

ICANN

Moderator: Gisella Gruber-White
April 30, 2014
10:00 am CT

Coordinator: Welcome everyone. Thank you for standing by. As a reminder this call is being recorded, if you have any objections you may disconnect at this time. All lines will remain on open line so please remember to use your mute button. And if you don't have one you can use star 6 to mute or unmute as needed.

And I'd like to turn the call back over to Miss Nathalie Peregrine. You may begin.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, (Lisa). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody and welcome to the BC call on the 30th of April, 2014. On the call today we have John Berard, Elisa Cooper, Jimson Olufuye, Timothy Chen as just joined Adobe Connect room, Ron Andruff, Tim Smith, Andrew Abrams, Richard Friedman, (Carmel Stewart), Alex Deacon and (Jonathan) (unintelligible).

We have apologies from Aparna Sridhar, Steve DelBianco and Philip Corwin.

From staff we have Terri Agnew and myself, Nathalie Peregrine. I'd like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes.

Thank you very much and over to you, Elisa.

Elisa Cooper: Thanks so much, Nathalie. So we have a fair amount of information to cover today. I wanted to talk just a little bit about what's going on with the London schedule and just make another request for somebody or a couple of people to volunteer for a position that ICANN is looking for us to fulfill.

Then I thought we would spend a little time doing a bit of a recap for those in particular that attended the NETmundial. I don't know - I believe Marilyn was planning on attending; I don't think she's on the line yet but if she's not then I'll cover a bit of a CSG update in terms of what is going on with the Board election.

Probably you saw a quick email that I sent out yesterday that we can dive into that little bit further. After that we'll hear from John and Gabby - although I don't think I see Gabby on the line yet - to give us a bit of an update in terms of what is going on at the Council and in particular what's going on with that Specification 13 which are the special amendments for dotBrand registries.

And then finally, if Jimson has an update on finance we'll hear from Jimson. And then I'll ask now, are there any other topics that we should add to our agenda today?

Jimson Olufuye: Elisa, may I just - this is Jimson - may I request (unintelligible) operation.

Elisa Cooper: I'm sorry, can you please repeat that?

Jimson Olufuye: Yes, I said I'll be speaking (unintelligible) operation...

Elisa Cooper: On operations, okay. Thank you. All right, there any other topics that members would also like to cover? Okay very good.

So to get started I think you probably just saw an email that I sent out regarding some potential changes to the London schedule. The Chairman of the Board, Steve Crocker, sent out an email to that SO/AC leaders asking what we thought about some potential changes to the schedule.

And in particular they were looking to change the Thursday of the ICANN meeting to reduce the length of time for the public forum but then to allow for some time to discuss the transition of the IANA function.

And so the other SO AC leaders generally were not happy about the reduction in time for the public forum but basically said they understood that this was a special circumstance and pretty much agreed that, you know, it was fine to make these changes this one time.

I think that, you know, the limited feedback that we've had - and I think it's very good feedback - is that, you know, we would be willing to start earlier and end later so that we keep the full four hours for the public forum and that we also have some concerns about keeping this very important topic to the, you know, basically the fourth day, the last day.

And that, you know, we would like to see the discussion around the NTIA and the IANA transition occurring earlier in the week as opposed to on the last day. And so that's - that is the feedback that I will provide. I don't know if

anyone else has any other feedback that you would like me to provide about those changes. But I think, you know, that makes a lot of sense.

Woman: Agreed.

Elisa Cooper: Great. Great. So the second point that I just want to ask people to consider is - let me back up a little bit, there are some funds that ICANN has made available for travel by constituency members within their region to promote ICANN.

And this would be travel, let's say, to a meeting or conference. And this is, you know, there are these funds that have been set aside. In order to distribute these funds though ICANN has asked that we provide one or two coordinators to sort of vet whether or not, within the constituency, we agree with the travel.

Already Wado Segunda has expressed interest in using these funds. Now the travel has to occur by the end of June. You know, I feel like it would be a wasted opportunity for us to not use these funds. That said, we do need to provide the names of one or two people who will act as sort of coordinators basically to say yes, the BC basically agrees and would like to request travel for any particular member to attend a particular event.

And so I would just ask members to consider volunteering for this. I'm not certain whether or not this program will continue into next year. Like I said the travel actually has to be completed I believe it's by the end of June. Any questions about that? Okay.

Jimson Olufuye: Hello, yeah, this is Jimson.

Elisa Cooper: Yes, Jimson.

Jimson Olufuye: Yes, well I'll be glad if (unintelligible) volunteer to (unintelligible) to coordinate this. But if there is no one (unintelligible) the schedule of the vice chair of Finance and Operations but I'll be glad if we have volunteers or more members that will assist to coordinate this.

Elisa Cooper: This okay so you will be happy to assist or been named as one of the coordinators. I see Ron's hand is also raised.

Ron Andruff: Thanks Elisa. I'm just a little perplexed, I thought that that was for outreach trouble finding that was being offered but I didn't know that it actually had a timeline on it that is effectively eight weeks. So within the coming eight weeks somebody has to travel; that just doesn't make any sense.

I do believe that there's a lot of outreach things that can go on in different parts of the world, Latin America, Africa, even perhaps in Asia where we have members that could attend various conferences and take advantages of those funds. But I'm just a little surprised by the short timeline. Did I understand you correctly or am I off base? Thank you.

Elisa Cooper: So this was a pilot program that was announced much earlier, maybe even last year. And it's something that basically did not catch my attention and sort of was not really - I really just didn't catch. And so that's why - so it went on I believe for a full year it's just that this program - pilot program is ending at the end of June. And it's for somebody within...

Ron Andruff: All right.

Elisa Cooper: ...the region to travel somewhere else within the region. It's not for somebody in the United States, for instance, to travel to Africa or South America.

Ron Andruff: Right, well this is Ron. I agree that it would be really good if we could try to capitalize Jimson and whoever feels that there some travel that could be done in the time and capitalize on that just so that we can keep this program alive. I think it's important; it's a shame that we missed it. But these things happen. So now let's try to grab some of that if we can. For Wado or Jimson - my recommendation. Thank you very much.

Marilyn Cade: Excuse me, it's Marilyn. Can you hear me?

Elisa Cooper: Yes, we can hear you.

Marilyn Cade: Oh sorry, they told me I was in listen=only. I was just checking. Thanks Elisa.

Elisa Cooper: All right. So with that let's move on. I think - I'm sure a lot of members are interested to hear from those that were in attendance at the NETmundial. And I know that Marilyn, you were there. I believe Caroline, you were there, is that correct?

Caroline Green: Elisa, yeah.

((Crosstalk))

Elisa Cooper: I think you were there as well.

((Crosstalk))

Elisa Cooper: Andy it was not their but his colleague, Aparna Sridhar, was there. So it'd be great to hear basically perspectives of those that were actually at the meeting because I think we've all kind of read a fair amount and we've all seen the

support that the US government has given and seen what, you know, has been said.

But it would be great to hear from people that were actually there an account of what happened and what you think whether this - what do you think there will be meaningful results coming out of it as we continue on and have this next meeting is what I understand.

So, is there anyone who would be willing to sort of share your perspectives on - oh and Barbara I think you were there.

Barbara Roseman: Yes, thanks a lot.

Elisa Cooper: So are there any members that were at the meeting that would be willing to sort of share your perspectives on how things went and what you thought of the meeting and the outcome?

Jimson Olufuye: This is Jimson, I was there.

Elisa Cooper: Oh sorry, Jimson.

Jimson Olufuye: Well (unintelligible) kick it off. The NETmundial (unintelligible) demonstrated (unintelligible) bottom up multistakeholder model. For everybody that was there (unintelligible) even though the timeframe was short (unintelligible) and try to (unintelligible) very very important.

And (unintelligible) from the (unintelligible) people from other application or (unintelligible) we all had one focus and that is to have the business position. Unfortunately we could not have agreement (unintelligible) points net neutrality and (unintelligible) abilities.

But apart from that there (unintelligible) freedom online and (unintelligible) and the appointing of the NTIA conditions. So (unintelligible) that are not happy with our multistakeholder model but I believe strongly that it's a good business showing (unintelligible) it was a good thing going forward into discussion for (unintelligible) working group, IGF, (unintelligible) in the year.

So those were (unintelligible) that came out of NETmundial (unintelligible) cooperation, collaboration and that is not only (unintelligible). There are issues about roles and responsibilities because (unintelligible). Well, we cannot (unintelligible) but when it comes to Internet governance the position (unintelligible) position which was reflected at NETmundial (unintelligible) is that a bottom up multistakeholder is the fast way forward for Internet governance.

And ICANN plays very, very important role Fadi, in particular and the Board (unintelligible) and the support for the (unintelligible) was really (unintelligible) quite unique. Thank you.

Elisa Cooper: Thanks, Jimson. I don't know if others have thoughts or perspectives to share. I know that I would sincerely appreciate hearing from some others as well who were there. Is there anything, Marilyn, or Barbara or Caroline, that you would be willing to share?

Barbara Roseman: This is Barbara. Well, I think that the NETmundial sort of successfully shines the spotlight on the IGF and the potential of the IGF to serve not only as a forum for dialogue but there was considerable discussion about making the IGF a forum for more, shall we say, concrete outcomes.

And I know a number of you are participants on the Inet list and there's been an extensive NETmundial dialogue on this issue. And I think - actually I think the post that came across from Marcus Kumar this morning was both from (Yannis Kirklands) as well as Marcus Kumar suggested a positive way forward that may be the next step building on the momentum created by NETmundial is not to sort of transformed and make the IGF a forum for negotiated outcomes but rather may be during this period consider it a useful hybrid.

That would include, you know, again started the discussion that we've enjoyed all these years on issues that are important to business but also on matters on which there is already a consensus, a forum for outcomes, for use of practical is this outcomes. Marcus cited spam and IXPs. I imagine there are others used too.

So I think that from ICC basis's standpoint we've been a very strong supporter of the IGF and we were happy to see that the support for extending its mandate beyond five years and making it a truly viable entity. Thanks Elisa.

Elisa Cooper: Thank you. I see Marilyn is back on the line. I know her line dropped. Marilyn anything that you would like to add in terms of the meeting in São Paulo?

Marilyn Cade: Two things I think. (Unintelligible) Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation. And I know Jimson is on the phone with you guys as well. He's another member. AT&T is also a member (unintelligible), I think the new name to some of you, but was with us at NETmundial.

The documents that - both the process and the documents that came out of NETmundial bring - I think they have lessons for us including potential

lessons for how we do negotiate it taxed that his policy statements that ICANN that I think we'll be seeing more of.

Because there were 80 governments who participated it was very well attended by governments; and there were several GAC members there. The document - I heard Barbara - the document went probably pretty far as far as the broad business interests are concerned.

The issues not addressed directly were - they were addressed indirectly and that is the concern that's directly related to ICANN about how the transition process will be structured for the IANA functions of agreement and the accountability mechanisms.

And there was very much, in the halls and in the room and in the special session that Fadi orchestrated that Theresa chaired. So it was after the main work, which is something that people should realize that was why it was shifted, it was viewed by ICANN as a special consultation that they were driving.

It is not incorporated directly into the NETmundial documents, although the topic is incorporated into the documents. But I think we're going to see some further implications. And if you read the transcript that specific just to the ICANN consultation you'll see a lot of similarity between what was said at the ICANN meeting and the concerns that are being actively expressed on some of the other lists.

So - it's really about inclusion, making sure that there's appropriate consultation with different groups noting that different groups have different meanings for the consultation. All goodness I think as far as the Business Constituency's interests are concerned. Thank you, Elisa.

Elisa Cooper: I see, Ron, you have your hand raised.

Ron Andruff: Thank you Elisa. Actually I would like to address the questions Marilyn because in one of your posts, Marilyn, you noted that it was it was an eye-opener first draft or something along those lines. I wonder if you might just expand a little bit on what you were suggesting in that post because I found it fascinating if you wouldn't mind. Thank you.

Marilyn Cade: Sure, sure. This transcript is posted to the private part of the BC and I appreciate that. You know, ICANN came in kind of in a - Fadi (unintelligible) meet with the President of Brazil, he made \$1 million financial contribution. The staff really seems to think that they were taking a very strong leadership role.

But Brazil had created a much more neutral organizing structure and they stuck to it. So there were representatives from each of the stakeholder groups - I'm not talking ICANN stakeholder groups but the stakeholder groups broadly, so academic, technical, civil society, business.

And there were 12 governments and the Brazilians really stuck to their commitments that this was going to be a true consultation and truly interactive and no one particular group was going to dictate the language.

And I think that was - we had a lot of running around by ICANN staff trying to be helpful but the structure that the Brazilian government had put together with CGI's help was very strong in and of itself, flexible but strong.

And so that I think was eye-opening to all of us to see, you know, started a different approach to bringing the - a group of decision-makers together not

driven by ICANN staff but driven by much broader-based inputs from representatives from each of the stakeholder groups.

Barbara Roseman: Marilyn, if you don't mind my jumping in to build on that I thought the process - what we refer to as the round robin process where...

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Barbara Roseman: ...different stakeholder groups got 2 minutes each to make their intervention was very very inclusive and very, how shall I say, equalizing in that you had all ranks of all seniority government officials queuing up to Julie take their turn at the microphone standing next to civil society, business community, technical community.

And I think Marilyn, you even noticed a very senior official from Saudi Arabia patiently standing in line as did our US government officials patiently wait their turn in the line.

So I think that was important for countries like Russia, which totally isolated themselves at this meeting, to see that government stakeholders in a multi-stakeholder setting are not necessarily given some sort of elevated status. That through this round robin process everyone's input truly was inclusive and everyone's input counted, if you will. Thank you.

Elisa Cooper: Thank you. So I have a question and then I'll see if there are any other questions from members before we move on to talk a little bit about what's going on with the Board election.

But my question is just a high-level question and do you think the outcome or what happened at the meeting was positive for business? I mean I think that's how the press is characterizing it. Would you agree with that?

Marilyn Cade: So let me kick off - it's Marilyn. One thing that many of the people on this call are familiar with is a term called the BRICS. And that is Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa.

And we've had these situations where they have taken a fairly harsh - a negative position both about ICANN and about various other things having to do with Internet governance.

And so what you should really think about, in my view, what we saw was Brazil stepping very much more toward the middle so away from Russia, two Barbara's point, away from India; very much away from South Africa and away from China and away from Saudi Arabia, who's not a part of the BRICS, and Iran.

So they moved - they really put a very firm commitment down to multi-stakeholder but recognizing multilateral institutions are needed they still came closer to the concerns of not just the business sector but the technical sector and to the sort of mature responsible parts of the NGO community as well.

That I thought was an astounding outcome that gives us friends to work with in other places. But I turn to Aparna and others - Barbara - to comment.

Elisa Cooper: So just as a reminder, Aparna was unable to make the call today.

Marilyn Cade: Oh, sorry.

Jimson Olufuye: Okay, Jimson. (Unintelligible), you know, coming. (Unintelligible) from the (unintelligible) opportunities given to everybody to speak is a demonstration of the bottom up indeed equal footing (unintelligible) mean by equal footing, that was really particularly demonstrated, (unintelligible) stakeholders.

And then (unintelligible) position - changed Iran's position. Iran is no moderate at that event really. And I actually went into conversation with (unintelligible) from Iran. And I got the picture of that change indeed.

With regard to business - in fact some of the feedback I got is that people were surprised that there is somewhat diversity in business. There is somewhat diversity in business and that business is not only (unintelligible) but also in the (unintelligible) which is an important takeaway for us so that we continue to build outreach and so that people will know that not only business in the north that is permitting (unintelligible) but also is (unintelligible) is the balanced engagement.

So that message was a good message for - include picture that people have of business generally. Thank you.

Elisa Cooper: Thanks. Andy.

Andy Abrams: Yes, yes, thanks very much. I was curious, what I haven't heard a lot about was China. And I know that they're a big player in all of this and it's unclear to me where they sit. I was wondering for people who were there what you think of them and what role you think they played and will be playing because I heard less than I was expecting from the floor.

Marilyn Cade: China is moderating their--it's Marilyn speaking - China is moderating the statements they are making, Andy, everywhere, at the CSTD, at - they were, I

think, relatively moderated here. Their statements at the IGF are practical, moderated compared to - for those of you who weren't there and weren't listening after the meeting ended certain states were allowed time to make a statement that is not a part of the formal meeting and that was Russia, India and Cuba as well as a civil society speaker.

Russia was very harsh in both their time and their language. India it noted they needed to consult. Cuba was - expressed disappointment with some parts of the document but did not, by any means, completely disavow the document, which Russia did.

China was silent. They did not take an exception statement which a lot of people were very amazed by.

Caroline Greer: Yeah, if I can add to that. It's Caroline here. I think what you saw of China is probably very typical of how they act in international meetings fora.

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Caroline Greer: They don't really like to raise their head above the water too much, probably worked behind the scenes. If I remember right China was going to be the first or second speaker when the mics opened so the gentleman did sort of make some (unintelligible) comments about the need to respect national sovereignty and situations in the Internet community. But beyond that they didn't really comment much at all.

Elisa Cooper: All right.

((Crosstalk))

Elisa Cooper: Well, I'm sorry. Did somebody else have a comment or question?

Caroline Greer: I did just that as well, Elisa, Commissioner Neelie Kroes, as you all know she was really putting the pressure on before the meeting. And at the meeting she was quite aggressive in really, you know, with her demands and asking for certain things in the roadmap.

I think, not that I can speak on her behalf, but having listened to her and some feedback today at a meeting from some of her staff she was quite pleased with the outcome. And she's posted a blog post on Friday where she sort of said, you know, we're on the right road and what she did see in the high-level statement was enough to satisfy her. So I think she and her team saw it positively.

Elisa Cooper: Thank you. That's helpful. Well I thank you all for adding to that conversation and providing information. I guess before we move on I just ask - because I know this is such an important an event - I'll just ask if there are any members that have other questions for those that attended the meeting before we move on. Okay well thank you to all that just provided information and those that asked questions.

At this point I want to move on to Marilyn for a bit of an update on where we are at with the election of Board Seat 14. So Marilyn, I'll turn it over to you.

Marilyn Cade: Thanks Elisa, this is going to sound like the election saga by the time we finish with it. And I'm just going to ask everybody to be patient with us as we work through it. There's a long history to the fact we don't have an agreed to process within our house on elections, whether that's the vice chair that gets sent to the Council or this Board seat.

And part of that is the newness of the process. It may not seem new but actually the last election of Bill Graham was the first time that we had actually had the opportunity in our house to elect a Board member.

You while we remember that there were two candidates, Avri Doria and Bill Graham. We went through three rounds. There was no agreement on meeting the 60% mark. And 60% is required by the bylaws; we didn't make that up, it is required by the election process.

So what that comes down to is six of our SG plus two or six of their SG plus two, which means that there has to be some demonstrated support from the other stakeholder group.

For anyone who's new, I'll just say very quickly, it's important to know that it took the - they took a very long time to get the NPOC, the second constituency created in the other half of the house. And they went in with a charter that they're desperately trying to change but have not been able to which gives them actual ownership even of their councilors.

Today the councilors, all six councilors, are elected by an election at large across the NCSG which they're unhappy with. So our process of getting a Board member elected is part of a larger evolution.

The present situation is to get to the last nomination process, although it wasn't visible to us, there was a written agreement between the NCUC and the NPOC, and again that's internal to their functioning.

But that written agreement was that if the candidate put forward in the last election did not win that NPOC would be allowed to put a candidate forward.

Subsequent to the election NCUC has reneged on part of their agreement and want to require the withdrawal of both candidates and have proposed that if both SGs will withdraw their candidates met then we could agree on a single candidate that they would put forward.

And you've seen the circulation of the nominee's name. Sam, real quickly, is an economist. There is more information about him but I can also forward to supplement what Elisa has already sent.

Listed (unintelligible) in the back he basically has a development background. His primary focus is the use of health technology, privacy, (ICT) (unintelligible). He - so we can make sure that other information is made available.

On the seventh there will be a working call to try to work through the process. The General Counsel has been notified that we have a need for an extension. And right now we have to go into the development of an election process which could mean - it could go back to three rounds, it could be only one round.

There's no agreement until we have a conversation across the CSG on whether we are agreeing to withdraw the candidate that had support from our SG. That takes a further consultation within each of the constituencies in order to put that information forward.

Timing wise it's very possible - I don't think it's likely - I think we will achieve an election one way or the other by the time we go - by the time we meet in June. But it is probably going to be another week of negotiations on process.

And then, if it's only one round, background can be a short round. There will however be an opportunity for an interview with candidates whether it's one or it's two or it's 16 - hopefully that was just a joke - but, you know, we are very much committed to whoever the candidates are that there's an opportunity for interview and engagement.

Some of you may know Sam. He's someone I've interacted with but he's fairly new. But you will have seen him - and he's been to the microphone several times on this Saturday/Sunday sessions as well as in the - some other meetings. So hopefully you're at least familiar with him. Thank you, Elisa.

Elisa Cooper: Thanks. So just to clarify, I mean, the CSG has not yet discussed whether or not - the CSG Executive Committee and the executive committees from all of the CSG constituencies - has not yet actually decided that, you know, there will be support from us to move forward with Sam.

And so I do want this decision to be something that we all have a voice and that we're all heard. And so I guess what I'm saying is if members have ideas about other potential nominees or have ideas about Sam - or have worked with him and have information to share I think we should take that to the list.

This is not a done deal. We have not, you know, the CSG has not decided that this is the candidate yet. This is all being discussed along with the process like what the election will actually - the timelines and how that process will work so there's still much to be decided and this is, in my opinion, still early days.

And if members have ideas about other ways forward in terms of the other candidates that, you know, we should consider and bring to the other CSG constituencies that's, you know, I think that's totally on the table as well.

Marilyn Cade: Right. Elisa, sorry, it's Marilyn. I should have been clearer. Thanks. When I said candidates I was probably not clear that there may be other candidates that thank you for that clarification.

On the early days thing though, just to reinforce this, we do have a preliminary call as the CSG on Tuesday with the - an exploratory call with the ExComm of the other constituencies. And we'll have a CSG ExComm call before we have the other exploratory call.

So I was projecting three weeks; do you think it's longer than that?

Elisa Cooper: I mean, I don't know.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Elisa Cooper: I think...

Marilyn Cade: Sorry.

Elisa Cooper: ...there was a question on the last call about, you know, what happens if, you know, the election doesn't happen as quickly as what had been desired or what if, you know, Bill's term ends and there's still no replacement candidate or if he's not elected or whatever what happens.

You know, until an election - a successful election occurs Bill remains in that seat. And I'm not saying that, you know, we don't cooperate and we don't hold a successful election but I did want members to know like that's what's going to happen; he'll remain in that seat until a six vessel election does occur.

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Elisa Cooper: But, like I said, I'm not saying that, you know, we stall and, you know, drag our heels or anything like that. Ron, I see you have your hand up.

Ron Andruff: Thanks, Elisa. In the interest of time - I see we're getting short, we've got lots of other things in the calendar - so I just wanted to just speak to the fact Stéphane and I have been exchanging emails on the list about the quality of the candidates.

And I think it's really important for all of us to understand - and Sarah would certainly support me in this that the scrutiny that we've put towards selecting Board members from a Nom Comm perspective is really intense and we really tried to find the absolute highest quality individual we can find to make sure that they really bring value to the Board.

And so I just wanted to perhaps send a message to the CSG leadership that this is not something they don't know but it really is critical that this is not about trying to appease the other side of the house as much as it's about making sure that the highest quality character - characteristics of any individual we send really is that.

And someone who understands what's going on within ICANN and sits on a number of very important boards, as Bill does, right now or committees I should say, within the ICANN community I think it's really important we really try to make sure that candidate stays in the running and gets promoted because he's a guy that fits within the Board constellation right now as I see it personally for the Non Comm. It's very important to have a character of that quality. So that was it thank you very much.

Elisa Cooper: Thanks, Ron. You're right we probably should move on. Just my own personal observation based on where we're at right now I don't believe that Bill is electable. I just don't see any change in the boats coming from the other side of the house. So I think we do need to look at other candidates and look at Sam and look at who, you know, who we can garner enough support for so that we have the eight votes that we need.

Marilyn Cade: Elisa, it's Marilyn. I said this on the list of but I need to say it again. It's unclear since the NCUC has not even yet fully committed to supporting Sam; they may still put forward a different candidate. And in that case the NPOC members might actually have independent votes so it is early days to support your view that it's early days.

Elisa Cooper: Thanks, Marilyn. Okay so I do want to do a bit of a policy review. This is material prepared by Steve. And I'm not actually going to read all of the recent comments and statements and positions that the BC has released. But you can see down here in the Adobe Connect room, you know, we've had a fair amount of activity.

I'll just let you know one thing that is being worked on is some enhancements - and I've mentioned this in the past - we're making some enhancements to the Business Constituency Website so that it can support WordPress so that we can get links to all of these comments and positions posted to the Website.

Right now that Website that we have is not conducive to making changes easily or quickly. So as soon as that--those updates happen to the Website you'll be able to see these positions out there as well.

So in terms of, you know, what's coming up we've got comments on the five-year strategic plan. And I know that Chris Chaplow had agreed to provide some support and is working on some comments there.

In terms of comments on the document prepared by the Cross Community Working Group, I think that my personal opinion is that because the data NETmundial has occurred that our time would probably not be well spent commenting on the document that had been prepared in support of the NETmundial unless there are particular members who want to work on creating comments for that. The reply period for that closes May 21.

The next sort of set of comments would be this proposal for policy advisory boards. The reply period ends May 7 so that's coming up very quickly. Unless somebody is already very familiar with this or has the bandwidth I'm not sure if we'll be able to prepare comments on this. Ron, I see you have your hand up.

Ron Andruff: Yes, Chair. As I am the--one of the authors of that document I'm very familiar with it. I'm happy to prepare some bullet points that are consistent with BC positions if you like.

Elisa Cooper: Oh that would be excellent. Thank you very much.

Ron Andruff: With pleasure. Thank you.

Elisa Cooper: So another reply period that is coming up very quickly is on this issues report on the use of UDRP and the URS for IGO and INGO. Although, I mean, I think - we definitely have the ability to comment on this. I don't know if there's anybody that feels deeply about this and would want to prepare comments that are in line with our existing positions.

I mean, I personally think that those, you know, those should to policies should be made available to IGOs and INGOs. But if there's anybody that's interested in preparing a set of comments on that issues report that would be great.

Otherwise the one that I'm really most concerned with - and we are ready have a number of people who've raised their hands to participate in the development of comments - is on the transition of the IANA functions with the comment period closing on May 8.

Already Andy Mack, Aparna, Steve DelBianco and Phil Corwin have agreed to prepare comments on that. And you'll notice that the comment period closes on May 8 which is coming up very fast. There was only a 30 day comment period on that to begin with; not the typical 21 and 21.

Is there anyone else that would like to participate with that group to prepare comments on the transition of the IANA functions? Ron, I see you have your hand up.

Ron Andruff: Thanks, Elisa. My only - the reason I raised my hand was this is such an important element and such - and we've seen many times a request for extension of the public comment period. I don't see any reason why we shouldn't have our drafting team submit that first to give the drafting team some time to really work on - with the constituency to develop really solid comments.

I think that's - it's just such a critical element I'm really kind of surprised know what the constituency has asked for an extension. And we probably should if we can unless there's a reason we cannot.

Elisa Cooper: Yeah, no I agree; regardless of actually whether an extension is granted I think we should take our time, develop our comments and take the time that we need and if we significantly than they're submitted late. So I think - I definitely agree with you, we should ask for an extension or perhaps we should just let them know that we'll not be able to make the timeline just to give them a heads up.

Ron Andruff: That's a good idea. Thank you.

Elisa Cooper: Thanks. And then I should also mention though there is this interim report on internationalized registration data. This is like the translation and transliteration of contact data - Whois data. I don't know if there's anybody who feels strongly.

The initial comments are due May 15 with the reply comment coming in the 26th I assume. Is there anybody that's interested in this particular topic who would be interested in preparing comments on this?

I don't - I mean I do think that this is - this is a topic of interest and concern although this is an interim report so I assume we'll have another opportunity. And I do think we should focus our efforts on comments that are most important to us. But that said, is there anybody that is interested in participating or taking the lead on comments there?

Okay. And then last but not least, you know, we had these comments to be that we had sort of discussed the different strategy panel recommendations. And I think it's looking at this time that we will be submitting comments on multistakeholder innovation. I believe Gabby was actually the lead on that.

Those will be submitted on 30 April. And as always of course, as Steve would say, BC members are encouraged to submit their own comments.

Any questions on any of those or, again, interest from members to take the lead on preparing comments?

Marilyn Cade: Elisa? Elisa?

Elisa Cooper: Yes.

Marilyn Cade: I just wanted to say that - it's Marilyn - not on the list that you read but the comments on the multistakeholder panel, which has quite a few errors in it. I have been contacted by Tony Holmes to ask if the BC would like to collaborate in short comments.

And I promised Steve I would do a couple of paragraphs that just sort of lay out our preference that - noting that were busy, at the bottom up process works much better, that we do feel that the reports now have to be corrected so that they're not marketed as BC positions.

I'll send those two or three paragraphs through and people can take a look at them. So they're not - they don't line-item that long report; they make a more statesmen-like introductory comment.

Elisa Cooper: Okay, yeah. I think that makes sense for you to coordinate with Steve on that. And again just for members who may have come on late I'm only covering this policy section because Steve had another commitment. I'm sure most of you know we're having our call today on Wednesday, it's a holiday in Europe so that's why the college today and not on our standard Thursdays. So long story short I'm just filling in for Steve in this policy section today.

Chris, you have your hand up.

Chris Chaplow: Thanks, Elisa. Yes, it was just on the strategic plan comments. I just wanted to bring in and thank Tim Chen, actually he's kicked the ball off on this one and sent an email. I don't know if it went to the list or if it just went to a couple of us that were on the original group.

I think myself and Andy and Marilyn did the - not the original comments but the comments - there was a structural document that we commented on. So I think it's time to get the file down and discussed that one off and look in that and see where we are.

If anybody has had a chance to look at the document it's actually - the strategic plan - the draft strategic plan that's there for comments now is actually quite a polished looking document actually, it looks more like a final document for publication than a draft plan. Obviously some graphic designer might be working on it.

And as usual it is a difficult one. We need as much help and input, ideas and kind of thoughts turn across the bow (unintelligible) on that one. So, you know, the strategic plan - this is important and it's one of the least commented on sections of the ICANN public comment period. Thanks.

Elisa Cooper: Thank you, Chris. And thanks also, Tim, for participating in the development of those comments.

So moving on we only have a few minutes left but, John, perhaps you can give a bit of an update as to where you think things stand with this Specification 13?

John Berard: Sure, Elisa. And my audible?

Elisa Cooper: Yes, you are.

John Berard: I thought it would be an easier fix than it is turning out to be. But there is now a motion that has been drafted that satisfy (unintelligible) position that telling the Board that Specification 13 is not at odds emotionally, politically with Recommendation 19.

There may be, however, some amendments - I've not seen them - still to be made by the Registrars. I will let you know when that happens, if that happens and the substance of them.

But at this point we're on a solid course where both Gabby and I will vote in favor of the current motion which will respond positively to the Board on its question as to whether Spec 13 is in line with the intent of Recommendation 19.

There is some discussion on the Council list that the question from the Board makes it impossible to say anything other than no it is not because the Board asked whether it is - whether Spec 13 is not just in line with the intent but also is in keeping with the language of Recommendation 19 and so some opposition to the motion will arise on the basis of that.

But I do believe that will be handled. So I'm confident it will - I'm confident - I'm fairly certain the motion will be put forward and approved and Spec 13 will be in place.

Elisa Cooper: Okay thank you. That's great.

John Berard: Sure.

Elisa Cooper: Anything else that you think we should be aware of at the Council?

John Berard: No. The Council is just as we, on this call, were focused through an extraordinary amount on Internet governance the Council is as well. There is an emerging concern that I have in which - by which the Council, as an entity, is offering primary comments on matters of public comment.

I think if you were on this call last time you heard me say that I don't think it's wrong for the Council to reiterate its stakeholder and constituency views in a reply comment period but I'm reluctant to endorse Council having an opinion in the primary comment period.

But the Multistakeholder Innovation Panel has prompted many of my Council colleagues to want to jump in and in fact they have jumped in. And I do believe the Council will forward primary comment on the Multistakeholder Innovation Panel recommendations.

I want to thank everybody from the BC who helped me at least put some context in those comments. They were well received and included. But it doesn't eliminate my primary anxiety about the Council acting as an entity or equal to our parts. I'll keep an eye on that.

Elisa Cooper: And you are concerned about that is it sort of multifaceted? Is it because, one, the comments are not really representative of the constituencies or then there's also sort of double counting and are those your concerns?

John Berard: My primary concern is that I may be participating in a discussion at the Council level that is simultaneous with a discussion at the constituency level and being asked to support something at the Council level that we may not - even if it is something that the constituency ultimately supports may be getting out ahead of the constituency.

And so that would then put me in a position of - you could put me in a position of endorsing recommendations in opposition. And I use me just as an example; it could do that to any councilor. And I think that any councilor would want to guard against having his or her name on conflicting recommendations.

Elisa Cooper: Okay, got you. Any questions for John? So we have just about a minute left. Any updates, Jimson, on finance or operations?

Jimson Olufuye: Yes, very quickly. This is Jimson. Members are still (unintelligible) of their dues. And I would like to indicate that (unintelligible) can certainly use wire transfer.

Two, we have issues with members not being able to pay their dues directly to BC because we do not have tax ID. So the finance committee is currently exploring options in this regard and will be informed about our finding at the next call.

Also to let you know that (unintelligible) yet to be (unintelligible) because we do not have a secretariat yet and also because of the challenge some of our members are having paying directly into BC.

But we're making - maybe down the line I will make arrangement for my staff to help that (unintelligible).

Then also to let us know that regard to operations ICANN offered us (unintelligible) secretarial support for the constituency. That applies to the other constituency as well. But this will not much (unintelligible) into the next fiscal year.

And, finally Elisa mentioned about the migration of our URL so, yes, this is currently going on moving from (unintelligible) to CMS WordPress and to be ready by end of May. (Unintelligible) graciously (unintelligible). Thank you, Chris.

And, finally, (unintelligible) on using the (unintelligible) express interest if anyone still is interested in using it within the region to also let me know (unintelligible). Thank you very much.

Elisa Cooper: Thank you, Jimson. And thank you, Chris, for your continued support especially with this Website migration. It's greatly, greatly appreciated.

I think that actually brings us to the end of our time. So as always I want to thank everyone for participating on today's call. And we will plan to meet again in two weeks. In the interim I would ask members to take any open questions or issues out to the list and we'll continue our conversations there. With that I bid you a good day and we'll talk soon. Thank you so much.

END