ICANN

Moderator: Gisella Gruber-White
December 4, 2014
10:00 am CT

Coordinator: Recording has now started. Please proceed

Brenda Brewer: Thank, you and good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone and welcome to the Business Constituency Conference Call taking place on Thursday, December 4, 2014, at 1600 UTC

On the call today we have (Andy Abrams), Angie Graves, Elisa Cooper, J. Scott Evans, Jimson Olufuye, John Berard, Michelle King, Tim Chen. We do have apologies from Cecilia Smith, Carl Shonander, Zahid Jamil, David Fares, Alex Deacon, Marilyn Cade, Michael Maoz, Alain Bidron, (Stephan Van Gelder, Susan Payne, Marie Pettullo, Jim Baskin, Sara Deutsch.

I am attending as staff, Brenda Brewer. If you would like to speak, today please remember to state your name for transcription purposes and I will turn it over to you Elisa. Thank you.

Elisa Cooper: Thank you. So I wanted to start off just giving a few updates on a few items, including the meeting in Singapore, just a reminder on the coming election for

our officers and also to tell you about an opportunity to participate in the GNSO working party.

To start off in terms of the Singapore meeting the CFG Executive Committee is currently planning to meet the third week, in December to discuss arrangements but you will be getting an email from Brenda asking whether or not you plan to attend. Please do let her know so that we can plan accordingly and make sure that we have enough seats in the room for everyone.

We did reach out to the GAC and we did ask for the GAC to meet specifically with the CS G. Now typically, you know, we have had breakfast with them but this would be an opportunity for us to meet with them in a more formal setting where we will have an agenda and probably focus on some of the issues around geographical names and some other items probably related to like things like the regulated strings and so forth and they were amenable to meeting with us.

I don't know yet whether or not there will be a time or whether it can be (unintelligible). They did express interest and I think that looks like that could happen so that will be something that we have not done in the past but I think will be worthwhile.

In terms of the election, upcoming election, just a reminder that the nomination period will be opening around the 15th of December and will be closing around the 30th - the 31st rather and then the actual election will take place January 6th through the 13th. So the important dates are the 15th through the 31st - that is when nominations will be made and then voting will be in January, the 6th through the 13th and we will send a reminder about that.

The last item that I wanted to cover is this GNSO working party and this is a group that I think made some initial recommendations and there is an initial report that is coming out. We did have two members of the BC participating in that working party but they are no longer able to fill that given their other commitments so there are two slots available to us and I will send out some additional information later today if there are members that would be interested in participating in that group.

And so those are the updates that I had - any questions about any of those items or any other things that folks would like to actually add to the agenda today?

Okay, I would actually like to switch the agenda around a little bit and I would like to ask, Jimson to take Marilyn's slot. Marilyn is actually not on the call because we often run out of time. So I am going to turn it over to Jimson and then we will go into our policy update. So Jimson take it away.

Jimson Olufuye: Thank you very much Elisa and good afternoon or good evening or good morning wherever you might be around the world. It is my pleasure to those who I talked to the last time.

I believe that you have gone through it. What I also observed at some (unintelligible) where (unintelligible) to ask some questions. We are finding (unintelligible) financial (unintelligible). But before then let me go quickly and recap that as of this moment we have about 63,343.19 euros in our account balance so (unintelligible). We recall that we have six months extension to July or June ending next year so any (unintelligible) cannot go out until the end of June next year.

And those (unintelligible) for the support given towards the (unintelligible) summit wherein we are able to do an outreach for (unintelligible) and we will expect the (unintelligible) beginning to manifest shortly.

We had in attendance a delegate from (unintelligible) as well so it will possibly lead to us having a footprint to (unintelligible) in Asia.

Then with regard to other (unintelligible) events we know that we have a CROPP committee right now. The idea of CROPP is to (unintelligible) the footprints of (unintelligible) and (unintelligible) concerning (unintelligible).

So the (unintelligible) and remarks of the - we ask to lead the Outreach committee. We only have five members including Andrew, (Cecilia), (Ellen), (Marilyn) and (Phil) - because of this experience in the (unintelligible) and in this region so we will be the lead person with regard to (unintelligible) activities with ICANN.

So I want to encourage everyone at work, to use this opportunity as much as possible because (unintelligible) we want to conduct our (unintelligible) around our regions.

Perhaps (unintelligible) will talk about the institute which - that it is a session now coming up in January what we forgot to note (unintelligible) January 12 to 15 and there will be an outreach on the 14 so I think (unintelligible) for (unintelligible) that and also the newsletter. Now we look for the newsletter in the (unintelligible). We are expecting that all articles will come in before the end of this month of December for that (unintelligible) and the design to be on time for (unintelligible).

(Unintelligible) that we need to (unintelligible) or look for is the (unintelligible) so especially (unintelligible) in the newsletter for that.

So I will set out this - back, now to the (unintelligible) issue and so I really (unintelligible) and I want to use the opportunity to thank (Chris Taplo) for - is highly (unintelligible) have been to (unintelligible) or came in through credit card - is a lot of work on him and I hope we can (unintelligible).

Next I would (unintelligible) and (unintelligible) work for them on (unintelligible) (ISBC) and the (IPC). When we (unintelligible) we can (unintelligible) together. So it is a challenge - the three of us (unintelligible) recognize and right now there is no resolution yet but we hope to take it forward in discussion at the (unintelligible), the general.

Maybe you have a legal person to do that but that would be quite expensive so that we can have (unintelligible) required for (unintelligible) to be - for an account to be open in (unintelligible) so that members be (unintelligible) transfer and we can supply with the tax id.

So those could be explained to but let the - we want to (unintelligible) and see what (unintelligible) so that - the question is still ongoing but in the meantime the (unintelligible) that a credit card is good and valid and ICANN at times helps to collect some of the checks like (unintelligible) and Verizon, yes. We are going to use ICANN to do that with this (unintelligible) so exploring of that by the (unintelligible). So that is it for me now in case maybe you have questions.

Elisa Cooper: Jimson a couple of questions. One, has the Outreach Event that is tentatively scheduled for January 14th - have the funds for that event been approved? I know that we had some discussion on the lift and I think that Marilyn had

been requesting something like $13,000 for that event and can you provide any more information on that?

Jimson Olufuye: Okay good. Right now what I know that we have commitment for is $2,500. The reason for that a lot of the (unintelligible) expenses will be taken care of by ICANN like lunch - they don't want travel commitment anymore because (unintelligible) taken care of by ICANN so this (unintelligible) about $2,000 (unintelligible) as a (unintelligible).

Elisa Cooper: And what is the $2,000, just curious - what is the $2,000 for?

Jimson Olufuye: Well, the $2,000 is (unintelligible) for refreshments and then I think (unintelligible) some refreshments and (unintelligible).

Elisa Cooper: Okay. Just also another question and - is the Outreach Committee looking at companies that might be perspective members to attend the meeting in Singapore because as you might remember ICANN has funds for basically two people, two perspective members to attend. Last time we had (Mercado Libre) attending in LA and is that group looking at potential perspective members that might attend the Singapore meeting?

Jimson Olufuye: Okay, I think that is very good highlights for the Committee who I will have to refresh the Committee on that and also to give the opportunity to encourage our members if there are potential leaders that will participate in our meeting and also the (unintelligible), yes who will apply through the committee. So the committee cannot do anything without input from members so that is very important but there is no doubt I believe we are making progress with getting more diversity into (unintelligible).

Elisa Cooper: Okay, any questions for Jimson? Okay, thanks Jimson. I am not sure if Steve is on the line yet but I will ask Steve, are you - I know that you wanted - Steve wanted to go very last today so he may still be (unintelligible).

Woman: I don't see that he has joined yet.

Elisa Cooper: Okay, so why don't we move on to the council so I will turn it over to you (Susan).

(Susan Payne):   Hi, this is - hi (unintelligible). I am sorry, I am not very prepared. So it has been a busy week. So I would say the biggest issue we have is (unintelligible).

Elisa Cooper: (Susan)?

(Susan Payne):   Yes, we have got a lot of...

Elisa Cooper: (Susan) we have got a really bad echo. Let me see if we can get the operator to do something about that? Let me - is the operator - is there - okay, I think, maybe it is taken care of. Okay, I am sorry, go ahead (Susan).

(Susan Payne):   Is that better?

Elisa Cooper: Yes.

(Susan Payne):   Okay sorry about that. I think I had my speakers on - on my computer. So as I was saying I am not prepared as I should be today but John Berard and I don't know if John is on the phone, prepared a draft for the GNSO sort of his last hurrah I would say, talking about the - responding to the comments for the nominating committee recommendations from the Board Working Group and I think this is something we should probably send out to the whole group. I

think it just went to several of us but he makes some good statements and talking about diversity is not - is hampered not aided by reducing the roll of the GNSO constituencies and stakeholder groups and he goes on and so I would think we should send this out to the whole BC and just get input on that for our next meeting. Our meeting is next week.

So I will send that out or Steve may also talk about it during the policy. Then the only other thing that I can really see that is on the agenda for our meeting next week is there is a...

(Gabby):   Can I come in?

(Susan Payne):   Yes, (Gabby) please, rescue me.

(Gabby):   Thank you so just to help (Susan) a little bit and to complement what she is saying so the first thing that I wanted to mention is that we don't have any motions for the next council meeting as none have been submitted in the red line so it is going to be a different meeting in that sense and we are going to discuss other topics of - (Sue) just mentioned the Working Group on the nominating committee and I also just sent - I am not sure everybody saw an email that I sent about the main coalition's issue so we really need some feedback from the people that are more technical on the main coalitions because the council has been asking if more policy work has to be undertaken by the council so - by the GNSO.

So please read that email and send us an input on that because we are asked to bring this input to the next council call. And I think that with that we are covered. We have some issues around also the GNSO and the GAC confrontation group because they are trying to improve the ways in which the GNSO can respond to the (unintelligible) and related to issues on policy so we

are going to talk about that a little bit but this just an opening and discussion on the topic so we just kind of give you some more information about that because the initiation of the conversation.

So I think that - this is so maybe John can - was having a hands up and maybe John wants to say something about his comment on the (unintelligible) for the board - working group on the nomination committee.

John Berard: Sure (Gabby) can you hear me?

(Gabby):   Yes.

John Berard: Okay, technically what I - what you saw (Gabby) and (Susan) was (Tony Holmes) as you recall from a meeting in LA I agreed to ghost write a reply comment that would be Tony's responsibility to distribute to the council.

The origin of the reply comment is the discussion at the council that it should be involved in providing primary comment which (Gabby) and I objected to and we settled on the fact that if the council wanted to offer a consolidated reply comment based upon the comments from the constituents and stakeholder groups that that might be a more appropriate extension of its activities and so I took it upon myself to ghost write that but (Tony) and it is now up to each of the councilors to discuss it with their constituencies and stakeholder groups in hopes that it can be voted on or discussed and then voted on at the next council meeting because the reply period deadline is July 9th.

So it was both a strategic initiative to forestall the council from offering primary comment which neither (Gabby) nor I felt was appropriate and to

focus attention on the value of the reply comment so that is where that came from.

(Gabby): Thanks so any questions for (Susan) and I or for John regarding the next council meeting?

Elisa Cooper: Yes, (Gabby) - first of all sorry, I didn't realize you were on the call.

(Gabby): That is okay, don't worry. It is fine.

Elisa Cooper: So interpreter feedback that you are looking for related to the collision names can you provide some more information about like what they are actually asking for?

(Gabby): Yes, actually I sent an email that has - I too exactly the transcripts from the last council meeting in which they were exactly asking what they want because when we were more giving them feedback about the (unintelligible) TLDs and about rights (unintelligible) using for the names that are coming off of the lease but they were more looking for a more permanent work and for all TLDs not the (unintelligible) TLDs so actually what the council wants with the - well this (unintelligible) is about staff report that was given to us in LA and that just send it to you as well in this email and so the idea is to define if we need to work on any further policy development regarding (unintelligible) collisions in a more broader way and deeper way, not only about (unintelligible) on the right protection (unintelligible).

Elisa Cooper: Okay.

(Gabby):   That is what I understand so far but as another technical person maybe it is better for someone to read these extracts from the transcripts that I send and be more clear in exactly what the council is asking for.

Elisa Cooper: Okay, that is helpful.

(Gabby):   Okay, thank you.

Elisa Cooper: Anything else for (Gabby) or (Susan) or John? Okay, I don't know if Steve has joined the call yet?

(Brenda):   This is (Brenda). I do not see Steve.

Elisa Cooper: Okay, why don't we pull up - he did send out his policy calendar so why don't we pull up if you can (Brenda) can you pull up his policy calendar? I think that - so we can kind of I guess go through the different items.

I think the one item that probably everyone is very interested in speaking about and discussing further, and I am not sure it is actually on here, is the recent work done by the community - I am sorry, the (BCWG) on the IANA transition and I am not sure if that is - oh yes, number six and I know that there are a number of folks that have been following that very closely in particular so I don't know (Phil) if you would be willing to kind of share with us your thought - oh and (Aparna) - I see (Aparna) you have your hand raised.

Actually I go to (Aparna) first and then (Phil) if you would like to also provide some feedback or your thoughts - (Aparna).

(Aparna):   Hi, can you hear me?

Elisa Cooper: I can.

(Aparna):   Great, so I have been following this reasonably closely.

I know (Phil) has as well and he circulated to the BC list the fairly lengthy proposal developed by the Community Working Group and I think, you know, I am still in the process of digesting it but with - for the purposes of sort of directing the BC's efforts it is a long document but I suggest that if you are pressed for time as I know we all are you focused at the very beginning there are some questions that are keyed up that the drafting group would really like interest you but that means (unintelligible) limitation but those are clearly areas where the speaking community and (unintelligible).

I think we should as a group focus on those and then if you have a limited appetite for all of the historical information the meat of the proposal is really connectors on page 61 and it goes through about page 60 - maybe like 70, so the part that we really care about or that I think we should really care about is pretty short.

Basically what they have constructively identified is to create a new contract (unintelligible) which is kind of the most vague part of the proposal and the part that I confess I understand the least and then there are for two review teams one would be kind of a broader review team that assesses the functions being performed adequately at a (unintelligible) and one would be a customer standing committee which is something - a committee that would sort of insure a compliance with service level agreement essentially and insure that a day to day performance would be effective.

You know, we are still discussing until (unintelligible) but I would say, you know, we are probably supportive of obviously the notion of a customer

standing committee so that people who are direct customers of ICANN functions can make sure that the functions are out being performed properly and were I think in concept supportive of the idea of the multi-stakeholder using a fourth piece that I think we just want to understand a bit better as an independent appeal process and I think what we want to do and the main concern I would say at this point I don't really understand what is meant by the contracting company and what role that is going to - what role that entity is going to fulfill.

And the second question I have in my mind is how do we make sure that we review - that the review processes and any independent appeal process that we establish here is not redundant of any improvements we would want to do in the broader accountability working group because I think we want those two things to be inter related timing wise but I don't think we want people to have the ability to forum shop and bring, you know, their issue to either of these bodies.

I think we want to have sort of clear delineation of responsibility between - if there are going to be two kind of separate independent appeal panels we want them to be - we want to understand which ones are doing what I guess is the initial reaction from me.

But that is a short overview. The key elements are really this contracting entity, a multi-stakeholder review team with kind of over - broader oversight authority to customer standing committee and the independent review panel.

Elisa Cooper: So what are your overall thoughts on the work or you just don't - you haven't totally digested it and you are not sure yet?

(Aparna):   So I think - I would say at the outset it is just - it is actually a crazy amount of work that was done regardless of whatever you think of the end product.

I think there are elements of it that we are definitely supportive of. I am not and my biggest hesitation is not understanding this - the umbrella contract entity because I am just worried about a separate (unintelligible) of power and that contracting entity creating instability. That is where I am.

But I think it's interesting - like, from what I've been able to digest, it's that kind of meta question I haven't really wrapped my mind around. A lot of the more detailed stuff seems to make more sense to me. I think another big question that the BC will want to consider is sort of is there a need for an ongoing RSP process? I think that's a very live question within the working group. I would say, yeah, that's another thing to kind of focus on as people reflect on this.

Woman: Thanks (unintelligible). (Phil)? Questions for (Aparna)? (Unintelligible).

(Phil):   Do you want to speak, Elisa, or...

Elisa Cooper: Yeah, go ahead.

(Phil):   Okay. Yeah, let me add some other things. As (Aparna) noted, it's actually a very incredible amount of work that this group has put out in a very short time under instructions from the ICG, the IANA coordinating group that they had to have something out for public comment by December 1st. Some things you need to understand; one, this is just a proposal on IANA regarding the names function.

The number and protocol aspects are coming from two other groups, one from the IETF, one from the RIRs. And it's this group that did this has no idea what those other groups are going to recommend or whether they will be readily integratable into one another by the ICG.

So it's kind of a crazy approach. And also, within the proposal structure -- and I sent her the BC this morning the slideshow which was being used on the webinars on this -- there were three being held - the last one's being held right now during this call.

I was on the early morning one today. There are six different structure - six different aspects to the proposal. The heart of it is number three, the proposed post transition oversight and accountability arrangements. And the last three -- the transition implications, the NTAA requirements, and the community process -- this group really couldn't do much on those last three because it all depends on how the community reacts to this number three.

So we're kind of in a situation where they're trying to build the airplane while they're flying it, is the way I've been putting it. Also, while there's a fair degree of consensus within the group, there's not - there's a lot of people within the group that put this together still questioning the very document they put out. There's a -- I would say -- an act of minority which doesn't like the contract proposal and is still pushing for some kind of internal accountability mechanism without replicating this contract co, the purpose of which is to have an entity to replicate the NCIA counterparty practice in the current IANA arrangement.

So it's an - this is a proposal that may raise as many questions as it answers, even within the group that put it out. This contract co, the heart of the accountability here is the contract co, but that's a shell corporation. There's no

answers from the group yet as to where it would be incorporated or if it would be incorporated, what type of group it would be, whether it would be an MOU or an actual - or a broader contract. How it would be funded, you know, if it had to - if it alleged a breach of the contract, where would the funds come from to engage in arbitration or litigation on that breach? It's overseen by this multi-stakeholder review team, which is out of the IANA - the ICANN community.

Then there's the review of the actual technical functions would be done by the customer standing committee, which would be the customers of the IANA - of IANA. And then there's this independent appeals panel, but again there's not much detail on how that would actually be structured, who would have standing to bring complaints against IANA.

And then -- as they themselves have stressed -- all of this is completely separate from the CCWG and accountability where Steve's the CSG representative, which hasn't even begun its work and they've stressed that nothing - whatever the final form of the IANA transition stewardship, it shouldn't go forward until that separate accountability group has come up with its accountability recommendations for ICANN the organization and the ones that it has designated as required to be put in place before the transition are in fact in place or assured of implementation.

And given the rush with when this group is doing their work to meet a basically July 2012 deadline to get something to NGIA so that it could act on it by September, I'm not sure there's any possibility of that accountability group getting done by September or by July.

So I hope that's helpful and hasn't confused things, but you need to understand, this is a work in progress for which there's some consensus but

certainly not complete consensus within the CWG and where they readily admit that many of the details are not yet provided and they're looking at the commit to the community to help them fill in the details if the community is okay with the basic structure of what they've recommended.

So it's a little bit squishy for common purposes and yet we only have 21 days -- which is now taking off one day at a time -- I guess we're down to 17 or 18. And there's no reply period -- again -- to meet this schedule that's been dictated by the ICG, all based on minimum comment periods required to get something to NCIA by July. So I'll stop there and I hope that's been helpful and not confusing and I'm happy to -- along with our panel -- answer any questions.

Elisa Cooper: Will you -- I know Angie Graves has been following this as well -- will the three of you be working on a set of initial comments? Or can we ask you to do that.

(Phil):   Yeah, I'd be willing to be part of a team to draft comments. I'd want to - this is one where I think the - you know, we really need guidance from as broad a group within the BC as possible, because I'm not sure, you know, what the sentiments are going to be within the BC reacting to this. And again, it's difficult to comment when so many details are not yet filled in and when in fact the comment period is asking the community to help fill in those details.

Steve DelBianco: Hey (Phil), Elisa, its Steve DelBianco, if I could get in the queue. I'm not on the Adobe.

Elisa Cooper: Yeah, go ahead.

Steve DelBianco: And (Phil) and (Aparna), thanks for being on point for this. If we did look at developing a comment for the BC on just this particular naming related function I think we have to focus hard on the structural elements of separation and the mechanisms for accountability. If the customers of the naming functions feel as if the vendor -- which is likely to be ICANN -- if the vendor's not delivering.

And I know that's really what you've focused on in the draft, so the BC can focus tightly on that to help move you along, I'll circulate excerpts from the comments we've submitted this year on the transition, because they do contain the BC's earlier positions in favor of accountability and -- if not structural -- at least functional separations that will help. So I hope that that'll help get it started, but we do want to try to get -- as you say -- a comment to the best of the BC - at least an outline of the comment over the next six or seven days to give us 14 days to approve.

Elisa Cooper: I see also (Aparna) has her hand raised.

(Aparna): Yeah, just to say I'm happy to help take a crack at it.

Elisa Cooper: That would be great. So Steve I was kind of filling in. I know that you were joining late. We actually skipped ahead because I - because this is such a big topic. So we can actually start up at the top and go through the other items on your policy calendar, starting with item number one. And I'll turn it over to you.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks Elisa. So we just covered number six?

Elisa Cooper: Yeah, we jumped ahead.

Steve DelBianco: That's great. And I am happy to defer if we need to get the time for Jimson to give a report. We typically crowd him out and I don't want to do that (unintelligible).

Elisa Cooper: Yeah, he's - everyone else has already presented, so we have the remainder of the time.

Steve DelBianco: That's great. I'll still make it quick and get us out in time. The first thing on channel one was Elisa, thank you for your work on the inner registrar transfer policy -- the IRTP -- we filed those comments this week in support. Thank you very much. So there's five open comment periods in addition to the one that (Phil) and (Aparna) just discussed. One is this amendment to the registry agreements for NGO and ONG because they were going to allow the bundling of second level domains.

Now, J. Scott did an analysis, had a conversation with the PIR -- which is the company going to be running those two domains -- and J. Scott's recommendation -- and I concur -- is that we not file comments on the amendment.

No comments by any party -- pro or con -- have been filed on this. And the comment period closes day after tomorrow. Any further thoughts on the bundling of second level domains in NGO and ONG? And I can't see the Adobe, Elisa, so I'll be happy to be interrupted any time you see a hand up. Thank you.

The second is reply comments in the board working group. You know that the BC - we did a great job on comments on the board working group on NomCom back on the 13th of November. Our comments became the basis for a draft that (John Berard) helped to prepare so that council may well weigh in.

And they're going to discuss that at the council meeting next week. But the question before the BC is that we have a reply period open through 9th of January.

This is an opportunity to reinforce points that we made earlier, to rebut points that we don't agree with that came in during the initial comment period. A number of BC members are so skilled at the NomCom -- I don't want to make it seem like this is a lot of work, because a reply comment like this can be very brief since we already invested so much time on our initial comment -- so I'm happy to collect some names of anyone who's interested in working on BC reply comments for this. And this is number two under channel one.

Ron Andruff: Steve, this is Ron. I'm not in Adobe Connect either, but as I started, I was the original drafter of that document. I'm happy to keep an eyeball on it and do a reply. I agree with you that having seen kind of job rice draft from the council that in fact it looks like our response will be very short, just in support of what they're saying.

Steve DelBianco: Fantastic. Anyone else? J. Scott and (Stephan), you're always on top of things with the NomCom or (Sara)? Thank you, Ron, appreciate that. The third item on here is the launch program for Dot Madrid. We had volunteers, Elisa, Chris Chaplow, Susan Kawaguchi, and Steven Coates of Twitter. And appreciate that. Steven and Chris have exchanged a few ideas via e-mail and I'm encouraging Steve and Chris - assist any way I can to try to get a draft to the BC next week. This is the launch program for Madrid. Steve, Chris, Susan, Elisa, anything to add to that?

Elisa Cooper: I apologize, I have not had time to spend on that.

Steve DelBianco: That's fine, Elisa. Steve and Chris have things underway. That's great, thank you. Number four, the five year draft operating plan.

Steve Coates: Steve, I would like to get a draft next week. Sorry.

Steve DelBianco: That's great, thank you. Is that you, Steve?

Steve Coates: Steve, yep.

Steve DelBianco: Fantastic. Number four is the five year draft operating plan. And on this one - great progress so far. Jimson and (Tim). (Chad) and Angie Graves got started on a draft already and I attached it to the policy calendar you have in front of you.

So please review and we'd like to file this by the 12th of December. Now, that's the initial comment period. But if there's active discussion right up to the 12th, we'll go ahead and open that up for the full 14 days.

But I would like to see if - don't wait until the 12th of December to read the draft that Jimson and (Tim) and Angie have circulated on this e-mail. Let's take a look at it now, please, and do a reply all so that the - we can work those comments in. Jimson, (Tim), or Angie, do you have anything you want to add to that? Great, thank you.

Jimson Olufuye: This is Jimson. This is Jimson. Nothing to add now, thank you.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Jimson. Great work on this.

Angie Graves: Yeah, I just - I do very quickly - very briefly. Anybody who is going to review this, I think a - also a review of the strategic plan is important to keep this in context. Thanks.

Steve DelBianco: Good point, Angie. Alright, number five is the new rules for the GTLD auctions. And this is for indirect contention; when a string contends with another string and then there's another string that contends with that one. So it's not direct head to head contention but indirect. And this comes into play on a number of strings that the BC has followed closely because they involve singulars and plurals.

Now, Ron Andruff and (Andy Abrams) volunteered to draft some BC comments and had promised they'd start that drafting after yesterday's webinars. And that webinar occurred and they promised to post slides on the ICANN Web site, which I haven't seen yet. Ron, I know you're on. I don't know whether (Andy) is. Anything to add to this?

(Andy Abrams):   Hi Steve, this is (Andy). Yes, so we are on track. We will get a draft to the BC shortly. Yes, it does - it does track very closely with the issue of singular versus plural. Unfortunately, the ICANN proposal for indirect contention auction - the process - it really tilts the scale unfairly against successful string confusion complainants. I think the design is really intended to facilitate the delegation of as many strings as possible, as opposed to the most fair outcome. So I think the BC does need to weigh in. And so we'll provide a draft shortly.

Steve DelBianco: (Andy), thank you very much. And you were so articulate in the letters we did on singular and plural -- particularly with contentions strings like this -- what would - taking a look at the calendar, the 14th of December is end of the

initial period. I do think there'll be comments followed, so they'll probably have a reply period.

To make the 14th -- and if we circulated something say over the weekend -- we'd still give our members somewhere between 9 and 10 days to review. And I believe that would probably be acceptable, if we can get it out this weekend. If it pushes out beyond next weekend, we may have to extend a bit and get into the reply period, but I'll leave that to you and Ron to see what you can pull off. Let me know how I can help.

(Andy Abrams): I think we can do that. Thanks, Steve.

Steve DelBianco: Yeah, appreciate it. Elisa, that was it for the current period. I did want to add the fact that outside of public comment, Ron Andruff's request - the BC has drafted a letter regarding the ALAC's recommendation on freezing contracts and delegation in some of the highly regulated industries that the GAC refers to as category one. That letter was circulated on 10 -- sorry -- on 30th of November.

I drafted something that Ron approved, we got a number of helpful suggestions from BC members -- among them J. Scott and Stephane Van Gelder. I incorporated their comments already and that's the second attachment to today's policy calendar. I'm happy to take a queue on comments people have on this ALAC filing, but we're going to - we've asked everybody to reply by the 10th of December. And again, this was circulated on the 30th of November. Take a queue.

Elisa Cooper: Steve, this is Elisa. Just two items. One, I sent some very minor just edits to the letter and that - I sent that out this morning. They're very minor. Also, I just wanted to let you know in the chat that J. Scott had actually offered to

assist in being editor on the comments related to the board working group on the NomCom. So he would like to participate as an editor. He can't' take the lead on it, but he'd like to be an editor.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks Elisa for both those items. And J. Scott, you and Ron can together take a look at those reply comments. And the reply comments don't just have to reinforce what we already said; they should potentially rebut things that others filed in the initial comment period if we think those are really inappropriate rationale to base the decision on. Any other comments on our - what we'll call the freeze letter?

Ron Andruff: Steve, this is Ron. I would like to be in the queue at some point, please.

Steve DelBianco: Go ahead, Ron.

Ron Andruff: Thank you. Just wanted to do two things. One, thank you for an excellent draft. I think you've captured -- because this is a working on time and I have a lot of different comments we've filed over an historical fashion -- so I think you did a great job of gathering all those loose ends up and putting together one document. So I'm very pleased to see that.

The second thing I want to share with the members is that I've also done outreach to build some consensus behind this with our colleagues on the other side of the host with the NCUC and NCSG. I've sent them a copy of our letter saying it's a draft and asking if they would like to step up and support our colleagues at the ALAC. So that's happening also with the IPC.

So just to let the members know that this is - we're trying to build a broader consensus around this, because this is -- if there ever was an issue of accountability -- this is one of them. And ICANN is trying to move too

rapidly through for expediency as opposed to being accountable on this matter. So I'm really grateful to see the members who've seen that as well. Thank you very much.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks, Ron. I want to note that what we did in our draft in the last two or three paragraphs - we really hit the accountability point hard, suggesting that failure on this particular element -- which is 28 strings -- failure on that element could really feed the fire of stronger accountability mechanisms being needed for ICANN. And I realized our letter is chock full of things the BC has said before, and that document -- a long history of concerns -- so that we can't be accused of coming in at the last minute and try and alter contracts.

I'm also well aware that the registries are portraying this particular freeze idea as last minute unilateral contract amendment and the BC is suggesting, "Well, hang on. The new GTLD program -- the guide book -- allows governments to object." And a government objections -- as they get baked into this PIC specs -- the public interest commitment -- doesn't mean you go outside the contract, it means you're remedying situations inside the contract. Any other comments on our freeze letter? Great, thank you.

Elisa Cooper: I see (Phil) hands - I see (Phil)'s had is raised.

Steve DelBianco: Go ahead, (Phil).

(Phil): Yeah, Steve, just a quick comment to echo what I had submitted by writing on the accountability issue. One hopes that ICANN will - the board will do the right thing here and adopt a phrase, but even if they do the right thing on this, I don't think that in any way reduces a need for very strong accountability provisions being...

Steve DelBianco: (Phil), you're exactly right.

(Phil): Developed.

Steve DelBianco: It's necessary but not sufficient. You think we'd need to put that in the letter?

(Phil): Yeah, that could just be - I wouldn't want to create the impression that I just put this freeze in that they get a pass on stronger accountability coming out of the CCWG. Because there's plenty of other reasons over the last several years illustrating the need as well as the position they've taken that no third party group can impose a binding decision on the board, which has to be addressed by the accountability group.

Steve DelBianco: And so -- as you know -- I completely agree. And the basis of our proposal for new accountability mechanisms included citations of instances where ICANN had failed to be accountable. And there are situations far beyond this particular one, from what I am - so I fully agree with you, but wonder whether - are you asking us to add a sentence or two to our draft letter or you're just sort of setting the table and...

(Phil): No, I just thought it - I didn't want to create - I didn't think - I just wanted to make sure that people were comfortable with the wording that didn't create the impression that somehow we wouldn't favor very significant enhanced accountability measures if they acted correctly on this. That was it.

Steve DelBianco: Got it.

(Phil): Okay, thank you.

Steve DelBianco: Any others in the queue, Elisa?

Elisa Cooper: There aren't, but I actually have a quick question for you and I'm not sure if you'll know the answer, but - so what is the timeline? When is the first meeting for the cross-community working group on enhancing accountability? When is that expected to happen?

Steve DelBianco: Yeah, thank you for that question and I appreciate the opportunity to be the - one of the representatives from the BC and the CSG on this particular CCWG. And again, it's open for everyone to participate on every single call, on every single discussion, and even drafting documents.

But if and when things come to a vote for consensus purposes, I'll be able to cast that ballot after consulting with you and with the ITC and the ICCs. I covered this in channel three at the bottom of the policy calendar and I included a link to the page where I would hope to find the answer to your question. That is when we are going to meet for the first time. So unknown as of yet, but our name is in with (Glenn) and I monitor that site regularly.

The BC -- as you guys know -- is the very first one to put on the table five or six concrete accountability mechanisms that we think would be appropriate. And those could be done by September of 2015. They're relatively simple to implement. They require bylaws changes. I realize the hard part is going to get consensus from all the other cross-community members as well as getting approval from the ICANN board.

But the mechanisms we suggested -- I have them embedded right underneath channel three in the policy calendar - all six measures -- we agreed to start to draw others to think as specifically as we did, because of all the groups, nobody put things on the table like we did starting this summer. So I do hope

that we can become the first one out of the gate with some ideas. I'll let you know the minute I know the first meeting.

That's it for me. I'd like to turn it over to (Susan) and (Gabby) to talk about council. You'll see the agenda items I've highlighted right there under channel two.

Elisa Cooper: Steve, they may have some more to add, but we actually covered the council before you got on the line. But they may have some more to add.

Steve DelBianco: That's great. Just go on. If not, that's it for the policy section.

Elisa Cooper: Yeah, I don't - (Gabby) or (Susan), anything that you would like to add? I mean, I think we covered the highlights. But...

Steve DelBianco: Back to you, Elisa, then. Sorry I was late.

Elisa Cooper: Oh, yeah, no worries, Steve, geez.

Woman: Yeah, no worries.

Elisa Cooper: So I think we've covered everything on our agenda today. Is there any other items that folks would like to cover today or make sure that we speak about next time? Are there any other topics that anyone would like to raise at this point?

Steve DelBianco: Elisa, I'll ask that we cover the intercessional planning -- topic wise -- when we have our next call.

Elisa Cooper: Okay, definitely. I think in terms of what that agenda looks like; it's in a pretty rough form right now. But I think that there'll be more work on that. And right now we have slated to attend -- just so everyone is aware -- from the executive committee, Steve, (Marilyn), (Susan) will be attending. I am not able to attend, nor is (Gabby); we are both not able to attend. Jimson will be in attendance, though. And then also Ron Andruff and (John Berard) are slated to attend as well.

And so those will be the representatives at that meeting. And the point of that meeting is really to spend some time as the non-contracted party's house. And so there'll be a fair amount of time spent meeting basically as a house, but then there'll be sessions where we'll be meeting just as the CSG, I think, and then also as the BC. But yes, we'll spend some time - and as we have more clarification on the agenda, I'll be sure to send that out. And we'll share that with everyone.

Any other topics or items that folks would like to discuss or bring to the table? Okay, with that I'll give you six minutes of your life back. Thank you so much everyone for joining today and we will speak soon. Thank you so much.

Woman: And (Dana), may we please stop the recording? Thank you everyone for joining today's conference.

END