

**ICANN**

**Moderator: Gisella Gruber-White  
November 6, 2014  
10:00 am CT**

Coordinator: The recording has now started. Please proceed.

Brenda Brewer: Thank you very much. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone and welcome to the BC conference call taking place on the 6th day of November 2014 at 1600 UTC.

On the call today we have Angie Graves, Andy Abrams, Brian Huseman, Elisa Cooper, Jim Baskin, Marie Pattullo, Michelle King, Steve DelBianco.

And I have apologies from Gabriella Szlak, Jimson Olufuye, Ron Andruff. And myself as staff Brenda Brewer. I'd like to remind everyone to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. And I'll turn it over to you Elisa. Thank you.

Elisa Cooper: Thank you Brenda. So, today as you can see we have a full agenda. I think we have a fair amount of time devoted to policy which is good.

I wanted to check in with folks and see if aside from sort of an update on where we're at with the CSG and the GNSO Council if there are any other

items that we should add to our agenda for discussion today because I did leave ten minutes or so for a discussion of any other items.

So are there any other items that we should discuss today?

Jim Baskin: Will we be covering - this is Jim Baskin. Will we be covering the ccWG on accountability at all?

Elisa Cooper: Yes we can talk about that.

Steve DelBianco: Yes. I have it in the policy calendar Jim.

Jim Baskin: Okay great.

Elisa Cooper: Any other items that we should take some time to talk about today?

Okay. So I just want to give you sort of a bit of an update from my side.

I've had over the past few weeks since we got back from LA a couple of meetings with Fadi where he was meeting with the SOAC leaders.

The first call was a call I think you were aware of where he gave us a heads up that there was a potential issue with having the Marrakesh meeting in Morocco.

And just to get our feedback I provided the feedback that I had heard from members that there was still a desire from some to proceed with the meeting in Marrakesh but that very importantly we needed to still have a meeting, three of them this year and one in the same timeframe.

So there was a second meeting that was last week. And, you know, he sort of confirmed what the approach was going to be.

In that meeting he also said that he made mention of the NETMundial and the ICANN will be providing a secretariat support for the continuation of that endeavor.

And so that's sort of where we're at sort of with the SO, the sort of SOAC meetings that Fadi has called. Both of those are very sort of last minute meetings. And I think he's really trying to do a real effort in terms of reaching out to the community and I see this as a positive thing.

The other thing that's been going on that I've been involved with -- and again this is as a result of a meeting that we had with Fadi and staff -- is that I'm participating with a group that is trying that - of SOAC leaders. It's a small group. It's a subset of SO AC leaders.

And we're trying to put together a way to prioritize activities so that the community can focus on things that are really urgent and perhaps set aside or I'm not sure what we would do with the items that don't reach sort of the highest priority levels.

But that group met last week as well. And the approach there is that we're going to first ask staff to identify every single work stream that's currently going on because I think we don't even have a good understanding of all the different work streams. And I think that'll be extremely helpful in trying to prioritize what we should focus on first.

So that's kind of like updates on my side.

Any questions about my calls with Fadi or this work that I'm doing with the subset of SOAC leaders to do some prioritization of activities across the community?

Okay I think that - is (Marilyn) on the line? Okay well is that (Marilyn)?

Brenda Brewer: No. She has not joined yet. Sorry.

Elisa Cooper: Okay. So I think (Marilyn) wanted to talk to a little bit about the upcoming meeting which will now be in Singapore and the work that we need to do to begin planning our agenda.

And an idea that was put on the list was one where we would ask for a specific meeting with the GAC. I know that the GAC actually has some interest in hearing from business relative to geographical terms.

And I actually heard that in one of the sessions in LA. And I would like for us to consider reaching out and asking for a meeting with them.

And I wanted to hear from others whether that's something that you think might be a good idea or whether we should try to correspond with them in a different way.

Any thoughts on having a meeting with the GAC it - in the Singapore session?

Steve DelBianco: This is Steve. I would say our GAC meetings are very productive. And we have new leadership that we need to get to know. So as long as leadership of the GAC, the new committee chairs and vice chairs are available then I do think that's the right way to go. Thanks.

Elisa Cooper: Yes. I mean I have no idea whether they're amenable to a meeting or whether they would meet with us separately.

I think, you know, if they are then we'll certainly want to do our homework well ahead of time to figure out, you know, what message we want to bring to them.

Any other thoughts from any others? Martin I see you have your hand up. Are you on mute Martin?

Okay.

Brenda Brewer: His line just disconnected.

Elisa Cooper: Oh, it's says he lost the mic. Any other - is there anyone else? Is there anyone that feels like we don't want to meet with the governmental advisory committee?

Okay well hearing no one I will attempt to reach out to them and see if they would be amenable to doing that.

The other thing I think that (Marilyn) probably want to raise with you is identifying who we would have at our cross constituency breakfast.

This upcoming meeting is one where the business constituency coordinates. So we're responsible for coordinating sessions with the full commercial Stakeholder Group. That's the intellectual property constituency and the IPC - I'm sorry and the ISPs. And we figure out the agenda and the topics that we take to the board.

Is there - are there any thoughts? You know, one idea that I had is if we're able to meet with the GAC separately in a regular meeting situation would be that way reach out perhaps and invite the board and have them at our breakfast.

But it would be great to hear, you know, any ideas, you know, if you're okay with that or any other ideas in terms of who we might invite.

I mean we've invited the GAC for quite a few of the last breakfasts but I think having something more formal with them might be what's called for at this point but any thoughts about the board?

Steve DelBianco: I think the noncommercial sorry the noncontract party house the NCUC brethren of ours it's always a great idea to meet with them. But we are also having an intercessional with them in January...

Elisa Cooper: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: ...Washington DC. So given that maybe it's less urgent to have them be an outreach.

The other candidate is the ALAC whose dance card gets very full at an ICANN meeting and we haven't done enough with the ALAC lately. So let's certainly consider them...

Elisa Cooper: Okay.

Steve DelBianco: ...as a candidate.

Elisa Cooper: Okay. Yes, no that - those are both great ideas. And I think in terms of non-contracted parties house I did, you know, I talked to some of the folks over there.

And I think there's a desire to meet us in a more social setting like we've done in the past where we've met for drinks one evening. And I think we could look to coordinate that as well.

All right so let's move on. Any thoughts or comments on any of that stuff? Oh (Susan), I see your hand raised.

(Susan): Yes. So on the board, you know, inviting them for breakfast I think that would be a good idea. And I'm wondering if that would be would we also meet with them later as a CSG?

And I shared this with you and Steve I think. But on the Friday GNSO Council meeting, you know, at the end of the LA meeting Bruce Tonkin said that the board finds all the meetings on constituency day repetitive and bothersome and that they hear the same things from each group basically and they would like to figure out a different way of doing, you know, being updated and doing those meetings.

So I don't know if we could, you know, brainstorm about that. I'm not sure how else can we convey the issues we have. But if we could come up with a new format or something that might be a good idea.

Elisa Cooper: So I can see how they feel that way. We do meet with them as a CSG. So we'll have a talk with the intellectual property constituency and ISPs to get their thoughts.

But, you know, I think this could be a very good thing actually. I feel like we're often rushed in terms of figuring out what it is they even want to say to the board when we meet with the board.

And, you know, if we had more time to prepare and we did something prior to the meeting perhaps we could use that session to answer questions that they have of us.

(Susan): Yes. That might be - that could be interesting because he also made the - you know, with the request for reconsideration he made the comment that, you know, it's like why didn't we pick up the phone and just call?

Elisa Cooper: Yes.

(Susan): And I'd be like how can that happen? And anyway but maybe if we put forward some ideas to communicate better with the board, I don't know, you know. Those are just two comments he made that I - that struck me as something we should pay attention to.

Elisa Cooper: That's really helpful feedback. And I think we'll - let's plan to take that to this full CSG and see what their thoughts are if there might be a better way.

(Susan): Okay.

Elisa Cooper: We might be much more productive if we do things differently I think. And Steve I see your hand raised.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks Elisa. (Susan) thanks for sharing the things that Bruce Tonkin mentioned in that off-site meeting in Los Angeles after the last ICANN meeting.



This is an opportunity, because Bruce Tonkin represents the GNSO, to ask him specifically what he thinks we ought to do because...

Woman: Yes let's...

Steve DelBianco: ...his claim that the CSG meeting with the board on Tuesday, the ccNSO meeting with the board he claims that they're repetitive. But he can't really believe their repetitive of each other because the ccNSO registries I mean they have very different concerns than the CSG.

He might be suggesting it's repetitive for the meetings they do on Sunday.

And I did want to relay to everybody that Bruce told (Susan) and others that he considered the Sunday morning sessions where he and Bill Graham soon to be Markus Coomer sit down for an hour at the, you know, ungodly 7:30 AM meeting on Sunday morning. And he felt those are very productive. And I would agree with them.

So he's not - is he suggesting we do the Sunday morning meeting but not do that Tuesday CSG meeting? Because the CSG meeting quite frankly has been where we have been incredibly effective and unifying the CSG and expressing our concerns, you know, in the strongest possible terms.

And when Fadi graces us with his presence he's able to respond and the board is able to respond to our concerns.

So just because they feel it's repetitive I'd like to understand more about whether it's repetitive to Sunday or do they believe that the series of meetings that they hold on Tuesday are repetitive of each other?

(Susan): Well that would be a good thing to reach out and ask him so...

Steve DelBianco: (Susan) given that you were there to hear him express those comments do you think a personal outreach from you could help you to give advice about how he'd like us to restructure things?

(Susan): Yes let me I can do that. So let me just I'll send him a quick email and see if I can start a dialogue on that.

Steve DelBianco: Let them know that the BC is discussing how to react to the sentiment that he expressed. But we'd like to learn more about the nature of what he thinks the problem is and what he thinks the solution could be.

(Susan): Okay, will do.

Elisa Cooper: Thank you Susan, thank you Steve. Any other thoughts or questions or comments on this topic before we move on to policy?

Okay great. Steve, over to you.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks Elisa. Brenda's been good enough to put up the policy calendar. and we have four open comments right now. And I want to leave lots of times for (Susan) and for (Gabby) our councilors to discuss the two motions that council has to consider next week.

So I- let me quickly dive in and say that the very top of this on Channel 1 I first recounted two comments that we submitted the last couple of weeks.

The first was BC support for changes to GNSO operating procedures -- big thank yous to Ron Andruff who chairs the SEI and J. Scott Evans who drafted the comment.

We put that comment in October 19. Later in the agenda (Gabby) and Ron I hope will be able to discuss amendments to the council resolution on SCI so we can figure out where we stand on that.

The second comment we put in was on October 24. Elisa Cooper thanks to you for drafting it. It was a very well-articulated comment on the registry proposal for two character domains and a handful of new gTLDs like .Berlin, .QE and .Global.

So those two are in and I've already posted them to the BC positions page.

We have for open public comments right now three of which are on the ICANN Public Comment page and one is (Accu) list.

The first is that Neustar has a proposal, sort of a blanket proposal for releasing country and territory names at the second level in brand TLDs.

And as we've discussed in Los Angeles and on emails Neustar's proposal is pretty consistent with things the BC said in 2011 and 2013 when we were commenting on the new applicant guidebook about things like that .brand TLDs.

And this was long before we knew there would be hundreds of dot brands at the time the BC wanted to make it easier for a brand .verizon for instance to be able to light up Canada.verizon, United States.verizon, et cetera, without

having to beg permission from each and every country especially when it was used in a closed way.

So Andy Abrams did some fantastic work on preparing an initial draft. Martin Sutton and David Faris helped out as well. And that draft called V2 was attached to my policy calendar for all to review.

And we want to get this in over the weekend because reply comments close on the 8th of November and today is the 6th.

So I believe that comments that were proposed have been incorporated in V2. And I'll quickly take a cue on this call. Is there anyone that wants to make any comments to amend what it is we plan to submit on the 8th of November?

I don't see any hands up. Martin you had a suggestion that we as soon as we finalize this that you would want to share it personally with the GAC? Is that correct? Do I have that right?

Martin Sutton: Yes either way whether - I'm not quite sure of any process for public comments. But because there was some relevant items there that affect the GAC I thought it's kind of useful for them to be spoon fed some of this and the different perspectives that come through as and when they're posted rather than plow through loads of different types of papers and lots of issues at each ICANN meeting.

So I mean if it's acceptable to others then I can post it to the GAC representative after it's posted on public comments then that's fine. Otherwise I was thinking that it could just be copied in to the GAC chair at the same time.

Steve DelBianco: I'm happy to do that when we submit it. But I would ask you could you send me the email address of the new GAC leadership if you have them?

Martin Sutton: Absolutely.

Steve DelBianco: And then separately...

Martin Sutton: Absolutely.

Steve DelBianco: ...if you have a personal relationship I would ask you to personally send it on to the GAC chair after we have submitted it.

Martin Sutton: I don't yet. But I think this is worthwhile and certainly gives it you know, the perspective from the BC on certain issues that do impact on the GAC. So if there's no objections then I would be very pleased to get the details to make sure that it does go off.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks Martin. Andy Abrams after he submitted an excellent first draft had a footnote to change as well as an additional set of evidence to put into our document.

And Andy was good enough to forward those. And those are all embedded in V2 which I sent you all last night.

So Andy I know that you highlighted the fact that some of the examples we have in here are examples that mention the names of companies that are BC members.

And we all want to be sensitive to ensure that that's okay with those companies. So this is meant to be a great opportunity for Disney, Microsoft.

So any others in the BC who would like to see the examples removed from the draft this would be the opportunity to do that. Any comments?

The examples I'm speaking our show up on Page 3 of the draft labeled V2.

Andy Abrams: Thanks Steve. This is Andy. I'll just add that, you know, these are all public examples in particular in the security section where there were certain very public examples of hacking of ccTLDs and companies such as, you know, Google and Yahoo! are affected by those. But I understand if there are sensitivities to putting that in the draft.

I think they can strengthen the argument a little bit to put in those specific examples. But everybody should take a look and if they want their company names removed to let Steve know. Thanks.

Steve DelBianco: Great. So folks we're all on notice. This comment will be submitted on November the 8th as is under V2 unless I hear otherwise from BC members.

Andy thanks again for all the great work you did there.

Let me move to Item 2 under Channel 1, Item 2. So on the screen in front of you in Adobe it's the Inter Registrar Transfer Policy or IRTP Part D recommendations.

We commented on this back in 24th of April of earlier this year, Chris Chaplow, Stephane Van Gelder and Elisa you were very instrumental in drafting those.

The question for the BC is do we need to file another comment to the board on these final recommendations?

The deadline for this is coming up on December 1 so we have some time for this. And I wanted to let you know that no one has filed any comments yet on what's going to be submitted to the board.

So Stephane and Elisa and Chris were the ones who did the lion's share of the work on this on the IRTP Part D.

One idea is for one or more of the three of you to quickly check with the final recommendations and see if they differ substantially from what the BC recommended back in April of 2014.

That would be an opportunity for us to reiterate a point we made back in April or to simply support the fact that we got what we wanted.

Elisa, Chris, Stephane any interest in taking up that small task?

Elisa Cooper: Okay yes.

Steve DelBianco: That was Elisa saying okay I'll give it a look?

Elisa Cooper: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: You're the best -- appreciate it Elisa.

Elisa Cooper: Can you...

Steve DelBianco: As if you don't do enough already.

Elisa Cooper: Can you just send me the - it's probably posted isn't it? Okay.

Steve DelBianco: Have everything in there. The first two hyperlinks under Item 2...

Elisa Cooper: Okay.

Steve DelBianco: ...the first link...

Elisa Cooper: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: ...it their proposal.

Elisa Cooper: Yes, yes.

Steve DelBianco: The second hyperlink Elisa is to what we submitted in 2014.

Elisa Cooper: Okay great.

Steve DelBianco: All we want to do is a quick compare and see whether we can rubberstamp that, express gratitude that we were listened to or to reiterate that we were not. Thanks Elisa.

I don't see any other hands up on that. Let me jump to number three on the policy calendar. Thanks for Brenda for bringing it up high on the screen.

This is the board's special working group who did a report on how to restructure the nominating committee. And this has been a - an extremely vital topic to the BC.



And with so many BC members in leadership with the NonCom we know a lot about this and care a lot about it. Our history on this goes back several weeks.

And most recently we met in Los Angeles we considered what the board working group had been saying about the NonCom and decide to change our approach a bit.

Now J. Scott Evans took up the unenviable task of completely kind of revisiting our draft comment. And I circulated that to all of you to take a look, would like to get this in by 11th of November which is the full 14 day period knowing that we have until November 30.

But let's get the BC on record after our 14 days. The latest drafting includes edits that Laura Covington of Yahoo! submitted.

And (Mary Jo) had another edit which was more stylistic which we need to address with the drafters to see whether J. Scott and Laura think that (Mary Jo)'s edit improve the clarity of our draft.

I actually don't know if (Mary Jo) - (Mary Jo) and J. Scott are not on the call. So I probably am not going to be able to completely have that discussion unless any of the rest of you have followed the closely.

Laura Covington: Hey Steve it's Laura. I'm on the call but I have not looked at her comments. I will try and pull those up quickly. I - mine were mostly a little minor knits as well so...

Steve DelBianco: They were. And thank you for that Laura. Just before you on the email list (Mary Jo) had submitted a couple of changes the J. Scott accurately

characterized as stylistic over substantive. And I don't think (Mary Jo) took any offense with that.

But it would be helpful to all of us if you took another look at (Mary Jo)'s edit to see if they would improve the draft and then reply all prior to we get to November 11.

Laura Covington: Okay, will do so thanks.

Steve DelBianco: You're the best -- appreciate it. Is there any other BC members want to get in the queue on that one? I know that I only have one more to go?

Great. The next one is Number 4. Brenda slide that up if you don't mind, Number 4. And this is the GAC's subgroup on figuring out how to give the GAC and governments more control over names that have anything to do with geography in the next round of gTLDs.

And so we continually ask the GAC to get involved early in policymaking. We continually ask the GAC to get specific early instead of just dumping letters and principles over the wall.

And now we have a dilemma because the GAC did what we asked them to do. They came up with a plan, a plan that well is really troublesome for businesses to work with if they're proposing a new gTLD and trying to figure whether it has any regional significance whatsoever and then trying to figure out who to go ask for a permission slip from before a geographically significant TLD is even proposed.

I worked closely with Brian Huseman at Amazon who's got a lot of experience in this area as well as some other BC members to try to come up

with a set of draft comments. We circulated those earlier. We'd like to get these in well today because we circulated on 23rd of October. The 14 day comment period ends today but we have flexibility.

November 15 is the due date for this at the GAC. And I believe it was (Gabby) who sent us all a note suggesting that there's a possibility the GAC could extend that. But I don't know why we would need to go beyond November 15 considering we've already had two weeks on these comments.

The ones that I attached included some original drafting, a lot of help from Brian at Amazon. Chris Chaplow added a paragraph that Brian felt was helpful and then Steve Coats offered three comments. And the first comment we put in there, number three we added it as text of the draft.

And then Steve I know you're the line, you had two other comments. And when we looked at them we suggested the first comment on strings that contain only a part of a geographic region it might not be time to dive into that level of detail but rather to do that later. Would you be open to that advice?

Steve if you're on the phone you might be muted.

I'm not hearing Steve so let me move on. Steve had another comment number two where he asked whether...

((Crosstalk))

Man: Stephen Coates might be in the chat room.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you Steve. And then your other comment with respect to the work related, I do believe that is the right word because that's the word the GAC

uses in their own document. And its vague and troublesome which is kind of why we want to use that same word.

So I'm watching you in the chat room to see Steve if you're okay with us accommodating one of your three comments in the pros and the other two comments with this substantive response. Thank you. Thank you Steve.

So this one is still on track to get this in by November the 6th which is today. Are there any BC members on this called who want further comment before we submit this?

All right, fantastic. Thank you. I'd like to turn it over now to (Gabby) and (Susan). Who do we have on the phone? Do we have either (Gabby) or (Susan) on the line today?

Brenda Brewer: (Susan)'s on the line.

Steve DelBianco: (Susan) you're on the line. So we have two motions with respect to your council under Channel 2 that we wanted to cover today.

The first is a motion that's already been noticed and we thought this was going to be routine that the council was simply going to approve the proposed changes to the GNSO operating procedures.

And this is pursuant to the SCI recommendations that the BC endorsed. Ron and (Gabby) have been going back and forth though because there have been some amendments to one particular element of that.

Do we have anyone on the phone who understands those amendments well enough to walk through them in time to give (Susan) and (Gabby) advice for next week's council vote?

(Susan): Is Ron on the line? I don't see him.

Steve DelBianco: He's not (Susan). And this is unfair to you since (Gabby) and (Ron) are the ones going back and forth over the particulars...

(Susan): Yes, no (Gabby) and I talked last night. So the issue is whether the motion is to allow a waiver of the ten day deadline to submit a motion to the council. And the issue is that is that pertain to only new motions or resubmitted motions. And so there has been discussion in the background and new language proposed. And so nothing set in stone right now on the amendment. So Ron has asked that we just sort of follow it until the - and then - and discuss it at the GNSO Council meeting call and then decide if we should move forward. He sort of gave us some parameters on what he would recommend agreeing to. So and I must say I'm not up to speed particularly...

Steve DelBianco: (Unintelligible). This would be one of the first - well I guess it would be the first council meeting at which you'll be casting a ballot for the BC...

(Susan): Yes.

Steve DelBianco: And yes the challenge is if amendments are offered and accepted at the last minute which don't comport with the recommendations and it's tough given the time zones it might be difficult to understand whether it fits with the BC's endorsement of the SCI proposals.

(Susan): Right.

Steve DelBianco: But we'd like to be as helpful as we can. You have the good fortune in this case the chair of the SCI being a BC member who's fairly easy to get a hold of. So unless other BC members have feelings and advice on this we'll leave it to (Susan) and Gabby to work this through with Ron because the BC has already endorsed the SCI proposal. Anything further on that?

(Susan): Not from me.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you. The next one is another motion we expect and it hasn't been formally noticed on the page yet but a motion to have the council adopt the new draft charter for the new cross community working group on ICANN's accountability. The very fact that we're doing a charter is a major victory for the BC who said we didn't want management to tell us who and how could run the enhanced accountability working group. We wanted the community to do a cross community working group. So far so good. This was a strong consensus draft. It's the fourth attachment to my BC policy calendar and I've already seen on council's list some endorsements from none other than Avri Doria who believes it was done quickly and done well. Personally when I reviewed the draft charter and I want to give kudos to David Fares of 21st Century Fox who participated for the BC. To me it's a roadmap to give the community the control of the enhanced accountability mechanisms.

We tip our hat to Larry Strickling and (Fadi Shahadi) who said that we ought to have sub groups, sub work streams for things that had to be done before and after the IANNA transition. But in all other respects this is a charter that allows the community to control the accountability and the mechanisms to hold management and the board accountable to the community. Why don't we take a queue on that. Jim Baskin I know asked about it earlier on the call. Let's take a queue on what's in that draft charter. It's the fourth attachment

before we ask (Susan) and Gabby to vote on it next week. It would be Jim Baskin, (Bill Cortland) and then (Susan).

Jim Baskin: Okay this is Jim Baskin. I looked through the document and I found something that concerns me to an extent and I wanted to share it. It appears that in the goal of the committee - of the group the primary goal is timing. And that to me seems to be the wrong way around and I don't know if there's anything we should try to do about this. But timing, you know, meeting the deadlines, particularly the September timeframe next year seems to trump everything else. And other things I've seen it appears that if we can't get our work done by that time our work may not be - or the work of the group may not be effective. And I don't know if anybody else is concerned about that but I think that they've got the emphasis backwards in parts of the document. It should be the emphasis of getting the accountability process or the components of the accountability defined properly and if we can get it done on the deadline that's great but if we need more time the deadline is not - that initial deadline is not the main goal.

Steve DelBianco: Jim this is Steve and I'm reviewing page two of the draft charter and you're right. It starts off by saying the goal is to deliver proposal to enhance accountability but the first time a goal is articulated it says to do so within the timeline with the expiration date of IANNA. That makes the timing seem more important than the effectiveness of the mechanisms. And that's not what I believe the drafters even intended. So Jim what we should do quickly is make a suggested edit that that little section under the box under goals and objectives that rearranges that - those items. Is that something I can ask you to take first stab at and circulate it to our colleagues?

Jim Baskin: Yes. Oh yes. I know you open your mouth and you get work.

Steve DelBianco: Well it's a great idea and if you don't have the time to do it we'll look for other volunteers. And David Fares I don't believe is on the call...

Jim Baskin: Yes I'm afraid that as a result of the last ICANN meeting I've got a plateful of stuff that is going to keep me from being timely on this. So if anybody else...

Steve DelBianco: I'm willing to take up that cause and quickly get it in but (Susan) it's under page two under goals and objectives. We don't want you to have to make this as a motion on November 13 in front of your colleagues on council. We want to do it well in advance.

(Susan): Right.

Steve DelBianco: Have there been other edits (Susan) that you've seen on council list, edits to the charter?

(Susan): No. You know, what and I may have missed them but I can go back and look.

Steve DelBianco: Okay. While you're checking on that let me turn it over to Phil Corwin. Then we have (Susan) and then (Aparno). Phil. I'm not hearing you Phil.

Phil Corwin: Oh sorry. I took myself off mute. Can you hear me now?

Steve DelBianco: We do.

Phil Corwin: Okay. Yes I sent an email last night after reviewing the charter which focused in on the same concern as Jim which that they're working backwards from the September 2015 which in reality means getting something final out in June of next year to give the community time for final review and get it to the NTA in time as this is going to be coordinated with the IANNA transition. Further



concern it's split into two work streams, one focused on things that must be in place regarding IANNA and then two everything else. And so I'm concerned number one that the timeframe is not realistic.

I can tell you I was on part of the sub group call for the IANNA accountability community working group this morning and they're having a heck of a time meeting their deadlines. They are - have been told they need to put something out for a comment by December 1 to meet this September 2015 deadline when you work back with all the time periods required. I don't know how they're going to have something coherent. I don't know how this ICANN accountability group even on work stream one given that it's about two months behind the IANNA groups can possibly make this and turn out a coherent and properly considered proposal.

And then my other question and concern is that the charter proposed to limit the number of participants in the CCWG is only 2.2 to 5 members per chartering organization. So my - I have two questions. That one why is there a limit? There's been no limit on who can participate in the IANNA transition process and two, what's a chartering organization? Is that the BC or the CSG or the GNSO? I'm concerned about it being too...

Steve DelBianco: BC and IPC are charter organizations Phil.

Phil Corwin: Okay so that would give us up to five for the BC so...

Steve DelBianco: Right that's - and again observers are free to join every call and look at every list. The point is here how many people are involved in the discussion of whether we have consensus...

Phil Corwin: Okay.

Steve DelBianco: ...and a discussion and potentially even the voting.

Phil Corwin: Well again so let's get. That's - I'm less concerned that if the BC gets to up to five participants. But I think we need to think serious about whether this working backwards from September 2015 works and whether in rushing to deliver a product on work stream one we lose all leverage for the really important accountability mechanisms to be addressed in work stream two.

Steve DelBianco: So Phil you're agreeing with Baskin and you're both right. And what we need to do is to draft selective changes to page two because just asking David Fares questions at this point is not going to get it done. We need to draft words that we think capture the idea that we're going to do our best in this working group to fit within the September 2015. That should be among our goals but it isn't the overreaching goal. The overreaching goal is to get accountability right and we'll do our best. So can I ask you to work with me at rearranging what's in the box on page two?

Phil Corwin: Sure. I'd be happy to work with you Steve.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you and of course any other volunteers readily available. So what we want to do is instead of pressing David with questions we want to come up with drafts that still capture our intentions but just change the priorities, flip the priorities on getting it right before getting it done by September 2015. Thank you Phil. Appreciate that. (Susan) and then (Aparna).

(Susan): Actually I just wanted to earlier just wanted to make sure that Phil had sounded off on this because he - the email thread that I was following with his comments so.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks (Susan). (Aparna)?

(Aparna): Hi sorry. I think I was on mute. I was just going to say I'm happy to offer a suggestion. You know, I didn't have that impression when I first read it but on second reading I think it could be made more clear that the timing is not - should not be the driver of this or the end product should be the driver. And so I'm happy to take a crack at it or collaborate with whoever is interested.

Steve DelBianco: Wonderful (Aparna). Thank you. Phil do you have time to take first draft of that section two and then (Aparna) and I, David, others will come in on top of that?

Phil Corwin: I'll try. I'll try Steve. Let's confer after this. I'm just kind of overwhelmed with other working groups I'm on including the curative rights for IGO and INGOs which is a very sensitive issue between...

Steve DelBianco: Well if you can't do it - if you can't get to it share your thoughts off the top of your head when we're done with the call. (Aparna) you're still in Korea aren't you?

(Aparna): No I'm back.

Steve DelBianco: Oh good, good, good. Well thanks for going in any event. And...

(Aparna): Yes. No I'm happy to do it like in the next six hours. Does that work?

Steve DelBianco: It does. It does. It works fine. Absolutely. If you want to take first crack at it then Phil and I and others can weigh in.

Phil Corwin: Yes thanks (Aparna).

Steve DelBianco: Thanks (Aparna).

(Aparna): Yes I mean I think that in the time we've spent talking about it we probably could have concluded it but I'll take a crack.

Steve DelBianco: (Aparna) thank you very much and then we'll make sure David's involved and the entire BC and then ultimately we want (Susan) and Gabby to have the best ability to present it to their colleagues on list well in advance of next week's vote. I know for a fact that drafters of a charter get prickly when council members make edits to their text. So we have to handle it very sensitively in a way that we hope will gain the support where David Fares one of the drafters says I'm on board and Avri Doria, Keith Drasek and others all get it that we just simply need to clarify. We're not putting time ahead of getting it right. Anyone else in the queue on this?

Jim Baskin: Hi yes Jim.

Steve DelBianco: Go ahead Jim.

Jim Baskin: Yes I wanted to go back to the comment about the chartering organizations and the participation. I think in your response you said the BC is a chartered organization. I guess that means that the charter of the organization, you know, has graded us and therefore we are chartered. But I'm not sure if that's the same thing as what they're referring to here as a chartering organization. To me that's the organizations that are chartering this charter. And I'm not sure that people would agree that the BC and the IPC down at that level are the chartering organizations. There's no definition as far as I can see in the document itself about what a chartering organization is.

Steve DelBianco: Yes Jim I'm looking through the document now to see if we can figure this out. If there's any question then we should never rely on my interpretation. We should as you say go back. David Fares hasn't replied to Phil's question on this yet has he?

(Susan): Not that I've seen.

Phil Corwin: No I haven't received any reply from David. I think he's just, you know, not able to get back yet.

Steve DelBianco: Got it. Then I will get back to David and ask for clarification on that right after this call and that will guide us. If in fact the BC doesn't get to appoint multiple members we are going to have a concern right from the get go. So let's continue to proceed on what (Aparna) and Phil discussed with respect to the timing versus goal. Let's do that in parallel with getting clarification as to the membership. We'll do both. Well thanks everyone. Great discussion. (Aparna) I'm glad you're there because we wanted to turn next to channel four which is anything you would want to report to us on what's been happening with the IANNA coordination group which has both names, protocols and numbers.

(Aparna): Yes thanks for the opportunity. I have to confess that I have been a little bit behind on that given that I was in (unintelligible) for the (unintelligible). But I think based on my reading of a list like the most activity is actually happening on the main side which Phil alluded to and there has been a big flurry of activity around kind of what a transition proposal actually looks like for the main community. So I'll just highlight a couple of the specific issues and I'm sure Phil can weigh in more in depth. So questions like should the IANNA function remain within ICANN? Should it become a subsidiary? Should a new entity be created entirely? What do the funding mechanisms look like? And,

you know, are there jurisdictional concerns? You know, will we want to somehow change the jurisdiction of the IANNA function from the state of California to somewhere else?

And I think, you know, it's probably worth a longer discussion among members of the BC on some of these questions. I mean on some of them I think I know where people would shake out. For example the jurisdictional question I wasn't surprised if anyone thought it was a great idea to move the jurisdiction from California to elsewhere. But I think some of them probably are worth a bit of a longer discussion at some point, you know.

Steve DelBianco: Any others want to ask questions or comment on (Aparna)'s report? (Aparna) what's your assessment of whether the relative progress between the protocols, the numbers and the naming people. Are they likely to be done at different times?

(Aparna): I think not. I think that the calls and the numbers people are ahead. And I think you could see a sort of - I'm speculating but I think you could see a world in which in September 2015 you'll have a completed proposal from the protocol so and a completed proposal from numbers. And then sort of the beginnings of a proposal on names. And then, you know, it's not just a function of what transition without the names being done but NTIA could start evaluating the first key components in the process. I don't have a strong view about whether that's good or bad but I think it's at least a possibility.

Steve DelBianco: And as I reported last week (Aparna) the general accounting office of the U.S. governor GAO was tasked by Congress, not the Administration but tasked by Congress to evaluate these proposals. And as I reported in a meeting with them we alerted them to the fact that there are multiple plans coming back and that the GAO should start to evaluate whatever it can whenever it comes over.

So I think that they have the impression they're happy to look at transition plans even if they come over in piecemeal, right. Numbers and protocols could come over long before naming or accountability and GAO was supposed to look at them quickly. (Carl) I see your hand up. Go ahead. I'm not hearing you (Carl). You might be on mute. All right not hearing (Carl) unless he can come back into the queue. (Aparna) anything else you wanted to add on the IANNA stewardship? Great. Thanks everyone. Let me turn it back over to you Elisa.

Elisa Cooper: Thank you Steve. I believe that Jim (unintelligible) was also unable to join us today. And so I think that brings us to the end of our call unless there are any other items that folks would like to discuss. We do have eight minutes left today which I will gladly give you back. But we also do have that time. So if there are any other topics that anyone would like to raise or things that we should be talking about or anything along those lines let me ask if there are. I see Jim you have your hand raised.

Jim Baskin: Sorry just turned my mute on. Yes I wondered if anybody that like (Aparna) who was at the (Plenty Pot) could give us two minutes about the - some of the final results. I think they've been voted on already.

(Aparna): Yes I'm happy to do that for you. So the final vote they don't normally vote but the final signing will be tomorrow Korea time. And it was actually a surprisingly successful meeting. So there were a whole host of people that could have affected the internet whether in the form of increased content resolution and filtering, standards development, proposals for the (unintelligible) to become a regional internet registry. Proposals from India for the IQ to develop standards for routing and increasing of tactic proposals for the IQ to develop what's called an IQ mark. What's the sub plant being used? The regional and national certification processes for consumer

equipment, proposals for the IQ to more heavily regulate tiering and interconnection agreements among network operators.

So really at every level of the staff there were proposals for increase anti-governmental control. And I think the bulk of the bad proposals were all sort of defeated. And this was absolutely not a foregone conclusion given that the U.S. and a lot of its allies for the (unintelligible) of the U.S., you know, are influenced in country in the global stages is pretty low after the Snowden revelations. And sort of these surveillance revelations have really given other countries the justification for increasing inter-governmental involvement regardless of whether or not they're at all related to sort of (unintelligible) model or the way ICANN works.

So I gave a sort of highlight of all of the issues but I think probably the ones that are more - most interesting to folks on this call would be the ones around IT address registry and around routing and addressing. Happy to go into more detail but I think folks are feeling like for those people who support a free and open internet it was a pretty big outcome.

Elisa Cooper: Thank you for that (Aparna).

(Aparna): Sure.

Elisa Cooper: Very helpful. Any additional questions or comments on that topic or any other topics that we should raise on our call today? Okay...

Laura Covington: Yes Elisa.

Elisa Cooper: Yes. Yes go ahead.



Laura Covington: I just wondered how many folks were on that Net Mundial call and any preliminary reactions to that. I joined this call a little late. So if you've already touched on it I'll get a download from others. I was on the call but I just was curious about reactions. I was kind of underwhelmed but.

Elisa Cooper: So I was not on the call. Were there others on the call?

Phil Corwin: Yes this is Phil. I was on the call and I share (Laura)'s feeling of underwhelment. Just to give a - I took a few brief notes. (Fadi) said it's all about action and it's going to use crowd sourcing mechanisms and quote it's going to be the mother of all bottom up models and anyone can join.

Laura Covington: But at the same time they can't - they're not the decision makers it sounded like right? I mean it's like.

Phil Corwin: Yes and...

Laura Covington: A very weird kind of - it's like IGF but we think we're cooler than IGF. I don't know. It sounded like a bizarre mix of the sort of veiled one net or whatever the thing was last year with the online component and then this sort of IGF super or something. But still not (unintelligible) action items...

Phil Corwin: Yes well I asked and several people asked, you know, how is this different from or add to the IGF and it was kind of vague. It'll be about action or that's up to the community to create - use this space to create solutions. Just the other important points is that CGI Brazil, ICANN and World Economic Firm they're all going to place one person on a transitional committee to facilitate selections for a coordination council and then this transition group will fall away early next year once that council is up. In the chat it seemed like a lot of people from the developing world still weren't buying in. So I'm just not sure

what the purpose is. It would almost be better if they just said it's to get, you know, big corporations that participate in WEF up to speed on internet governance issues. But instead it's very vague as to what the goals are and what the differentiator is from IGF and it's not clear how enthusiastic the community is going to be in joining up with this. But we'll just wait and see.

Elisa Cooper: I think I may have seen another hand raised. (Ellen). Are you on mute (Ellen)? I think (Ellen) is typing something here. So I don't think we're able to hear (Ellen). Any other questions or comments or thoughts on the webinar, the Net Mundial webinar from others? All right with that - oh did somebody have a comment.

Woman: I just (unintelligible) sorry.

Elisa Cooper: With that I think we're at time. So I want to thank everyone for joining today. Just to let you know I will take as an action item I'll be reaching out to the GAC to see if they will be available to meet with us and then we'll continue to take it to the list in terms of what want to do with the breakfast and begin our preparations for the upcoming meeting in Singapore. And I think that's it for now. So I will let you know that there will be another call with (Fadi), his monthly call, and that will be on November 19. And as we get a little bit closer and when I have some more information I'll be sure to send that out to let you know basically what goes on with that call and what is discussed. So with that I want to thank you and we will speak soon. Thank you so much.

Coordinator: Thank you everyone for joining today's conference and (Damon) would you please stop the recording.

END