the agendas that would be extremely helpful.

What I want to do is we are scheduled to meet again next - in a week from today so next Thursday we have a pre-Council call. I think what I'd like to do is to discuss the upcoming election for the - there's an upcoming Board election and the Non Contracted Parties House we have a - basically an election to appoint a new Board member to Seat 14 or to keep Bill Graham who currently fills that role.

There's a lot of discussion right now about what that process should be. And I think we should discuss that all next week. What I want to do is I want to turn it over to Steve now so we can go through policy so, Steve.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks, Elisa. I think that currently the policy calendar is up and Benedetta, if we could just move to the top of it or allow people to scroll? Appreciate that. So there are eight open public comment periods that I believe we need to weigh in on. Before I dive into those I wanted to remind all of you that we had privacy and proxy accreditation working group - they're doing a PDP on this - and they had asked several times for BC input.

Tried to solicit on this call and we're unable to get anybody to volunteer. And rather than have us go silent on something we've commented on before I pulled from previous positions then added several key questions. And I put them in on Friday night before the deadline to the working group. This it the Privacy and Proxy Accreditation.

I put a link at the top of my policy calendar to that response and I invite BC members that have a chance to look at that. The most important part is that getting one or two of you to volunteer to at least participate a bit in that working group as they move to the next step.

And one way to start that is to read what we submitted. Another is to look at their wiki and then of course to attend their session in Singapore. This is not going to be a heavy lift. It's a relatively easy working group. Be glad to hear right now if any of you have experience with privacy and proxy providers and could volunteer for this. Otherwise I'll keep following up. Any hands up?

All right, not seeing any. Let me turn to the first one. It's the status update from the Expert Working Group, we call it the EWG, on gTLD directory services. Fantastic work here by Jimson and Tim and Susan helped as well.

Now we were able to consolidate lots of great comments from members and submitted that. I've got assurances from Susan Kawaguchi that the BC comments are already being looked by the EWG members. Jimson, thanks for your leadership on that. Marilyn, you too, for helping out.

Number two on this list is this ATRT 2 the second Accountability and Transparency Review Team. I circulated a draft on the 17th of February. And I have say I was blown away by the member responses. We had over 70 comments on multiple threads, some on BC private, some BC public. And I am still working through almost 15 pages of 10 point font, of all the comments that all of you provided in trying to figure out how close we are to consensus, for instance, around Linda Kinney...

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: Oh, Aparna, thank you for actually participating very actively in that discussion. David Farris did, Marilyn and others. So we have until the 15th of March so I'm going to continue and should in the next day circulate a revised draft that I believe captures the consensus and reconciliation of over 70 BC member comments. Thanks for everyone in participating. Aparna, anyone else want to mention something about the ATRT 2 right now?

All right hearing nothing moving to Item 3. This is a public comment on the qualified launch program. Here's what this is about, allowing every new gTLD registry operator to have 100 names for its own purposes, whatever purposes those are. This has come up before in the BC because in the notion of

exclusively controlled generics dotLawyer, for instance, would search.lawyer be controlled by the TLD? Probably? Would divorce.lawyer be controlled by the TLD? Well probably.

Because more of a concern if it's a single competitor. If Goodyear controls dotTires then offroad.tires would be controlled by Goodyear and might well lead to some concerns. Those concerns are all still alive because 100 names is more than enough to control a lot of the key generics out of this.

Is there anyone in the BC interested in commenting on Number 3? This is the qualified launch program, relatively easy, one shot comment. I see a hand up for Ron Andruff. Go ahead, Ron.

Ron Andruff: Thanks, Steve. I'm not sure if I can take that on right now in terms of drafting it but I did want to make the - or ask a question of you - you may be more informed than I - and that is with this 100 names what happens if there's within the 100 names there may be trademark names?

Steve DelBianco: I don't believe there's any chance of all since trademark protection that we helped to design would defeat that. So Goodyear could offroad.tires but they could never run firestone.tires. Firestone would be the only one who could put that up.

Ron Andruff: Very good.

Steve DelBianco: Ron, I'm going to take that as a volunteer, huh? How about it?

((Crosstalk))

Ron Andruff: Let's you and I have a chat offline to see what that work's going to entail, Steve, okay? I'm happy to chat with you about it.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Ron. Anyone else? Great. Let me go to Number 4. Four is the mechanism - and Andy and Stephanie, you're both on the call. Please think about whether we could do a BC follow up for the good work you helped on earlier in the BC.

And, again, this is the singular/plural objections. And incredibly ICANN has decided that they would take care of it for a couple of TLDs but not for all and ended up excluding hotel and hotels even though they would do car and cars. All I wanted to do was to follow up with the BC to reiterate our concern that it apply as well to other singular plural sets that should have been reviewed in this mechanism. Andy and Stephanie, would either of you be willing? Andy, you're up.

Andy Abrams: Yes, I'm happy to help out with that. Yeah, I mean, we've been consistent in advocating for a broader appeal mechanism and I think we have to reiterate that here. It's pretty disappointing that they've - they focused on two specific decisions and I think we do need to still consider the singular plural issue.

Steve DelBianco: Andy, thank you very much. And, Stephanie, please help out if you can as well because I know you helped with Andy and I on the first round. Okay great.

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: ...Number 5. Michelle Chaplow is a BC member who's been following the meetings strategy and we have initial comments by the 20th of...

Phil Corwin: I've had too many potential clients who just wanted to keep getting free advice while they were thinking about things and they never...

Marilyn Cade: I'm not sure one of our knows that they're being heard on the call. Steve, maybe you could ask people to mute?

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: Phil Corwin, please hit mute. Calling Phil Corwin. Phil Corwin. All right he doesn't here. Send him an email if you don't mind, Benedetta, thank you very much.

                   Chris Chaplow, I see you on the line. Is Michelle available to give us any guidance on the meeting strategy?

Chris Chaplow: Yes, she was and it would be strategic with her being a member whether, you know, she can certainly help with the document and then where it gets posted also by somebody else or by her, I don't know that that - that's a strategic question.

Steve DelBianco: And thank you very much. And it's also a political question. It's exactly what we've done in the past for instance Susan Kawaguchi was a member of the Expert Working Group. She helped us to understand key areas for the BC but she is not listed as a contributor because we don't want to have that ruin their ability to be credible inside of the group. So if Michelle could give us guidance she wouldn't be listed a drafter and I would coordinate. Thank you, Chris.

Anyone else on meeting strategy? And again this is where the meetings are held and potentially how they're structured. Okay, I'm almost done, Elisa. Number 6 is name space...

Elisa Cooper: Take your time. Take your time.

Steve DelBianco: ...okay name space collisions. We now have, from ICANN, and there's a webinar - I believe it's later this week - a webinar announcing the new proposal for how to manage collisions. The one thing the BC would probably be concerned about is that the experts who came in, Jeff Schmidt, have said when it comes to collisions it won't be sufficient for those of you who are having problems with collisions.

The NGPC had said if you have demonstrably severe harm you could ask the TLD operator to please to spend the second level domain because you had demonstrably severe harm until we could work out the collisions.

However, the expert came back and said that the only way you could get ICANN to postpone that second level domain that's causing you problem is if you show that there is a risk of loss of human life. That is a unilateral change on the part of the expert and I believe makes it nearly impossible for BC members to stop collisions that are causing economic harm, maybe even fraud and abuse but unless a human life's in danger.

That's just to whet your appetite and get some BC member to read through the collisions recommendation and help the BC decide whether to comment on it. Looking for hands. Andy Mack, thank you for volunteering to help Michelle, really appreciate that.

Jim Baskin is not on the line but I know...

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: I didn't hear that?

Andrew Mach: I said no problem, Steve, I'm sorry. I'm muting my line because my voice is mostly gone. My apologies, everyone. I sound like a frog, I know.

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: So while Andy's losing his voice let's have another BC member find their voice and volunteer to help on collisions. I feel like I'm doing a telethon or something here.

Marilyn Cade: Steve, it's Marilyn. I'll volunteer to help on collisions.

Steve DelBianco: You're the best. Thank you, Marilyn. Anyone going to help Marilyn out? And I bet we can lean on Jim Baskin, Marilyn, as well.

Marilyn Cade: Oh yes, I was going to say I'm going to offer to help Jim Baskin.

Steve DelBianco: Let's do it that way. We volunteered Jim. Let's do that.

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Steve DelBianco: All right, Chris Chaplow, you know I'm going to turn to you on Number 7, right, the Inter Registrar Transfer Policy or IRTP Part D. You had a terrible experience with some of these transfers among registrars. This is a relatively short one. And this concerns reporting and disputes and best practices and

penalties. Any chance you could take a look at that, Chris, and give us some guidance?

Chris Chaplow: Yes, yes certainly. I can do that again and maybe get posted by yourself rather than my name, whatever, but yeah.

Steve DelBianco: Happy to do that, Chris. Thank you so much.

((Crosstalk))

Chris Chaplow: So it shouldn't be too difficult.

Steve DelBianco: Right. Chris, thank you. And other BC members who've had experiences, good bad or otherwise, with transfers among registrars of the domains that you manage. Phil Corwin, any of your members have issues with transfers of domain names in the portfolio? I'll follow up with Phil on that. Elisa, the last one on here was Number 8 which is the ICANN strat panels...

Stéphane Van Gelder: Steve?

Steve DelBianco: Go ahead.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Sorry, this is Stéphane. I'm happy to help Chris on the transfer issue. I've had both experience the GNS and through the IRTP PDPs and the transfers themselves as a former registrar so if I can help, Chris, I'll do so gladly.

Steve DelBianco: Hey, Stéphane, thank you so much.

Elisa Cooper: I'll also participate in the group working on that one.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks, Elisa. And, Elisa, Number 8 we've already covered, it was the strat panels so with that I'm done with the policy section. Thanks everyone.

Elisa Cooper: Thank you so much, Steve, as always tremendous, tremendous job and I know that we all appreciate all the work you do so thank you so much for taking us through that.

We actually have about five minutes left so, Marilyn, if you want to go through your CSG update because, like I said, we're having a pre Council call next week and John is actually not on the call today. I know Gabby's here but let's keep that for next week. Marilyn, did you want to do an update on the CSG?

Marilyn Cade: I'll be very quick because it's actually, I think, been largely covered but just to highlight a few things. The CSG will be taking up the ExComm and all members will be taking up the discussion as Elisa had already mentioned, about the process for election to the Board seat.

I think Elisa and others in our conversation - Elisa, we've already covered the gatherings an the topics for the CSG so I don't want to repeat that. But just to say there's an increased opportunity to collaborate within the CSG on issues that, you know, for instance I'll just raise the CCWG as an example. There's four representatives from the BC, Phil, Aparna, David Farris, myself, we are trying to work collaboratively with the other reps both in the CCWG and beyond that.

So I don't need to go into more detail because we've already covered the meetings but I think we need to be asking ourselves how do we use the CCWG - how do we use the CSG as we go forward to give consistent

messages since we go to meet with the Board on Tuesday morning we're coming with a consistent message.

When we meet with the two Board members we are trying to give consistent messages. Elisa has already identified the topics. I'm just asking people to think about it so we can figure out where we agree and where the BC members think we need to have distinct messages. Thank you, Elisa.

Elisa Cooper: Thanks, Marilyn. All right any other topics or things that people want to discuss on next week's call or things for this week's call? We have a couple minutes left. Okay so you probably all know at this point I believe that this will actually be Benedetta's last call serving us as the secretariat. I think you all know that she is going to be taking a position within ICANN so we'll probably be seeing and interacting with her as an ICANN employee going forward.

But I'd want to take this opportunity to thank Benedetta for all of her hard work and dedication over the last three years. I sincerely appreciate it and I know that the members do as well. And you will undoubtedly be sorely missed. It will be, you know, a bit of a difficult transition for us as we try to find our way. But thank you, Benedetta. So we all appreciate everything that you've done for us.

Are there any other...

Benedetta Rossi: Thank you, Elisa.

Elisa Cooper: ...anything else that people want to bring to the table before we sign off? The ExComm is going to actually stay on this line. We are going to be discussing sort of transition as Benedetta is moving out of her role as Secretariat and into

the staff position. But anything that we should discuss as the full group before we break? All right with that I guess I want to thank everyone for joining today's call. We'll plan to meet again a week from today. And then we'll see everyone in Singapore. So talk to next week. And, ExComm members, if you can stay on the line that would be great.

Thank you so much.

((Crosstalk))

Elisa Cooper: Bye-bye.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks, Bennie.

((Crosstalk))

Benedetta Rossi: Thank you, (Carolyn), you can now stop the recordings.

END