

**ICANN**

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

Coordinator: The recording has been started. Please go ahead.

Brenda Brewer: Thank you very much. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone and welcome to the BC members call taking place on the 6th of October 2014 at 1500 UTC time.

On the call today we have Angie Graves, Andy Abrams, (Claudia Ferry), Elisa Cooper, Gabriela Szlak, Jay Scott, Jimson Olufuye, John Berard, Marie Pattullo, Michelle King, Susan Kawaguchi. We have apologies from Steve DelBianco and myself as staff Brenda Brewer. You may begin your conference please.

Elisa Cooper: Thank you Brenda and thanks for everyone for joining today's call. The purpose of today's call is really to get prepared for the meeting in LA and also to do a bit of a policy update.

Now Steve is not going to be on the call but he did send out a policy calendar. And I did want to run through some of the recently closed comments and some of the open comments.

So with that, I want to go ahead and start off by really diving into the schedule for the ICANN meeting. To start off on the Sunday we will be meeting - there will be two meetings. There'll be a meeting in the morning with Bruce Tonkin and Bill Graham. And that is scheduled to begin at 7:30 and to run through about 8:45 or 9:00.

We are in the process right now of determining some topics. Now the coordination for this meeting will be handled by the Intellectual Property Constituency. But we can provide our topics that we're interested in and that we would like to discuss with Bruce and Bill.

Now the ISPs are very interested in discussing with Bruce and Bill the fact that the CSG is more and more being treated as sort of one voice when we have three very different in some cases opinions coming from the Intellectual Property Constituency, the Business Constituency and the CSG. So that's a hot topic that they would like to discuss with Bruce and Bill.

But I would like to hear from other members what other things you would like to talk about with Bruce and Bill. And I will pass that information back onto the IPC to include in our list of topics to discuss with them. So I will open the queue and I'm asking what other topics would you like to discuss with Bruce and Bill when we meet with them on the Sunday.

Are there any other topics that you would like to discuss? What would you like to discuss with Bruce and Bill when we meet with them on the Sunday morning on the 12th?

John Berard: Elisa, this is John. Can you hear me?

Elisa Cooper: Yes I can.

John Berard: So one of the things that we've been grappling with is the increase in what essentially are policy and issue mandates coming from the Board. We take a look at the recommendations from the Board with regard to the Nominating Committee structure. We take a look at the initiation of going back to the Expert Working Group to forward to the Internet Governance Community discussion.

So I guess one of the questions I have is is this a - is this evidence of a new level of Board activism and is it in response to what the Board feels is the unruly and slow process that is reflected in the multi stakeholder bottom up consensus driven model?

Elisa Cooper: Okay. I've taken some notes but just so that I really accurately capture that, would you mind sending an email to me so that I can capture it in its essence?

John Berard: Sure. I'll do that.

Elisa Cooper: Thank you. Other topics that you would be interested in discussion with Bruce and Bill? Okay. Well if you think of any and it comes to you later, just drop me an email and I'll get that onto the IPC.

Now later that day at 4:30 to 6:30 we are scheduled to meet as the CSG. And this will be a meeting where we will really be prepping for our Board meeting, which will be on Tuesday. So we'll be meeting Tuesday with the Board but on Sunday again 4:30 to 6:30; this will be a time for us to meet with the IPC and the ISPs to discuss, you know, what topics we want to bring up with the Board.

I think it'd probably make sense for us to have just a little bit of a discussion now about what topics we would like to broach with them. But you will definitely obviously still have some time to think about that and then we'll have a larger conversation with the larger group.

So topics that you think we should be bringing to the Board. It'd be great to hear sort of what your thoughts are and what you'd like to raise with them as issues.

Jay Scott: Are you guys still there? I can't hear anything. This is Jay Scott.

Elisa Cooper: Yes. We can hear you Jay Scott.

Jay Scott: Okay. I just - it's been silent so I was just wondering. Okay. Thanks.

Elisa Cooper: So are there topics that you would like to bring up with the Board. Or what are some of the topics that we should be addressing with the Board when we meet with them on Tuesday?

Marie Pattullo: Elisa, this is Marie.

Elisa Cooper: Hi Marie.

Marie Pattullo: Can we talk about accountability with them?

Elisa Cooper: Yes. I think that'll probably be a big one for sure.

Marie Pattullo: Thank you.

(David): This is (David). Can we also talk about the state of compliance as we embark on the whole host of new gTLDs and where things stand given the new gTLDs?

Elisa Cooper: Yes. I think, you know, we kind of started to talk about that with them last time. And I'm aware of some very concerning - well, issues around some of the new gTLD registries and the fact that they're not complying with some of the requirements of the registry agreements. And so we're starting to see some compliance submissions. And so yes, let's definitely bring that up.

Other thoughts of things we should be bringing up with - now the one thing I think we've learned from the last few meetings is they're always very interested in examples and I'm sure that the direction from the IPC will to be - will be for us to support these ideas or questions or thoughts with examples.

So I know I'm starting to collect some examples but I would ask for you all to do the same. Other things that we want to bring up with the Board. So we've got accountability, the state of compliance. Do we want to talk to them about the multi stakeholder model and are we - is that something that we want....

(David): Actually that's probably a good thing to raise Elisa. Not just that but also the role of ICANN in, you know, in the whole host of organizations that constitute the landscape of Internet governance. Because we know Fadi's been out there doing a lot of cheerleading and helping facilitate a lot - the organization of a lot of meetings in new organizations that the community has no idea about.

Elisa Cooper: So sort of the larger topic of Internet governance and ICANN's role and where ICANN is and how ICANN is being directed in that participation.

((Crosstalk))

John Berard: ...on the - this all NETmundial initiative that they continue to push and continue to have traction. And it's funded by ICANN.

Marie Pattullo: Elisa, it's Marie again.

Elisa Cooper: Yes.

Marie Pattullo: Can I add onto the last comment with which I fully agree the general state of trust between ICANN and the community.

Elisa Cooper: Yes.

Marie Pattullo: Thank you.

John Berard: Elisa, this is John.

Marilyn Cade: And I just wanted to announce I had been able to join. Sorry for the delay. It's Marilyn.

Elisa Cooper: John.

John Berard: Yes. If I read the transcript of the last SO/AC Leaders call with Fadi correctly, he said that he was pulling back from - on his role - on his activities related to Internet governance at the - in response to the community's concerns about his being too far out front.

But he also said that they were going to slow down the accountability process. And that's the very that was in there of what - you heard him say it. What did

you make of it? Does it seem as if accountability and stewardship transition are becoming further apart when in fact we have long wanted them to be in parallel?

Elisa Cooper: I didn't take it in that way. I think he was talking about the fact that the leaders had a lot of concern over the whole accountability process. And the fact that the mechanism that had been developed was in our opinion probably not really developed in a multi stakeholder fashion.

And so I think he was talking about slowing down to make sure that the community had been heard. That's what I believe he was saying.

John Berard: Well, maybe there's an opportunity at the meeting with the Board for clarification.

Elisa Cooper: Okay.

John Berard: Thanks.

Elisa Cooper: Okay. So we have quite a list and I think, you know, these are probably topics that will probably be shared concerns for the other two constituencies. But I have topics around accountability, the state of compliance, around multi stakeholder model, around Internet governance and ICANN's role and also the fact that ICANN continues to promote NETmundial, the general state of trust and basically ICANN - basically how staff is supporting or whether they're slowing down this accountability mechanism.

Anything else that we should include in that list? Because I think that's a pretty good list to start with. Again, we have time on the Sunday. That's when

we'll be talking about how we'll be and what we'll be discussing with the Board with our other two constituencies that are part of the CSG.

Angie Graves: I want to add - this is Angie. I want to add something onto the NETmundial motion. And that is that (Doma Marusa) is actually going to be running in an election and is not favored to win. And I'm just wondering what might happen, you know, since she's had such a leadership kind of a role in that. So I don't know if that would tack onto the NETmundial but there you have it.

Elisa Cooper: Thanks Angie. I don't know if anybody can provide any insight into that or...

John Berard: So Elisa, this is John. I don't know that I can provide insight. But it is worth noting that her point person on NETmundial is a new member of the GNSO Council from the non-contracted parties, non-Contracted Stakeholders Group. I forget her name. (Gabby), if you're on the phone, you remember her name.

Woman: (Basically no).

John Berard: Anyway, she was with us at a couple of ICANN meetings in anticipation to the NETmundial meeting. So the spirit will likely still pervade.

Marilyn Cade: It's Marilyn. Let me provide a bit of clarification. So NETmundial's position is (please) try to separate that that from NETmundial in Brazil and in the past. The NETmundial initiative is something new. It buildings on NETmundial but it is a WEF initiative that Fadi - (it's) ICANN, WEF and CGI.br.

And it is moving forward. It was discussed at some length at the recent (Wixon) meeting and previously at a speech that Fadi gave in Geneva to ambassadors from Geneva.



The initiative is two tracks. One is an agenda for action. So building solutions that are supposed to address the orphan issues and address that concerns that governments have that no one is adequately addressing (spam) or (child online) protection, et cetera.

The other is an agenda for dialog, which is driven by - now by WEF. But ICANN's pretty much a significant contributor and player in both of those. But they're not directly related to whether (Doma) is reelected or not.

Elisa Cooper: Thanks Marilyn.

Gabriela Szlak: This is (Gabby).

Elisa Cooper: Yes. (Gabby), go ahead.

Gabriela Szlak: Just - sorry, I was on mute and I couldn't react to John's. I think he was referring to (Marilia McGill). That's right John?

John Berard: Yes.

Gabriela Szlak: Okay. Yes. She's a new member of the Board and she's from Brazil and very active in Internet governance.

Marilyn Cade: A new member of the Council or the Board?

Gabriela Szlak: Sorry, the Council. The GNSO Council.

Elisa Cooper: Okay. Thanks for that. Why don't we turn to the Monday meeting? And this is where I really need your input. What we're looking at here on Adobe is

basically a draft agenda. And this is, you know, I didn't get much feedback from members. So this is - we can totally change this.

But on Monday at lunch this is an opportunity for us to meet as a closed group. And what I have tentatively scheduled for us to discuss as a closed group are where we're at with the BC charter amendment. So Jay Scott and I know Ron also is very involved as well as the others who are working on this project.

But Jay Scott has offered to lead a discussion around the charter amendment. So kind of to go over sort of how we're going about it, what the status of it is and the next steps and then I think we can have some dialog about, you know, what this sort of very big ideas and major changes that we're talking about and looking at. So that's sort of - that's one thing that I've got on a draft agenda.

Now Stephane Van Gelder wanted to have a private discussion about the NonCom. And so we've got 30 minutes dedicated to that. And then a bit of time to do a finance and operations update, which is something probably that's in our open meeting as not appropriate.

But are there other topics or items that you would like to discuss in a closed meeting that we should add to this or are there things that you would like to take off of this draft agenda? I'll take a queue. Are there things - again, you know, do we want to spend any time talking about outreach? That might be something we could also look at discussing in our open meeting.

Gabriela Szlak: Yes.

Elisa Cooper: But is there anything else you would like to add to this. Yes.

Gabriela Szlak: Just supporting that I would like to talk about outreach. That would be good.

Elisa Cooper: Okay.

Gabriela Szlak: This is (Gabby). Sorry.

Elisa Cooper: Is there anything - so I think we might have a better time to discuss that in our open meeting. So we'll look at that agenda in just a moment. Is there anything - are you happy with this as an agenda for our closed meeting? Okay. I will take that you are okay with this.

Moving on to the Tuesday. So what will happen on Tuesday starting early in the morning we will have our cross constituency breakfast. And we are meeting with the GAC. We have sort of two high level topics to be discussed. One is around GAC involvement with the GNSO and the other one is around ICANN accountability.

You know, it's a breakfast and so the conversation sort of naturally happens. These are just ideas that'll be put forth on the table as topics to discuss. Following that meeting though, that breakfast, we will move right into our open meeting with the CSG.

We are scheduled in that meeting to hear from the SSAC and from the NonCom. But again, they are looking and asking us what other topics we would like to discuss.

So I have the topics, you know, that, you know, we might have for the Board. And I think that those are probably some of the same topics that we might like to discuss here. Are there other things? Is there anything else you would like to discuss in the open meeting with the CSG?

John Berard: Elisa, this is John again.

Elisa Cooper: Thanks John. Go ahead.

John Berard: So one of the things that has increasingly been put upon us is coordination with the CSG on the selection of members of committees and councils and things.

Right now in fact there is a Board initiated request of the GNSO Council to create a committee to oversee the movement of the Expert Working Group into the Policy Development Process.

The request to us has been for a member representing each SG to participate. And it's been difficult at least in this instance for me to try and instigate any kind of collaboration that would allow for the selection of a person.

I mean I have personally promoted the appointment of Susan Kawaguchi but that's just essentially a BC request. I haven't seen any other requests from the other - from IPC or the ISPC.

But how do we - how do we go about making it easier to collaborate on what is an increasingly - an increasing number of calls for the stakeholder group to participate as a single entity? That would be helpful.

Elisa Cooper: Yes. I think that's an excellent topic to discuss because I struggle with that all the time. It's a lot of time spent on trying to figure out well, who should be representing the CSG even sometimes when it's not that important like on, you know, a panel that's speaking or it's not even always like a working group.

Sometimes it takes a lot of energy and a lot of - there's a lot of back and forth negotiation, which is not really in any one's best interest. And it's also been again not representative of necessarily the three different groups.

So I'll mark that down. I think that's an important topic to discuss with the CSG. And that's the same topic that the ISPs want to discuss with Bruce and Bill basically. The fact that the call is coming, you know, from the GNSO for a single participant from the CSG.

Other things to discuss that you want to talk about with CSG?

Gabriela Szlak: Elisa, this is (Gabby). I have a question.

Elisa Cooper: Yes.

Gabriela Szlak: I think this is if I'm not mistaken the last session in which Bill Graham will be our Board representative. And afterwards we'll have Markus Kummer. That's right?

Elisa Cooper: That's right.

Gabriela Szlak: So is he going to participate in this session (at all)?

Elisa Cooper: So unfortunately he was unable to make this meeting on Sunday. He - we did invite him. But I think...

Gabriela Szlak: Okay.

Elisa Cooper: ...we were trying to see if there was another time he could come and meet the group.

Gabriela Szlak: Okay. Thank you.

Elisa Cooper: Certainly going forward we'll make sure that he knows that this is sort of a standing invitation that the - that there's a Sunday meeting that we have.

Gabriela Szlak: Yes. That would be good. Thank you.

Elisa Cooper: Any other questions or thoughts? Comments? Changes that you want to make to the agenda? Okay. So moving on. The last sort of big meeting we have as a group aside from we meet on Wednesday when we talk about what we're going to do at the public forum or what we're going to speak on at the public forum.

On Tuesday after lunch. So 1:15 to 4:30. This is our open meeting. And this is a tentative agenda that I have for that. So we'll spend an hour - I have tentatively scheduled for us to speak an hour around policy issues, which Steve will lead. I've got half an hour...

Jimson Olufuye: Elisa, I'm...

Elisa Cooper: ...for us to review some of the open new gTLD issues. Some of those are compliance related. Some of those are related to the efficacy of some of the RPMs.

I then thought it might make sense to have a bit of an open dialog basically for us to identify what our priorities are. We've been I think very reactive and have done a good job reacting to everything coming to us. But I'm not sure we've, you know, been out in front and leading in any particular topics that are

of concern to us. So this might be an opportunity for us to spend a little bit of time as a group to talk about those.

I had tentatively scheduled for 3:45 to 4:15 to get an update from staff on the GNSO review, which I think is very important. They had reached out and they had asked if they could present. But then I asked if they could present multiple times. They've not gotten back to me.

So this might be a place where we can discuss outreach if they're unable to, you know, meet with us at that 3:45 time. So that's tentatively what the agenda looks like. Is there anything that you would like to change or take off of the agenda or move around or is there anything that you would like to add to this agenda?

And I heard from (Gabby) about the outreach so I will get this outreach - topic of outreach on the agenda regardless of whether or not we meet with the - we hear from staff on the GNSO review.

Jimson Olufuye: Elisa, this is Jimson.

Elisa Cooper: Hi Jimson.

Jimson Olufuye: Hi. I'm sorry that I'm taking us back. I just want to add these two points to the agenda discussion with the Board.

Elisa Cooper: Okay.

Jimson Olufuye: Yes. I'll be interested in getting the Board's view on the IANA transition process.

Elisa Cooper: Okay.

Jimson Olufuye: I (unintelligible). And two...

Elisa Cooper: Okay.

Jimson Olufuye: ...I would also - I would also like to get their view (unintelligible) the upcoming ITU (plan report). And now it's (meet) in fact ICANN. And ITU (plan report) coming up with the week after ICANN meeting.

Elisa Cooper: Okay. Thank you. I've got both of those questions. So I will add that to the list and I will send the entire list as sort of a list of ideas that we should, you know, start our Sunday discussion off with. Thanks Jimson.

Anything regarding this schedule though for the Tuesday. This is - again, this is our meeting. This is when we meet. This is our open meeting for just the BC.

Man: Hey Elisa, just a quick question. I know I've seen - I've received some emails. But will there be a full schedule of BC meetings sent around?

Elisa Cooper: Yes. So...

(David): Okay.

Elisa Cooper: ...Brenda prepared sort of a list of all of the meetings and she's highlighted when the BC meetings occur and then also she's highlighted in a different color the meetings that are of potential interest to BC members.



So I will send that along with this sort of more detailed schedule. So both of those will be coming out to you.

(David): Thank you.

Marilyn Cade: Elisa, it's Marilyn. Just to follow up. I had sent a proposal that we invite Markus (unintelligible) to the CSG in the morning to meet with either on Tuesday - to meet with (the full) group. But also Ron Andruff had offered to invite the new Board members that is a general Board member to meet with us.

And I don't know that we've heard back on the confirmation on that from the CSG. If it doesn't work for the CSG, would you be interested in our inviting her for 15 minutes to our meeting?

Elisa Cooper: I think that makes sense. But I'm also hopeful that the IPC will be able to squeeze her in to one of the CSG...

Marilyn Cade: (Right).

Elisa Cooper: ...like the CSG meeting.

Marilyn Cad: Right. I think it'd be better if we could put her into the CSG. But if not, could we maybe just hold on that and come back to you?

Elisa Cooper: Yes. I'm sure, you know, later in this like more around the 3:45, 4 o'clock time. We have this wrap up part right at the end that's like sort of an additional 15 minutes of cushion. So I'm sure like being that would work fine.

Ron Andruff: Elisa, this is Ron.

Elisa Cooper: Hi Ron.

Ron Andruff: Good morning. So just to follow-up on that I heard back from (Asha) and she doesn't know her entire schedule yet but she's anxious to meet earlier than later because she's concerned that she'll be doing the board activities later in the week.

So just an FYI and you're correct I think (Christina) has that now we exchanged emails over the weekend. So I understand it's in her hands to make that meeting.

But I just want to let you know as well but if it doesn't happen at the CSG level it's early in the week perhaps on the Sunday would be ideal to meet with (Asha). Thank you.

Elisa Cooper: Thanks (Ron).

Jim Baskin: Hi. This is Jim Baskin joining. Sorry I'm late.

Elisa Cooper: Hi Jim.

Jim Baskin: Hello.

Elisa Cooper: Okay so we'll see if we can fit (Asha) in. Again she's one of the new board members. And (Ron) had reached out to her to see if she would be willing to come speak with us and she had expressed that she was.

All right so if there are any other additions or changes or anything please let me know. I will plan to send out basically a final agenda along with sort of the longer schedule that will come to you in one email.

I want to thank (Brenda) again for putting together the larger schedule so thanks (Brenda).

All right any questions about the ICANN meeting at all about logistics or timing or anything what we're doing when, who we're meeting with?

Jim Baskin: Yes this is Jim. I'm sorry because I'm late you may have already said this. But that - or that list of all the activities for the I guess the BC and the CSG is that that's going to be sent out and...

Elisa Cooper: Yes.

Jim Baskin: Will it be continuously updated as things change like they usually do during the course of the meeting?

Elisa Cooper: If that's something that members want we can ask (Brenda) to do that because I know things do change a lot although sometimes they can get kind of confusing.

Yes let's - let me get back to on that and...

Jim Baskin: Okay.

Elisa Cooper: ...see if (Brenda) is able to do that for us.

Jim Baskin: But at least we will have an initial...

Elisa Cooper: Yes, yes, yes, yes he's already prepared it. It's actually already been completed.

Jim Baskin: Okay great.

Elisa Cooper: But I want to send that out when I send sort of the final agenda that gives you like sort of the actual point that we'll be reviewing.

Jim Baskin: Okay thanks.

Elisa Cooper: Any other questions before we move on to sort - where we're at with policy?

Okay and then just a reminder on Wednesday we always meet around lunchtime to talk about preparation for the open forum.

This usually we do not take the full-time but this is sort of a quick meeting for us to figure out what we want to say.

All right anything else before we move on about the meeting? Okay so let's move on to policy.

Again (Steve) is on a plane so he was unable to attend this call today. But he did prepare his regular policy calendar and so all of this information is in the policy calendar.

I just wanted to go through some of the recently posted public comments and some that we still need to work on so I want to go through that right now.

The first on the list are public comments around GAC advice. So this was around proposed bylaw changes for the consideration of GAC advice.

And so we prepared comments. And you can find those comments, (Steve) had provided a link in the policy calendar that he sent out.

There were a number of people that helped in preparing those comments. So I - and I think we kind to spend a bit of time talking about it.

But (David) or I know Jay Scott's on mute or Marilyn do you want to provide any additional color about the comments that we provided on this issue of the GAC advice the board consideration?

(David): Sure. I'm happy to just provide very high level. I think we had a lot of conversation about, you know, why we were making what - why we decided that at this juncture we did not think it was the right time to consider making this change because two - there were two reasons.

One because we're in the midst of this current the IANA transition and the accountability review which might require larger bylaw changes.

So we just thought it was best to not considered at this time. It was - we didn't - we did not take a substantive position for or against.

And, you know, I know Marilyn in the past has said that this was not a request from the GAC. It was driven by the board.

Though I do think there was some consultation with the GAC from some of the conversations I've been having with people. But not the - there was not a GAC consensus on moving this forward as I understand it.

But I, you know, I think the statement pretty much speaks for itself but again we didn't take a substantive position one way or another.

We just at this time given that there are so many things in flux that it wasn't appropriate to proceed with the proposal.

Elisa Cooper: Thanks (David). Anything else or any questions for (David) about the comments that we submitted on this topic?

Okay the second we talked about this also on our last call. So there was a set of comments around RPMs for the collision names.

Essentially we ended up working with the registries and the IPC to submit comments. And then we followed up by answering some questions that had been published.

And so I think, you know, we basically said that we needed to have RPMs, specifically we need to have a sunrise like period for names that were on collision lists that had not previously been subject to sunrise periods.

And so we're still waiting to see how that shakes out. But I anticipate that we will have some type of a sunrise like period.

And the reason I keep saying sunrise like period is because we didn't want to call it a true sunrise purple because we didn't want to be forced to use EPP which is the protocol for automating the submission of registrations because it might be easier for the registrars to do it manually.

At any rate I do think that we'll end up with some kind of requirement that every single name that's on a collision list at some point has been subject to a sunrise period.

Any questions about this?

The next set of public comment period that's out there there are a number of different registry proposals asking for the allowance of two character domains.

These are not two character domains that would be matching any ccTLDS but would be all others.

Basically the GAC does not want any two letter combinations and I guess for fear that they could at some time later in the future be required for a new country or a new country name.

But I think we had decided or we were sort of going down the path that there are many companies that do use two letters or have two letter trademarks and that's important to them and that we would want to have those.

So we were basically a number of us had volunteered to draft comments but no comments have been drafted yet. So and my - even my name is up there. So that's where we're at. (Ron) would you - are you still able to help in drafting these comments?

Ron Andruff: Yes I can step up to that if you'd like to Elisa. I think what - the way I left it was (Steve) in the last exchange of emails was we were going to wait for the first series of comments to come out and then kind of look at that and see how our members felt about which path we should take two...

Elisa Cooper: Okay.

Ron Andruff: ...find a way. But yes I can pick that up now that the nominating committee documentation is out to the members for their review.

Elisa Cooper: Okay.

Ron Andruff: Thanks.

Man: Just to confirm this is that the second level right?

Elisa Cooper: Yes. So this is to the left of the dot.

Man: Okay.

Elisa Cooper: Yes. So, you know, a company like HP might want HP.or something along those lines.

Any questions or comments or thoughts on this particular topic?

Okay there is another public comment period that is now open and it's around GNSO operating procedures. And this includes some changes to working group consensus levels.

So far we have no volunteers on this particular comment. Is there somebody that would be willing to take the pen and would be willing to review what's out there and to begin drafting some comments on this?

Ron Andruff: Elisa. This is (Ron). May I ask a clarifying question?



Elisa Cooper: You can.

Ron Andruff: I - just around the point was this the Standing Committee on implementation asking for public comment or is this the GNSO driven consensus document?

I'm not quite sure but I the reason I'm asking the question as the chair of the SEI we put out for public comment two or three items recently which were all kind of just refine the elements for GNSO operative procedure.

And we don't really expect to see any comments coming back from the committee's point of view. This is we're just kind of going through the formality.

But I just wanted to make clear if it's that if it's the STI we don't need comments necessarily because they're (unintelligible) others.

But if it's a GNSO consensus issue that I'm not clear on then yes we should be commenting on that because consensus is a very important element.

Thanks.

Elisa Cooper: I'll have to get some further clarification on that. I'm actually...

Jay Scott: This is Jay Scott.

Elisa Cooper: ...not certain.

Jay Scott: I can see here that it's the Standing Committee on Improvements it looks like it's the one is what it says in the executive summary on the comments page.

Ron Andruff: Great Jay Scott. Well if that's the case then that's - this is a light load for the BC in this regard. Because unless any members see something glaring that they want to approach otherwise I can share with you is pretty light stuff and most of it was passed by the BC before it went to public comment.

So in other words we brought it back, we got consensus agreement within the SCI and now we put it up for public comment. So that's one we can perhaps check and keep others focused on other activities if you'd like. Thanks.

Elisa Cooper: (Ron) would you be able to provide some information about what the changes to the working group consensus levels are?

Ron Andruff: I think it's in fact it's noted in that public comment in the preamble and so forth. It should all be right there.

Jay Scott: And this is Jay Scott. I'll take a stab at drafting something. It's not due until the 30th right?

Ron Andruff: Thanks Jay Scott, appreciate it.

Jay Scott: I mean the comment period closes I guess the 8th. Do we want to make them by the 9th or do we want to wait till the reply period?

Elisa Cooper: I think given everything going on doing it before the end of the reply period is a little bit more practical.

Jay Scott: Okay all right.

Elisa Cooper: Thank you Jay Scott. That's great.

Okay the next open comment period is around the - basically Neustar which is applied for .neustar as a closed TLD is asking for approval to have country names and country codes to the left of the dot.

And I think this is going to be a very interesting case study for all of the brands out there. I don't know what members feel about this.

I also don't - it's my understanding also that Neustar in addition to maybe asking for a change to their registry agreement that they will also need to get the approval from the individual countries. It's not just for approval from ICANN.

But I can understand that a lot of brands wouldn't want to have the names of countries to the left of the dot in combination with their brand to the right of the dot.

Any thoughts on this and even whether we should be commenting on this?

Andy Abrams: Hi Elisa. This is (Andy).

Elisa Cooper: Hi (Andy).

Andy Abrams: I have a question. Do you know if the BRG is weighing in on this issue?

(David): That was - this is (David). That was going to be my question too.

Elisa Cooper: Well I that I don't know. I do know that the BRG is interested in having some sort of a template that could be used by the countries to sort is streamline the process of getting the approvals from the relevant governmental authorities.

I assume I mean this is a hot topic for them because I think it makes the .brands a lot more valuable to be able to have a country code or a country name to the left. I assume they will but I don't know.

(David): Yes...

Ron Andruff: That's great. Go ahead (David).

(David): No, that is my understanding. And I know that there has been some work with some of the GAC representatives too to try and come up with the template so that there could be a quick resolution to an issue in a .brand for example.

Because it's clear that, you know, the .brand isn't attempting to compete with the government for it's - for the gTLD or for the Web site that they're operating.

And there was some progress on that but I'm not sure where it currently is. And I do think it's probably good for us to speak to (Philip) and try and figure out where that is and for us to then figure out whether it's appropriate for the BC to be weighing in.

I think us as a company would be interested in that but we might be doing it through the BRG. I just need to close the loop.

Elisa Cooper: Okay.

(David): And Elisa I agree, same thing for me. And I'm happy to reach out to (Martin) who's in the BCM and the BRG and just to kind of see where they're at and maybe we can kind of link up in LA?

Elisa Cooper: Okay. That sounds great.

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

Elisa Cooper: Yes go ahead Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: So a couple of things. One, Neustar as a member of course has a conflict so would recuse themselves on this discussion.

But I think if we could go to the branch roots but I think also there's a letter from the GAC which has an indirect reference to this between the GAC and the board saying the GAC is continuing to work on this issue.

And I had suggested earlier that we may want to have an information I don't know, I'll call it just an information exchange to understand however we pursue it I think it would be good whether we pursue it in conjunction with the .branch group or we pursue it directly.

I think it would be good for us to have a better understanding of where the governments are.

Elisa Cooper: Yes. I agree. I agree. Maybe we can try to ferret some of that out when we're in LA.

John Berard: Hey Elisa this is John.

Elisa Cooper: Yes go ahead John.

John Berard: I guess it's a matter of serendipity but I'm having lunch this afternoon with (Byron Holland). So I'll ask him what he thinks.

Elisa Cooper: Okay. Great yes I don't...

Man: And...

((Crosstalk))

Elisa Cooper: ...interesting topic. All right any other thoughts or comments or questions on this one?

All right so I think that's kind of what we had in terms of sort of open comment periods and so forth.

John if I can turn it over to you for a discussion about any - and (Gabby) for any discussion about what's going on at the council level if there's anything in addition that we need to know about?

John Berard: Sure. This is John, (Gabby). Please interrupt me if I missed something or misspeak. I don't always hear properly out of both ears.

I think that there will be at this point two motions on our agenda. One is to - one is dealing with the IRTP Part D which is a continuing discussion of transfer issues.

The BC has been for a long time a part of the discussion. I think were in favor of the motion. In fact I don't see it generating much. I wouldn't be surprised if it moved to the consent agenda in fact.

The other motion is to accept the, to adopt the charter for the Internet governance cross working community via most of the other SOs ACs that are

participating have adopted. And I know that the ccNSO Council adopted at its last meeting.

I think that also well be an easy yes from the council. On either of those motions is there any comment? Okay hearing on...

Marilyn Cade: John?

John Berard: Yes?

Marilyn Cade: Sorry it's - sorry I had to get off mute. Could you just say a bit more about the Internet governance motion?

If we have time at the end I'd like to just give just a very quick update on other things that I'm hearing about Internet governance activities from ICANN but I don't want to take up the time on it but anything in particular about the motion?

John Berard: The only - the reason is - well let's see, let me rewind this. The Cross Community Working Group was an instrument of the board.

(Olivier) had a leadership role from ALAC. There was a - an initial charter for it that was offered. There were then - and at that moment that the charter there was a motion before the council two meetings ago to accept the charter.

We then learned that there were going to be some changes made to it. Substantively I don't know what they are. I apologize.

But and so we passed on voting on this charter the last at the last meeting which would have been simultaneous with the ccNSO council vote.

A revised motion by James Bladel seconded by Avri Doria is supposed to be coming to us for the meeting in LA.

In fact I apologize I've been on the road and living off my iPhone. It may in fact have, yet I just haven't seen it already yet.

(Gabby) have you seen it?

Gabriela Szlak: The motion? No sorry.

John Berard: Yes.

Gabriela Szlak: I didn't see it either. So I have to...

John Berard: Right.

Gabriela Szlak: ...read it right now.

John Berard: So we assume that it's on its way. Once we get it we'll circulate it but again I don't see it as being outside the lines.

Now it may be that we're not seeing stuff that's going on inside the lines  
Marilyn so why don't I turn it back to you.

Marilyn Cade: So let me wait and see how much time we have to talk more about this. I think the issue I'll just say quickly right here is I think the debate is is this working group going to provide guidance to ICANN staff and board on Internet governance or is it going to merely rubberstamp what is already going on.



And most of the participants in the working group take the guidance position rather than the rubberstamp position. But I haven't seen what the modifications are to the proposed working group targets.

John Berard: Yes this is John again. I agree Marilyn. I have heard nothing that would suggest that this group is going to rubberstamp anything.

In fact I think the - it will take maybe even a harder look at the actions than it might have otherwise because of the tumultuous way in which the Internet governance discussion has been conducted inside and with ICANN.

So I encourage people to keep an eye on this matter because this Cross Community Working Group on Internet governance is a key platform for the community and to have input and perhaps even influence.

The other two points relate to this notion I mentioned earlier of an increase in board initiated dialogue with the GNSO Council.

The first one is related to the board needing to rectify the differences in the consensus policy of the GNSO council and the advice of the GAC on certain matters related to the protection of IGO and INGO acronyms.

There was initially a thought that we the GNSO council could reinstate the working group that came up with the original proposals, assess the differences and offer a way forward.

It was determined at the last council meeting that that would not be specific enough. And so a letter was sent by the council to the board asking for specific language as to what it is they would like the council to consider and then the council will consider it and I think vote it either up or down.

So we're still waiting for a response from the board on that.

The other bit from the board of course is Steve Crocker's letter to the council asking that there be an oversight committee essentially created to guide the movement of the Expert Working Group into the policy development process.

This is the point I made earlier about needing a CSG endorsed candidate and we - I hope that we'll be able to by the time we get to the public meeting in London which would be in London in LA which should be on Wednesday that we will have consensus on just what that is.

(Gabby) is there anything that I have missed or underplayed in your view?

Gabriela Szlak: No that was great. Also mentioning that this is the first meeting in which we will have the GNSO liaison to the GAC.

He's made some call and so I read that also in in our public comment to the - on the issues on the change of bylaws.

We've mentioned that it's important that we support these kind of movements like involving the GAC in the policy development process.

So this is an important part of this involvement and just wanted to make sure that we all know that this is happening in this meeting for the first time.

John Berard: Thank you (Gabby). Elisa that's it from us.

Elisa Cooper: Thank you so much. I know we're scheduled to hear from (Jimson) at the meeting to do a bit of an update. And that's just next week in terms of finance and operations.

We have a bit of time for any other business. Are there any other items that members would like to discuss or any questions all about anything?

Gabriela Szlak: Elisa can I say something?

Elisa Cooper: Yes.

Gabriela Szlak: Just want to remind everyone that in this meeting we will have an invited member of the business constituency (Hoko Animach) from (Italia Libre). And I just wanted to encourage all of you to engage with him the ones that are going to be in the meeting and to make him feel comfortable and welcome from all of us.

And I'm talking with him and he will be participating in all our sessions at least the ones that are not in collision. We only - there's one meeting in which he will be participating which is about the (lock) strategy.

So this means that he will not be able to participate in the session that we have after the Monday morning ceremony but it's a panel that in which (Steve) is going to be our speaker.

But for the rest of the activities he will be joining us. So that's all. Thank you.

Elisa Cooper: Thanks (Gabby). Anything else from anyone?

Okay with that I'll give you five minutes back of your day. I want to thank everyone for joining today's call.

Be on the lookout for me to receive again the full agenda and then the more detailed agenda that will probably be coming to you within the next day or so.

And if you do have ideas about things you want to make sure that we cover please let me know.

With that I guess I will see many of you very soon and I wish you safe travels and I'll see you next week. Thank you.

Thank you.

Man: Thank you.

Woman: Thank you.

Woman: Thank you.

Woman: Bye-bye.

Woman: Bye.

Man: Thanks everyone.

Woman: Thank you.

Woman: And you may stop the recordings at this time.

END