

ICANN

**Moderator: Gisella Gruber-White
February 19, 2015
10:00 am CT**

Coordinator: The recordings are started.

Brenda Brewer: Thank you very much, and welcome to the BC Members Conference Call on Thursday February 19, 2015 at 16:00 UTC.

On the call today we have Elisa Cooper, (Cheryl Miller), (Beth Alegretti), Andy Abrams, Steve DelBianco, Jimson Olufuye, Aparna Sridhar, (Carl Schonander), (Cecelia Smith), Jim Baskin, John Berard, Philip Corwin, Tim Chen, Laura Covington, (Marie Patullo, Andrew Mack, Zahid Jamil, Barbara Warnner, and I'm sure some joined we're doing roll call.

I do have apologies from Ron Andruff. I'm joining as staff, Brenda Brewer.

And for transcription purposes today, if you do speak, please state your name. And I'd like to turn the call over to Elisa. Please begin. Thank you.

Elisa Cooper: Thanks, Brenda. And I want to apologize. We'll be in touch with the conference company and let them know of the long wait. I will want to turn it over to Jimson just because we are sort of behind schedule.

Before I do that, though, is there any other business that folks would like to make sure we cover today? We're planning to here from Jimson on finance operations and membership, and we'll turn it over to Steve. We do have 25 minutes dedicated to policy today. I know that Susan is not going to be able to join us today, but Phil is on the line. And I'm not sure if David will be able to join us. So we should have plenty of time to cover what we need to cover.

Are there any things that people want to make sure we cover today before we move onto to Jimson? Okay, Jimson, over to you.

Jimson Olufuye: Thank you, Elisa, and good morning, everyone. Let me apologize in advance if I have network outage. The network here isn't quite linking today.

Straight to the point on finance, our balance is still at (unintelligible) levels, it's seven plus, it's 7,000 euro plus. And we have two new members that are joining: Rock Media and (Ugahut). We are expecting new members shortly: Microsoft, (Net Green) and (Sing Sing).

I would like to use this opportunity to mention to everyone that the dues will remain will the same, as the BC decided in Singapore. So except for applicants in developing countries so that have been given the approval to get the discount of about 75% to apply for it. So the new amount will begin from July 2015.

Now to outreach. We planned a few roundtables in (Budga) for March 25, and (unintelligible) to by the station in ICANN. So (unintelligible). So this continues my last report, so I will now want to float this up to this opportunity to shape everyone for supporting the outreach, the ExCom and the outreach community in particular towards the originally participation in ICANN and

the BC. The project team of close to ten new members attended this outreach. Members that we need to add value to ICANN and BC work.

Then on invoicing and banking, we've been discussing this severely. We discussed this at the Singapore meeting and I believe you all can recall that you said Fadi works well in former bodies, (unintelligible) too was also well communicated at the Singapore and they all committed to helping out.

But just in case there's a Plan B and a Plan B has communicated also that we exhaust this particular responsibility, invoice to our members and the detailed banking operation.

And then we also agreed or the members approved in Singapore that the request of FC, the finance committee, to be able to have a program to impeach applicants that are not successful, so this was approved. They will not be on the on the list but they will be informed of our regular program like a month later and also an announcement.

Then the sixth point I want to mention is in regards to our constituency request, budget request. So we're going to submit the assistant budget request in the absence of any new one. We're going to submit it before the deadline. And the one that you know is in regard to prop and the secretariat support, the leadership equipment support that will enable two leaders to join us in Singapore, one from Nigeria and the other from Taiwan from (unintelligible).

And then the professional tools. We're going to make (unintelligible) following general approval for us to meet more regularly in the COG.

And then finally, I would like to thank everyone that contributed to the ICANN (unintelligible) in Singapore. I appreciate (Anisha), Steve, Marilyn,

Susan, and Steve thank you in for advance for your next (unintelligible) for ICANN 53 and also to elect member (unintelligible) if you have an applicant that you want to discuss the subject matter, please feel free to send that so we can begin to prepare as we prepare to go to Buenos Aires.

So this is all I have for now. Thank you, Elisa. Thank you, everyone.

Elisa Cooper: Any questions for Jimson? So I believe we'll have the same opportunity.

Marilyn Cade: Elisa?

Elisa Cooper: I'm sorry, who is that?

Marilyn Cade: It's Marilyn. May I ask a question?

Elisa Cooper: Sure, Marilyn. Go ahead.

Marilyn Cade: Jimson, I just wanted to compliment you on all the work that you've done, but also to note that you're leading the work in the constituency to advance the support request to ICANN for the formal request that has to be completed by the 28th. And I wanted to just note that as a complimentary work initiative that you're leading that you haven't mentioned.

Jimson Olufuye: Sorry, Marilyn. I didn't get the last statement. Hello?

Elisa Cooper: Yes, I didn't catch that either.

Jimson Olufuye: You said something lastly and I couldn't catch that. But I also believe she was talking about the submission. So we're going to be meet the deadline shortly

and I really encourage anyone that has any input in this regard to forward them for this submission. Thank you, Marilyn. Thank you.

Elisa Cooper: I see Andrew has his hand raised. Andrew?

Andrew Mack: Thanks, Elisa. Yes, I also wanted to compliment Jimson on a lot of work and some really great ideas. A suggestion since we were just talking about our newsletter, and that is that I think one of the things that would be relatively - would be a good piece of content all the time going forward would be to have some sort of a piece about our outreach efforts, highlighting events, highlighting new members, anything along those lines. I know we've done some of it in the past, but I think it makes good sense and just hopefully a helpful suggestion there.

((Crosstalk))

Elisa Cooper: So I think we should probably move on, but just a couple of things to keep in mind. I believe we'll have the same opportunity to invite a couple of guests to attend our BC meetings in Buenos Aires. So we should be thinking about companies in Latin America that we would want to invite as our guests.

The other thing is I also wanted to let you know that (Mahut Latuf) is planning to support an outreach event in Oman, Jordan, and that is an event that's focused on the DNS. And I'm sure he'll be providing some more information. He won't be requiring any funding for that since he's local, but he is taking on the work to have our - one of our fact sheets translated into Arabic, so that's really great news, and I think that'll be a good event too.

Andrew, I see your hand's still raised from before. Anything else from anyone? No.

Okay let's go onto Steve and policy. Steve?

Steve DelBianco: Hey thanks, Elisa. This will be a relatively quick policy report. There are - the policy calendar I circulated last night lays it out. I'd first like to thank (Laura Covington) for turning around the quick comment on the five brand gTLDs and their RSTEP, or second level country and territory names.

As of last night, we were the only one who commented on that RSTEP, and we supported it with much of the same rhetoric we used in support of BMW and mini and Neustar. A little later I'm going to come to a broader topic on the release of country and territory names and two-character codes and dot-brand TLDs to pick up on that. And so, (Laura), we're going to turn to that and I attached the draft of your broader comment to the policy calendar as well.

Also on February 2, we had also filed on translation and transliteration. I probably reported that to you while we were together in Singapore, so no need to go into that now.

All right, turning to the current ICANN public comments. There are only four open right now, thank goodness. The Whois accuracy pilot study report. Angie Graves, many thanks to for circulating your initial draft back on February the 2nd. J. Scott Evans and Susan Kawaguchi were fantastic. After traveling home from Singapore, they spent some time updating and putting comments and questions into Angie's draft. And that is a first attachment to today's policy calendar.

Jimson, you and (Opey), maybe even a few others, promised to also look at this, so please add your thoughts before the 25th of Feb so I can get this filed

by the 27th of February. I want to add that J. Scott and Susan who know Whois inside out added some comments, a side bar for Angie.

Now those comments are difficult for me as your policy coordinator to work out, because the initial author, in this case Angie Graves, is the one who should respond to the comments that fellow drafters have come up with. And, Angie, if you're unable to respond to those, I'm in a position to sort of splitting the difference, figuring out which comments to put in, which ones to leave out.

Any questions from BC members on the call about that Whois accuracy pilot study report comment draft? Thanks for the team effort on that.

One is the GNSO policy and implementation. J. Scott Evans is our co-chair of that working group, so not appropriate for J. Scott to put his name all over our comments. J. Scott is going to work with Zahid to try to come up with some appropriate things for the BC to put in. Those comments are due the 3rd of March, and we need to get those circulate soon.

I do hear an echo so somebody may not have...

Zahid Jamil: Steve, this is Zahid, can you hear me?

Steve DelBianco: I do. Go ahead, Zahid.

Zahid Jamil: Yes I just wanted to add J. Scott couldn't be with us on the call today. He's traveling in the middle of a train journey. Him and me are going to speaking tomorrow to come up with a quick draft on these for comments, and you'll have it pretty soon, probably in the next two to three days so it can be

circulated to the members and then basically for comments, et cetera. I just wanted to say the challenge here is it's such a good report.

The only thing we're going to probably want to say is we support it, but we will come back with more later when I have more news with - after discussing with J. Scott. Thank you.

Steve DelBianco: Okay, Zahid, thanks a lot of taking that up. When you do look it, I indicated in the policy calendar a link to the most recent BC comment on this distinction between policy versus implementation. So please, Zahid, feel free to draw upon and cut and paste from anything we've said before. That was a rather extensive comment, recognizing that is that it, well, it was the BC's fault that this issue came to the floor when we pushed so hard for what became known as the straw man improvements to RPMs after the guidebook was done. Okay?

Zahid Jamil: I will do that. Yes, I remember as a council we created quite a fuss about it. Thank you. Yes.

Steve DelBianco: Exactly. So if you're pleased with the report, if you and J. Scott are, then that's a good sign for us.

Any other BC members wish to contribute to the work of J. Scott and Zahid on this? It's relevant to any of you who use the rights protection mechanisms and are also interested in future policy development in that area. All right thanks.

The third one is the idea that ICANN wants to reduce or eliminate the requirement for commercial liability insurance as part of the registrar accreditation agreement. They may do it on a means tested basis, or if we're

developing parts of the world, there's a link to it there. Those comments close the 13th of March.

While we were in Singapore, Elisa Cooper and (Alex Deacon) with MPAA volunteered to draft those comments. Elisa, I see you're on the line. Anything to report on that effort, or is there anything I can do to be helpful?

Elisa Cooper: No I'm going to take a stab at it and, you know, hopefully I'll have something to you within the next few days.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you very much. If there's anything I can do to help, let me know.

The fourth and final one is that...

Marilyn Cade: Steve, Steve?

Steve DelBianco: Go ahead.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you. It's Marilyn. I just want to mention Elisa for you or (Alex) if you can find just a paragraph that explains something for the government so they understand the importance of this, that would be very, very helpful because it's kind of confusing for them. So if you could have a paragraph or two that explains why this development, I think we could just advance the understanding of the governments that are concerned.

Elisa Cooper: Okay yes.

Steve DelBianco: All right, and the fourth one on here is ICANN staff has embarked upon a review of the rights protection mechanisms that have been applied in this latest round of new gTLDs. This not the only review. There's another review

the community will do as part of the affirmation of commitments. The GAC has also requested a review, an independent review, of RPMs.

This is a third review. It's driven by staff. Comments are supposed to close on the 3rd of April. So we've got some time. And I'm glad to report that (Cat McGowan) with LinkedIn, and (Mahud Latuf) both volunteered to draft those reports for the BC. And again, this is a review of the effectiveness of RPMs in the last round.

Anyone else want to volunteer to help (Cat) and (Mahud) on that? Great.

All right let me turn next to the topic of revised approach for country and territory names and the dot-brand TLDs. (Laura Covington), I know you're on the line, and I attached your one-page draft. This is picking up on the fact that in Los Angeles, the GAC seemed to say they would support a streamlined process, at least for the dot-brands, those who have qualified for specification 13, and that's a streamlined process for the two character and the country territory name.

That came undone because a handful of governments convinced the GAC chair to write a letter to ICANN saying, "Hold on, we have some second thoughts." So we arrived in Singapore and they GAC advice that came out on Wednesday said that governments want to be notified as soon as there's a request that's been initiated, that government comments should take 60 days, not 30, and that the government comments should be fully considered.

They also said that per specification 5, two character releases have to get government approval and that country names have to get reviewed by the GAC. Now the GAC advice applies to basically all gTLDs, not just the dot-brands. So I think that (Laura)'s pointing out the fact that the GAC needs to

appreciate that there's a huge distinction between a dot-brand and a regular gTLD with respect to the safety, security and desirability of having geographical indicators at the second level.

So, (Laura), I did want to turn it over to you. Folks, you can open this attachment. This is the second attachment to my policy calendar. There's not an active comment period. So this would be one of those instances where the BC feels strongly, wants to make a point. We might coordinate with our friends in the registry constituencies and brand registry group, but we ultimately would probably need to send a letter, a letter to the GAC or a letter to ICANN, deciding on what it is we are asking folks to do.

So, (Laura), why don't you take us through what you're thinking.

Laura Covington: Well I guess my thinking is very much what you've just said. My reservations about submitting anything are twofold.

One is that the GAC in its communiqué and, you know, despite some differences of opinion as expressed in the meeting where they discuss these issues, some continuing differences of opinion, they did in their communiqué, you know, issue, you know, some comments which would suggest, you know, some consensus if only around process, you know, new process, that there needs to be this list that would make it easier, better notification so the governments know, you know, what's being requested, and separately this list for registries to see which governments care about, you know, approving or not.

And so I, you know, to the extent they now have some kind of consensus, despite this back and forth in the background, is it worth it to, you know, to say something. And then the other thing is, you know, there was some

discussion going into the public comment, the public forum about, you know, this really is more of a dot-brand issue.

You know, certainly I think it's relevant to many of us in the BC, but I also wanted to, you know, throw it out there, you know, does anybody have any problem if we do, you know, make any comments on this based on feeling like it's really not so much a BC issue as it is a registry or a dot-brand issue.

Steve DelBianco: Hey, Laura, thank you for that. The draft comment that you circulated, the one attached, is mostly about process. And it would be my personal opinion that process isn't our best point, since complaining about the process is not likely to change the GAC's mind about what they did. It's not going to undo the board resolution.

I think looking forward, we should build upon the BC's long-established position that business registrants and business users benefit from security and safety of dot-brand and being able to localize it to a market or a country, a territory, both for linguistic purposes as well as market offering, make a lot of sense.

And that would point to us trying to argue for a much more streamlined process when it comes to the dot-brands. And it's well within the BC's voice. The BC is on record on this, and much of the dot-brand changes in the guidebook were prompted by BC comments that were submitted before the brand registry group was even formed.

So what would be your thinking of the process complaining about process or being suggestive of how to streamline it for brands, you know, going ahead? What are your thoughts on that?

Laura Covington: Well certainly it was, you know, it was easier if there was just, you know, either it was going to be an RSTEP or better than that if there was going to be some other kind of streamline process. I don't have the solution. You know, I hadn't really thought about it in terms of analyzing what's the best approach to it. You know, I - but, you know, I'm certainly open to whatever folks think is the best, the easiest way, you know.

For me, from my perspective, I just want to know what I need to know, you know? I just want to know do I need to file RSTEP, do I need to, you know, what are the hoops I need go through. And I don't want those hoops to change or move. So, you know, and I don't...

Steve DelBianco: Laura, Andy's next in the queue, but I wonder if anybody can the question that you just posed. Is the RSTEP still a valid way for a dot-brand to get country territory and two characters? Andy, I'll turn to you next.

Andy Abrams: Yes, I think that's a good question. I think it is. The problem is that with the ability of governments to weigh in, they can simply object for no reason at all. And it's up in the air whether that serves as veto, whether the board is going to consider that, how much weight they're going to give to that.

So I actually don't have a huge problem with the streamlined process so long as we have some clarity. And I'd love to have a case for a presumption of approval of these sort of requests for dot-brands, absent exceptional circumstances. Because currently the presumption seems to be, you know, if nobody objects, then there's a presumption of approval. But if anybody objects, then we don't know what happens, and that's problematic for dot-brands.

Steve DelBianco: The GAC did say that they were going to come up with a list of countries that were going to be fine with it, preapprovals. I mean ideally, we get a handful of countries that lead the way, lead by example. But I would assume that they would be much more willing to give blanket approvals to dot-brands than they would to all new gTLDs.

And I think I heard Phil Corwin. Did you say something just now? I'm sorry, anyone else in the queue? Elisa, go ahead.

Elisa Cooper: Yes, I mean, so there are bunch of generics that have actually also made requests for two letters, country codes and non-country codes. And we started to talk about this in Singapore. And I think the BC should probably look further into this. I think, you know, what will result is if we allow, you know, just the generic TLDs to essentially have two-letter country codes delegated to the registry, and then the registry then starts selling third levels, I mean, you're just proliferating the number of registrations and it puts a tremendous burden on brand owners.

Marilyn Cade: Steve it's Marilyn. Can I get in the queue?

Steve DelBianco: Okay Marilyn. Elisa before I turn to Marilyn there are no significant restrictions of what happens below the second level in any form right now.

So I would think that if brands have to defend themselves with defensive registrations at the third level today that isn't just because of geographical (name).

It could be anything they put at the second level as to whether a company has to buy a defensive registration below that.

Elisa Cooper: I - yes but...

Steve DelBianco: In other words ICANN doesn't manage anything below the second level. Isn't that right?

Elisa Cooper: No, they do. So like if you think back to dot-wed they released all of those third levels. And I think there was a question about whether or not the RPMs would apply to the third level. But those were sold to the registry as third level registrations.

Steve DelBianco: The RPMs huddle.

Marilyn Cade: Steve if I could comment and then go on to others if you don't mind.

Steve DelBianco: Yes go ahead Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: I just want to support the idea that brands governments can understand a distinct category of brands and treat them as a special category.

And my engagement with government I think that can be validated. And I think we can also justify why we are engaging with special characteristics or qualifications for .brand.

I say that and then I go to the generic. I think the governments are very concerned about generics. And if we can differentiate why we are, you know, the .brands applicants need to carry their own water but we can come forward with validating information and support I think that's easier for the governments who are very concerned about exploitation when there's nobody paying attention. They can build a trusting relationship with brands.

But on the generics it's kind of a scary world for them. And maybe we can build the relationship that supports what we believe the - is rational about the .brands and then limit the exploitation concerns that they have in the generics at the second level and the third level.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you Marilyn. That's very consistent with what we discussed earlier in the prior BP position on brands and it's consistent with what (Laura) is talking about and trying to create a streamlining. It is targeted to brands.

And it might be the only way to set the GAC at ease is to understand that it's safe for them to streamline for brands and they can relax about that. That might be the only thing we can do at this point.

That's why I feel like complaining about process (Laura) doesn't really get us anywhere because it's done right? The board acted immediately upon the GAC advice and it seems to...

(Laura Covington): Right.

Steve DelBianco: ...to act very quickly on this.

And I don't know what complaining about that would do unless we were to do a formal reconsideration or an independent review of the board's decision to accept that GAC advice that way. But we...

Laura Covington: Right. Well that's why I had the question is that, you know, when we were in Singapore when we first discussed this and it was prior to the GAC communiqué. So I completely get the need to shift a bit now.

Steve DelBianco: Right.

Laura Covington: I'm not wedded...

Steve DelBianco: And looking ahead if we can - if we have - there's a tiny opening in the door and that the GAC advice, you know, keeps alive the idea that they could come up with a list that they could come up with a streamlined process.

I think they've opened the door a tiny bit and we need to go through that door with a streamlined process for those who qualify a Spec 13.

That may not be the BC's leading role. I mean to Marilyn's point it might be the Brand Registry Group that would lead on that. And the BC should be there to support it since we came up with a lot of these ideas long before BRG even existed.

What do folks on the call believe is the right path ahead?

Marilyn Cade: And it's Marilyn. Can I just ask a quick question? Don't we think that the ALAC would also support this?

Steve DelBianco: Oh no.

Marilyn Cade: I'd be happy to explore if they would because coming in with an advisory committee the support for this would be also very helpful.

And if you wanted I could once we reach what our views are we could quickly go after them.

Steve DelBianco: That's right. But our views are pretty well slam dunk. It's our what is our path ahead? What - how do we articulate those views?

There's no open public comment. We don't even know what process the GAC is going to employ to come through on their promise of putting together a list on the GAC Web site, a list of countries that are going to be agreeable to certain releases.

So to be honest I would ask that folks on the call like Andy, like (Laura), (Cecelia) can you do some outreach to brand registry groups and Martin Sutton to see if they are deciding how to move ahead and take advantage of the small openings that the GAC gave us?

Woman: Yes and...

Steve DelBianco: And then maybe we can...

Woman: Sorry.

Steve DelBianco: Andy your hand is up. Go ahead.

Andy Abrams: Yes. I was wondering this is actually pretty similar situation to the name collision situation at the second level with the release of the blocked names.

And we were effective there when we had a joint letter together with the IPC and the Registry Stakeholder Group. And because we are relatively aligned with those groups again on this issue I wonder if a similar letter wouldn't be wouldn't be affective here again?

Steve DelBianco: Yes I think that's a great idea. Should we - do we do a formal outreach to - do we know - does anyone on the call know if BRG is already doing something like this?

Laura Covington: This is Laura. I - we don't have another call for another week or so but I'm happy to circulate something to the list. I don't know if Martin's on this call. I don't see - I don't think he's on this call today. But I'm happy to circulate something within the BRG and see what they think about it.

I think it probably makes sense for them to lead frankly. And then, you know, if the ICC and the BC and others want to pile on that seems great. But I think that it may be best for them to lead to be honest.

Steve DelBianco: And if they lead by drafting the position to Andy's point they don't have to go out there alone. It could be a joint letter when it's...

Laura Covington: Right.

Steve DelBianco: ...reviewed with the GAC.

One of the keys is to say what - who is the audience? Is it the GAC or is it ICANN? What is the purpose? Is it to streamline or to complain? And the audience and the purpose will drive the design of the letter.

And I think it's pointless to write a letter until we know who is the audience and what is our purpose? And that would be the kind of dialogue we should have with BRG right now yes?

And (Cecelia) you're in the queue as well. Go ahead.

(Cecelia Smith): Yes I was just going to agree with Laura and just say that I can help in any way with circulating or discussing with the BRG group as well.

Steve DelBianco: Great. Then my recommendation is that we - that you folks who are involved there at least ask the Brand Registry Group as opposed to circulating draft points for them because it's not like we have that much to say yet.

We should ask them what is your strategy to react to or exploit the opportunities that have been created by the GAC's advice and the GAC's communiqué and the board's resolution and then report back to the RBC on BC private so it doesn't go outside of the BC list, report back to BC private whatever you learned about BRG's plans and then we can coalesce around a way to support them. How does that sound?

Cecelia Smith: That sounds great. I'm happy to do it. I'm happy to lead on that communication with the BRG.

Steve DelBianco: Right. And we are I mean to (Marie) and everybody else in the chat this conversation is about brands. It's not about other gTLDs. It's about .brands or Specification 13 registries.

Marilyn Cade: Steve it's Marilyn. I just want to very quickly support all of this but also note that there are trademarks also in the NGO world.

And once we get our position together I would suggest we make a quick outreach to the chair of the NPOC.

I think there's a lot of allegiance when the NGOs also have brands. They're not a part of the .brands group but they might lend some support for us. But we need to have our act together and then ask them.

Steve DelBianco: Yes, agreed. We don't know - we don't even know who the audience or what our purpose is yet. Too early to ask for help if we don't even know what it is we're asking for.

All right well (Laura) anything else on there? Your hand is still up?

Laura Covington: I'm sorry. That was from before.

Steve DelBianco: No worries. Thanks (Laura) for taking the lead on this and being so concerned.

Let me turn next to this notion of vision. This is the last item under Channel 1.

Well we met in Singapore a number of you Kat McGowan who's on the call Laura and Marilyn were joined by J. Scott and (Stephan) in saying that when it comes to the GNSO and restructuring if we can develop a co, a sensible vision for the restructuring we need to put it in paper and start to recruit allies in GNSO so that we can push hard for the GNSO review to include the element of restructuring.

And then visioning document would be something that is in the camp of, you know, Jay Scott, Kat, (Stephan), Laura and Marilyn. Anything to report on that?

Laura Covington: I still don't know what time zone I'm in Steve so I'm afraid not.

Steve DelBianco: Not a worry (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: However it's Marilyn. Maybe we could just look for a brainstorming call in the next couple of weeks and then come back for our next CC call if that sounds okay?

Laura Covington: That sounds good.

Steve DelBianco: Okay I'd like to turn it over to Phil. I don't think Susan's with us yet. But Phil Corwin anything you want to report on the council meeting last week in Singapore?

Phil Corwin: Yes thanks Steve. Can you hear me okay?

Steve DelBianco: We do.

Phil Corwin: Okay. I want to also Steve before when you had asked for others willing to assist on the comment letter on the RPMs I raised my hand so wasn't recognized at the time but just want to get that on the record. I'd be happy to help on that.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you.

Phil Corwin: In regard to the council activities the next meeting of the council will be March 19. There's no agenda yet so I can't raise that with you.

At the BC meeting in Singapore we discussed what had gone on in council over the weekend before we met.

And this morning just before the BC call I sent around an edited transcript from the council meeting of Wednesday, February 11 which took place in Singapore showing participation by myself and Susan.

I guess I don't know if Susan's still in transit or whatever but I know she's not on the call today.

Real quickly and then people want to discuss any of this, there was an intervention on the discussion of the new ICANN meeting plans for next year.

And we're also trying to get a handle on that. But Jonathan Robinson indicated he thinks they're going to enforce that four day thing pretty strictly that council have to meet during that four day period and will not have a chance to meet beforehand. But we're still trying to get a handle on the schedule and funding.

On the IANA transition I reiterated the BC support for the internal so-called internal solution but noted that as we became more familiar with the four options that are before the transition group.

Now we understand they're all complicated, they all share some essential elements. And we're waiting to see the next version that's put out for public comment in the next month or two to see where we stand as a constituency on that.

There was extensive discussion on Whois. And Susan intervened on that to a great extent. Her remarks are in that transcript.

GNS review, I brought up the personal comment on, you know, the need to assure the private sector members were not going to push in the future for using technical control of the DNS to restrict information flows that this would not be good for business.

And then on TLD option funds I noted that while we weren't against starting a process so at least there's a placeholder for the GNSO to have a say on this position Jonathan Robinson indicated that he was concerned that the council didn't start to get engaged with the board might think that they didn't care and might go off on their own.

But that we thought given the community's active engagement on so many big issues now that this should be a slow and considered process because right now the people most likely to jump in with ideas for how to use the money would be those who wanted to get their hands in the cookie jar.

And in fact right after I made that comment James Waddell spoke and said that the registrar stakeholder group wanted to use the money for dealing with the universal acceptance situation for new TLDs which is not surprising and may be one worthwhile use.

But, you know, we don't want to rush into this and the money in there is likely to get a lot larger before the decision is made.

That said that was the extent of BC council intervention at last Wednesday's meeting. So I don't have any other issues to bring up right now since we don't know the agenda for the March meeting.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks Phil. And you made a colorful hand in the cookie jar metaphor during council when it came to that auction proceeds. Appreciate that.

Any questions for Phil on council activities?

Marilyn Cade: It's Marilyn. Can I get in the queue?

Steve DelBianco: Go ahead Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: The policy budget is somewhere between 6% to 8% of ICANN's total budget. I know that's kind of a surprise to all of you because that's what we spend our time on.

But basically (David)'s ability, (David Alan)'s ability to affect expenditure on our behalf is it's both profound but limited.

We have really great policy staff I think supporting the council. But I just want to flag when we start thinking about what affects us and how we then benefit from other expenditures the council's important but limited in their ability to reflect backwards.

At the same time we need to be thinking that intercessional funding and funding for the working groups of the council may need to be really significantly beefed up.

When we look at ahead once the meeting, the change in the format of the meetings takes place and there is a only a four day meeting if the council Phil if you and (Susan) think I will tell you that I think that you need to be asking for additional funding so that you can do your work intercessionally or increase the meeting in that short four day meeting that ICANN is planning.

We've got to get that funding request in now. And Jimson and I are part of the budget group.

You may need to be thinking now that you're asking to have additional provisionary funding so you can have intercessional meetings or you can have - you can add a two day meeting for the council for that short four day

meeting. I'm just positioning this so you can start thinking about how the council addresses this.

Phil Corwin: Yes, thank you Marilyn. I think those are the good thoughts. And in fact after I made my comment at - and you can see it in the transcript excerpt after I made my comment on the new meeting schedule Jonathan Robinson came back noting that he thought ICANN might take a hard line on any group asking for extra days before the official start but then emphasizing that everyone needed to start thinking about the next year's budget and the financing for this meeting.

So that - what you just said is right in concert with what Jonathan noted at the meeting last week and thanks for flagging it.

Steve DelBianco: Okay thanks Phil. Any other questions for Phil?

Elisa only had one other item on policy and that is a discussion group on the next round of new gTLDs.

Ron Andruff circulated a note on that and I'm glad to report we had two BC volunteers who are going to join that discussion group and keep us apprised of what they're working on.

That's Steve Coates at Twitter and (Cecelia) at 21st Century Fox. So thank you to Steve and (Cecelia). I trust by now you've had a chance to look at that note.

It looks as if there's some report that will be developed by the DG, so please dive right in. Anything you want to share with your colleagues about that right now?

Okay Elisa I'll turn it back over to you. Thank you.

Elisa Cooper: Thank you Steve. So I don't have anything else to cover today unless there is anything anyone else wants to bring to the table I'll take a queue.

Marilyn Cade: Elisa it's Marilyn. I would like to raise the concern and ask if we think it's a serious concern then we raise it with the CSG ExCom. It's I just want to flag it and it's an informational point.

In the past the transcript for key meetings were always made available within 12 to 24 hours.

I take great exception to this because if we're not in a meeting unless one of our members captures the real-time transcript then we have to wait until the transcript is available.

I'm tracking the availability of transcripts. And some were available yesterday but like some were available 24 hours ago.

But the point is we don't have transcripts within 12 to 24 hours of the meetings of the - and that means we - we're dependent on whether our meetings, our members are capturing them. But they're also not available to the broader community.

And I'm thinking we were told in the last budget meeting that Fadi had saved \$230,000 by delaying the transcripts. But they - they're not available, you know, thinking that they weren't available until the 16th, 17th, 18th of you know, that's several days after the meeting.

Could we think about checking in with our colleagues and maybe advising that more rapid turnaround on the transcripts will advance the transparency and the accountability of the public meetings?

Elisa Cooper: Yes. I can review that with Fadi and staff at our next month's (unintelligible). In terms of transcripts for the BC meetings and the CFG meetings those have been turned around within...

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: I know. I know. We actually have preferential treatment that we don't need to go into. But it's really phenomenal. We get ours turned around with rapid turnaround. It's really fantastic.

Elisa Cooper: All right yes. I'd happy to mention that. I think honestly it has to do with the fact that when they send those transcripts before they post them they asked whoever is the chair of that particular meeting to review the transcript to make sure it looks okay.

So that's where the delay could be because I'm asked to look at those transcripts briefly get back and make sure, you know, give my okay before they're posted. So I'm guessing that's where the delay is but I can check in and find out.

Any other questions, comments or things that maybe you want to make sure we discuss on our next call?

All right well I want to thank everyone for joining today's call and especially to Steve for a great policy review as always and we'll talk to you next time. Thanks so much.

Woman: Thank you. If the ExCom members will standby we'll transfer your lines into the next conference. Thank you.

END