

**ICANN Transcription
BC Members Call
Thursday 05 January 2017 at 1600 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of BC Members call on the Thursday, 05 January 2017 at 16:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

The audio is also available at:

<mailto:https://icann.box.com/shared/static/pp8uuv9xzxc52d4es40sj63rmbzav731.mp3>

Coordinator: Excuse me, your recordings have been started. Speakers, you may now begin.

Michelle DeSmyter: Hi, thank you so much. Well good morning, good afternoon and good evening to all. Welcome to the BC Members call on the 5th of January, 2017, 1600 UTC. In the interest of time today, there will be no roll call as we have quite a few participants on the line, attendance will be taken via the Adobe Connect room. If you're only on the audio bridge, could you please let yourself be known now?

((Crosstalk))

Kathryn McGowan: Hi, this is Kathryn McGowan with LinkedIn.

Michelle DeSmyter: Hi, thanks, Kathryn, we will note that. And as a reminder to all participants please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. And please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to

avoid any background noise. With this I'll turn the call back over to you Chris Wilson.

Chris Wilson: Thank you, Michelle. This is Chris. Welcome, everybody. Happy New Year to all. First BC call of 2017. Hope everyone had a wonderful holiday season. Just real quick I wanted to announce and welcome obviously all the new BC officers in particular Barbara Wanner who is our CSG representative for this year and thank you, Barbara, for being willing to serve in that capacity and certainly appreciate it. And want to thank Cheryl Miller for her service in that capacity last year.

Why don't we go ahead and turn to Steve and we can dive into the policy calendar? I know there's been a flurry of activity over our email list the last few days on comments that are percolating. So, Steve, why don't we go ahead and turn to you?

Steve DelBianco: Thanks, Chris. Hey, everyone. Happy New Year. And I'm really amazed at the excellent turnout, that's fantastic. That means lots of potential volunteers are on the call today, I'm glad to see that.

The policy calendar I circulated just a few days ago and I can quickly recap things that we filed recently. Last week, two weeks ago on the 22nd of December, Denise Michel drafted a short and sweet comment on ICANN's draft report for continuous data driven analysis of root server system stability. And it was generally a positive comment where the BC was applauding ICANN for the work they've done and especially how they had incorporated some comments that we had made. Thanks, Denise.

And then on the 15th of December, thanks to work from Claudia and Jay, you're both on the call today and Susan Kawaguchi, we put in a joint comment on two aspects of thick Whois, one with respect to transitioning the last three remaining legacy TLDs without thick, and the other with regard to

consistent labeling and display. That was a joint comment and, again, thanks for helping us to get that in, Claudia and Jay.

And then back on 10th of December, Jimson and Marilyn worked together on a comment that we filed regarding the FY'18 operating plan and budget for a particular aspect of ICANN for the identifiers.

And back on the 5th of December, thanks to Eva and Cecilia's great work, we were able to get in a comment on the competitive effects of the new gTLD program. And, again, any assessments of the new gTLD program have two outcomes to them. They contribute to not only whether but when we would do a next round or open rounds of new gTLD applications. That's the first aspect. And the second is it informs how we would modify the application and evaluation process for new gTLD applicants to improve consumer choice, consumer trust and competition.

So with that in mind I know the BC is keen to have all those aspects improved, but there are also many BC members who also would like to see another round open up for some brands as well, so we're conscious of that, although that's not the BC's primary perspective.

Okay, so let's scroll down to the currently-open public comments. The very first one is a comment on a very brief two-page policy - somebody needs to mute - due the 12th of January. There are several other comments that were extended; this one was not. And it has to do with the anti-harassment policy. It's a two-pager. I've linked to it here. And they did adopt many of the comments the public had put in, and now Denise and Marilyn had worked to draft BC comments. This was back in June of 2016. And those weren't - I would say they weren't literally adopted by ICANN, but figuratively they picked up some of our concerns.

Now Chuck Warren wrote me yesterday - Chuck's not on the call today - but he volunteered to work on that. But I see Denise and Marilyn are on the call

today and I wonder whether I could ask you, Denise and Marilyn, to give a quick look, it's only a page and a half long, to see whether - how you feel about the new harassment policy. And I do think it's better to have the perspective of some women and others who might feel the victims of harassment than just have people like Chuck Warren and I do the analysis. Denise or Marilyn, any chance you could help with that? Okay, well thanks anyway.

Denise Michel: This is Denise. I'm happy to take a look at it despite the fact that I am not a victim. But happy to look at what we wrote previously and what's in our policy now.

Steve DelBianco: Denise, thank you very much. It's very brief and if you're able to do that, circulate it to BC private and then I will nudge Chuck Warren to try to finish on his commitment to get it done. We do have to turn this around by the 12th of January. I appreciate that. Any other volunteers? Yes, and, Denise, I certainly didn't mean to imply that you were a victim, it's more the notion of being a - more of a potential victim than Chuck Warren or I, but thank you very much.

The second is this identifier technology health indicators. A big thank you to John Berard who drafted a first cut at that. Denise Michel is going to assist John and Andy Abrams has already done a set of edits. This is in the first attachment to today's policy calendar. And Andy added quite a bit I think will be helpful. So our goal then, and John, I see you're on the call, be happy to have you react to the edits you got from Andy and set this up so that the BC can move forward on a review and comment and get this in by the 23rd of January.

John, do you want to offer any perspective even describe at a high level what you took sat the angle on the BC comment? Not hearing John...

John Berard: I hope I can be heard. Sure.

Steve DelBianco: You do. We hear you.

John Berard: Denise and I mapped out what you see before you as a rather short and sweet, but I believe, we believe, pointed response to the request for public comment. There is - I mean, there's an aspect of there's nothing to see here, let's move along. Rather than creating labels for problems that we have long known about, why don't we start focusing on the solutions?

And I think that's really the point that we also wanted to be clear that the BC has, over the course of the last six years, been diligent in identifying the problems using even smaller words to describe these diseases in a way that the broadest band of the community could get attached to. And...

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: John, I have a question for you, John. This is Steve. Is it - it's my impression that this initiative, to give it these labels, that this initiative was very much a top down initiative. This is not something the community requested or that arose out of a working group. Do you have the same impression?

John Berard: I don't have that impression but Denise has been a part of the discussion so, I don't know, Denise, you have anything you can add to that?

Denise Michel: Yes. This rose out of the community's input to the long-term strategic plan. And there's a commitment in the strategic plan to undertake this type of data gathering and publication. The staff has been doing outreach for, gosh, I don't know, it seems like two years talking to a lot of companies and organizations and others. So it's a culmination of a lot of planning and outreach and comprised with a commitment that ICANN has to the community in the strategic plan.

Largely this is all positive. This is all - this is in line with what the BC has - the BC's position on a number of specific policies and programs. It just needs a

little tweaking, I think, to be more accessible to the public and to get underway. Thanks.

John Berard: And, Steve...

Steve DelBianco: All right, thank you, Denise.

John Berard: ...I'll close by saying that I'm reminded that everybody needs an editor.

Steve DelBianco: I understand. And Andy's comments are very helpful. So while there are many ways in which we do criticize ICANN, I guess we should acknowledge that a strategic initiative that the community approved was the genesis for the effort to generate and publish data. The labeling, the clever labeling may not have been something the community asked for. But it probably doesn't get in the way of the gathering and publication of the data the community asked for.

So it's possible that our pointed criticism about spend a lot less time renaming things and get back to work on fixing it, we should at least acknowledge that ICANN is moving towards the gathering and publication of the data the community asked for. So I hope we can do that as well.

All right, thank you very much. I will look forward to reactions on the list, reply all, so that we can assess John's initial draft and Andy Abrams edits. Any other questions or points on this?

All right, Number 3, ICANN has published supplemental procedures to the IRP, or Independent Review Process, and this is pursuant to the CCWG on Accountability. The work we did in the transition was to modify the bylaws in ways that enhance the IRP process, makes it more powerful tool for the community to use as well as any aggrieved party to bring an action against ICANN.

There is one element that we called controversial, which is that the IRP timing, there's a statute of limitations, if you want to call it that, proposed here that an IRP has to be filed within a year of whatever the action or inaction of ICANN was. So within a year, so if you only discovered it a year later, you wouldn't be able to file on an item.

Now Jay Sidowsky, you and Phil Corwin, let me thank you very much for the work you've just begun on drafting a BC comment. And Jay circulated some questions this morning that Phil and I are researching. It would be helpful to this group for us to understand how BC members feel about the one year statute of limitations on the event itself. There's also a 45-day shot clock from the day you become aware of an action or inaction for the need to file an IRP.

So the BC needs to comment on whether we think the 45-day shot clock or the one-year statute of limitations are appropriate or not. So let's take a queue on that particular question only so that Jay and Phil and I have a better idea how to draft the comment. Denise, you're first.

Denise Michel: Yes, I'm quite concerned about the one-year limit and 45-day clock. I think there are many instances where it takes more than a year to understand how staff is - how staff is interpreting and implementing global policy and the Board's intent. So I think that's an issue that the BC definitely needs to take a look at. Thanks.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Denise. So I will register that you and Jay at this point think that's too short. Do we have a recommendation for what it should be? Happy to take anyone in the queue. All right so you're all on notice that given that the drafters of this believe the timeframes are too short, we will make that point and we will probably recommend something longer and then it'll be incumbent on all of you who failed to speak up today to quickly react to what we come up with in the draft comment.

Jay, thank you and Phil and again for volunteering to draft that. We have to circulate something in the next week or so.

The fourth item on here is renewing the dotMobi-sponsored top level domain registry agreement. There are folks on this call who probably don't even remember when there was a round of sponsored TLDs and dotMobi was one of them. It was thought to be a dramatic improvement for those of us who viewed Web content on a mobile device, that's what dotMobi was invented to do so that a TLD would have a dotMobi extension. I might be at LinkedIn.mobi if I'm on my phone but go to LinkedIn.com if I were on my laptop.

But, look, all that changed because it became relatively easy for the server side browser software to detect the device that was dialing in and thereby render the screen so it's appropriate for a mobile device or appropriate for a desktop. So it's my impression dotMobi never got off the ground. And yet they want to renew their sponsored registry agreement.

And I don't know whether it was their desire or ICANN's desire but ICANN has made it a policy. They want to move all of these old legacy TLDs to the new gTLD registry agreement. And that is this proposal, that dotMobi is moving to the new agreement but of course they're striking any of the provisions like a sunrise period or Trademark Clearinghouse provisions that would have applied to the launch period since there is no launch period because dotMobi has been in the works for many years.

So I'll take a volunteer or a queue of those who have an interest in commenting on the dotMobi new sponsored agreement. Phil Corwin, you're up first.

Phil Corwin: Yes, thank you Steve. And I don't want to take the lead role on this as with the XXX comment. I'd be happy to be a backup on this. I wanted to point out with dotMobi, as we had with dotXXX, we had - once again this is a legacy

TLD, not someone from the new TLD program, which has accepted the URS in exchange for monetary benefit.

In the case of dotMobi and in addition to the contract being recast where it's no longer really a sponsored registry but comes under the new TLD registry agreement, they're getting very substantial monetary - annual monetary benefits in exchange for that. I just posted something yesterday at the Internet Commerce Website on this which I'll circulate to BC members.

But I want to - as members know, I'm cochair of the RPM Review Working Group. We're charged with determining and will be addressing this this year, it's coming up soon, whether the URS is effective, whether it's being administered properly, whether it should be changed in any way and very importantly, whether it should become consensus policy for legacy TLDs.

At the same time, when you go from XXX to Mobi and the exchange of financial benefits for accepting what's been identified by Council as a policy issue, the dotNet registry agreement that's coming up for renewal in the middle of this year, VeriSign pays 75 cents per domain fee at dotNet. I believe the differential from the standard 25 cent fee is supposed to go into some kind of development fund, whether it's actually doing that is something I'm not clear on.

But you have the possibility and, again, this is no statement on what should happen with that fee, it should be determined on the merits, where VeriSign could be confronted by Global Domain Division staff with saying well, if you'd like you fee reduced from 75 cents to 25 cents, which for VeriSign would result in saving \$7.5 million per year because there's 15 million domains at dotNet, you have to take URS.

And so that decision could be made by contract negotiation and take it out of the hands of the PDP working group. I know the BC has a strong record of saying we like the URS, but this is a determination that should be made

through the policy making process. So this dotMobi sets the stage for what could be a very controversial proposal on dotNet later this year. And I just wanted to make members aware of that. Thank you.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Phil. And to the extent any of the members of the BC have been registrants in dotMobi, this would be a great time to check with your business side to see whether your company has been happy with the service you've received from the registry.mobi. They are signing up to the public interest commitments but if any of your companies who bought dotMobi domains have concerns, this is a great time for the BC to bring them to light.

As many of you know, ICANN does bilateral negotiations with registry operators when it comes to contract renewals. ICANN does not consult with the community before they begin to negotiate. The most they do is to publish the negotiated agreements for public comment that seems to have no impact at all on negotiations that are already done. A number of us raised this concern with Akram when I met at the IGF and he has promised that in the future they would ask the community, "What are your priorities for this renegotiation of, say, dotMobi or dotJobs?" And that those priorities would inform ICANN's bilateral negotiation.

But here they go again. They did the dotMobi negotiation without ever asking the community ahead of time what are our concerns about dotMobi. So disappointing once again.

One more item then I want to turn it to Denise. There's a call for volunteers on the review of Whois, it's now called the Review of Registration Directory Services. This is a review that was mandated under the Affirmation of Commitments which have been brought into the bylaws as a result of the transition of the IANA contract.

And so far, Susan Kawaguchi is the only BC member to have put her initial interest - registered her interest to be on that team. Susan was also on the

first Whois Review Team so has a lot of experience in this field. But again, we have - it's open until the 13th of January so there's a great opportunity for any of the rest of you who have a lot of experience with Whois who want to jump into a review team.

Now this review team actually may go on for several months but it is going to be a much lighter and easier review than the other Affirmation reviews because it has a very limited scope. And I think that that will make it easier thing to jump into. Are there any questions from BC members about that review? You'll need to get your applications in before the 13th. If you go to the link that I put into the policy calendar it tells you how to submit your application. And you should indicate that you're a BC member when you apply.

But do not send your application to Chris Wilson. You can copy the BC but you've got to get your application directly into ICANN to have it be considered.

Denise, over to you. I know you wanted to mention something.

Denise Michel: Thanks, Steve. I just have two things to put on people's radar. No action but just as a point of information. We're waiting for final sign-off from the IPC on the joint BC ISP IP letter to the Chair and CEO on publishing - gathering and publishing data. So I'll let you know as soon as that's - as soon as that's sent.

And then second of all, Steve and I, just to remind people, Steve and I have a draft of a first cut from the consultant in mapping the historic public comments and resulting responses and actions on all of the BC's submissions. So as soon as we have time Steve and I will take a look at that and then likely come back to the, if we can, to the people who originally held the pen on those comments so they can take a look at the substance of the comments and how the consultant - the follow through. Thanks.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Denise. Hey, Phil Corwin, it's over to you to talk a little bit about Channel 2 for the GNSO Council.

Phil Corwin: Yes, thanks, Steve. And I'm doing this on behalf of Susan Kawaguchi as Susan had a conflict this morning and couldn't be on the call. The last Council meeting was on December 15. As you can see from the document here, we voted on three items and approved three motions. One was appointing GNSO members and a GNSO cochair to the new CCWG for the auction proceeds to determine how they should be used. The second was adoption of the GNSO review of the GAC communiqué from Hyderabad for submission to the ICANN Board. I believe that's been submitted.

Interestingly, yesterday Council members received an email from Council regarding a transcript and Adobe recording of a Board call regarding the Hyderabad communiqué. And it - there's an interesting line on the communication from Donna Austin saying it's clear from the discussion that some in the GAC were aware of the GNSO Council response to the communiqué but the Board was not. So I don't know why the Board was not familiar with our positions.

And finally, adopted the GNSO Review Working Group implementation plan. The next Council meeting is on the 19th of January. We have not yet seen a proposed agenda so it's difficult to talk about what'll be coming up. That is on the same day as the next BC call. And it's later in the day, it's in that afternoon so we'll have a chance both by email and on the next BC call to discuss and give guidance to Susan and I regarding that Council meeting before it takes place.

And there's other Council work noted. The RDS PDP Working Group and that's about it, a thin agenda on Council for today's call. Happy to take any questions. Okay, I guess everything was clear so back to you, Steve.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks, Phil. I do have one small question for you on Number 1, the first motion that was passed.

Phil Corwin: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: This is the new gTLD auction proceeds. The CSG got one rep and it's Tony Harris of the ISPCP. And I did want to clarify that I don't think they will determine the use of the auction proceeds, but I believe the charter asks this group to come up with a methodology by which we can determine where to use the auction proceeds. So when they're finished their deliverable will be a methodology or a process, it won't actually be here's where the money goes.

Phil Corwin: Yes, thanks for pointing out that distinction, Steve, that's correct. They're not going to be determining what the money - which particular uses the money should go to, they're going to be proposing a system for accepting proposals and making determinations as how the money should be used and also whether it should be used all at once or in annual increments. So that is their task to create that methodology.

Steve DelBianco: Hey thanks, Phil. Chris, back to you.

Chris Wilson: Thanks, Steve. Maybe we can go ahead and turn now to Barbara...

Marilyn Cade: Sorry, Chris. It's Marilyn. Can I make a comment before you go to CSG?

Chris Wilson: Sure, go ahead, Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: Thanks. I just wanted to comment on this auction issue because I have a long history of working on this. And I will join the group as a participant. I think this is much more important to the BC than perhaps we've previously identified. There's a lot of implications for ICANN on how this proceeds. And there's not only the image issue but there's also the practical issue of whether ICANN

itself benefits from the auction proceeds and how this implicates perhaps their antitrust standing in the United States.

As I said, (unintelligible) asked to join the group as a participant, but I think I would just note that to my regrets, all four - at least three of the four representatives from the GNSO have vested interests. And I think we need to be concerned about that and pay attention to it and perhaps have additional members from the BC who join that group as participants or observers.
Thanks.

Chris Wilson: Thank you, Marilyn, for that comment. Could we maybe go ahead and turn to Barbara to provide a quick report from the CSG perspective? I know we just had hot off the presses, if you will, the latest NCPH intercessional call just a half hour ago. So maybe, Barbara, if you wanted to provide an overview of what was discussed on that call for folks that'd be great.

Barbara Wanner: Sure. Can you hear me? Okay?

Chris Wilson: Yes.

Barbara Wanner: Okay great. Well as everybody knows we'll have the intercessional on the 14th and 15th in Reykjavik Iceland. And I guess the constituencies, Chris confirmed during the chat, that the constituencies would meet on the 16th. And I have a specific question to you, Chris, would that be in the morning because that likely would affect travel arrangements.

Chris Wilson: So, yes, so for folks - so Thursday morning or a lot of people are leaving - flights won't leave until later in the day on that Thursday. So the thought was that constituencies could have their own meetings if they wanted on that Thursday morning because it'd be sort of time available.

I have reserved time for the BC really from a BC ExComm perspective to have a meeting.

Barbara Wanner: Okay.

Chris Wilson: I think because the trickiness being that we're going to be in Iceland in different time zone it would be awkward, I think, to have - we can't do a meeting later in the day to accommodate - put folks in the United States. So I think what we may end up doing is simply having an ExComm meeting that morning. So that's where - tentatively where we are. I think the other constituencies may end up having a fuller - their own full constituency meeting, I guess via conference call. But I don't know exactly what they're doing, but that's sort of where we are.

I think, you know, we can have this conversation among those that are attending offline, about scheduling purposes and logistics if that doesn't work for people we can figure that out. But that's basically what we're discussing.

Barbara Wanner: Great. Okay that clarifies things for me too. Just from sort of practical logistical information and if you need a visa to attend this intercessional, Benedetta informed us that she would have some letter available probably later this day that would be posted on the wiki space so they're aware of this need for visa letters and the importance of getting that taken care of sooner rather than later.

There will be a newcomer webinar, it is under development and that will be - information will be released on that shortly which will be important for me, you know, as a first time attendee to one of these intercessional meetings. And then finally, there will be a delegate's reception, they're looking at doing that on the evening of the 14th of February leaving the evening of the 15th open if the individual constituencies want to hold their own separate dinners or get together.

Much of the call focused on programming and how to focus the seven plenary sessions that have been slotted, if you will. Toward the end of the call - the

topics were very wide-ranging covering everything from priorities for 2017 to procedural issues and the selection process for the GNSO NCPH Board member. But there was a lot of discussion toward the end concerning maintaining the GNSO's traditional policy making leadership position and how to take that forward.

And Rob, who is the ICANN assigned person organizing this, felt that we were actually coalescing around that as the theme for the meeting, looking at the GNSO's traditional policy leadership role and then thoughtfully considering how to move that forward.

There would probably be a lot of sub-themes that were discussed wrapped under that so this could conceivably become a multipart session that would extend say beyond the allotted 75 minutes so it could, you know, maybe take up two of the allotted plenary sessions.

But sub themes that could be wrapped up that would be the implications of bylaws implementations, areas of common interest among the various constituencies, this issue of staff created policy through contracts. There was a lot of discussion about that. GNSO review implementation conceivably could be wrapped up in under that sub theme.

So Chris and I had to drop off to join this call but that's kind of where things wrapped up as we left. Oh and importantly another topic that received a lot of interest and likely will be a focus of our discussions will be a meeting with Jamie Hedlund in his new capacity of the leader of Compliance.

So that's kind of where things wrapped up for the moment. I would say that we're really just trying to refine the program and narrow it down to how we want to effectively utilize the seven plenary sessions allotted. Any - happy to entertain any questions.

Chris Wilson: This is Chris. Thanks, Barbara. A good summary. And as I said, we'll hopefully have a little more clarity on the meeting schedule in the near future. I think we'll probably have another call probably another week or two is my guess to sort of finalize that because we are about 40 days out from the intercessional. But as that gets finalized we'll let everyone know.

Marilyn Cade: Chris, sorry, it's Marilyn. And I'm really sorry I can't raise my hand. Can I ask a question about remote observers to the session? Is that possible to just be a remote - not a participant but an observer?

Chris Wilson: No, I think that's - I think the expectation is that there will be remote capabilities so for all the BC members who won't be there in person, certainly should be able to - there'll be Adobe room set up for folks to tune in. So I think that's the expectation. Okay.

Jimson, why don't we go ahead and turn to you for operations and finance?

Jimson Olufuye: Thank you very much, Chris. And good day, everyone. Welcome to 2017. As you are all aware, I believe majority of us, that we do maintain accounts with like Kaiser Bank in Spain and also Wells Fargo in DC. And we have (unintelligible) system. So through the system as of this morning, the BC current account balance is about \$158,000.

Secondly, it is time for us to work on our FY'18 budget request, that process is currently on. And it should be due by January 30. So as we did last year, we are making budget request for policy consultant. Steve mentioned the work of the policy consultant when it was (unintelligible) enough. So this would be the second year running for a policy consultant to help with tracking the history of our policy submissions and its effectiveness and overall ICANN policy development process.

So we are making a budget request for BC leadership travel support for trade (unintelligible) apart from the councilors, travel support would - it's already

guaranteed. So and we did request for extra travel support last year so we are making one extra request this year again but it will not come through the normal process, it will come through the public comment submission process as we have been advised.

So we are also making budget request for leadership support for potential leaders from developing countries to attend ICANN meetings. And also to attend IGF and the United Nations Commission for Science and Technology for Development meetings and the WISIS meetings.

And also for outreach, outreaching using the CROP, that is the community outreach effort to bringing new members and to reach out to the global community. So we are going to make request (unintelligible) CROP then also for printing of outreach materials. So five in all, though last year we did seven. We are removing two now because the secretariat support that is we have Chantelle, I think BC can be proud to be the initiator of that initiative to getting ICANN to support a secretariat service.

So it has been moved to the main budget now so there will be no need to make that budget request again so also the intercessional, the intercessional was moving to the main ICANN budget so we won't be making a request concerning that.

Secondly, on the operations, we have 59 members now. And I would like to happily welcome our newest member, (unintelligible) and company based in the US. We also have four processes ongoing for new members. We want to thank the Credential Committee for their prompt response to all these applications.

I would like to remind members that our project is still ongoing, the Meet the BC project. We requested that all members to send in their bio, be no more than 300 words, and good resolution picture, as we said, we want to publish it this information which will be useful with regard to the community knowing

more about the Business Constituency and who we are and etcetera. So (unintelligible) and Chris Chaplow was quite good. So I would like to (unintelligible) members to please respond and thank those that responded. So perhaps we could look at January 30 as a deadline to respond.

Still in operations, I'm happy to inform you that (unintelligible) member of the Executive Committee (unintelligible) is one of the successful business Fellows for ICANN 58. So I'd like to say congratulations to (unintelligible). On the list (unintelligible) business people that have been successful, so I think the Fellowship is becoming more responsive to business needs, so that is good to note.

And still on operations, we project outreach initiatives in Latin America, is still in the FY'17. And I would like to (unintelligible) the outreach committee for (unintelligible) to come up with proposal for the outreaches in those regions. Let's see what we could do, we need the stakeholder to engage. So and I thank you for all your efforts so far.

And lastly, on other matters, I would like to note that Marilyn and I would be participating on behalf of Business in the United Nations Commission for Science and Technology for Development working group on Enhanced Cooperation on public policy matters (unintelligible) to the Internet from January 26 to 27 in Geneva. That is just for information.

And also the articles are being (unintelligible) into the BC newsletter for ICANN 58 so (unintelligible) an idea about things that could benefit our work, the BC work in the ICANN community, please you can write and send and we'll publish in the upcoming BC newsletter.

So I don't know if there are questions but this is where I will stop for now. Thank you. Chris, back to you.

Chris Wilson: Thanks, Jimson.

((Crosstalk))

Chris Wilson: Andrew Mack, I see your hand raised.

Marilyn Cade: And, Chris, it's Marilyn. I'd just like to make one quick comment?

Chris Wilson: Sure, why don't - let's to Andy Mack and then you.

Andrew Mack: Hey thanks, Chris and thanks, everybody. Thanks, Jimson, for a great report. Two things, first of all, in an effort to try to get our outreach going as early as we can and to be as responsive to the BC as a whole as we can, if people have - we've identified Latin America and Asia as two priority areas for this year. If people have good ideas of either contacts that we should be reaching out to or events that we should be looking at, please do send them to the Outreach Committee, that was Idea Number 1.

And Idea Number 2 is I think that there will be a fair amount of participation in Johannesburg and we have in recent months started to get some nice pick up from our outreach efforts in Africa. And so I think we should be thinking about trying to do something around the Jo-berg meeting. And so look forward to people's thoughts on that and to anybody else who might want to join us in - as part of the outreach group. Thanks.

Chris Wilson: Thanks, Andrew. Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: Thanks. So I have two comments. One is just a reinforcement to remind everybody that actually we don't have Fellowship funding for the midyear meeting unless we specifically request it or develop it. That's probably not in our interest as the BC, we may want to try to change that in the future. Unless you're already approved as a Fellow for Copenhagen, the - you don't get Fellowship funding although we have such high interest from our African business. I mention that only for us to be thinking about.

I wanted to mention that in addition to the CSTD Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation, that Jimson and I will be attending, I will also be attending the CSTD intercessional. And I'm hoping that others from the business community will be particularly interested as the CSTD, the Commission on Science and Technology for Development, as Jimson mentioned, is actually responsible for the WISIS follow-up. And perhaps we can come back in a later BC meeting and provide more information on that to the rest of the BC members.

Chris Wilson: Thanks, Marilyn. That's great. Because I think those meetings both occur sort of late January, if I'm correct. So perhaps in our early February call we can set aside a few minutes for an overview from you all. That would be fine. Okay, any other questions or comments regarding operations or finance? Seeing none and hearing none I'll go ahead and turn to AOB.

Just real quick, we will have our next call, next meeting in two weeks on January 19, same time. So please put that on your calendar. And then additional item, yesterday ICANN hosted the SO/AC leaders call with regard to planning for ICANN 58 in Copenhagen with particular focus on scheduling issues and etcetera. Bulk of the call focused on what are known as now the high interest topics.

There were - as you may recall from previous discussion I had with everyone, there was pushback on having a large number of these high interest topics scheduled within the ICANN meeting. There were eight scheduled during the course of ICANN 57 and the community - most of the community if not all the community felt that that perhaps was too much.

It looks like for ICANN 58 we will likely have three to four high interest topic discussions scheduled. Two had been submitted by the GAC, one with regard to mitigating DNS abuse and the other with regard to engaging underdeveloped countries and getting them engaged in ICANN related

activities. Both of these high interest topics from the GAC are being seen, from their perspective, as being continuations or follow ups from the discussions that occurred in Hyderabad.

And so the community wanted to make sure that these were not going to be repetitive to what was discussed in Hyderabad, but that they would be some new material as part of their discussions.

And I think the other high interest topic that was proposed is regarding ICANN and data and improving ICANN's data collection, data sharing, etcetera. So I can't - I don't remember off the top of my head who proposed that, but those are the three core high interest topics that were submitted to ICANN staff.

The additional one would really serve as the sort of has been traditionally the SO/AC update to the community. There was discussion on the call about concerns that the - the way it's scheduled now the SO/ACs are sort of providing these - sort of providing these updates sort of for newcomers. And in some instances some of them are being - going well over their time allotment therefore encroaching upon other SO/ACs for providing their update.

I think the thought was that it may be more pertinent to hone the focus of that session to really providing updates that are important to the community generally and that updating with regards sort of just providing general focus for newcomers could be done in a webinar perhaps before the ICANN meeting at some point rather than taking up all the time for the entire community when many didn't see value there.

So there's ongoing discussion about that but those are the sort of the core four high interest topics that will be - likely will be on the schedule for Copenhagen. I think we'll hopefully get a better structure - schedule structure

in the coming days in which case we can all - each constituency can sort of plan accordingly around that schedule.

From the BC perspective, my hope was that we would have obviously continue to have during Constituency Day have an open and closed meeting. I would like to have a guest speaker come to either the open or closed meeting depending on how people wanted it - wanted to structure it. And I'm open to ideas for speakers.

As you may recall in Marrakesh the CSG had David Conrad come and speak and we could certainly - the CSG I'm sure will have - we will be having our open and closed meetings as a collective group. And there may be some speakers there. But I think from a BC perspective I think it'd be helpful to have someone come specifically to speak to the BC.

So I'm open for folks to either today on the call or obviously offline in the coming days and near term weeks to provide some thoughts on that if there are particular speakers within the ICANN staff or community that we think we'd want to come speak to us. Yes, as you may recall obviously in Hyderabad we had Xavier and the budget team come and speak to us sort of at their request. But obviously if we want to have that - a follow up with them we could certainly think about doing that as well. But I think it'd be nice to do that.

In order to accommodate that I think we would have one of our meetings be longer than an hour and a half, try to make it maybe even up to two, two and a half hours if we can to really have a fulsome discussion with the speaker. But that's what I'm thinking now so if folks have other thoughts about our meetings and planning then we'll do that.

Marilyn, I see your question. I think there will be an engagement with the GAC. I can't recall if it's going to be a breakfast or lunch necessarily but I do believe that - I am confident that there will be - that an invite has been sent

out to the GAC for a CSG GAC engagement. So hopefully I'll know a little bit more about that. There's going to be a CSG ExComm call later today in about an hour and that maybe we may have a little more clarity on that for folks but there will be a CSG GAC engagement in Copenhagen.

So again please let me know if you have thoughts about our meetings - our BC meetings in Copenhagen and then we - I can start working on - with the ExComm and working on planning that around the bigger block schedule. But that's where we are now.

Any other thoughts, questions, concerns about - well about ICANN 58 or about anything else in general? I see some folks are typing. Okay this is I guess enough. Well, I don't see any other questions or concerns about that so why don't we go ahead and wrap up and look forward to talking to folks in a couple of weeks. And of course offline as well if issues come up. But everyone have a wonderful rest of your day and we'll look forward to talking to you soon. Michelle, we can go ahead...

END