ICANN
Moderator: Gisella Gruber-White
November 20, 2014
10:00 am CT

Brenda Brewer: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone, and welcome to the BC members' conference call on Thursday, November 20, 2014 at 1600 UTC. On the call today in attendance we have Jimson Olufuye, Zahid Jamil, Jim Baskin, Andy Abrams, Elisa Cooper, J. Scott Evans, Ron Andruff, Claudia Selli, Marilyn Cade,

And we do have apologies today from the following people. Martin Sutton, Michael Maoz, Janet O'Callaghan, Steve Heimbecker, Jorge Aquila Avila, Bob Heimbeck. And Susan Kawaguchi has also joined us. We have from staff myself, Brenda Brewer.

And please remember to state your first and last name before speaking for transcription purposes, and I'll turn it over to you, Elisa. Thank you.

Elisa Cooper: Thanks, Brenda. And thanks to everyone, as always, for joining today's call. We have, as usual, a pretty full agenda. I want to tell you about a couple of items, and then we'll move to Marilyn, if she's on the line, for an update on the CSG. And then we'll spend the bulk of our time discussing some of the policy issues.

Hopefully Susan will be able to join us, and (Gabby), to talk about where we're at with the Council, and what they're working on. Jimson did send out, in advance of this call, an update. So he can go through that or answer any questions. And we do have a fair amount of time for any other business.

I know that Ron Andruff wanted to spend some time talking about these ALAC comments on regulated TLDs, and so we can spend some time. Perhaps we can actually cover that during our policy discussion.

But to start, let me stop here and ask, are there any other items that we should add to our agenda today? Or things that people would like to discuss in today's call?

J. Scott Evans: This is J. Scott, Elisa. Are we going to be discussing elections?

Elisa Cooper: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Elisa Cooper: That was one of the two items that I'd like to talk to you about today.

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Elisa Cooper: So the first item that I want to say about is the monthly call that Fadi holds. He held that call yesterday. And, you know, typically on those calls, Fadi spends a lot of time telling us what he's working on, and what his big focus is for the upcoming months.

But this time on the SOAC leader call, we spent the bulk of the time reporting out on the different sort of subcommittees that had been formed. And as you

might recall, there are three sort of subcommittees that have been formed by the SOAC/SG&C leaders.

One of them is around the prioritization of work streams, so that we can really focus on just try to pare back what we're focusing on in terms of work, because there's just so much going on. So that's one of the initiatives and one of the groups they're working on, which I'm actually part of. That's sort of the community prioritization group.

There's another group that's focused on volunteer engagements and addressing the whole issue of Board burnout. And then there's another group focused on improving the way we disseminate and provide information, and that's the sort of information management group.

So let me just tell you quickly sort of where those three groups are at, and what they're working on, and what their next steps are.

The community prioritization group, which is the group that I'm working on, essentially is recommending that we first take an inventory of all current work streams that are going on, because I think that's something that none of us has a handle on.

There's so much going on at ICANN, before we can even think about prioritizing anything, we need to understand exactly what all is happening. So that's our recommendation, and that's sort of a first step, and that's something that staff is going to assist with.

We're then recommending that the next step will be to develop a prioritization matrix that will allow all of the different SOAC/SG&C groups to give their guidance on which items should be prioritized higher, and which should be

lower. So that's what's going on in this community prioritization work group. Any questions about what that group is working on?

Then the next group is the volunteer engagement group. And essentially they're recommending the development of sort of a problem/solution matrix. So they're sort of laying out what all the problems are, and what the solutions might be.

And they're looking at it in terms of what are problems occurring within the current ICANN community in terms of volunteer engagement, like the problems with volunteer burnout and getting people that are not engaged that are, you know, part of the community, getting them more engaged.

And then they're also looking at it from the perspective of outside of the ICANN community. So how do we get folks that are not engaged, engaged, and beginning to be part of the community? So that's their focus, and what they're working on.

And then the final group is this information management group. And they are focused on really ways to improve content management, and they're looking at some new options for content management. They're looking at some different ways of organizing information, whether that be on the ICANN Web site or on the wiki. They're looking at some better standards for archiving.

I know one problem that was discussed at length was like sometimes you find something on the ICANN Web site, and you can't tell if it's still current, or is something that is out of date. And they'll be also seeking additional comments for ways to improve the way information is disseminated.

What came about by the end of the call was that these three topics - they're looking at potentially addressing these three topics in the high interest section that always occurs at the ICANN meeting, usually on the Monday.

And the majority of the folks on the call felt that that was a good idea, that we should bring these ideas to the community and have further discussion, unless of course there's something else that rises in importance and, you know, we need to focus on that.

So that's kind of what the bulk of the call was focused on. Fadi spent just maybe ten minutes, if that, talking about his stakeholder call, which was held earlier today. I was not able to attend, but I think some folks were actually on that call. And so that's what he focused on, what the agenda of that was and how that was going to run.

Was there anyone on that call that might be able to share any feedback or perspective on how that call went? Okay, hearing that no one was, so I do know that there will be a transcript made available of Fadi's stakeholder call. And when I receive that, I'll make sure that it's distributed to members.

The other item - any questions about anything that I just talked about? About this SOAC/SGC leader call that Fadi holds, and what we discussed on that call?

Marilyn Cade: Yes, Elise. It's Marilyn. Can I ask a question?

Elise Cooper: Go ahead, Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: Thanks. Did Fadi discuss at all the NETmundial initiative and the range of comments that have been coming in in relation to that? I know in the past that

has been a topic of significant concern to many of the leaders, and there's even a pretty strong post coming out of the ccNSO as well as the ISOC press statement. And I wondered if there was any discussion, updated information, from Fadi about that.

Elise Cooper: That was not a topic of conversation in the call. There may be some mention of it. But again, I can send you the transcript and perhaps there might have been something. But I don't recall.

J. Scott Evans: This is J. Scott. I can say that in the call that was held this morning, where he did the report out on the progress of ICANN over the last quarter, the first call, I can't remember if he did it on his own initiative or if he was answering a question - I apologize, Marilyn, (unintelligible). But he did address it there. He was asked about NETmundial and ISOC's response specifically.

And he said that they were studying that response and looking at that response to understand it better, and that ICANN was still committed to the NETmundial initiative.

Marilyn Cade: Thanks, J. Scott.

Elise Cooper: The second item that I wanted to just bring to everyone's attention is that we are coming upon the next set of elections for the BC officers. So we will be voting to elect a chair, a vice-chair of finance and operations, our vice-chair of policy coordination, and our CSG liaison. And so that election will be coming up soon, and I will be sending out the timing for that.

There's been quite a bit of discussion within the executive committee, and concern by some on the executive committee. And it has to do with the fact that because this next ICANN meeting is occurring much earlier in the year,

that the officers - in order to allow for the new officers to attend three meeting, as has been the status quo, that the current term would be shortened by about two weeks for the current set of officers.

We took a vote of the ex comm, and it was a split decision. But I felt, as the chair, that it was important for the new set of officers to also have the opportunity to attend three meetings, just as has always been the case. So the takeaway is, be on the lookout for the election procedures and the timing.

The plan is to do the election, the actual voting, in January. But what that means is the actual nomination period will occur in late December. Any questions about the election?

J. Scott Evans: This is J. Scott again. And is that what Jimson's recent email relates to in looking over our details with regards to representative and...

Elisa Cooper: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: So we need to look at that and get that back to you soon, so you can assimilate a list of who will receive ballots. Is that correct?

Elisa Cooper: Yes. So if the information on what Jimson said is not correct, then please let Jimson know. I looked through it, and I think everything looked correct to me, based on what I know. But please do look at that information to confirm that the ballot is going to the correct person and the correct email address. Because only members who are paid up through this year will be eligible to vote. Ron, I see you have your hand raised.

Ron Andruff: Thank you, Elisa. I just wanted to bring to the members' attention that J. Scott, Sarah, myself, yourself Elisa, Jim Baskin, David Farris -- I'm missing some

people -- Andy Abrams, are all working currently on the subcommittee, working on the BC's charter. And that work is progressing very well.

So I think from the timing of having the elections in the new year, we hopefully will have a charter that the full body of the BC can look at and approve, and obviously modify where they feel necessary. But I think the two are kind of running in parallel tracks.

But I just wanted to bring that to everyone's attention, that this new slate of executive leadership in the BC will also be able to work with a charter that is up to date, and will reflect all of the things that we've been working so hard to bring forward, in terms of differentiating the BC from other constituencies, amongst other things, in terms of the membership criteria. So I just wanted to make members aware of that. Thank you very much.

Elisa Cooper: Thanks, Ron. I think I would like to mention, I don't anticipate that the charter would be in place prior to the election, given that it needs to be posted for public comment.

Ron Andruff: I agree. I just wanted to let everyone know that they're kind of running in parallel paths. I just wanted just to bring an update there. That's all. I do agree. Yeah, it has to go out for a full raft of different responses from the community and others. But I just wanted to let people know that that work is progressing. Thanks.

Elisa Cooper: Yes, and I'd like to personally thank everyone who's participating in that group. I think it's really moving along, and I can also say that ICANN staff has been extremely helpful in helping to coordinate and take some of the heavy lifting on. Jim, I see your hand's raised.

Jim Baskin: Yes, thanks. Just a quick question about the dues issue and eligibility to vote. I know that Verizon, in the past, has had some difficulties making payments. And does anyone have an update on how many or which members might be in arrears, and be subject to the voting restrictions?

Jimson Olufuye: This is Jimson. As of this moment, all members listed on the list are fully paid.

Jim Baskin: Okay, thank you very much.

(Laura):   This is (Laura). I have to agree with what Jim's saying. It's a little bit challenging. We jump through a variety of hoops and had credit cards dinged and, you know, rejected and everything else, you know, with some of the challenges. It seems like it's a little complicated to pay.

                I'm not quite sure if there's anything that's being done about that. It's certainly not a topic for this call, but just to flag that we had some challenges - some of which were my own, but some of which were because it's insane, you know, and just there were a lot of hoops to jump through, it seems like.

J. Scott Evans: This is J. Scott Evans for the record. I think prior to the next billing cycle, this needs to be closely looked at because, you know, it affects us operationally, because we don't have the funds. And it affects us when we take votes, because - so I'm not saying we have to change everything, but I definitely think that now that two corporate members have raised this, it's very important that we look into it before we go to the next invoicing cycle.

Marilyn Cade: It's Marilyn. I'd like to make a comment on this. There's been a lot of work done on this by (Chris) in the back, (Christoff) and Jimson. Maybe it'd be helpful if we just actually scheduled a time when you guys could hear the

detailed work that Jimson has done on this to try to fix the problem. In previous reports, there's been a written report. And I think it's actually in his financial reports.

Because there have been a lot of efforts made to try to address those exceptional situations which are important. They've affected, I think, maybe three or four members that I can think of, J. Scott and (Laura), not just - and Verizon.

They typically take a lot of time to resolve from whoever the vice-chair is as well. So maybe after the financial chair's report, if there's interest in a more detailed discussion, that could be set up separately.

Elisa Cooper: (Steve), you have your hand raised.

(Steve):   Thanks, Elisa. Two comments on the election. The first is the notion of timing. And the current crop of officers have already served for all three of the ICANN meetings that occurred in 2014. And there isn't a sense of urgency that I share with Elisa about getting the next crop of officers elected before the 2015 series of three meetings begins.

So I think that that element of timing, to me, is far more important than merely counting the days that the current officers have been there. It's about attending the three meetings a year that each officer cohort is supposed to attend.

And the second, with respect to elections, is I really want to encourage BC members to consider standing as a candidate for some of these officer posts.

And to that end, please reach out personally to any of us that are officers now, and we can explain how we do our jobs, the amount of time it takes, the tools and tricks that we use to make that time a little bit more manageable, and help you to explore whether standing for an office is something that's right for you, because we want to make those decisions pretty quickly.

And I don't want to feel as if people have to do it on the list. I'm happy to do private conversations if people want to learn more about what the job entails. Thank you.

Elisa Cooper: Yeah, and I'd really like to emphasize especially - well both of - I agree with both of (Steve)'s points, and I especially want to emphasize the second one. I would please encourage you to consider running for, you know, one of the positions.

Some of us have been on, you know, serving for quite a while. It'd be great to have new folks engaged. And again, if you have any questions about any of the positions, please feel free to contact us. Any other questions or comments before we move on to Marilyn?

Jimson Olufuye: Yeah, Jimson. This is Jimson.

Elisa Cooper: Yes, go ahead, Jimson.

Jimson Olufuye: Yes. Also on the election, I just wanted to say that I felt that the officers should, you know, run through their one full-year term. That was my conception of the, you know, charter, (unintelligible).

But I felt maybe (unintelligible) come much earlier, you know, confining three-meeting period. So for ICANN meetings. There's only three meetings

that are required or basic for officers to attend. So that was why I was quite not so in line with the fact that we need to have the election much earlier, before the full time of officers is explained.

I want to perhaps - again for the charter review, maybe in the charter review we can also tie to the three election - the three meetings, ICANN meetings, in the year. So that would make it much clearer, and to avoid maybe skipping of terms, it would be with new officers. Thank you.

Elisa Cooper: Thank you, Jimson. All right, Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: Thanks, Elisa. Moving on, I take it to the CSG discussion. Is that right?

Elisa Cooper: Excuse me?

Marilyn Cade: It's okay if I move onto the CSG discussion?

Elisa Cooper: Yes, that's next on the agenda.

Marilyn Cade: Great, thanks. Actually I just didn't know if you were asking me for a comment on this, so let me move into CSG discussion. The CSG's been quite active on a number of areas. And I just want to mention, because we are discussing this on the list, a lot of the activity is visible to the members. But I want to flag a couple of key things that are coming up.

There will be a CSG full membership, 30-minute call coming up on the 25th. You all have the announcement on that from Brenda, and the agenda is to discuss formation of the CSG working group on accounting - sorry, the cross-community working group on accountability; update on the IANA

stewardship, following the face-to-face (unintelligible) meeting; and then talk about coordination activities within the CSG.

Prior to that there will be a CSG ex comm call to discuss the criteria for selecting the (unintelligible) CSG representatives to that cross-community working group on accountability.

Although there was a very strong effort made -- I think (Steve) will probably go into more details on this -- I'll just note that there was a very strong effort made by the participants in the drafting group -- David Farris from the BC and others -- to ensure there was one representative per constituency in this particular group, the charter was not approved with that.

So that discussion continues about whether it's possible to change that. But in the meantime, in order to participate, we have to reach an agreement within the CSG on who the single participant is.

The very good news is there's an unlimited number of participants, and so we will have a lot of opportunities for members to be participants. But in the event of votes or if there is a call for a single spokesperson for a group, then we are limited to one. So that's one thing I just wanted to mention.

The CSG is also beginning the planning for - the ex comm is beginning the planning for the upcoming meeting in February. I took that off as the CSG representative calling on the other CSG representatives to start asking their members for ideas and topics, et cetera. And we'll be putting together a further CSG ex comm call on that, so we need ideas. And I'll be sending something out to members to ask for email input.

We will be verifying when the breakfast date is. I have a call in to David and others to verify when the date of the breakfast actually is, whether it will stay on Tuesday or it will need to rotate. And we'll need to then adjust the CSG agenda accordingly.

One of the discussions so far from us has been interest in having that breakfast perhaps before, and I did send out a call for input on that, but I'll send it out again in an organized way through Brenda, to ask members to keep sharing their information with us,

Singapore is a lot more expensive to travel to than Morocco. So I'm going to ask Brenda to do an early straw poll on members who will be confirming that they're going to be able to participate in person. And when we kick off the list of topics for the CSG session, I also ask that you keep in mind we have been discussing the idea of either a BC-only or a CSG dialogue with the governments, and there's been a couple of topics suggested.

And we'll be continuing to solicit input on whether the CSG ex comm wants to have a full CSG meeting with the GAC -- I'm not talking about a breakfast in this case; I'm talking about an actual exchange -- or if we want to make this a BC-only, for some reason, because we think we have unique issues.

And then I will report later on the - let me just touch on the intercessional planning. Members know that there's an intercessional two-day meeting scheduled for January 12 and 13. That is where it mirrors and builds on the initial pilot, which is largely about bringing officers of the house together to sort of talk about management issues.

In our case, each constituency has seven seats. In our case, we will need to be coming up with a criteria for how we fill three of those seats. There's

discussion going on, but it has not been verified that we might have an additional two seats that would be local participants, an observer seat.

The room is big enough potentially to add in a few extra seats, but they would not be at the tables that are set up with the microphones. They would be additional seats. But hat has not been agreed within the planning group. It has been proposed. If that were to happen, then we would have a potential of nine attendees, but there would not be additional travel for those two additional attendees.

We'll be circulating the agenda more widely within the BC, just to go over topics and make sure that the full membership has an opportunity to comment on the topics that are proposed. The meeting room will have remote access for listening, and will also have video in the main room for people to be able to actually watch the proceeding as well.

And there is a one hour and - I don't know - it's 110-minute session with Fadi for each of the supporting - each of the (XG)s on Tuesday morning - sorry, on the 13th. And that will have audio only, because we'll be in a breakout room for the CSG. But all members will be able to listen in to that and participate, and it will be transcribed as well. May I take questions?

Elisa Cooper: I think J. Scott's had his hand up for a very long time.

Marilyn Cade: Thanks. I'm sorry. I'm not able to be in Adobe, so thank you, Elisa for - if you could alert me to that. Thank you, J. Scott.

J. Scott Evans: Yeah, my question has to do with the representation. You know, I understand and it's all on the list the heroic efforts that David and (Gabby) made, trying to

make sure that we got seats for each of the constituencies. And I was a little offended by some of the comments that were made back to them.

I think everyone forgets that this governance structure was - we volunteered into it as a compromise to see how it would work, and obviously it's not working very well.

But those editorial comments aside, I just want to ask you, Marilyn, do you have a feeling that since we sort of went through this with regards to the service on the stewardship committee and the ISPs were so very vocal about how they wanted their representative there, we all conceded, that they are going to be gracious and understand that now they've gotten their representation, and so it's for the other two constituencies to decide?

Marilyn Cade: Oh, you know, J. Scott, thank you for raising this. This is a discussion about the process for how we reached agreement on when we have only a single seat. This has been a problem in all of the cross-community working groups, and in the affirmation of commitments and (ATIT) working groups as well, that members will recall.

I think we tried to get past there being this emotional attitude, and within the CSG ex comm, trying to talk about what's best for the CSG; what the criteria is; what the skills are; and then also really fighting to change the number.

I will just say, from what I understand -- and I don't know if David's on the call -- but my personal observation is that it is the NCUC that is actually the most opposed to the stanchion of more representation. We also have a problem in that ICANN staff themselves are opposed to broadening the numbers, although there's really no justification for that when you actually look at the performance of the working groups.

But I hear you. You know, we're going to have this discussion. It is going to be probably very tense between the three groups. Certainly the last one was fairly tense as well. But I don't think there's ever been an agreement that it's just a rotation. I think we have taken the view as the BC that it needs to be based on - and Elisa should comment also as CSG alternate, that it needs to be based on the skills and the best interest of the broadest perspective of the SG.

But I will just say - I think we have got to fight this battle of changing the number. And to me that means we've got to go build support for that from some of the other groups.

Elisa Cooper: All right, I think we need to move on to policy. Any other questions for Marilyn that she might be able to answer quickly before we move on? Ron, I see you have your hand raised.

Ron Andruff: Thank you, Elisa. Marilyn, I just wanted to ask do you have any sense of why these people are pushing back on not having more people? It just seems to me that the more of us around the table the more effective we can be. It doesn't mean everyone has speaking privileges but it just - I don't understand it. Is there any logic you can bring to that? Thank you.

Marilyn Cade: I can tell you what's been said to me and I do work with these folks at the IGF and other places. There's a perception that the business community, including all of us, are more skilled and more effective than certain other representatives in certain other sectors.

And that we have an unfair advantage just from the very beginning because of the expertise and the nature of professional training and professionalism that we bring so that's one thing I hear.

The other thing I hear is that we're more organized and we work ahead of time to develop set positions and consensus positions. And so we have an unfair advantage because of that.

And then there's also this perception that all we've - I'm sorry to say it but there's always this kind of anti-business attitude that gets put forward from some parts of the NCUC. I'm not saying from the NPOC, I'm distinguishing one particular constituency.

But you know, we might consider proposing that there be limited speaking rights as a compromise but I think it's something we've really got to push forward with and go build some allies with other groups like the ccNSO and maybe the ASO and others.

Elisa Cooper: All right, (Steve)?

(Steve):   Yes, on November 13 when council debated the draft charter (Gabi) was as forceful as she could be about presenting the idea that we have seven seats of the GNSO, which would mean enough for the CSG so that we would have three reps for the CSG.

Marilyn's probably right in characterizing the underlying motive for them to block that. But none of those motives surfaced in the discussion and the opposition came mainly from Avri who - Avri Doria who I believe the NCUC would like to limit business's participation as Marilyn described.

Her reasons for irrational, she talked about descending into chaos if we were to expand to five from each SO to seven and that's just not enough a sensible argument.

And then James Bladel of the registrars agreed with Avri about not wanting to expand it. Then we ran into the Chair (Tomas), who's a very rational actor but didn't love the idea of modifying the drafting team's draft in a council discussion and kept falling back on precedent by claiming that the stewardship group brought in a transition was able to work with five.

So what difference does it make? And then finally - and I hope that (Susan) can shed some light of this in the council report, we got assurances at every turn from the Chair (Tomas) that this number that we're debating, this number of seats, is only with respect to the voting on a consensus call.

In all other discussions, meetings, writings, filings, debates in every other regard, we can have as many people in that group as we want. And unless there are participation limits we would be able to be as vocal as we want to be and persuasive as I hope we can be at arguing for strong accountability for ICANN.

And again, it's only when we have a consensus call or a vote that the CSG would get just one vote and it's in those instances we'd have to quickly coordinate with the ISPs and the IPC to be sure that we're voting a consensus of the CSG. But there may not be more than a few instances of voting in the entire cross community working group. Thanks.

Elisa Cooper: Thanks, (Steve). We should definitely move on to policy now but I will just give folks a heads up that we do have two individuals who've expressed interest as possibly being the CSG representative in that ccWG.

And I'm going to ask (Brenda) to send an email to each of you stating your preference for either one or the other of the two individuals who have

expressed an interest in serving in that role so that when we do meet with the CSG we can put forward a potential candidate.

But (Steve), let's go on to you. (Steve)?

(Steve):   Thanks, Elisa. This should be a very brief report on policy. I sent out a policy calendar on Tuesday and then an update to it yesterday. So the update is the one you should have in front of you still.

I - really quickly, I wanted to thank (unintelligible) (Abrams), (Martin Sutton), (David Farris) for their work on comments we filed on Neustar's registry proposal. We also filed a disagreement with the board's working group report on the nominating committee and that's where (Jay Scott Evans), Ron, (Aparna), and (Stephane) contributed to a great effort.

And then finally, we disagreed with the GAC subgroup on geographic names. The drafting on that was led by many in the BC but primarily by (Brian) of Amazon but that is a BC consensus comment. Thanks to all of you for drafting on that, it's been a great team effort.

If I turn now to the current public comments that are opened there are only five. There's the inner registrar transfer policy Part D. We approved most of these 18 recommendations back in April of 2014 but the board now has to consider whether to take the recommendations up. These reply comments would close on December 1.

So it's just around the corner. The good news is that Elisa was able to draft the BC position drawing upon what we've already done on all 18 recommendations and that is attached to the update that I circulated yesterday.

So best case, I will give everybody an opportunity to weigh in with edits over the next seven days so that we can honor that 1 of December deadline. But I'll take a queue now if there are any BC members that want to comment on the draft that I attached yesterday.

Great, seeing none, thanks again, Elisa, for drafting that. And I will send a reminder to everybody three days before December 1 to see if there's any final comments.

The second - the second, third, fourth, and fifth are fairly new. These are items that we need to get volunteers from the BC to take a look at. The first is this notion of amending the registry agreement or PIRs application for .NGO and ONG.

And these are - I would guess I would call them non-English versions of the ORG TLD that they run today.

And what they've talked about is bundling of their second level domains amongst those different TLDs that they'll be running. This is a very short comment period because it's a registry agreement amendment. So it's 26 of November, which is next Wednesday is the initial comment. And then we have until December 6 for reply comments.

Again, this is second level domains and the idea of bundling them across TLDs, something the BC had supported back when we were arguing that the guidebook should make it easier for a second level registrant to register multiple versions of the domain across different TLDs that are linguistic translations.

But this is somewhat related to that. Is there any comments, any BC members interested in volunteering to take a look at that and help draft the comment?

J. Scott Evans: (Steve), this is J. Scott, I'll take a look at it.

(Steve): J. Scott, fantastic. So this is Item 2 and to help get things started...

J. Scott Evans: And that's due - so I need to get something by the end of the weekend so that everyone can look at it, right?

(Steve): You know what, J. Scott, it's a holiday week for you as well and I did want to say that it's December 6 is the reply comment close date. So if necessary we have until December 6.

J. Scott Evans: Well, you know, even if it takes me longer we can put in something in our comments just as we're looking at it, we're going to make a comment just so that, you know, we make an initial comment or reply.

(Steve): So they don't close it.

J. Scott Evans: That's right. Okay, I'm happy to do that.

(Steve): J. Scott, thank you for that, I will send you some of the stuff we have filed before on the applicant guidebook.

J. Scott Evans: Okay, not a problem. Got it.

(Steve): Anyone else? Jim Baskin?

Jim Baskin: Yes, thanks.

Woman: (Unintelligible), thanks.

Jim Baskin: A question about the PIR proposal, I - I'm sure it's in their document of
                   proposal but just quickly, can you explain what they intend with bundling? Is
                   it going to be required, optional, still with an independent charge per
                   registration? How does that - how do they expect it to work if you could
                   briefly explain that?

(Steve):   Yes, Jim, I haven't dived deeply into it. I don't want to misrepresent it so I
                   haven't dived...

Man: Jim, I'll send you something on that to help look at it.

(Steve):   Yes, and Jim - any potential that you'd be interested in helping J. Scott on
                   some of the drafting?

Jim Baskin: I don't know that Verizon has a big stake in that one for that particular pair of
                   TLDs. But I'd be happy to look at whatever drafting you're doing.

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

J. Scott Evans: And did you say you wanted to be involved too?

(Steve):   (Angie)?

(Angie):   Yes, (Angie)'s here. I'm - my comment is about the IRTP topic and I apologize because I had myself on mute and didn't get to respond. I've been attending those meetings - the IRTP weekly meetings for almost a year now.

And - or actually the (unintelligible) before that. If anybody has any high level questions or wants to know how we came to any particular decision or get some context for the document I'm happy to provide that, thanks.

(Steve):   (Angie), thank you for that. Can I ask you a favor, please? Would you review that little four-page draft that I attached yesterday from Elisa and see if there's anything in there that you think could be more artfully worded to reflect what you've seen in a year of attending those meetings?

(Angie):   Will do.

(Steve):   Fantastic, and then reply all with that so that it will get - it'd be great for the BC to approve that quickly.

(Angie):   Yes, okay, gladly, thank you.

(Steve):   Thank you. Next item up is the launch program for new TLD for .Madrid. They want initial comments by the second of December, reply comments go until the 24. There's time on that. We have not commented on previous launch program proposals for some of the more narrow - new gTLDs. I don't suspect there's a significant BC interest on this but just in case I thought I would ask. Anyone interested in reviewing or drafting BC comments on this?

Marilyn Cade: (Steve), it's Marilyn. I don't have an interest in commenting but I have a question for you.

(Steve):   Go ahead.

Marilyn Cade: And that is are - I guess I was surprised to see - I'm assuming that the city names are being put out because - put out for public comment because of the relationship to the government. Is that what we should expect for all of the city names?

(Steve):   I don't think we can make any expectations with a launch program of a single TLD for single city. I don't know how we could extend this across - remember, .Madrid is a city name and (unintelligible) single TLD.

Marilyn Cade: No, sorry, I didn't mean we would make a single comment, that wasn't my question. My question was do you think we should expect to see all of the city names ultimately put out for public comment? I was just trying to gauge the volume of work that might be coming up.

(Steve):   I see. Yes, with respect to launch programs, that all depends on how closely their launch correlates to what they submitted in their application. Some applicants were more explicit on what they thought they would do in a launch program.

                  But I'm curious about why some of these applicants feel it's necessary to get approval on launch programs and we may see many more of them. We may see more.

Marilyn Cade: Okay, thanks.

(Steve):   Susan Kawaguchi - thanks, Marilyn. Susan? Not hearing you, Susan.

Susan Kawaguchi: Sorry, I was on mute. And I just thought since (unintelligible) comment - he's working on comments for .Madrid for INTA. But I could also take a look at that and see if there's any thing that, you know, we think we should comment on if you'd like.

(Steve): Of course, that would be very valuable. If you could take a look at that and - (Steve) - (Steve), would you share your INTA draft with the BC private? Thank you very much, appreciate it. Great.

And then the next one, number four, is ICANN's five-year operating plan draft. Jimson, you're on the line and typically in the past it's been our vice chair for finance and administration who would take the lead on assessing and drafting BC comments on things like the operating plan and the budget.

I don't want to blindside you on this, Jimson, but you would, of course, be first in line if you're interested in jumping on that. Before I turn to volunteers on that, I didn't mean to miss your hand being up, Elisa. Why don't you comment on - I may have skipped over you for .Madrid?

Elisa Cooper: I just said I would also take a look at it, that's all.

(Steve): Thank you. And that was the .Madrid, not the operating plan, correct?

Elisa Cooper: Yes, correct.

(Steve): Great, thank you.

Jimson Olufuye: And (Steve), yes, I'm on for the operating plan. This is Jimson.

(Steve):   Thank you, Jimson. Who among BC members has a level of interest in some time to help Jimson diving into their draft five year operating plan?

Marilyn Cade: (Steve), it's Marilyn. I'd like to volunteer and I don't know if (Chris Kepler) is on the call. He in the past has often volunteered.

(Steve):   I don't see (Chris)'s name but you are absolutely correct. (Chris) has really carried an awful lot of weight for us in terms of assessing their plans.

                  (Kim Chen), I just saw your name pop up in the chat, (Kim). Were you referring to the Madrid or the five year operating plan? Strategic plan, fantastic. So (Kim Chen) just indicated in the chat he'll help Marilyn and Jimson on that.

                  (Kim)'s the CEO of a business who does its own long term operating plans and I think that will be a great perspective to bring, too. (Angie) as well, thank you, (Angie). This is fantastic.

                  All right, next one, number five, which is the new gTLD auction rules for the indirect contention. I've not even read this proposal yet. Don't know for sure if the BC - don't know for sure if the BC has any dogs in this fight but it has to do with multiple contenders are there for indirect contention. At that point there wouldn't be a community applicant left because they would have bypassed the auction rules.

                  Are there any (unintelligible) keen interest in commenting on the auction rules? I see Ron Andruff - hand up, go ahead, Ron.

Ron Andruff: Thank you, (Steve). Unfortunately I'm overwhelmed with the other activities I have right now if we're just starting with the nominating committee process

and I'm chairing a number of subgroups. But I do believe that this is something that we should be looking at because I think - unfortunately whether we like it or not, whatever happens in this gTLD auction round will become precedent going forward.

And it would be very good if we could get a couple of members to put an eyeball to that and see if we can make sure that that's going down the right track. Otherwise it's going to be very difficult to correct after the fact. Thank you.

(Steve): Ron, I did want to comment on it. This is largely a mechanical proposal. It's not so much policy as the mechanics of the ascending clock auction by a company called Power Auction. So in some respects it's a mechanical process more than a policy one.

Would you please read - it's a quick read, take a look at it and if you spot things in there that you believe the BC should comment on please write and I'll exercise my role as policy coordinator and try to turn your thoughts into something we could file.

Ron Andruff: Absolutely.

(Steve): Great. If there are BC members as well who also are applicants and if those of you that have participated in auctions - and I know for instance that Amazon and Google have.

If you're able to take a look at this new auction mechanical plan and if there are flaws in that plan that undermine business interests, you know, please join Ron at sharing your perspectives so the BC can make a comment.

All right. See any other hands on that? Great, thank you. (Andy Abrams) is typing in the chat. Let me give him a chance to finish. Okay, thanks, (Andy). (Andy)'s going to also look at that - the mechanics of the auction.

Great. Channel 2 was the council discussion. We don't have (Gabi) on the call. We already covered the discussion of the charter that was approved on November 13. And the next council meeting is on until the 11 of December. So Susan, I know you're on the line, anything you want to share about the November 13 council meeting or what you're seeing on the list for the 11 of December?

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes, one of the things we were asked to do was to go back to each of our constituencies and discuss name collision and there was a call for - to figure out if any policy development is needed or an issue report should be issued by issues report should - ICANN staff do an issues report.

So I would love to hear people's perspectives. I think we're pretty aligned with the current status of the name collision issue but any other thoughts on that or should we take that list and in the interest of time today?

(Steve): Thanks, Susan. Again, folks, this is the disposition of names that come off of the block list. So when the TLD - the registry operator decides to put those previously blocked names out we had a consensus position even with the registries on a need to go through a modified aspect with the rights protection mechanisms and (unintelligible).

I do believe you're right that we thought that the consensus position satisfied the BC and the written comment we submitted. So I don't know that we need extra work by staff. I'll take a queue on that. Elisa, your hand up right now?

Elisa Cooper: I'm sorry.

(Steve): No worries. Susan, you do - if you don't have it I'll send it to you, the BC's prior comment on that consensus position on how to dispose of blocked list names.

Susan Kawaguchi: Right, and I do have that.

(Steve): Great, thank you.

Susan Kawaguchi: I think there was - that was a call from other constituencies to do more staff development on the process. So that...

(Steve): What was their rationale? Why did they believe more work was needed?

Susan Kawaguchi: I think it was more - you know, just as a caveat. It was a call between 3:00 am and 5:00 am so I wasn't the best attuned to the call. But my impression is that it was more that people didn't understand it where it's, you know - we live and breath this issue so they just called for extra work in my opinion.

So if anybody - I'll review our position again but if anybody has any ideas on this or if I see anything on the list - the council list, then I will get back to the BC and - to make sure that we have a strong argument in favor of just moving forward.

(Steve): Thanks, Susan. You have visibility of the council list and the minute you spot something that we need to know...

Susan Kawaguchi: (Unintelligible) the GNSO. I am now (unintelligible) of the EWC process working group. So I'm taking that role on pretty seriously to see if we can

move forward on something with the Whois record. And I think that's all I have today, (Steve). Is there something I'm missing?

(Steve):   Not at all, Susan. Thank you very much. I think we've already covered CSG so I'll stop there. Thank you, Elisa.

Elisa Cooper: Yes, I think that Ron wanted to discuss this ALAC set of comments. Can we do that now?

Ron Andruff: This is Ron. I'm happy to report if you'd like, yes.

Elisa Cooper: Yes.

Ron Andruff: Thank you, Elisa. And thank you for putting this on the agenda. As members of the BC will know, we've been tracking this issue of the highly sensitive strings from the very beginning. And we submitted comments all along the way.

The ALAC have taken some really strong steps forward in this process. They were very strong proponents of the policy advisory board model that had been put forward. I was one of the authors of that document. And that went out for public comment. The result of that was that the new gTLD committee of the ALAC then took the comments under advisement and reviewed all of the issues.

And at the meeting in LA they stepped forward and passed a resolution calling on the board to freeze the 28 highly regulated, high sensitive strings until such time as the proper public interest commitments have been established.

And they had suggested that a working group of the GAC, ALAC, and other members of the community would be participating. This is very important because we as - if we're trying to build an institution of ICANN and we don't capture or correct these really fatal flaws along the way it's only going to hurt the institution as we go forward.

And so those of us that have been working a long time within the ICANN community it would be such a shame to see things go sideways because of something we could have done along the way.

Staff have taken liberties with the community. They have - well, the GAC have called for public (unintelligible) commitments from Beijing, which is about six meetings ago and every communiqué since. Staff have gone ahead and had the audacity to sign registry agreements with seven applicants in this highly sensitive string area.

The GAC communiqués have noted - from LA noted that the GAC and ALAC exchanged views on the shared serious concerns about the implementation of the public interest committees. And the GAC raised vital consumer protection issues in Beijing, Singapore, and most recently London communiqués, which helped established an environment of trust.

This is exact text from the LA communiqué. (Unintelligible), former board member and a leading voice in Internet governance that many of us know, put this into start release for me in LA when he said that the operators of these strings will de facto assume a regulatory function at the second level.

So I've been pushing on the BC to really take a stand on this and I'm grateful to see that a number of members have stepped up and thwarted that call. And what I would suggest we do at this stage is get a letter drafted to the NGPC

and to the board to let them know that we support the ALAC resolution as has been called for by the ALAC chair. He's sent out a message to all of us, which I posted in the last couple of days.

So that's a quick summary. I'm happy to answer more questions but I think the critical nature of this particular issue is that we have to do what's right and get the right thing done here as much for the institution as for all Internet users going forward. Thank you very much, Elisa.

Elisa Cooper: (Steve), given our previous position on this is there a reason why we wouldn't be able to go ahead and support the ALAC resolution?

(Steve): This is (Steve). If I could get in the queue on that - I mean I circulated this to Ron when it came around. The BC is a written comment approved by members in June of 2013 on the safeguards.

And our position was to support, as I indicated in that note that I sent to all of the members. Our position was pretty strong as we endorsed most but not all of the GAC's safeguards on strings for regulated industries.

I think the issue now is the question of timing, of saying that we've already endorsed these things, the board is proceeding to approve contracts without doing them.

And Ron, if I could characterize it then, the essence of this letter is to say stop approving contracts until these issues are resolved.

Ron Andruff: That's it, (Steve). And one step further is to say that there's no reason. There's absolutely zero reason why we cannot stop these 28 strings because I circulated the list. It's .lava, .insurance, dot (unintelligible) in German which

is insurance in German. These are strings that are really critical and for us to put a hold on them while this gets sorted out, there's no reason why we should not.

And I think the NGPC seems to act in the order of expediency, just get them out the door, just get them out the door. And we can't - we have to stop, take a breath, get this part right.

So it's really about supporting the call to freeze these 28 while this working group then - that's with the GAC, ALAC, and I would expect BC members and others from the CSG and the noncommercial parties house would also participate in that working group. And just get it right.

So I expect that it will probably take a couple of meetings to do that but once that gets done then those things could move forward.

(Steve):   But Ron, are you looking for a signature on ALAC or looking for a new communication from the BC making the point about stop signing the contracts?

Ron Andruff: I think both. I think it could be a very short - it's a two-paragraph letter and it's as you just described. We cited it as the BC in June. We were very clear about that. We've now see the ALAC have put it past to resolution. They read it into the public - into the minutes of the public forum in Los Angeles.

And we fully support their call. And we call on the board to enact it. It's that short. And I would expect that I've spoken with colleagues and other constituencies and other bodies within ICANN who feel the same way.

And I believe they could sign on to such a letter, although I would not suggest we hold ours until everyone signs on. I would suggest we invite people to sign on to a very clear and concise - one paragraph, two paragraph letter. And if they can, just as we did with other things most recently where many members of the GNSO bound together to bring a message to the board we could do so.

But it is something we have to act on right now, (Steve), and that's the concern is the next NGPC meeting probably happening early December. And the concern of ALAC is that they will push ALAC back on that and say we're not doing it. And that's why the board needs to know that others in the community feel the same as ALAC. Thank you.

Elisa Cooper: So we're actually..

(Steve):   Ron, you don't believe though that we would get the registries, registrars or the...

Ron Andruff: Absolutely right. The contracted parties have no interest in doing any of this.

(Steve):   Okay.

Elisa Cooper: So given that we're actually out of time can I ask you, (Steve), to make a recommendation as our policy coordinator about how we should proceed? And I know that you're - you know, off site at a board meeting today so I know that you wouldn't be able to do this today but in the next couple of days can I ask you to help guide us?

(Steve):   Certainly, Elisa.

Elisa Cooper: All right. My apologies, Jimson. I don't think we have time to go through the finance update but as always you've prepared an excellent report and thank you sincerely for all of your work, especially in preparing for the upcoming election.

Again, I would encourage everyone to review the list that Jimson sent out to make sure your name is appearing, that you are fully paid up, and that we have the correct email address to send the vote - the ballots to.

With that, I want to thank everyone again for joining today's call. And we will speak again soon. Thank you so much.

Man: Thank you, Elisa.

Elisa Cooper: Thanks.

Man: Thanks all.

Woman: Thanks all.

END