ICANN

Moderator: Brenda Brewer
January 7, 2015
10:00 am CT

Coordinator: At this time the recordings are in the conference.

Brenda Brewer: Thank you very much, (Jeremy). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the BC Candidate Call for the BC office elections for 2015 taking place on the 6th of January, 2015, 1600 UTC.

On the call today we have David Fares, John Berard, Ron Andruff, Elisa Cooper, Jimson Olufuye, J. Scott Evans, Jim Baskin, Martin Sutton, Marilyn Cade, Steve DelBianco, Zahid Jamil, Philip Corwin, Marilyn Cade. I also have Andrew Mack, Carl Schonander, Robert Hogarth - he is from staff.

I do have apologies from Laura Covington, Gabby Szlak, (Michael Malad), Caroline Greer, Jim Baskin, Sara Deutsch, Michelle King, (Elizabeth Thomas Swahi), Cheryl Miller, Alain Bidron and Stéphane Van Gelder. And as I said, from staff we have Robert Hogarth, Glen de Saint Géry and Brenda Brewer.

And I'd like to turn the call over to - oh I do need to remind everyone to please state your name for transcription purposes.

And also we have nominees to announce and I'd like to advise BC members that will nominators and the nominees qualified according to the BC charter rules as paid up members of the BC and all nominations are therefore valid. Six nominations for the open seats were received. All nominations received were acknowledged by the voting officer and accepted by the candidate.

The nominations are as follows: standing for chair, Elisa Cooper, nominated by David Fares; for chair, Ron Andruff nominated by Scott McCormack; standing for vice chair for policy, Steve DelBianco nominated by Laura Covington; standing for vice chair for finance and operations Jimson Olufuye nominated by Gabriella Szlak; standing for CSG representative, Marilyn Cade nominated by Chris Chaplow; also for CSG representative David Fares nominated by J. Scott Evans.

Today's call will allow a discussion with the candidates. Today's call will allow a discussion with the candidates. Questions received for part of the call will be addressed to each candidate followed by an open floor for members to ask questions on the call.

Each candidate will have a 15 minute slot to answer questions. The questions and answer session will be moderated by Glen de Saint Géry as returning officer and moderator for this call. Candidates may choose to respond on the call or in writing. Ballots for the elections will be sent out today after this conference call closes.

And nominations will close one week from today and be announced on - I will have that date momentarily. I'm sorry. I will now turn the call over to Glen de Saint Géry to lead the discussion with the candidates. Thank you very much and over to you, Glen.

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you very much, Brenda. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. Welcome and happy new year to you. And thank you for giving up your time to be on this call.

I think in the interest of time if you would agree, we will not read out all the questions because there have been quite a number submitted. But if you are all able to see the screen the questions will be up on the screen shortly. And if you agree I will take the list of nominees in order of the office, that is starting with the chair and then going to the vice chair of operations and finance, the vice chair of policy and the CSG reps.

Do you agree that we don't read out the questions or would you like them read out?

Marilyn Cade: Glen, if Marilyn. For the record Marilyn Cade. I'm happy with us not reading out the election but I just note that some questions have obviously come in very late, I think there are 11 questions, and I wonder if it would be helpful to also agree that all the candidates may want to supplement their comments with written comments to the list since, in the interest of time, probably not everybody will be able to fully address all questions and that would be helpful to members to have written elaboration as well.

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you very much, Marilyn. I think that is a good idea. And are the rest of you on the call happy with that approach as well? I see there is acceptance for it in the chat. Are there any members who are not familiar with the questions? Any nominees who are not familiar with the questions?

So, shall we start right away then and shall we start with Elisa Cooper. Elisa, welcome.

Elisa Cooper: Thank you, Glen, and thank you...

((Crosstalk))

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you. It's my pleasure. Elisa, you have the questions in front of you and would you like to go through them?

Elisa Cooper: Yeah, thank you, Glen. So starting off with the first question about whether or not the IPC and the BC are redundant, I think that the BC does provide a unique perspective as we are focused not only on ensuring that the Internet is a safe place to conduct business but we are also concerned with the security and stability of the Internet.

Now I can't think of a position that the IPC would have that the BC wouldn't also support but I can't say the same of the reverse. I think the big question here is, is the current GNSO structure working for us? And do we need to have a stronger voice at ICANN?

And to answer the first part of that, no I don't think that the current GNSO structure is working for us and I don't think that our voice is being heard clearly. I think that we have a lot of work to do to figure out what that new structure is and how it changes.

I do think that the IPC brings important information having to do with legal rulings and the law and the importance of trademarks and how that fits in in the international way that I think that information might be made available in a different way. So like I said, I think we have a lot of work to do here and I do think that there is an issue with the structure.

The second question is from Stéphane Van Gelder. And I have to say I think this is a great question. And his question is about whether or not there are internal politics and whether they loom too large and whether they are creating an adversarial atmosphere.

And while I really appreciate this question, I have to answer honestly and say yes, unfortunately, I think that there is an extremely adversarial atmosphere currently within the BC. And I think some of that is evidenced by even some of these questions, by the candidate statements, by what goes on on the email list. And I can only imagine that when new members come into the BC and the seed is that they are very put off by it.

What can I do and what have I been doing? Well I can tell you that over the last two years there have been many times where simply I've just bitten my tongue and I haven't said anything and I've done my best really to, you know, from getting into the fray of things because I don't want to go there.

I would just ask that all members do what they say and say what they mean. That's what I do. And when somebody asks me a question I've respond to the question. If somebody sends me an email, I get a response. I don't decide to answer some folks and not other folks. I don't ask pointed questions. I am trying to be as honest as I can and when I see others doing it, frankly I'm just trying to ignore it.

How can we improve this in the future? I think that the leadership of the BC has a lot to do with this particular issue and I would only ask that members try to vote for leadership that does not engage and participate in this kind of behavior. And for others that are not in leadership I would just again ask you to all think about what is best for the BC.

We have so much work to do. I think we've done an outstanding job in this past year in focusing on policies. You know, we had over 40 different comments and letters sent from the BC, which was a record number; our second highest number was the year previous.

But we have so much more to do and I think we need to continue to focus on policy. I think we need to focus on outreach. We need to focus on ensuring that ICANN continues to be a strong, viable organization and getting involved in these kinds of backroom dealings and this kind of adversarial behavior it just doesn't serve anybody any good.

So I would just ask that we all think about the way we behave and tried to act more professionally in the future.

Let's see, the next question is from Gabby. And the question is whether or not we could benefit from meeting with other groups like the ccNSO or the ALAC. And I think there is a lot of merit to that and I agree, meeting with the other groups I think is an important thing to do.

The problem is that at the ICANN meetings we are already so pressed for time as it is. I think perhaps on a rotating basis that might be something that we can do. I will tell you that in a meeting just yesterday we did discuss implementing an hour-long meeting going forward with the entire non-contracted parties' house.

And I think that's a very important thing to do because we need to, as much as we can, build a bridge and find the points where we do agree with the non-contracted - with the entire non-contracted parties' house in particular the Non Commercial Stakeholders Group.

And to do that I think meeting with them face-to-face in a more formal setting can only help us. In the past we've met with them informally and we've had drinks with them but I think trying to sit down and find those points where we're in line with them is a good thing.

And I think meeting with those other groups to share our perspective And also get information from them is a good idea, I just think we'll have a little bit of a challenge given the time constraints.

The next question, asked by Gabby, is around diversity and whether I think this is a relevant issue for BC and I think absolutely. I think diversity is of utmost importance not just for the BC but really for all of ICANN because without it not only are we not representative, I think we'll have a serious credibility issue. And so I think this is something we need to focus on, again, not just within our constituency but more broadly across the entire ICANN community.

The next question is around what we could do relative to awareness and outreach in developing - in the developing world to become a more diverse group.

I think, you know, this is something we've been struggling with for years. And I know that we need to do more. I know we need to improve here. But I also think that it also comes down to members. And clearly we've had some members like Jimson, for instance, who really started to make some inroads, he held an event.

And from that event in his region, we will now have two participating from Africa at the next ICANN meeting. And I know that's just a small start and we have a lot more work to do. But I think starting with the members - if the

members - if we can each take a little time to reach out to those that we know within our own industry, within our own geographies I think that we can start to see some improvement and have more of a grassroots effort.

I think there is also - and in a further question that's down below I'll address more - but I think there's a lot of opportunity for us to leverage the different funds and services being provided by ICANN.

The next question is around whether or not I participate in any other constituencies or my company participates. And the answer to that is yes, we are nonvoting members of both the IPC and the Registrars constituency.

And I do not share any confidential information with either Matt Serlin or Kiran Malancharuvil. We've never had that issue. Although I am very close to both of these individuals there is a Chinese wall between us and we do not share information and they do not share information with me.

Let me move down to the next question which is about the income and where were out with our budget. Let me just put a point of clarification, technically we are not a non-for profit but in terms of our finances we actually did have projected revenues of around €53,000 and we are at about that.

We had projected expenses of around €27,000 that we've probably only spent around €10,000 for things like Website development comment newsletter layout and outreach.

Frankly, we had some expenses like €5000 for banking charges and a $5000 for administrative charges which I don't really quite understand. That said, the bulk of the surplus that we have is due to the fact that we are no longer paying for third party secretariat services. And those services are actually being

provided to us by ICANN. Printing services are also being provided to us by ICANN.

It was actually decided that the surplus that we have given out, that we should delay invoicing by six months. I agree that we should take a look at our budget for the next year and that we might consider altering our membership fees may be to encourage more participation from businesses from developing countries or perhaps we look at greater outreach programs and devoting more funds to outreach. But I think this is something that we all need to decide as a group with some leadership from the finance committee.

Glen, how am I doing on time?

Glen de Saint Géry: Sorry, Elisa, I was getting off mute. You have about four minutes left.

Elisa Cooper: Okay very good. So the last set of questions are from myself. And the first one is around describing the company that I work for and a little bit about employees and coverage and products and services.

I can tell you that the company that I'm representing here at the Business Constituency is Thomson Reuters. And Thomson Reuters was founded in 1934. We employ over 60,000 people in 100 different countries. We are a mass media and information firm. And I work in the IP and Science Division.

Within that group I worked with in the brand protection business. And the services that we include in that line of business are things like trademark watching, trademark clearance, online brand protection, anti-piracy services, anti-fraud services and domain registration.

I, over the years, have worked closely with our clients to provide them information about ICANN and to help them define their own strategies relative to brand protection on the Internet. And so that's just a little bit about the company that I work for.

The next question is how can communication within the BC be improved? You know, I think that Ron, in his candidate statement, had some great ideas about creating a digest that explains current issues and might lay out the pros and cons of each. I think that's a great idea and I think if we can find support from members to carry some of that work that's a great idea.

I think that many members are still having a very difficult time following the massive amounts of email that are sent and following along with all of the acronyms and insider terms and use of first names without last names. And I think, you know, I am probably guilty of that and I'm trying to work on not doing that because I know that when I was new to the BC I found that to be very confusing.

So I think we can improve in sort of, you know, if we can put together something like a digest to make it easier, great. But at the minimum if we can try to speak more clearly and explain things I think that will be helpful.

I know that one thing that I have personally done relative to communication within the BC is that when I do send emails I've done my best to keep my emails relatively short. I use bullet, you know, bullets to keep things very brief. And I think if others can do that that would help as well. And, you know, if I am reelected, you know, I'll continue that practice of trying to be as brief as possible.

The final question that I had was around outreach and recruitment. And I think again, you know, it's up to really every member to help in this effort. Certainly we need to take advantage of all of the resources that we have like the CROP Fund and the Leadership Development Funds from ICANN. Those are both funds provided by ICANN that we've not made very good use of.

I think we also have funds that allow us to invite potential members to meetings and we have used that that we still have a few spaces in the coming meetings as well.

But I think it's up to every member to at least even play a small role. You know, probably many of you don't know that every quarter I speak to 200 to 300 business people on a webinar where ideas and ICANN update. I always make a pitch for the Business Constituency and I always explain the work of ICANN. And I think if others can do the same I think we can try to make some headway there.

And, but I know clearly there is much more that we can do. We recently put together a group of members who will be reviewing the request for the CROP outreach. Perhaps that same group can also provide guidance.

I did also recently, at the request of a member, just send out a list of upcoming ICANN events where we might also consider attending and utilizing some of the funds that ICANN has made available to us. But clearly I know there is much more that we should be doing and I think, as I've stated previously, outreach and diversity is really critical for all of ICANN.

So I think that pretty much covers it. Glen.

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you very much, Elisa. There is one more question that came in from Andrew Mack and that is, "The BC has a goal of representing the opinions and interests of businesses around the world but also of different types and sizes. In your view how are the perspectives of small businesses different in the BC?"

That's the last question and perhaps you'd like to take it quickly?

Elisa Cooper: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Elisa Cooper: Yeah, I think, you know, clearly we have the Better Business Bureau as a member and representing small business but I think clearly there is much more that we could or should be doing. And again, I think this goes to the need for outreach.

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you, Elisa. Is that...

Elisa Cooper: Thank you, Glen.

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you very much. So without wasting any more time, Ron, may I ask you to start the questions before you? And may I also just remind you of the 11th question? Thank you, Ron, over to you. Ron, I think you're on mute.

Ron Andruff: Know I'm not right now. Can you hear me, Glen?

Glen de Saint Géry: Yes, perfectly area thank you so much, Ron.

Ron Andruff: Can you hear me, Glen?

Glen de Saint Géry: Guess I can. Please carry on.

Ron Andruff: Wonderful. Thank you. Thank you very much. And thanks to all the members for getting on the call today. I know that elections are not something anyone likes to spend time but I appreciate everyone taking the time.

With regard to the first question, do I think the IPC and BC are redundant? Absolutely not. The IPC concerns itself with trademark issues in the first instance while the BC concerns itself with Internet stability concerns. And the BC is focused on those issues that impact business users. So they're very clearly two different bodies certainly in my view.

And the question or the suggestion that we might merge these two groups so we speak with a stronger voice, in my view would be a huge mistake. While the questioner suggests we would have a stronger voice, in fact I see it in the reverse.

Having to constituencies in support of or (pushback) on an issue is vastly stronger than having just one. And I would question why we would want to narrow our focus and lose our voice in the GNSO, the Nominating Committee, Standing Committee on Improvements Implementation and other ICANN forums, makes no sense to me at all. But I can appreciate that there are those within the greater ICANN community that feel that way.

I think one thing we should be doing more of, and under my chairmanship we will be doing, is more coordination on issues that impact all of the CSG constituencies. And I would use the example of the current ALAC call for a freeze on highly regulated strings while the PICs are sorted out as an example.

The IPC is informed of our efforts in this regard that more needs to be done to enroll them in this important matter when they see other issues as more important or a higher priority for them. And that door swings both ways. We could be picking up on key issues that concern our fellow CSG and non-contracted party house counterparts so clearly we can do better there.

The second question is how would I react to the assertion that internal politics loom too large within the BC. I would agree with that assertion. Many people within ICANN irrespective of the bodies that their affiliated with have got strong views on how issue should be addressed and whether someone is, in parentheses, right or wrong, is not the issue. And there should be no debate about those things.

The chair's role is to facilitate dialogue rather than bottle it up or close it off. And as I noted in my candidate statement, guiding dialogue and working to establish suitable debates that empower the BC to work anymore synchronized and harmonious manner in the Executive Committee is the chair's responsibility.

If there is disharmony it's incumbent upon the chair to get with those members of the ExComm privately and work through whatever those issues are that they're not happy about defines common understanding and more importantly, appreciation for the other's point of view.

Every BC member is a volunteer so the goodwill we all bring cannot be squandered or wasted on petty issues or members will simply walk away. No one has time for such things into busy lives that we live certainly in my view.

I agree with this assertion, actually I'm going to - I've got my notes in a backwards way here. So the third question now is - pardon me for a second while I move around.

Do I think that there could be any benefit to the BC meeting with other groups like the ALAC, ccNSO and so forth? Absolutely. There is no doubt about it that we should be spending more time talking with our colleagues.

ICANN is a unique forum, and we are a bottom-up consensus driven organization; that is us. And there is no other organization in the world similar to this. Therefore it's incumbent upon us that we spend our time getting to know the other people and the issues that are resident within our sister bodies. Otherwise how can ICANN, or the BC, expect to building a consensus with anyone?

So in my view the BC should have a procedure in place that assures we are meeting with every stakeholder, every stakeholder group and supporting organization on a rotational basis so that relationships and trust can be built on that foundation.

Following on, the next question is do you consider diversity in membership relevant for the BC? Yes, absolutely. Diversity is the foundation on which ICANN is built and in fact is the key to accountability in so much as having more people from every part of the world looking at, discussing and debating the issues will give us a truly global perspective.

Put another way, ICANN is an easy target for naysayers when we are solely North American/European centric as an organization. And as I noted in my candidate statement, incumbent upon the BC to gather our global constituency together.

What do I think the BC could do for awareness and outreach in developing world in order to become a more diverse group? I addressed this question is somewhat in my candidate statement but I think we need to utilize our human resources within our BC membership and we should couple that with our financial resources when and where needed to bring potential members on on a global scale for ICANN.

So these are critical issues in my view and I think something that we really need to address quite sincerely.

Now we're moving to Question Number 6, if I'm not mistaken. Does your company participate in any other constituency? The answer is absolutely not. ONR Consulting is solely a member of the BC and is unencumbered from any other conflict of interest that are seen in other parts of ICANN.

I've noted that because ICANN is the steward of a global (unintelligible) all of its leadership ought to be unencumbered at the very least. And in that we'll get more recognition and respect as a global body.

With regard to Number 7, the BC income in 2014 was over €50,000. In my mind that is a shocking revelation. I'm not sure why we are collecting those kinds of funds in our bank account, I'm (unintelligible) about it. We're not saving to buy a building to house BC officers and such like so I question what the money is being reserved for.

In any case, over $80,000 in our bank account is too much money to be sitting on without any plan. And as I noted before, I believe that we should be looking at committees to do work. And I would look to our finance committee

to draw up a list of recommendations on use of funds and give that to the ExComm for consideration.

And the ExComm then would discuss the merits of each and propose the top three to four to the membership as a whole who would in turn determine which ones they would like to pursue.

A determination over use of BC funds must be in the hands of the entire membership but the ExComm is responsible for guiding those discussions in my view, and the chair is responsible for guiding the ExComm conversation.

Number 8, as a Business Constituency - as a member of the Business Constituency please describe the organization I represent. I represent ONR Consulting. It's a small consulting business and we have - we were founded in 2014 and we have two employees. And it's international in its geographic coverage.

We have two general lines of business. The first is ICANN related in that we provide to those impacted by the new gTLD program and who have no understanding as to where they should go or what they should do to give them some guidance and helping them find their way through the maze that is ICANN. The second line of businesses international marketing consulting.

Moving on to Number 9 - Question Number 9, how can communication within the BC be improved? Communications within the BC can be improved because if we start to listen to one another. It is my sense that no one is listening to all that's within ICANN, which has placed the BC in an awkward position.

It seems to me the BC is always in a reactionary mode because we have insufficient staff support. Prior to the current BC chair, we had a full-time staff support which enables considerably more timely communications to and within the membership. And why anyone would decide to eliminate full-time staff support and personally take on that role on top of the chair role and a day job is a mystery.

With regard to improving communications within the ExComm the chair's role is to listen to everyone's point of view, and get a strategy together with their fellow ExComm members and bring that strategy out to the larger membership for consideration.

One way to do that would be having a weekly 30 minute ExComm update call every week to make sure that these actions are facilitated. It would be a tight call. It would put everybody on point as to what we're talking about this week, what we need to do and how we go forward so that we're not in a reactionary mode but we are rather looking at issues that are more out on the horizon so that we can make sure we deal with these things in a more timely fashion.

Some of these ideas Steve DelBianco brought out in his candidate statement and I fully support those ideas that Steve had suggested.

How can outreach and recruitment be improved? Outreach and recruitment should be improved by subcommittee. As was noted previously, I've recommended a number of ideas about small subcommittees where we have groups of people focused on specific elements and in that way breaking down the workload enables everyone to share that load. And we get more results as a result.

I noted that we are underutilizing our talents that are resident in our membership. And a subcommittee solely focused on outreach we would be able to use every ICANN meeting to invite local and regional businesses to learn more about ICANN and the BC.

Using the Rolodexes of every member to reach out to their contacts, your contacts, and underserved parts of the world is another way to improve recruitment. And these are just two ideas is but a small group dedicated to outreach would serve us all through the recommendations that they could come up with.

And finally, Question 11, the BC has a goal of representing opinions and interests of businesses around the world but also of different types and sizes. And the question goes on to ask the differences between small business and large business without going any further into that.

My response to that is I think this is a great question and I'm very grateful it was put on the list today. Indeed there are significant differences between small businesses and large businesses in the BC.

For those that work in corporations the understanding of running a small business may be difficult to understand. Small businesses and small business owners basically do everything and must be proficient in every aspect of running a business whether it's accounting, marketing, sales, filling the order, whatever it might be they have to have some ability to do all those things.

Those who work for large companies are more geared to be specialists in their respective fields and so they know those areas more intimately as opposed to a broad range. That's a huge difference between the two groups.

What's become more apparent in the recent past within the BC is that small businesses with their single vote in elections have trouble to win elections where large businesses with their three votes can prevail with their candidate. In the two recent elections one candidate won the popular vote while the other won the election.

So we need to be more mindful of the differences between large and small businesses but we also need to address these types of issues in our charter. And we need to find ways to encourage both groups, small and large, to participate in the BC.

For my part I was impressed with ICANN's egalitarian approach and that's to say my business - my small-business voice and ICANN is equal to that of big business and even governments when it comes to raising an issue or taking the floor at ICANN.

Glen de Saint Géry: Ron?

((Crosstalk))

Ron Andruff: ...shared - I'm just finishing up with my last statement, Glen.

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you.

Ron Andruff: These ideas I've shared with regard to subcommittees and outreach are the way I would approach gathering members - more members from both of the important parts of our constituency.

So in my view much more can be done and I would look to our small business and large business members to contribute ideas on how are our mutual goal of

expanding membership in emerging markets and underserved parts of the world such as the global (unintelligible) are in fact addressed.

Thank you very much. Thank you, Glen.

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you so much, Ron. Jimson, are you on the phone? And can you hear us?

Jimson Olufuye: Yes, Glen. I can hear you.

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you very much. Jimson, would you like to start off with the questions please?

Jimson Olufuye: Okay. Thank you very much. I want to appreciate everyone on the call. Thank you for listening in. And thank you, Glen, and your team for your support. So the...

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you.

Jimson Olufuye: ...first question for discuss, really I cannot speak for IPC but I think that BC is very dynamic and absolutely relevant and just need to keep its focus concerning its mission in the community.

And the second question from Stéphane, concerning politics. Absolutely, there is nowhere that we do not have politics. Even in these (charts) you have politics in place. And what matters the most is for leadership to manage and balance different points of views and collate those points of view and present it in a clear manner to the membership. So politic is everywhere. I think what matter the most is leadership to rise up and balance different views.

Then on the ccNSO and ALAC engagement with us, yes, I think the more we engage (outside) the community there ought to be no ramifications. Then on diversity in membership I believe that there is need for us to be diversified, yes. Diversity have strengthened our collective outlook and (unintelligible) that ICANN strategic objective is the global focus - globalization, internationalization and its commitment to the Internet serves (unintelligible) communities. So BC too should be ready for diversify its community in that regard.

Then the next question on awareness and outreach in developing world, what we could do. Yes, BC - we've been trying really I comment the BC leaders in trying because my presence today is one of the fruits of what we've been doing, what we have been doing to encourage strategic partnerships with business associations in the developing regions and prove that interested companies that are interested in joining us will join because of value position we will have an opportunity to be (unintelligible).

So concerning my organization (unintelligible). And to increase questions, actually ICANN has shown us what to do when it comes to (unintelligible) need to focus on global outreach mechanism. BC (unintelligible) outreach support program. You know, ICANN has been there incorporation of we too on our we need to have our own specific (unintelligible) and I'm happy we are doing that but we need to enrich that.

So critical questions to (unintelligible) still the most effective network. Yes, I believe we can add webinar and many (unintelligible) lot of difference. And I would propose (unintelligible) in other events around the world specifically like ICANN (unintelligible) direction.

In addition it's very important that we get the best support possible for our internal operations so that we can concentrate on the BC call (unintelligible) operation we need to - we can (unintelligible) to our members.

Concerning (unintelligible) organization not for profit (unintelligible) organization established in May 2012 (unintelligible) for Africa about 20 Africa countries now. Thanks to BC support the last conference was quite (unintelligible). So we have about three staff that are working on (unintelligible).

So - but the passion is there. So to ensure that the Internet (unintelligible) African economies are doing (unintelligible) more now on the Internet so we push out to our members businesses.

Then on (unintelligible) communications, the BC and the ExComm itself, I believe this (unintelligible) an ExComm so that specific decisions can be handled and they (unintelligible) from the ExComm working together and reaching consensus (unintelligible) positive or negative they should have a verdict on all issues before passing out (unintelligible) to the entire membership for review or for their comments.

So and also ICANN outreach can maybe be improve by reaching (unintelligible) as I mentioned earlier in (unintelligible) economy through strong collaboration with (unintelligible) and providing (unintelligible) to enhance such representation. So I am happy that (unintelligible) going forward.

Then lastly on the last question (unintelligible) I think we need to look at the (unintelligible) that our collective business interest is (unintelligible) some of our (unintelligible). So I will say that the contribution of small business

should not be (unintelligible) because we are small businesses. So (unintelligible) contribution to ensure that the collective global business (unintelligible) yes many times we are (unintelligible) and there is no parity compared to what (unintelligible) small countries and big countries (unintelligible) model to tidy up that area.

Then also, this is very important, small businesses in emerging economies (unintelligible) they barely make enough profit to take care of business needs like paying salaries (unintelligible) and keep the business afloat just like one of the earlier speakers said.

You know, so most do not have experience traveling to ICANN meetings and so they need to be encouraged as a part of BC to (unintelligible) to complete (unintelligible) based on certain criteria.

Yes, this shall be (unintelligible) but I think we need to fund (unintelligible) any prospective member from developing country because (unintelligible) that the - maybe finance committee recommends. So as I said (unintelligible) finance committee sign but we can do more (unintelligible) not to turn down member because of fees from prospective member from emerging economies.

So this is all I have to say. I don't know if I missed anything. Thank you.

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you very much, Jimson. And thank you very much for keeping so very accurately to the time. May we ask now Steve DelBianco as - in the office of vice chair of policy? Steve, are you ready to answer the questions for us, Steve?

Steve DelBianco: Sure, Glen. Can you hear me all right?

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you.

Steve DelBianco: I sent around a candidate statement which I'll just briefly summarize and then dive into the questions. I do want to point out that it's an absolute pleasure and privilege to be the policy...

Woman: There you go. Thank you.

Steve DelBianco: Hearing some background. Should I wait? Yeah, it's been an absolute privilege in the past year because so many of you stepped up to be drafters on policy and comments and positions, many of you for the very first time. We even had several brand new BC members step up and take a crack at doing a draft. And that makes doing my job so much easier.

I hope to continue to replicate that success because 2014 will be a tough year to match. We did 38 separate positions and statements in calendar 2014. The previous record was 22 the year before. It's hard to top that. And beyond just those positions and statements the BC was the very first group to come out with really specific accountability mechanisms.

So when something really serious happens at ICANN it seems time and again it's the BC that steps up and tries to break through a roadblock on getting policy whether it was us leading the way on public interest commitments and the new gTLD program, what we did on accountability, try to come up with metrics on evaluating the new gTLD program.

I think our ability to get specific early allows us to guide the debate in a really important way. And it doesn't - it doesn't constrain what we do because later on if someone else has better ideas than the BC, hey, we embrace the ideas.

But it often allows us to form consensus and coalesce support around what we're doing. And as you know we're leading the way in the current cross community working group on accountability.

By the middle of 2015 we're going to need to tap into these same resources again because we will have a large opportunity to influence the Affirmation of Commitments Review on the new gTLD program. This is the one that will involve many different metrics around whether we improved consumer trust, choice and competition in the new gTLD program as an effort to guide what the next round of new gTLDs will look like.

And beyond that ICANN is, well, for better or worse it's found itself and placed it self at the center of the global Internet governance debate, things that are stoked by decades of rivalry between the ITU, United Nations and what the private sector has been doing, resentment for the United States role, resentment for the Snowden revelations.

And all of that politics get stirred up and creates a problem in that ICANN becomes a target for those that would covet a greater role in Internet governance. So I still believe, as many of you do on the BC, that ICANN needs to refrain from doing top down strategic initiatives that raise ICANN's profile beyond just the management of the DNS. We have a narrow technical mandate and we ought to stick to it.

So I'll turn it to the questions, J. Scott's Question 1 on the IPC and BC, are they redundant? The BC has a larger mission that certainly includes all of what is in the IPC. We want to protect the business registrants and their consumers and that is the essence of trademark law; protecting both the customers from fraud and abuse and protecting the assets of our companies and registrants.

So the BC has a larger mission but the IPC adds expertise with international trademark law and very arcane mechanisms such as the UDRP and WIPO. That mechanism - that expertise and mechanism would not be present in the ICANN debate were it not for the IPC's individual presence.

And I gather, knowing a lot of you who are trademark attorneys, you are highly specialized. It's a relatively tiny bar. I've been to one of your meetings and I was blown away at the level of detail that you immerse in trying to protect the consumers and brand assets of your companies in a variety of fora. Of course it's not just within ICANN.

So when the IPC members dedicate their time to dive and deep dive into a process at ICANN I understand they are there only to look at the mechanisms of trademark protection for the purpose of protecting your clients and your company.

We have to preserve that. So any effort to merge IPC into BC would potentially reduce the attractiveness for these trademark attorneys who dedicate several hours a week to help us. And I don't want to do anything to diminish their level of engagement and involvement.

Moreover, I don't think that merging us with IPC would give us a stronger voice at all; I think it would potentially weaken us. Now if it looks like the new restructuring is going to force the CSG, the Commercial Stakeholders Group, to become a real organized entity well then we are going to be forced into a merger with the BC IPC and the ISPs. We're doing everything we can to avoid that.

We don't believe that's the right path to pursue. But if it happened that merger would be something that's forced on us so we've got to be ready for that when it comes.

Stéphane, let me turn to your question on internal politics. As Jimson said, politics show up in every communication and conversation among human beings. We haven't quite evolved out of that yet.

But I'm very afraid that the way we do business in the BC are these tiny concentrated calls and meetings, these carve-outs of an hour of incredibly precious time where a bunch of professionals working in different time zones around the world, distracted by what's happening in front of them, are getting on the phone, dedicating an hour trying to get work done, trying to figure out what they need to listen to, when they need to speak up, what emails they need to follow because sometimes the emails themselves can be overwhelming .

So there are - when this happens patience gets tested and small differences in our personalities and our opinions become magnified. Look, all of you can sense the tension that shows up in people's voices on a call, you know, the pregnant pause, the intonation of voice that indicates someone has taken offense at something someone else has said.

That's going to happen and when it happens on the phone there's no way to use eye contact and body language to diffuse it. My personal belief is it's always best to diffuse that tension immediately when I'm chairing a policy discussion or when Elisa is chairing a general meeting, first by acknowledging there's differences of opinion, they're all legitimate.

Try to propose a compromise or a separate email string that will focus on the substantive differences between the two people rather than on personality difference. And I'm so afraid that too many times we let conversations head off down that track.

Stéphane, believe it or not it's much better now than it was two or three years ago. So we still have work to do on this but I believe we're doing a better job at managing those personalities and it's a very tough thing to do.

Let me turn to Gabby's question 3 there. CcNSO and ALAC, let me say yes but in two different ways. The ALAC, the At Large Advisory Committee, can be targeted as a BC ally when it comes to protecting business users and customers because that At Large constituency are our users and customers.

So for instance the ALAC has been a huge ally on the cross community working group on GAC safeguards and public interest commitments. On the Affirmation of Commitments review of the new gTLD program you would think that the BC and ALAC were joined at the hip. We made music together. It was fantastic.

And those relationships are going to serve us well. We had a two-hour call on the cross community working group today and ALAC and BC working side by side. It's a great relationship because we have common member interest.

We don't always have the same tactics though. I believe the BC is much more forward-thinking and aggressive and the ALAC tends to be a little more cautious. So we ought to be able to have a synergy there.

The ccNSO is a different matter. The ccNSO considers themselves a separate universe. They don't sign contracts with ICANN, they don't follow the rules,

they don't even follow the policy development process. But we have a lot in common since every ccTLD operator has business registrants that are using their ccTLDs and not only bringing them registration fees but building up their ccTLD so it becomes an important brand in their respective country.

I don't think we've done nearly enough to leverage that. That would require us to do a little planning. If we meet the ccNSO we'd want to emphasize how many of you have ccTLDs in your businesses, in your subsidiaries and your clients and your members.

I think once they see that commonality of interests there's a chance we can start down the long road of building a relationship with the ccTLD community.

Let me turn to Question 5, BC awareness and outreach in the developing world. As the vice chair for policy, I'm going to stick to what I do and thereby I will try to answer that challenge by cultivating relationships, by getting new people involved in the BC policy comment process.

As soon as someone emerges as a BC member who has experience or interest in an area I am always trying to find a way to recruit them to become a member of a drafting team on a comment, to recruit them to contribute a section to a given piece of comment.

It's been my experience that when you bring people in and nurture them, cultivate them, help to prepare all of what the BC has said before so that they don't have to do any research and flounder around on the Website, do some guidance, take care of all the editing and formatting, and if I do that we are able to bring new members up to speed quickly so they become contributors.

Chris Chaplow asks about what to do with the surplus of funds, I think that's easy, we've done this before. I believe we should evaluate or propose something for membership approval such as a reduction of dues for the coming year.

I think skipping the dues is not the wisest thing to do but reducing the dues by as much as 1/2 for one or two years so that that surplus comes down to something more akin to what we need to manage contingencies. If that's done properly then the discount is enjoyed by those of us who have stayed in as well.

Elisa, you had two questions, Number 8 and 9, for those of you who don't know, NetChoice is a nonprofit trade association headquartered in Washington DC. We were founded in 1999, gross revenue of approximately $750,000 US. We advocate for policies and regulations that enable businesses to use the Internet for innovation, competition and growth. I like to say we try to make sure the Internet is safe for capitalists.

Now we work at ICANN and IGF but we care about the integrity and the availability of e-commerce. And we also look at US federal government, we testified in 15 congressional hearings, many of them on the ICANN topics, and of course in the states here in the US.

And finally, Question 9 on there, was how can we improve communication and recruitment? I think we should try everything and then replicate whatever works. For instance, ICANN does these outreach calls that Chris Mondini conducts in these meetings. I try to attend. Whenever I'm asked I'll speak.

I'm not convinced that it's garnered us a single new member but I'm glad to be told otherwise. If it works I'll do it every time. If it doesn't work we have to change the way it's being done or try something else.

Look at events such as what Jimson organized in Africa with some BC assistance funding in the last quarter. That, I believe, is generating two or three potential members in a part of the world we need more representation. I'm anxious to follow up with Jimson on who in that group I can follow up with.

And then personal recruitment, nothing works as well as a personal referral to another business colleague, someone you meet with as a competitor or an ally at a trade association and you say how come you're not involved in ICANN? And explain to them how joining the BC will be a way to get in.

So I hope that that covers it. Glen, have I run out of time?

Glen de Saint Géry: Steve, you've got one minute left and you've done very well.

Steve DelBianco: All right, I'll stop there unless anyone else has other questions.

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you very much. Has anyone else got a question quickly for Steve in the one minute that's left for him? Otherwise we will go on to the CSG representative office and we will ask Marilyn if she will answer the questions. Marilyn, it's over to you. Thank you.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you, Glen. And I appreciate the opportunity to be speaking to the members as well as to note that since we have it transcribed even those members not on the call will be able to hear the responses and perhaps provide additional questions.

I've been engaged, as I said in my candidate statement, in the processes related to ICANN that led to the creation of ICANN. I've been a member of the BC since we helped to found ICANN along with several others who are on this call today. And I've been engaged in ICANN governance and policy activities since that time.

I've had the honor of serving on the Nominating Committee where I worked to achieve the addition of the second BC seat for the BC on the Nominating Committee. I was also on the President's Strategy Committee; the only business representative that helped to establish the Affirmation of Commitments and influence the establishment of the ATRT review team process at ICANN.

We revised the organizational structure of the BC in 2009 and wrote the new charter which led to the creation of the Executive Committee. And I mentioned that because it was an effort to change and distribute and increase the participation of all members of the BC in the decision processes but also to distribute the leadership across more members of the BC replacing a small triumvirate of only three people with six people and moving to a process of making decisions as much as possible by consensus based on the recommendations of the full BC.

I'll turn now to the questions and say by the ITC and the BC redundant? Should we consider merging? While we're not redundant I think we have to struggle with the misinterpretation of many that because the BC perspective, which is more about the broader issues of security, stability and resiliency and how trademark protection and IP issues support that larger portfolio, there are many in ICANN that misinterpret the focus of the BC and refer to the BC as the shadow IPC.

We need to continue to advance our own broader identity, collaborate with the IPC and the ISPCP but to speak more broadly and more clearly and individually as a constituency and to focus, again, on what led us as the BC to create a business user constituency.

That means we need to articulate more carefully and we need to articulate ourselves not just standing behind the CSG, but articulate our points of view very directly. I think we can do that. And I think at this point that off of these constituencies and the ISPCP deserve to continue with individual constituencies. And I agree with Steve, we need to avoid in the GNSO review being smushed together into a single entity which some would advance.

On the question of internal politics, you know, I think we've come a long way in advancing the professionalism of how the Business members interact with each other. And I think we can do more along that way. But we also need to understand that differences in perspective, as Steve said, do sometimes lead to the view that it's a political difference.

Differences should exist within the BC that we need to be professional and collegial and how we deal with those. And I think I strive to do that and if reelected will continue to strive to do that.

I do want to make a comment, which I'll make later, about the incorporation and induction of new members into the BC and a rollback can be taken by the Secretariat to help to advance the understanding of new members and how to use the wiki, how to use the Website.

I have just reinstated, as the CSG, working with Brenda a Meet the BC document which is an informational document which will help to advise all

members about who the members are but also help new members to become acquainted with who the membership of the BC is.

I definitely think there's a benefit to the BC returning to something we used to do and that is collegial interaction with the ccNSO, the ALAC and other groups and reestablishing our identity and finding commonality issues, meeting with those groups and then moving on to those areas where we may not have commonality that we need to be able to negotiate and advance understanding.

The Board it makes decisions based on consensus across the community. And if we standalone then we stand undefended. The more we can build bridges and find commonality that will help us and then where we have strong differences that's also still means we have collegial relationships and we are able to advance our own different views more strongly.

Diversity of membership is absolutely a relevant issue for the BC and the reason for that is we are losing ground because we are not viewed by others as being diverse. We can advance the better understanding of our own diversity, the membership of some of our trade associations is extremely diverse, but we've kind of lost out on advancing that visibility.

We need to go back to our associations and ask them to also advance more awareness among their membership and help to build the understanding of the diversity.

I'll say more when I come to the question about awareness and outreach in the developing countries and that is we can better use our relationship with our associations (Avista) but also sister relationships with (Aleto), with ICC, with ETNO, with (AIM), and look for the commonality of SMEs in the developing

countries and find a way to partner with those associations to advance awareness and outreach in the developing countries just as we've done with eInstituto and with (Avista), we need to broaden that and use other associations as well as companies who have a geographic presence.

For some time we've been trying to recruit GSMA as a member, sorry, associations like that bring significant diversity. And we need to find a way to build on that even if they don't become a member we could find a way to partner with them.

I do not participate in other constituencies. Mcade, LLC is solely focused on the Business Constituency. And I'll just describe right now the answer to Question 8, I founded Mcade, LLC when I retired from AT&T in 2005. I am the main principle, from time to time I have associates or interns but I do no work at ICANN using those associates or interns.

I do have a global focus on Internet governance and (Wisis) follow-up and those are the services that I offer. And know nothing my revenue comes from contracted parties. I have a current SOI, as all of us should have, and that is available on the ICANN wiki so no participation in other constituencies.

On the question about our income, there has been a proposal made by the finance subcommittee and proposed by the vice chair of finance and operations that we delay invoicing until at least six months into 2015.

I support that and I also support the idea that our outreach and awareness subcommittee, supported by the finance subcommittee, should put together strategies for spending some of this money on outreach activities and put those proposals forward to the ExComm but then forward to the full BC and

engage the full BC and what they can do also to participate in spending some of the money on outreach and participation.

We could also offer an incentive to some of our associations that if they can bring in 2 to 3 of their members from developing countries we could have an extremely low introductory rate for those SME participants from developing countries. And that could be a good way for us to increase our membership but also really kind of continue to buy down the revenue that we have.

We could look at reducing the dues for a period of time as well and ask the finance committee to reconsider that.

I need for you to - I can't - Glen, I can go to the next layer of questions on the page and I can't see question - thank you. Question 9 and 10, communication be approved, I think better use of subcommittees. And I like the idea that's been put forward that we create working groups and subcommittees.

I think Steve has tried to do that in the policy area. And I note that Ron has proposed that as a further idea so I do think that's a good idea. And then have those subcommittees help to become experts in particular areas and continue to report in and update the full membership, have those subcommittees be open to ongoing recruitment from other members who as they learn about topics may then want to join those subcommittees.

Outreach and recruitment I've spoken about. I think that all of us need to continue to think that outreach and recruitment is an ongoing responsibility for every member of the BC and we can all contribute to that through our individual activities.

But I think we also need to strengthen the activity of the outreach committee itself and consider not just how we effectively use the ICANN funding but whether we need to augment that in some way by strengthening actual national and regional activities.

The activity that (Avista) just did was extremely effective and there will be an opportunity for us to think about doing more of that perhaps in Latin America as we move to BA for the upcoming ICANN meetings.

We might also think that Ireland might offer a great opportunity for European recruitment as we look toward the end of the year and think about relying on (AIM), Etno, Stéphane and others to create some kind of aggressive outreach within Europe by the end of the year.

On the issue of SMEs, I'll just say SMEs do have very different issues. Hello? Sorry? Hello?

Brenda Brewer: You're fine, Marilyn. Go ahead, please.

Marilyn Cade: Thanks. SMEs do have very different issues in terms of their ability to self-fund their participation but their voice is incredibly important and they bring in particular a very strong commitment about SSR.

The particulars of trademark protections are generally driven by their concern about making sure that it is a secure, reliable and resilient e-commerce environment. And they - if they come from developing countries they have a particular very strong voice typically with their government and also with key decision makers.

The Board and others from ICANN are looking for us to demonstrate that we are more diverse and to demonstrate that we are bringing in the voice of SMEs not just the voice of big global companies. I think we have the ability to do more of that. I note that Andy Mack is on the phone as well as (Avista), and others who have relationships that we can build on.

But I think we're going to find ourselves much more credible if we continue to build those relationships with SMEs. But it may take additional support for SMEs to get them engaged. It may take a couple of years of lower introductory membership fees, it may take further coaching.

What I've seen a very high interest from SMEs but a challenge to overcome the time barriers and the expense barriers of getting engaged. Once engaged I'll just note that we've seen that many of our officers, people who pick up and do the hard work, have come from the SME environment, people like Chris, people like Gabby, people like Jimson, other SMEs, myself and Ron, have all been very strong contributors.

But I do think - John Berard - but I do think we need to be asking what are the challenges that smaller BC members face particularly from developing countries and consider what we can do to support their engagement thus enhancing our credibility. Thanks.

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you very much, Marilyn. Is that - have you concluded?

Marilyn Cade: Thank you, Glen, I have.

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you very much, Marilyn. And you were perfectly on time. The next - our next nominee is David Fares. David, welcome.

David Fares: Great. Thank you very much, Glen. And thanks to all the members for participating...

((Crosstalk))

David Fares: ...participating in the call which is proving to be a bit lengthy so I'll try and be as brief as I possibly can. On the first question, I agree with what others have said regarding the differences between the BC and the IPC. We as members of the BC focus on the security and the stability of the Internet while the IPC largely focuses on trademark issues.

Of course there is some intersection between those two buckets of issues but I do generally think is important to keep the organizations separate. But also agree with what Elisa had said and that is that we have to look at the overall structure of the GNSO as we move into the GNSO review and have a robust debate about how best to ensure that our interests are best represented in a new GNSO, if it is restructured.

Regarding the internal politics within the BC, I definitely agree that there are politics but I think that there are politics in every organization. What I think might be at the heart of this question is personal agendas. And I think we've made significant progress over the last few years in focusing the work and the debates within the BC on policy issues and on the substantive work that we have before us.

But I do think there are still hints of personal agendas within the BC. If I am elected I will do everything in my power to work with the ExComm to keep the focus of BC's work on substance and to ensure that all interactions remain as constructive and collegial as possible.

I agree that we definitely need to work with the ccNSO and the ALAC and indeed with all organizations. In a multistakeholder body like ICANN it's incumbent on all of the different constituencies to understand the views of others so that we can identify where we have consensus and bridge differences wherever we can. That is what a bottom up consensus policy development process dictates of us and that's what we must do.

And Elisa did mention, though, that the meetings are very busy but I think that we can also find ways of having sessions with the different organizations outside of the very busy meeting sessions.

Diversity is critical. It's not only required by both the BC charter and the ICANN bylaws but it's critical to our - to our credibility as an organization. And indeed when we talk about multistakeholderism we need to make sure that we're representing the diversity of all business users around the world that is incumbent on all of us. And I think we all need to work at ensuring diversity not just in geography but also in different types of businesses so long as they're business users.

Awareness and outreach to the developing world, I think I talked about the importance of that. It's critical to us. We need to make sure that we understand the needs and demands of business users not just from the developed world but from the developing world as well both large and small business users from the developing world.

My company does not participate in any other constituency in ICANN.

Several people have mentioned what we might be able to do with the additional funds that we find ourselves in reserve. I agree that we could use them to do additional outreach; we could use them to fund potential new

members to come to BC meetings. And we should absolutely review the membership due structure if we find ourselves in a situation of repeated reserves in surplus.

And, Glen, could you scroll down for the additional questions?

((Crosstalk))

David Fares: My - yes, I can see them now. Thank you very much. My company's name is 21st Century Fox. We are a global media company. We have over 25,000 employees. We operate in all geographic regions of the world. And we - well, people may not know 21st Century Fox but I'm sure you know News Corporation.

At the end of June 2013 News Corporation split into two companies, what is now the new News Corporation constitutes what were the publishing assets of the old News Corporation. I work for 21st Century Fox which is the second part of the spinoff which is the film and TV business of what was the old News Corporation.

I think one of the most important things we can do to improve communication within the BC is to streamline the communications with the members. I think there's been significant progress in that over the last two years.

I think we can do more to make sure our summaries and our questions and our proposals are short, concise, digestible and understandable by everyone not just those people who are the people who attend every ICANN meeting because we need to be able to be accessible to business users that may not have the ability to attend ICANN, that may not be immersed in the work of

ICANN, that may not know the jargon, but nonetheless their business hinges on the security and stability of the DNS.

So I want to work with the ExComm if I'm elected to ensure that we continue to streamline communications and that we ensure that all information provided to the members is digestible and understandable for everybody.

We have, historically, the coordinated BC outreach for recruitment has been through organized events. I think that those are important but I - excuse me, I've just lost the questions. I'll continue with this one. But I think what we also really need to focus on is one on one outreach.

I have done that since the founding of the BC when I first started participating through the US Council for International Business but I've continued that as I've been an employee of News Corporation and now 21st Century Fox.

I think the importance of relationships, of being able to explain personally to people why ICANN is important, why their participation is important is absolutely critical. And I have been committed to doing that. I will remain committed to doing that. And I think perhaps what we need to do is to develop a roadmap for each active member in the BC to target 5, 10 companies that they know that they believe should be participating in ICANN.

And I think, based on what I said in my response to Question 9, streamlining our communications and ensuring that we focus on substance is going to be critical in our success in continuing to recruit new members to the BC.

As I mentioned in one of my earlier responses, I think it's incumbent on us to ensure that we have representation not just from large companies but also from small companies. I think small companies that are members of the BC

can be most helpful in explaining to other small businesses why their participation is important.

I also, again, think streamlining communications, making sure that communications are digestible will help us to recruit smaller businesses because they don't have the resources that a large company like mine has to have people who are devoted to ICANN.

And even I'm not - my portfolio is much broader than ICANN but at least I have been granted part of my portfolio to be ICANN. And I think it was Ron who said the people in small businesses are doing marketing, they're doing outreach, they're doing coms, they're doing business development.

And we need to make sure that our communications are streamlined and digestible so that they don't have to spend an inordinate amount of time trying to become engaged, trying to understand the issues and why those issues should be important to them and help them formulate what - help them formulate what their view should be vis-à-vis the policies and the issues that the DNS presents for them.

So I think I might have some additional time. I'd be happy to answer any other questions that people may have. And, Glen, if there are no other questions I'm finished, and thank you all very much for your time.

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you very much, David. In fact there is extra time. And may I now open it to the floor for extra questions because I see we have a large number of participants on the call. So without wasting any more time anybody who'd like to ask a question please go ahead or let's form a queue. You can either put your hand up in Adobe Connect or do it verbally.

Are there no questions from the floor? People on the telephone line would you perhaps like to ask any questions?

Marilyn Cade: Glen, it's Marilyn. I don't have a question but I have a request to you and to Brenda.

Glen de Saint Géry: Please, Marilyn, yes.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you. While we have very good member turnout just looking at this I think we're well under 50% of our members. Can we make sure we have an expedited transcript to go out to the full membership? I know that we probably should have made that request before but it just occurs to me now.

Glen de Saint Géry: We'll get the transcript out to you as soon as possible, Marilyn. Our provider is usually very good and although I can't make any promises on their behalf we usually get the transcript within seven to eight hours.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you.

Glen de Saint Géry: And the recording will be up as soon as possible so that will also help. We'll get that sent - we'll get Brenda to send it to the list.

Steve DelBianco: Glen, a couple of us have our hands up, is it okay to ask a question?

Glen de Saint Géry: Please. Please. Please. Yes, Steve. Steve.

Steve DelBianco: Steve DelBianco. A question for David Fares. David, the last three ICANN meetings I was amazed to see three or if not four people from 21st Century Fox show up at the meeting. And not just at one session but you had colleagues in the entire BC meetings, the breakfast with the GAC. So I'd be

interested in what's that all about? How have you been able to generate that kind of interest within 21st Century Fox at multiple levels of the company and when they observe the BC in action how does that inform your interest at wanting to be our new CSG liaison? Thank you.

David Fares: Well, Glen, should I proceed in answering or do you want to take Andrew's question and then we respond?

Glen de Saint Géry: Please answer, David.

David Fares: Okay great. Thank you. Steve, thanks for the question. My company has understood the importance of ICANN's work for a very long time. As I mentioned, we have been members for - of the BC for over 10 years and we have regularly attended the ICANN meetings.

There - the whole debate around Internet governance and the important role that ICANN plays in Internet governance I think has heightened the awareness of ensuring that we participate meaningfully not just in ICANN but in all of the different Internet governance bodies that exist.

ICANN is the very first example of a multistakeholder organization. If we're committed to multistakeholderism we have to make it work. That means we have to improve ICANN's accountability, it means that we have to participate so that we can ensure that our views are being heard and being respected throughout the process development - policy development process.

That I think has been - that recognition about the need for broader participation, not just from one person or two people but a broader set of people, is what has brought us - has brought them to the meetings recently.

And I think that you're going to see that that's going to continue going forward. But thank you for the question. And we look forward to - not just me but my colleagues look forward to continuing to work with everyone to make sure that ICANN is as effective and as responsive to business users' interests as possible.

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you very much, David. Andrew, would you like to put your question?

Andrew Mack: Sure. Thanks, Glen. I actually have two and they're kind of for everyone. What I've heard is a lot of nice stuff but not a lot of stuff that helps me differentiate between different vision. And so just as a curious question since I know everyone, I guess what do you think is the single biggest issue facing the BC in the coming year? And if you're willing to go out on a limb, how are you different from the people that you are running against if you are running against someone? Thank you.

David Fares: I'm sorry, Andrew, could you repeat your second question? You were a bit choppy.

Andrew Mack: Sorry about that. The second question is, if you're willing to go out on a limb if you're running against someone how do you think you differ from the person that you're running against in terms of your approach? What would be different?

Steve DelBianco: Nice.

Glen de Saint Géry: David, would you like to take that?

David Fares: David did you say?

((Crosstalk))

Glen de Saint Géry: Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: Yes, sure, I'm happy to be in the queue or I'm happy to go first, what is it? Shall I kick off?

Glen de Saint Géry: Yes please, Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you. Andy, thanks for that question. I think the single greatest - single most important issue for the BC is ICANN governance. Returning ICANN to the bottom up consensus based approach not just in gTLD policy but in all aspects of Internet governance. And that means reestablishing the leadership voice of business as users and moving ICANN back to a balance.

Right now they're incredibly focused on sort of being the trade association for new gTLDs and for contracted parties. I think (unintelligible) we as much shift that back to a focus on users and particularly the voice of business users not just individual users.

Because business users bring the concern about the security, stability and resiliency of the entire aspect of unique identifiers what makes the Internet run and be reliable and support reliable e-commerce is what advances the needs of business users but also of individual users. So we need to shift that back.

I think ICANN is tipped toward focusing on, as I said, the contracted parties. And that puts ICANN at significant risk as a trusted steward. Being a multistakeholder entity does mean paying attention to all voices but ICANN

has a function that is incredibly important as the trusted steward and that means not all voices are created equal.

Just because you have an opinion about the number of digits in the next generation of Internet protocol does not make you qualified to devise the policy on that technical aspect.

I think I differ...

((Crosstalk))

Glen de Saint Géry: Marilyn? Sorry, I must ask you to give the others a chance too, please. Our time is getting very short. I'm terribly sorry to interrupt.

Marilyn Cade: No, no no problems, Glen, I'll just say very quickly I think I differ from other candidates because I bring a very broad background in the technical aspects as well as in the policy aspects and an ongoing engagement both in the broad aspects of Internet governance but day to day understanding of ICANN as well.

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you very much. Elisa or David, would you like to...

David Fares: Sure...

Ron Andruff: I have my hand up, Glen, if I might?

((Crosstalk))

Glen de Saint Géry: Sorry, Ron, yes I see your hand is up, yes.

Ron Andruff: I beg your pardon, I don't want to walk on anybody but I did want to respond to this because I think it's an important question, and I thank Andy for bringing it forward. Accountability is what the BC faces. We have been pushing for a long time for ICANN to be more accountable. And we've watched them over the last 15 years the Board basically making its own decisions.

And I go back to vertical integration as an example. There was a working group that worked long and hard on trying to come up with a decision and the Board basically said fine, you didn't meet your deadline; we'll make our own decision.

That's not very accountable to the community. And the community is what gives ICANN its ability to stand out and become the steward of the Internet. So I think accountability is the answer to that question.

What separates me from the incumbent candidate, as some members know I come from a sports background and (won) several championships so I know what it takes to achieve great things. It starts with mutual respect and respect, as we all know, must be earned.

The chair has to recognize that they don't have a right to nominate people, they do not have a right to pose questions, they have a right to - no rights to impose their will on a body; rather the chair's job is to encourage all parties to speak their mind clearly without fear of reprisal and so that every issue, large or small, is given the appropriate airing and then work to build consensus around those points that are most acceptable.

So therefore a chairperson is really a traffic director, not a participant, and thus must always look to be the best interest of the constituency to seek a common solution. So that's what I would bring...

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you.

Ron Andruff: ...through my chair...

((Crosstalk))

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you, Ron. Sorry, I must also be short with you. David Fares, you've got your hand up.

David Fares: Yes, thank you very much, Glen. I too believe that accountability is the biggest issue that we are confronting. I think ensuring that ICANN is accountable to the community will help us ensure the bottom up consensus policy development process works because we can hold the Board accountable to the bylaws. And that's the best way we can do it.

I also talked about Internet governance generally. And I think, as I said earlier, ICANN, being the first multistakeholder body, needs to ensure that it has rules of procedure and robust accountability mechanisms so that any future multistakeholder, whether it's a one-off meeting or entity, follows suit because we've seen other Internet governance mechanisms that they have not had clear rules of procedure or accountability mechanisms and that has made it much more difficult to participate in them.

So it's important - ICANN accountability is important to ICANN in and of itself in ensuring the bottom up consensus policy development process and

holding the Board's feet to the fire vis-à-vis the bylaws but it's also important in the much broader Internet governance landscape.

Regarding my views vis-à-vis my opponent, I respect Marilyn very much. I believe I would focus on substance always, on the consensus views always and I would ensure that we find ourselves in a very constructive debate at all times because our role, if I'm elected as a participant of the ExComm, is to keep the organization running smoothly, keeping the members happy and facilitating a process for dialogue among all of the members.

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you, David. Andrew, I see your hand is still up. May I give the last word to Elisa?

Elisa Cooper: Thank you, Glen.

Glen de Saint Géry: For your question. Thank you.

Elisa Cooper: So I think I agree with most that from a strategic perspective the issues around accountability are going to really take center stage next year. But I also think that as we move into the delegation of additional new gTLDs and with the launch of the RPM reviews and various other reviews around the new gTLD program that we will have to spend a fair amount of time engaging in those because this does still have the potential to have a major impact on business users. And it likely will have a major impact on business users.

And I think from a more tactical perspective that's something that we'll also have to pay very close attention to next year.

In terms of what makes me different I truly believe that I have the best interest of the BC and its members at heart. And I'm always looking out to see that

decisions that are potentially being made that might be contentious within the ExComm if they are problematic that they are brought to the full members, that decisions are made by election and not, again, by a small number of ExComm members.

I really believe that I've done my best to really put the BC front and center and to help lead the group. I'm not making the decisions; I'm just the spokesperson for the decisions that have been made. And I've also been very careful to only speak on positions that have been adopted by the BC and not to speak in my own capacity when I'm acting as the chair.

So I think those are the things that really differentiate me along with the fact that I actually have a very extensive business background and I really understand the business issues faced. I've worked for small companies, I've worked for startups, I've worked for midsize companies and I now work for a very large one and I understand those issues relative to domain names and numbering and I think that's - those are the things that really kind of differentiate me.

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you very much, Elisa. With that we are nine minutes over our allotted time. And is there anyone who would like to say something before we close?

Elisa Cooper: Glen, this is Elisa. I would like to say something and that is I'd like to thank you and Brenda very much for all of the work that you've done, Brenda especially and Glen as always. Brenda, I know that you're transitioning into a new position and you've decided to help us with this last bit of work so thank you so much. And, Glen, as always you're just such a pleasure and we all appreciate the support you give us.

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you very much, Elisa. And I wish you all a very good day onwards today. The ballots will be launched today - will be sent out today. And may I also add that if there's anything else you would like to add to questions you can do this on the list. I don't think that it is closed. So please if there are any comments or additions you'd like to do that on the list. But I think we have to close the call now. So thank you all very much and thank you for your kind words, Elisa.

((Crosstalk))

Ron Andruff: Thank you.

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you. Could we please stop the recording, (Jeremy)?

Coordinator: Thank you and this concludes today's conference. All parties may disconnect.

END