

ICANN

**Moderator: Gisella Gruber White
November 28, 2013
10:00 am CT**

Coordinator: Excuse me, this is the Operator. Just need to inform all participants today's conference call is being recorded. If you have any objections you may disconnect your line at this time. And you may begin.

Benedetta Rossi: Thank you very much, (Laurie). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the BC Members call taking place on the 24th of October, 2013.

Man: Yes, thank you.

Benedetta Rossi: On the call today we have Jimson Olufuye, Elisa Cooper, Angie Graves, Gabriella Szlak, Chris Chaplow, Steve DelBianco and Jim Baskin. We have apologies from Ayesha Hassan, Marilyn Cade, David Ferris, Phil Corwin, John Berard, Stéphane van Gelder, Barbara Wanner, Andrew Mack and Sarah Deutsch. And Richard Friedman has just joined the call, by the way.

Thank you very much and over to you, Elisa.

Elisa Cooper: Thanks, Benedetta. Well there's a couple items that I want to cover and then turn to really a policy update and a bit of a discussion. But the first thing that I want to talk about is our upcoming meeting in Buenos Aires and exactly what we should be spending our time on there.

It seems like, clearly, this whole issue around the Montevideo statement is just a huge issue. And I'm scheduled to talk to Fadi next Thursday as the Chair of the Business Constituency so I sent out just earlier today a request for questions to be posed to Fadi. And I've already received some and so that will be very helpful.

And I've been told that that call will be recorded so it will be made publicly available. The other attendees on that call are the other leaders from the other constituencies. So I think it'll be a very interesting call.

And for those of you who are not totally familiar with what this Montevideo statement and what is everyone so concerned about it's the fact that there's a call for greater internationalization both with ICANN and mostly with the IANA function.

And the IANA function is the function that actually does the technical management of adding to the root zone new gTLDs and management of TLDs in the root zone.

And right now the US government has a contract for doing that service. And what's being called for is essentially to internationalize that. And I would assume that means taking it away from the United States.

And so I think there is a ton of ramifications for this. And I don't know what I still think about all, I mean, I'm very concerned about it so I'm very curious to

see what Fadi has to say because I think this all came as a surprise that he was moving forward with this. When he made a statement I had no idea and I think others had no idea that he was on this path.

So we'll have to see but I would be curious to hear what thoughts are from others and what kind of questions you would like me to ask him.

((Crosstalk))

Elisa Cooper: Or just any thoughts at all about - or questions maybe others might be able to answer. Steve.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks Elisa. I submitted a post this morning to CircleID. It's similar to the interview I did in IDG last week. I really think you need to see the IANA contract as a tether that holds ICANN to the Affirmation of Commitments. The affirmation of Commitments, for all its imperfections, is the only document we have to hold ICANN accountable and transparent and to hold it to doing reviews and then implementing the recommendations of the reviews.

I can't even imagine how we hold ICANN accountable if they walk away from the Affirmation and they can. And the only reason ICANN stays in the Affirmation is they knew that if they walked away the US government wouldn't give them the IANA contract. That's the leverage. Those are tied inexplicably.

And a Fadi knows this. So for them to take IANA and assert that it's the world's decision, not the USG's decision, allows ICANN to walk away from the Affirmation. So whether you think that's a good or bad thing you have to evaluate it in the light of what world we would be moving to, not just the world we are moving away from but what world are we moving to.

I think it's ridiculous to sever the ICANN IANA leverage relationship and accountability unless we know the new accountability structure that we're going into. And the biggest risk in that accountability structure is that if it's governmentally managed and controlled like the UN or ITU, any of you who've been to a UN or ITU meeting realize that the private sector sits in the back of the room. They can watch but they don't have a flag on their desk and they don't get to vote at all ever.

So all of us who build the Internet, build the content, the civil society that cares about freedoms of expression and safety, there is no vote in that regime. So look at CircleID; it should be up in about an hour and I have a rather long post in there and anxious to be participating, Elisa, on that call if I can if the officers are permitted. But if not most of my concerns are expressed in that post. Thanks.

Elisa Cooper: So we received an email just today where they asked for just the chairs. I actually asked if all of the BC members could join and was politely turned down on that request. And then today I just saw something that adds just that the chairs attend.

So, Steve, what do you - like...

Steve DelBianco: Yeah, my post is called quote unquote, Rethinking ICANN is not a one-man job.

Elisa Cooper: Yeah.

Steve DelBianco: Right? So...

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: ...let's have a conversation. Let's understand the implications and know where we're going.

Elisa Cooper: Yeah.

Steve DelBianco: So I will refer you to that post. And if you wish I could probably turn it into some specific questions you could put to Fadi. But undoubtedly they'll be questions that your fellow other chairs will probably ask as well. Fadi is playing defense right now. He's trying to walk back a little bit from the statements that have been made. And yet the cat is out of the bag, right?

Elisa Cooper: Yeah.

Steve DelBianco: These governments are now, as Marilyn, the blue helmets are walking around together. And I think that they consider Fadi one of their own at this point. It's going to be hard for him to walk away from that.

Elisa Cooper: Just in your personal opinions like what do you - what would be the worst-case scenario that you could see? Like could it be possible that whoever takes over the IANA contract would refuse, for instance, to add, you know, DotSex to the root zone because they find that objectionable?

Steve DelBianco: Very unlikely. Very unlikely in my opinion. I believe the most likely thing is the Affirmation is a document that currently only one government signed; only the US government signed the Affirmation thereby claiming that it pledges to stay in the GAC and support the multistakeholder model.

If IANA contract is gone with 120 days notice...

Elisa Cooper: Yeah.

Steve DelBianco: ...the intergovernmental entity running ICANN will simply cancel this US Government bilateral agreement. It would be inconceivable that they would keep it up there. They might replace it with something else and we might like that something else that we have to have an opportunity to have input on that.

So the worst-case scenario is the Affirmation disappears within 120 days. All the reviews are done. There is no more Affirmation of Commitments review on Whois, no review on the new TLD program, no accountability and transparency review because the only reason those things are there is because they Affirmation required them.

Right? So we lose those reviews. They're just gone. There are no metrics on the new gTLD the program. And more than likely we'd continue to go to ICANN meetings. There'd be lip service to community input like there is today lip service. But ultimately you have to believe the GAC would control the decisions that get made and there'd be no review process to challenge that.

Elisa Cooper: Thanks Steve. Chris.

Steve DelBianco: That'll brighten your day.

Elisa Cooper: Yeah. So I got that. I'll be honest, I mean, I did send our letter that we developed on the singular and plural issue. And I kind of felt a little bit like I was just - I don't want to say that we're on the Titanic but I felt like I was rearranging some deck chairs when there was a much - there seems like this is a much, I mean, significantly bigger issue that we should...

Steve DelBianco: Yeah, but ironically on - you're right but the deck chairs do matter in this respect. The governments who covet a greater role share our concern that the singular plural confusion...

((Crosstalk))

Elisa Cooper: Yeah, yeah, yeah, right.

Steve DelBianco: So at least on that issue you're putting the chairs in the right place.

Elisa Cooper: Yeah, yeah. I just feel like this is so potentially - I don't want to say catastrophic but anyway. Chris.

Chris Chaplow: thank you, Elisa. Just before I ask my - well suggest my quick - my question - I just wanted to just ask Steve from my perspective the Affirmation of Commitment sort of came out of nowhere. Maybe there was something going on before I was really involved in ICANN.

And in that have you got any perspective on that - and what was there before if there hadn't been an Affirmation what would there have been? The thing that you are saying is so important and I agree with you.

Steve DelBianco: Right, so a quick...

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: ...history lesson and when the US created the Internet and created ICANN that said in the white paper let's have a memorandum of understanding, people called it the MOU 11 years ago, and said it calls for a gradual transition so that ICANN would be a fully international - internationalized

multistakeholder decision-making model. And that turned into a joint partnership agreement, or a JPA.

And that was a document whereby the US continued to commit to a transition and wanted to hold ICANN to certain milestones on the accountability and transparency front before it would be given full independence.

And then in September of 2009 the final JPA expired and over the course of two months (Paul Levins) and the Commerce Department here, worked very hard to write the Affirmation of Commitments.

And, like you, I think it's a brilliant document. It affirms the government's commitment to be in ICANN and it affirms ICANN's commitment to serve global public interest and do these reviews. It is, however, cancelable by either party.

And unfortunately no other governments took my challenge when I handed out pens and said please sign the Affirmation; show that you too want to support the ICANN multistakeholder model and hold ICANN accountable. That happens at a higher level of pay in diplomatic circles so they weren't ready to do that.

So it replaced the MOU and the JPA. It was really a - it's as close as anything to a constitution for ICANN. And absent that all you have our bylaws and articles and the constitution would have to be replaced with something else if we're lucky.

Chris Chaplow: Thanks, Steve. Elisa, if just - I'll ask my original question - well the question will be a suggestion to ask Fadi would be why he felt he had to sign the

Montevideo agreement now and not after the Buenos Aires meeting where he'd had consult with the community. Thanks.

Elisa Cooper: That's a great question. Any other questions or thoughts around this particular issue? Angie.

Angie Graves: Yeah, this is Angie Graves. I'd like some expectations set. So if I were to have a conversation with Fadi I would - I'd like to hear a little bit more elaboration of what's to come in the near term and what his expectations and goals are with this direction.

Elisa Cooper: Okay great. So I've taken notes on both of those questions. But if I could just ask both of you to quickly send me an email so I capture it exactly. I'm not sure I'll have the transcripts by the time the call happens. That would be super helpful. Any other thoughts or questions before we move on?

Oh and I see on the Chat Gabby says that you'll also check with (unintelligible).

All right, I would like, you know, obviously I think this will be a topic for discussion kind of depending on what we hear next Thursday from Fadi in terms of what we discuss in our meeting although I'm not necessarily - I guess we can discuss what approach we might take or how we might react to what we learn from the call on Thursday and have that as part of our discussion in Buenos Aires.

But are there any other topics that people would like to spend time on in Buenos Aires? And I see Angie's hand raised but I'm not sure if that's new or from before.

Angie Graves: From before. Dropping now. Thanks.

Elisa Cooper: Okay. Are there other areas that people would like to spend time on as a group while we're all together face-to-face?

Angie Graves: I'm going to raise my hand again this is Angie Graves.

Elisa Cooper: Okay. I'm glad.

Angie Graves: Well Chris and I had a conversation a little bit earlier this week. And Chris, forgive me if I'm speaking out of turn. But we both realized that this is the last meeting before any kind of financial chair transition...

Elisa Cooper: Okay.

Angie Graves: ...that would be worthwhile to touch on at least meaning open issues, things that any incoming financial chair would want to be aware of and the BC as a whole.

Elisa Cooper: Okay. Is that something, Chris, you would be okay with?

Chris Chaplow: Yes, I can do a short presentation sort of fairly open thoughts, ideas, and where we're going that sort of thing.

Elisa Cooper: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Chris Chaplow: Yeah.

Elisa Cooper: Great. Other ideas, things that people want to discuss maybe around new gTLDs, maybe around rights protection mechanisms, maybe about privacy proxy abuse, maybe around the new gTLD directory service - gTLD directory services, formerly known as Whois.

Anjali Hansen: Elisa, this is Anjali. I think I accidentally logged off of your Adobe. I can't raise my hand.

Elisa Cooper: Oh no worries.

Anjali Hansen: I'm going to try to get back on. Sorry about that. So I would like to just say something about the proposed outreach project. Maybe I could just give a little presentation there - it doesn't have to be long - about some thoughts that we've had - the group that we're working with on outreach...

Elisa Cooper: Okay.

Anjali Hansen: ...for businesses. Because that way we can try to get more input in person while we're there.

Elisa Cooper: Yeah, that sounds great.

Anjali Hansen: If we have time. If not, you know, you can get it off the agenda. But if we're looking for topics...

Elisa Cooper: Yeah, no I think it would be good to spend a little time to talk about outreach and - for the entire group in terms of, you know, we've had some, you know, I'd say we've had, you know, good additional membership, you know, in this last period but certainly it could be a lot better.

And also just outreach in general, not necessarily focused so much on membership, but kind of like what you're concerned with in terms of getting small to medium businesses even aware of what's going on and what the issues are.

Anjali Hansen: Right. And we've been working on - Gabby and I and also some others have been working on some slides that we could maybe put together for this first Buenos Aires conference for the Latin American outreach efforts.

So maybe even like some - like the FAQ sheets and we had also talked about translating the most recent newsletter and some information about the BC into Spanish and Portuguese. So I'm hoping that's happening. I haven't followed through. But I'll do that before the meeting.

Elisa Cooper: Okay. Benedetta, are we going to - are we going to make some updates to the FAQ sheet and have that translated as well? I know Benedetta just send out some timing for articles for our newsletter. But I didn't see anything, Benedetta, about...

((Crosstalk))

Benedetta Rossi: Yes, that is the aim.

Elisa Cooper: Okay so we'll also make some minor - I think the edits to the FAQ sheet have to do with - I think it mentions Durban and it needs to be...

Benedetta Rossi: Exactly. It's mainly about making it more aimed at Latin American businesses rather than Africa businesses.

Anjali Hansen: And I'm happy to look at that too if anyone wants another pair of eyes on it.

Elisa Cooper: Yeah, that would be awesome.

Anjali Hansen: So just send it around and then, Benedetta, you're going to get that translated then? Or do we need to do anything?

Benedetta Rossi: No, that's fine. We will take care of that.

Anjali Hansen: Oh great. Thank you so much.

Benedetta Rossi: You're welcome.

Elisa Cooper: Okay...

Anjali Hansen: That's all I have.

Elisa Cooper: Oh yeah, yeah, go ahead.

Anjali Hansen: No, that's all I have, I said.

Elisa Cooper: Okay.

Anjali Hansen: Sorry.

Elisa Cooper: Any other ideas? And if you want to think about it and then just send them to the list that's fine too. And then I guess the final thing worth mentioning and I'm sure you've probably all seen this but I feel like it's worth a mention is that, you know, ICANN has now delegated the first four new gTLD registries. They're all IDNs.

Even though they've now been delegated we actually do not yet have timelines for them but I'm sure that will be coming out soon and I'm sure they're all anxious to start either their notice period or their sunrise period soon. But I know that businesses are obviously very curious and concerned and are kind of going to be watching those carefully.

Steve DelBianco: Elisa, if you could please? This is Steve. I don't think we will see any significant number of domain collisions with these. These are four IDN....

Elisa Cooper: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: ...TLDs. And we are very unlikely to see a collision between an ASCII internal domain name and an IDN that starts with XN dash dash. So at least that won't be a problem in these four.

Elisa Cooper: Yeah. I think even with these IDNs they did identify anywhere between a couple hundred to maybe it was like 600 lookups that have ever occurred or that occurred in the day in the life studies. So those names that had been looked up that weren't like - so there were some like computer-generated lookups that happened and those were...

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: By the Google Chrome.

Elisa Cooper: Yeah. Those were not - those will not be added to the black list. But the other will so those will not be available for registration at the time that the registries open, it will be put on reserve name lists. And, you're right, I'm sure we'll - that will not be any kind - I would hope that that would not be an issue in terms of collisions.

All right that is kind of all I wanted to cover. I actually sent out an update from John Berard about what's going on at the Council and what's coming up in their next meeting. And I don't know if, Steve, you'd like me to cover that in John's absence or if you would like to cover that? It probably falls more under policy but I'm good either way.

Steve DelBianco: Is it your - this is Steve. Is it your desire that we walk through John's memo or walk through the Council agenda? What's your preference?

Elisa Cooper: Probably just walk through his memo.

Ron Andruff: Excuse me, Elisa, this is Ron. I'm just getting in late. I apologize for interrupting. I tried to get into Adobe Connect. I've been on hold in the waiting mode for some time. Just wonder if someone might check that? Thank you.

Elisa Cooper: So you were on the conference line waiting for the operator to answer?

Chris Chaplow: Elisa, Chris here. No I think he said Adobe Connect. Probably Bennie has to...

((Crosstalk))

Elisa Cooper: Oh okay.

Chris Chaplow: Thanks. And he's gone anyway. Carry on.

Benedetta Rossi: I actually see him already on the AC room.

Elisa Cooper: Okay. At any rate, Steve, yeah, I was thinking we would just kind of briefly walk through his email that he sent. And I'm happy to do that...

Steve DelBianco: Great.

Elisa Cooper: ...or if you wanted...

Steve DelBianco: Happy to do it.

Elisa Cooper: Okay.

Steve DelBianco: And the agenda - again, this is October the 31st, a week from today, a Council call. They will consider a vote of the PDP on Thick Whois. And this is of course important because it helps to move the two big registries than use thin Whois, that's Com and Net, it helps to start that move from thin Whois to thick Whois a substantive move to a more standardized Whois regime but it one that's likely to be significantly changed as we move to the directory services which Susan and the Expert Work Group are working on.

There's another motion that's alongside that which is to start a PDP on translating and transliterating the information that's in Whois. That's a complement to what happens in thick Whois and therefore local language could be included in the Whois database. And Zahid seconded that motion so the BC will support it.

There's another motion on - any questions on that?

Elisa Cooper: I think, Steve, we should just remind members we did write a set of comments - and we've written many comments on, you know, for support of thick Whois. And just a reminder what thick Whois versus thin Whois is all about,

when it's a thick Whois that means all of the ownership information is held by the registry. And today for Com and Net that's not the case, the registry VeriSign doesn't hold that information.

Today what happens is it's actually the registrar and there's, you know, hundreds and hundreds of registrars, they hold the full contact information and so moving to thick helps to ensure a great consistency.

Steve DelBianco: All the new gTLDs use the thick Whois model.

Elisa Cooper: Right. Thanks, Steve.

Steve DelBianco: Another motion is one about process. The Council itself has long had a - kind of a temporary committee on improvements to how the GNSO Council operates and they want to move it to a structured or standing committee so that it's a permanent committee. So that's a vote that councilors make based on their views as to whether this committee is constantly going to have things to look at and therefore it needs to be more permanent in nature.

And to me it's not a policy question, it's more of a process one. And I'm very happy to defer to Zahid and John since they're on the Council, to know whether it needs a permanent committee as opposed to temporary. Are there any strongly held views by BC members on this call that we want to advise John and Zahid about?

Great, let me go to the next one.

Ron Andruff: Steve, I'm sorry, it's Ron.

Steve DelBianco: Go ahead, Ron.

Ron Andruff: Yes, I'm actually the chair of the SCI on behalf of the BC. And just a few words to what's happened here. Our charter now, as the SCI has been in operation since the last GNSO review, and all of the implementation issues that came up and if there were things that were not moving smoothly or there were some complications of some sort we were responsible for dealing with making sure those things got all the rough edges knocked off and could operate smoothly and we would send them back to Council.

Over time the question was whether or not we should still be operational or not. So we had a long debate with the committee and we ultimately took it back to the Council for their review. And it was determined they would like to have us continue or have the SCI continue as a standing committee to continue the work that it's doing. So this new charter really reflects that.

And the second element is whether or not the standing committee should be operational on the rule of unanimous voting - unanimous consensus or whether it should be a - the next level down in the five levels of consensus which is where one or two may oppose but it will pass on the basis of having majority.

And that's the issue that's being looked at right now within Council. They'll make that determination and then finalize the charter. Thank you.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks, Ron, and thanks for serving on all those improvement committees. There's also going to be a motion on approving a charter for a PDP to look at privacy and proxy provider accreditation. This is something that was carved out of the new Registrar Accreditation Agreement negotiations.

And the BC has a pending draft comment on this accreditation process that was authored by Elisa and Susan Kawaguchi. Elisa, I think that you're just putting some final touches on that and we'll circulate it for a member review since that comment period closes the 13th of November.

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: There will be a vote on the charter itself. And I believe that the charter is close enough to what we need to study that the PDP charter should be approved. And I imagine our councilors will support it. Are there any comments on the charter for the PDP on privacy and proxy accreditation?

Finally, there's a discussion - and John Berard believes that most of the time at Council will be on these discussions. The first one is on protecting at the top and second level things like Red Cross and the Olympics and hundreds of other intergovernmental - nongovernmental organizations.

That comment is due November the 1st. We found no BC volunteers to pull together the text. So the BC will submit a list of views on those protections that Elisa and I initially drafted. And I'll try to get it in over the weekend.

The other hot topic of discussion is the singular and plural TLDs also broadly known as the string confusion discussion. We tend to focus on the singular plural as the most blatant example of how these panels and then the arbitrators afterwards are reaching inconsistent results; all of which was covered in a letter that Elisa sent in to ICANN on Monday.

There is no motion on that but it should be pretty exciting. John notes in his email that all of us can dial in and listen. You don't dial in on the phone, you

just use the - go to the Council agenda and there's an MP3 audio capability.
You can listen but you can't interrupt or talk about the Council meeting.

If you miss it because of the time zone issues it's at 7:00 Eastern Time. You can always dial in at a different time and listen to the MP3 once it's archived a day or so after the Council meeting is over.

Elisa, that's all that John had in his update. I'll stop there.

Elisa Cooper: Thanks, Steve. Should we move on to - unless there are any questions from anyone? Should we move on to our policy discussions? Seeing the there are no questions I think we should talk about some of the upcoming comments that are - comment periods that are coming up and also just recap where we are in terms - I know we've got - I know you submitted a comment today and we...

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: Right, there are four of them. I can go through them quickly for you, Elisa.

Elisa Cooper: Yes, that'd be great.

Steve DelBianco: Great. The first was on the public interest commitments made by a registry operator in the new TLDs. These public interest commitments, or PICs, are subject to dispute resolution when anyone claims that the registry isn't following its public interest commitments.

This was a hot topic for the BC. We really did pioneer the work of adding the PIC commitments because we were concerned that registries or new TLD

applicants wouldn't feel any obligation to uphold promises they made when they put their application in.

Gabby and Anjali took the lead on researching and drafting those comments. And we circulated them for the full 14 days and submitted them and finalized them today so those are the PICDRP. They've been filed. I circulated to the BC this morning. Again, Gabby and Anjali, thank you very much for your work on that.

A second is the privacy and proxy accreditation service comment. It's only a two-pager at this point. Elisa and Susan did the initial drafting. And I imagine Elisa and Susan have something suitable to circulate to all of you in the next day. We'll have until 13th of November to get that turned around.

The intergovernmental organization/nongovernmental organization, that's the IGO/NGO that I spoke of earlier, I will only submit the BC comments as a list of yeses and nos with some minor explanation and I'll submit that over the weekend.

Now we have a new comment coming up, the Accountability and Transparency Review Team second edition, we call it the ATRT2. Their comment period just opened because they've circulated their draft recommendations on the second round.

This is a review that's required under the Affirmation of Commitments that we talked about earlier on today's call. The first two items that I think will deserve attention is that they want to assess whether ICANN properly implemented the recommendations of the four previous review teams and those include the Whois review team and the ATRT1 from two years ago.

They also want to talk about better ways to run these reviews because they really are a great deal of work for the people that are involved and it's difficult to get the community input that everyone expected since the community is stretched a bit thin, what do they call it volunteer fatigue.

These comments are just opened up and they are usually something that the BC is vocal on. So we have a small number of BC members on the call today. I won't put a lot of pressure to look for volunteers. If anybody wants to volunteer for this please put up your hand. Otherwise I will circulate an email to the BC highlighting the fact that this public comment is now open and we need some volunteers to draft BC comments.

Elisa, that's all I've got there. Happy to take questions.

Elisa Cooper: So just as a reminder we are scheduled to meet in Buenos Aires with the ATRT2 as part of our CSG meeting. So they will probably be asking us our perspectives and I'm sure by that time we will - some of us will have read the report and we will be working on our comments. But we will have some time to actually interact with them face to face in Buenos Aires. Anjali, I see your hand is raised.

Anjali Hansen: Steve, what is the timeframe for having to do these comments? What's the deadline of having a draft that would have to circulate to the BC?

Steve DelBianco: Let me bring that up for you right now. The comment period - the first period closes November the 22 so figure about November the 8th would be the day we would circulate to the BC so that we'd have our 14 days and get it in on schedule. So there's quite a bit of time to assess and draft those comments, November the 8th, circulate it to the BC. Thank you.

Anjali Hansen: Okay so I'll volunteer. I don't know if anyone wants to help me out on that. I have volunteered (unintelligible) the committee to do the next review for the consumer metrics evaluation of the new TLD program. So I've been notified by ICANN that I'm on that review team, by the way.

Elisa Cooper: Oh congratulations.

((Crosstalk))

Elisa Cooper: Thank you, that's awesome.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Anjali, that's great news. And thank you for volunteering on taking a look at the ATRT2.

Back to you, Elisa.

Elisa Cooper: So I actually do not have any other topics for us to discuss. We definitely have time to discuss any other business. So does anyone have any other topic that they would like to cover or discuss? I see Chris's hand is up and I see Anjali but I think that was from before. Chris.

Anjali Hansen: Sorry, I'll take it down.

Elisa Cooper: Oh yeah, no worries.

Chris Chaplow: Thanks, Elisa. Chris Chaplow here. It was just to ask and really remind our self where we were up to with the charter changes, the BC charter changes. Is that something that's already programmed for Buenos Aires or is it happening outside? Thanks.

Elisa Cooper: So, you know, that has definitely stalled a little bit. I think where we last left we were talking in terms of like what we've actually edited in the charter itself had to do with term length. There has been also some discussion amongst some members about what, if anything, we should do to make sure our membership criteria is in line with our objectives.

And so we could discuss membership criteria in particular if that's something that people are interested in. I think there is clearly a blurring of the lines because you've got, you know, myself included, I mean, you know, we participate in the contracted parties house. My colleague Matt Serlin was last year the Chair of the Registrars. So, I mean, there's clearly some blurring where you've got membership of companies across multiple constituencies in, you know, in multiple houses.

So I'm not sure if that's something people would like to take on for a discussion because I think it's a pretty complex issue. At the same time, like I said, I feel like there's some other, you know, major issues going on related to just the longevity and ICANN as we know it today. So I would be curious to hear from others if that's something that we would like to take on.

Ron, I see Chris's hand is up but I think that's from before.

Ron Andruff: Thanks, Elisa. Just speaking to the charter, indeed my recollection is that Marilyn on one of the recent calls said she was going to come back with another draft of the most recent charter and pulling in some of the elements that had been discussed on previous calls. So if I'm not mistaken that's where it stands. And maybe we want to give her a nudge just to see where she's at with that.

But I did understand that at one point she said she would take on working on some of the draft - the next iteration, if you will, of the charter.

Elisa Cooper: Yeah.

Ron Andruff: And then...

Elisa Cooper: I recall that as well.

Ron Andruff: Yeah. And then the second thing is just - having just come off the credentials committee it's quite clear that we're working with a very outdated charter relevant to what's going on within ICANN here in the 21st century. We're 48 meetings in and that charter was developed more than 48 meetings ago.

It's gone through some upgrades along the way but it does need a good long look so it's good that we take the time now to get that done. And if we could put some time forward for the Buenos Aires meeting when we're face to face I think we could probably get a lot of work done on that.

Elisa Cooper: Yeah.

Ron Andruff: Thank you.

Elisa Cooper: My personal opinion is that when we looked at the charter in our last meeting, you know, we were - I think it was too much to take on to try to look at the entire charter. I mean, I think we made some good progress and we discussed some areas that were problematic that were kind of easy to solve. And I think we've got some progress there.

But this issue about membership I think is one issue that's multifaceted and, you know, probably enough to focus on, you know, at the meeting without sort of also looking at all the other pieces. So I'm happy to include that.

Any other questions, thoughts, comments, things that people would like to raise in today's call? Chris?

Chris Chaplow: Thank you. It's Chris again. But I'm actually speaking for Gabriella on the Chat and that she wants to share out loud...

Elisa Cooper: Oh.

Chris Chaplow: ...that there's going to be a Webinar in Spanish next week organized by ICANN and the Institute so she's going to circulate an invite targeted at Latin America with support of herself who'll be speaking together with Tony Harris and the ISPs, Ariel Manoff from IPC and Rodrigo de la Parra. Thank you.

Elisa Cooper: Excellent. Thank you, Gabby.

Steve DelBianco: Gabby and Chris, it's Steve. Let me invite you - the CircleID post is up. And let me invite you to run it through your favorite translator. Put it in Portuguese and Spanish if you can so we can help to broaden the alarm at what these recent changes and Montevideo really mean for the private sector.

Elisa Cooper: Anything else from anyone? No? All right then well I want to thank everyone for joining. I know that we had met just last week so I think we're fairly well caught up. And I do - just for the record I really appreciate everyone who's at the (Bali) meeting, all the information that they're providing to us it's very useful to hear their perspectives.

And I think it'll be very interesting when I speak with Fadi next week. And of course I'll share my thoughts with you after that meeting and the recording as well. So with that unless there is anything else from anyone I will wish you a good day and we shall talk soon. Thank you so much.

Chris Chaplow: Thanks. Thanks, Elisa.

((Crosstalk))

END