

Transcription ICANN Buenos Aires BC meeting Tuesday 23 June 2015

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

On page: <http://gnso.icann.org/en/calendar/#fjun> The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page

Elisa Cooper: All right well I'd like to welcome everyone. This is our open BC meeting. And we have a very extensive schedule today. If we can actually move on to the next slide? So we start off, we have a little bit of time at the beginning here. I wanted to begin to collect topics and lead to the open forum so I want to spend a little time that an then touch on on any other topic that folks want to discuss.

Then we're going to be hearing again from the GNSO so we'll have a little bit more time to ask some more questions about the GNSO review. And then we'll go back and turn it over to Steve who will take us through our policy discussion. And he has sent to us his wonderful policy calendar which he always puts together. So we'll have plenty of time to run through that.

Then we will be hearing from Thomas Rickert and update on the CCWG. Then we'll turn it over to Nick Tomasso. So we have just a little bit of time to go through the upcoming new meeting schedule. I think there's some questions and we'll have just 10 minutes to ask him some questions.

Then finally we'll hear from Sandra Hoferichter on the ICANN leadership training program so we have a very full schedule. For the record, if we could

just have folks run around the room if you can just take your name and affiliation that way we can get it into the record, we have a record of it. So if we can start from the end of the table?

Man: Thank you. Good afternoon everyone. My name is (unintelligible) from AfICTA.

Elisa Cooper: Welcome.

Andy Abrams: Good afternoon. Andy Abrams from Google.

Cecilia Smith: Hello. Cecilia Smith with Fox.

Claudia Sellii: Hello. Claudia Sellii, AT&T.

Cheryl Miller: Cheryl Miller, Verizon.

(Caroline Winn): (Caroline Winn), Microsoft.

Paul Mitchell: Paul Mitchell, Microsoft.

David Fares: David Fares, 21st Century Fox.

Jimson Olufuye: Jimson Olufuye: AfICTA.

Elisa Cooper: Elisa Cooper, Thompson Reuters.

Steve DelBianco: Steve DelBianco, NetChoice.

Man: (Unintelligible) ICANN staff.

Glen de Saint Géry: Glen de Saint Géry, GNSO Secretariat.

Woman: (Unintelligible) fellowship program.

Man: (Unintelligible) fellowship program.

Susan Kawaguchi: Susan Kawaguchi, Facebook.

Beth Allegretti: Beth Allegretti, Fox.

Andrew Harris: Andrew Harris, Amazon.

Brian Huseman: Hi. Brian Huseman, Amazon.

Woman: (Unintelligible)

John Forman: I'm John Forman from Brazil who is the fellow program and also is the IT Union of companies from Rio de Janeiro.

J. Scott Evans: J. Scott Evans from Adobe Systems.

Man: (Unintelligible) from Brazil. CGI representative of the users - company's users of Internet. I am new member of BC, authority of registers by (PKA) from the work from (unintelligible) to signature (unintelligible) in Brazil. Okay.

Laura Covington: Laura Covington from Yahoo! And I think I saw - I think there were a couple people in the back but I would encourage you to come to the table. There is no screen in this room so any slides that we'll be showing you really need to be sitting at the table.

Steve DelBianco: And also wanted to welcome Will Hudson also of Google who joined us.

Elisa Cooper: All right so I wanted to start off well I guess I'd like to ask how you thought the session with the board went I mean in terms of that setup versus what we usually do which is where the three chairs set up at the front and then the

board of follow up at the front and some are in the audience and I guess I wanted to get your feedback on how that format went.

Paul Mitchell: Okay, Paul Mitchell. From my perspective it actually went pretty well. The discussion was reasonably candid some parts more than others but reasonably candid. I thought the body dynamics from what I could see actually worked pretty well having the smaller number of people, you know, upfront and it seemed like you were getting eye contact, the speakers were getting eye contact which is a good thing.

Elisa Cooper: Thoughts from others? Laura.

Laura Covington: I agree, I thought there was much better exchange. And for whatever reason it seemed like we weren't has rushed as we sometimes are. I felt like we really got, you know, people got to articulate pretty much everything they wanted the say. And my thanks, by the way, I thought everybody who spoke to just a really good job. I thought everyone was -- it just was very calm. I thought the tone, despite the challenges and some of the tones in response I got was just incredibly professional and measured and exactly the kind of thing I love to see so.

Steve DelBianco: David's exchange with Fadi, though, I talked a little bit over lunch with David. You kept your cool. Thank you because I thought his answer to you was quite provocative. And the way to work this is to play the long game. Let's take note of the things that Fadi said which we don't agree with and determine how to get back into the contract -a a calm rational discussion of contract compliance.

David Fares: And I do think there were some contradictory messages coming from Fadi. In response to the first question regarding differential pricing he basically said there is no contractual provision and therefore we really can't do anything notwithstanding the fact that Chairwoman Ramirez has said that it is a violation of the spirit when you look at it in conjunction with the RPMs.

And then when I raised the point about the contractual - ICANN's on the contractual model and without -- if you don't ensure compliance the multi-stakeholder model crumbles. He basically shut it down and said well, I'm not a cop. But that's not -- this isn't about being a cop or not being a cop, this is about contract compliance.

And there is a provision in the agreement that requires the registrars to review submission by a legitimate party if there is a justifiable claim about some sort of abuse. Now I understand that there is this interpretation issue, you know, we might have to delve deeper into what they have to do. But to say that's not a compliance issue is absolutely wrong and I felt that that -- we were dismissed and I felt -- I was frustrated by his response to us on that because he basically said, I'm not going to address that point because it's not relevant.

Steve DelBianco: When the meeting began, with respect to contract compliance, I first met with Fadi and said I'm going to be bringing it up and said it, that every congressional hearing and Fadi, we've had to deal with it. It will be in the report language and the bill that will pass the House today at five o'clock.

And so he made sure that Allan Grogan, the chief compliance officer, was sitting right there who would be able to come up to the table. And I would encourage you all to read the last two blog posts from Allan Grogan. They're on the ICANN Website, right hand side you'll see the ICANN blog. Click on the ICANN blog.

And on June 11 and June 12 Grogan put out two thoughtful blogs about what he is doing in his listening tour to figure out what should those words mean, to investigate and respond in a different context of whether -- what kind of a national law is being violated, what's the situation.

We challenged him today to say that that's not something you just resolve in a hallway conversation, it needed to be more involved. And the reply from Fadi was very surprising this notion that it doesn't involve you guys, right? It's just between us and the contract parties.

If you stuck around for the IPC's discussion with the board, I thought that (Koran) did an excellent job pointing out that the ICANN side of the ICANN contract is all of us and we do have a stake in that. So we may need to go back there thoughtfully and our interaction maybe with Allan Grogan and maybe not with Fadi or the board. Sometimes will get more done if we go directly to the person who's in charge of it. I don't know him very well, he's relatively new to ICANN.

But if he thinks he can listen to the community by only visiting with registries and registrars, the contract parties, I think we have to gently educate him that we are on the other side of the contract too not just because we are the community but because the BC represents registrants who are parties to those terms and service agreements and end-users who are often the ones reporting the abuse that might merit follow-up like investigation.

So I think one of our key items is a follow-up meeting with Allan Grogan, and we ought to do it while we are here if we can. And maybe we invite him tomorrow at our 12 o'clock meeting, right, something like that if we can do that. And then maybe we follow-up at the public forum on this very topic on Thursday.

Susan Kawaguchi: (Unintelligible), so I wish I could have thought faster on my feet they are on the -- when he kept saying -- making the point, you know, you asked us not to get involved with pricing. I like, no, we agreed to sunrise fees in exchange for those trademark protections that we didn't agree to exorbitant pricing.

And so, you know, and I don't think it would be worth going back to Fadi to say this but I don't think the BC, and I can't speak for the CSG, was involved in those negotiations, I think it was the registrars and registries that were saying please don't affect, you know, don't do anything about pricing.

Also I was little surprised so much of the interchange was with Fadi because I think the value of talking to the board is to make sure that the board members really understand the issues because oftentimes they don't. So I was a little bit hesitant that he kept taking control of the conversation too. And I would have felt better if that would have come - that exchange would've come from board members themselves. I get that, but he's also the CEO and so he has people there.

David Fares: I'm just going to move to process. I actually thought the dialogue was very good too, while frustrating, I thought the format was a good format to have more exchange with the board. But I do think though we learned is that we don't have enough time for 30 minutes per constituency and we need to reinforce the fact that we ran 20 minutes over and we all didn't even get to raise all the topics that we have presented.

So the CSG actually needs three hours if they're going to do a CSG timeslot so that each constituency gets the same amount of time as the other constituencies get. Hopefully the CSG will agree to send a joint letter to Fadi and Steve on that point.

Jimson Olufuye: Yeah - yes, I fully agree with you, David. The question was quite (unintelligible) and there are a lot of (unintelligible) that were not completely exhaust. But our - also want to recommend that going forward we can articulate at least some of the discussion points today and the way we look at it and the feedback we got from the conversation, clearly (unintelligible) maybe in written form as a form - as a conversation going forward with the board.

Elisa Cooper: All right, so we have just five minutes before we begin our discussion on the GNSO review. But I would did want to take a few minutes to talk about which topics we would consider taking to the public forum. It sounds like a topic around - around this would be something that we would be interested in. Okay. Other items that we want to bring forward or consider bringing forward in the public for them to the board and the community? Do you have any ideas, Steve?

Steve DelBianco: Often the next two hours of the BC meeting will reveal whether we have a high degree of anxiety over something like the CWG transition or the launching of a new round because if you recall tomorrow in Council, there will be a vote on a motion to start an issues report and that will surface a debate about how soon after the issues report would there be a call for a PDP and moving to the next round.

So a lot of our concerns would develop over the next 24 hours and I think that'll suggest itself easily as to what we would talk about on Thursday afternoon at the public forum. We have no shortage of topics on which we commented recently. We have, you know, an inventory of well-established and documented positions from which we can draw on the topics of interest.

Having said that, we've learned over the past 10 years that there isn't much accomplished at a public forum in the way of changing minds unless the crowd is moving in a certain direction and we can find a way to get support from others it's often not productive for us to just repeat a concern that we've repeated four times during the week to the same people unless we think we can bring others alongside.

So, you know, we'll be alert for items like that and there may be -- the BC may have some other concerns about the transition that we want to surface particularly the CWG and also the accountability transition. We talked about this public interest commitments specification and it may be that the

organizational review has been an underachievement that we want to comment on. And that's what's coming in next. Right? Okay.

Elisa Cooper: Right. I just received an email from Marc Trachtenberg. And, I mean, like just minutes ago, about a statement on dotSucks in response to the discussion we just had with the board. So I'll just read it to you. And he wants to know whether or not we can support this statement as it currently is written. And I read it right now.

So the statement is as follows, "the IPCs and others, including ICANN constituencies and other professional and legal entities like INTA, members of Congress and the media, have made clear our concerns with the operation of dotSucks. Fadi and Allan have said that there is no mechanism available to ICANN to address these concerns because ICANN is limited to enforcement of the Registry agreement. But I think that there is a mechanism available to ICANN in the registration agreement to address these concerns, Specification 11."

"Specification 11 requires registry operators to, quote, operate the TLD in a transparent manner consistent with general principles of openness and nondiscrimination by establishing, publishing and adhering to clear registration policies. I would argue that at least the following practices of dotSucks, and now other registries that appear to be following suit, violate that obligation."

Then it goes on and says, "like frequent changing of registration policies and pricing common discriminatory treatment for trademark owners," and I don't even know this word, "a registration policy purportedly on subsidized model for consumer registration and a third-party complaints platform where there is no standing for the subsidized registrations for consumers and no realistic likelihood of any party being found and no third-party identified to create or operate the third-party complaints platform."

So he's basically - what Marc Trachtenberg is saying is that the Specification 11 as it's currently written, we refer to that as the PIC, that's the PIC commitments, the Public Interest Commitments Specification 11, he's saying that there's language in there that he thinks we could use to basically address dotSucks.

I will send this -- I will just forward this out to you also you can read it. But, you know, its face value. I think this is time sensitive because they would like to know whether or not we can stand by this as well.

Steve DelBianco: Forward that to the list?

Elisa Cooper: Yes, I'm going to do that right now.

Steve DelBianco: While we're waiting for the GNSO review team to come in, you're here, great.
Why did you come up to the table, why do that now right?

Elisa Cooper: And we'll come back to this.

Steve DelBianco: You can sit anywhere, there's some blank seats over there.

Elisa Cooper: So I think we have your materials and we're probably pulling them up right now although we did just hear a bit during the CSG meeting so I don't know if we really want to go through a set of slides unless you have something different to share with us because we may just want to answer questions that folks might have.

Richard Westlake: Thank you. Good afternoon everybody. For those we haven't met I'm Richard Westlake from Westlake Governance and I have my colleague, Colin Jackson with me. We would absolutely welcome the opportunity to talk through, to take questions and feedback and to encourage you to continue to participate through this, the public comment period which runs until 20 July.

Elisa Cooper: So let me just open the floor because the BC was part of the CSG meeting so I think for the most part everyone was part of that meeting so they've seen your presentation grade I think that there may still have been some questions that folks had so I guess I'd like to open the floor for any questions.

Steve DelBianco: And I would like to particularly turn to Laura Covington, Marie and J. Scott who's been so kind to volunteer to lead the BC drafting of our reaction to that. And we circulated amongst the drafting team just last week a pretty rich set of prior Business Constituency positions reaching back to the previous review that was done seven years ago, has it been that long.

And through that process the BC commented many times on structural elements, commented many times on the kind of process type improvements. So if you could address why you believe and concluded that no structural fine tuning -- and I don't like to use the word restructuring because it makes it feel so disruptive that no one would ever contemplated because it is so much work but fine-tuning of structure and voting, why did you take that off the table? I know that's going to be paramount on the minds of many in the BC.

Richard Westlake: Thank you for the question. It's Richard Westlake again. And as you would understand this is not the first time the question has been asked but it is a very valid question.

I think what we tried to say is that we're not saying the structure is perfect. We are saying it has been there for a relatively short period of time that it took an enormous amount of effort and was enormously distracting for a long period of time while the GNSO worked through, argued, debated and finally came to a structure of the two houses, four stakeholder groups, multiple constituencies.

So what we have tried to suggest is that we've provided 36 recommendations under four themes. We would like to recommend that you take those with the overall report, that these are, to our view, the substance of what we're

recommending and that form should follow function. Once you have implemented those that you choose to do because they're practical or because overall you have accepted the report, once you've made your final decisions as to how you will treat the report and its recommendations, that is the time we believe, to consider whether the structure is fit for purpose, whether it needs to be changed and if so, to what.

And I would caution that final step because it took so long to get there. We're not suggesting it's perfect but it's what you've got, it's how the GNSO is operating at the moment. We think about the difficulty in reaching any form of a consensus getting to the current structure. We would caution against playing with one aspect of that unless the GNSO collectively is very clear about what it is going to replace it with. So while it may not be the best of all possible worlds maybe it's actually that currently the least bad.

Colin Jackson: If I may just add one point as well. You referred to fine-tuning, I do think that the recommendations we've made around constituencies do allow for some fine-tuning. And we would hope that that would take place if those recommendations are implemented.

Steve DelBianco: Well the fine-tuning I was referring to, and that everyone in this room is thinking of, is the fine-tuning not within the BC but in the BC's relation to the Commercial Stakeholders Group, the noncontract party's house in the broader context of how voting occurs.

Richard Westlake: And I think those are absolutely valid questions to be asked. And the one point we want to make, which I think the board has already made, is the fact that structure was specifically not part of our terms of reference, yet many people commented on it, is that it's not in our terms of reference but it could well be if you choose to be, and the GNSO's terms of reference as to how you take the implementation and other moves forward.

But we would, again, caution that moves, changing structures, can be enormously distracting to people who are already phenomenally busy and probably have substandard work to do around the GNSO in developing policy.

Jimson Olufuye: Yeah, thank you. I just wanted to try a little more light on those recommendations with respect to transparency support and training for the constituency.

Richard Westlake: Sorry, could you - what was your specific question around that? Those are the recommendations we've made on transparency.

Jimson Olufuye: Yes, well like maybe just a little more elimination concerning maybe some gaps that you identified with respect to constituency, operational floor or training needs.

Richard Westlake: These recommendations are instituted or promoted to cover gaps that we perceived. And I'll just go through them. The first one is that there has been a number of attempts to form new constituencies. We found, in the course of our research, it very hard to find out what had actually happened and we had to interview people and collect information from a wide variety of sources that were not available to most public. And we felt that that was not in keeping with ICANN's spirit of transparency.

Decisions such as this should be made in a public fashion with the foreknowledge of all information and that should be placed where everybody can see it. That's the meaning of that recommendation.

The second one on the screen, that's Number 26, this is about statement of interests and to being clear about who is actually participating in decision-making statements, decision-making processes and PDPs. In many cases this is done but it's not done consistently, at least that was our experience as we were looking through all this.

And there was a view in many cases that this is not done consistently, which leads to people being concerned about people have hidden principles that there's a little bit of conspiracy theory going on in the background. People saying oh well - there's this group of people, they're not really doing what you think they're doing.

Our view is that is cleared up by clear SOIs that are enforced and required and a clear membership that is, again, clearly made available on a publicly accessible database so that everybody knows who's involved and what their interests are, simple as that.

Where there is an attorney-client privilege or some such that will prevent identification of a principle, we think that even if that is the case then it should be -- the attorney should be required to identify the interests of their clients with whom they're acting for even if they can't identify the client themselves. So, you know, I'm being paid to say XYZ or whatever.

The third recommendation on that page, that's Recommendation Number 27, I've pretty much covered already. And the final one is about language in the operating procedures. This looks a little hard to read as it just stands as a recommendation. But what we found when we read the operating procedures was that a number of things, particularly around SOIs, and processes in the PDP, are described in these rules as optional even though most people think they're compulsory.

Yes, we have recommended changes in the language and we provided that as an appendix to the report that simply say change things like "should" or "might" to "shall" and make effectively codify what we believe the practice is anyway.

Jimson Olufuye: Okay and on training? Training, what level of training are you also recommending?

((Crosstalk))

Richard Westlake: Yes, thank you very much. Richard Westlake here. In terms of training, I don't think we made specific recommendations. We did in relation to council office holders if I recall correctly. But we certainly recognize how difficult it is for people to get the level of knowledge required to contribute adequately.

So we are certainly, we are encouraged by the ICANN, I forget what -- ICANN Academy process. We certainly would welcome the process of buddying up, doubling, mentoring, whatever you like to call it when people get involved. A lot of that we think will be helped through the current, whether called scheme -- Fellowship scheme which is starting to introduce people, starting to make sure that people are exposed in the right areas.

But we certainly haven't been specific but again, when it comes to implementation we're hoping that the implementation group would do exactly that. And if we could perhaps go forward...

((Crosstalk))

Richard Westlake: ...Slide 15, back one. There we are. The Recommendation Number 22 does actually address it in relation to some. So there we are, skills and confidence these for each council member, training and development needs being identified, training and development relevant to each council member being provided, formal assessment system with objective measures and continual assessment and review.

So we're saying it's necessary. The details of it we've not gone into because we think the people who do it and are involved with it are far better qualified to do so. But the aim is to allow -- the objection we've had to date is that it is so complicated for people to get involved that the insiders increasingly, their level of understanding increases so the disparity between those who've been

here for a long time and those who are trying to come in now is only widening. And we're saying this needs to be addressed because otherwise it will be a self-ward, inward - self-fulfilling circle that eventually has to fail.

Jimson Olufuye: What about internal ICANN staff? Internal ICANN staff? Did you do some review concerning that? The requirement for training for ICANN staff...

((Crosstalk))

Richard Westlake: Our brief was to review the GNSO, not to review the ICANN staff so we haven't certainly.

Elisa Cooper: J. Scott and Maria.

J. Scott Evans: This is J. Scott Evans from Adobe Systems. A couple of times earlier today, and then again today when queried about our - or you could say received pushback from regarding the fact that you didn't address GNSO structure or the structural - structural issues that were given to you during some comment periods.

You seem to indicate that you felt like one of the things we need to do is sort of implement the changes, the recommendations that you've done -- you've put forth, those that we choose to and then see how it fits. And if they haven't helped then maybe look at a bigger change.

And in both of those instances you've pointed to the recommendation of allowing constituencies to form more readily. So could you go over those for us? Because you seem to be intimating that that might be a tweak that would at least resolve some of the tensions that we have perceived. You haven't explicitly said that that you seem to imply that that might be helpful in relieving some of the tension. So if you could just go into those for us here I would appreciate that, if there's no objection from anyone else in the room.

Richard Westlake: Yes, first of all I did cover the point around structure earlier on which I hope was adequate in those points. But going back to the question of constituencies, will they solve it. What we're saying is we don't know whether they'll solve it. We're saying there is a process that is set out around new constituencies, not just new constituencies but old superfluous ineffective constituencies also being dissolved, that it is a two-way process.

And certainly the board envisaged that in the recommendations that came out of the previous review said that. And what we tried to do was to say yes they've been implemented in theory but in practice it hasn't, in our view, been effective. We're trying to find ways of making it more effective.

But again the form then following the function, we're not saying it will resolve but we're saying see whether it does resolve before you presuppose whether it will or not. So addressing the structure now I think that's a very good example of why we think it would be the wrong sequencing.

Elisa Cooper: Maria, then Stéphane, then Ron.

Marie Pattullo: Thank you, Maria Pattullo, I'm European Brands Association. And, I'm sorry if this seems we are laboring a point but I'm trying to get my head around this. When you talk about transparency...

Ron Andruff: We can't hear you very well, could you get closer to the mic? Thank you.

Marie Pattullo: Is that better? Maria Pattullo, I am European Brands Association. On your slide about transparency, and you left out something with which we have no problem, you want a list of people who are in this room to be publicly available. No problem with that.

I work for a trade association, you want to know the list of my members. Go to my website, they're all there. Whois, now the point is I can give you an example of how some policies aren't going to get through the GNSO easily

because the BC has very basic things that if you want my credit card details I want to know who you are. That's part of Whois.

And why isn't it happening, because there are some other of the parts of the GNSO who have a different view. Now I'm not saying this is the time or the place to discuss that but I'm using it as an example as to why the current structure prevents policy working.

And your idea that let's come up with lots of new processes to be able to develop policy, and if they don't work they we'll change the structure, it's a wee bit like me telling you at the moment I'm renovating my house, which is true, but if I can't plug in the fridge and the cooker at same time then I do think that needs to be dealt with before I try to actually cook anything.

Thanks.

Richard Westlake: Marie, I'm sorry, I probably got lost in a little bit of that final metaphor but I think I've got the gist of what you were asking. We do think that the question around transparency is an important one so that people are quite clear about the perspective that people are arguing for or from. And I know that the BC, this is not a room which is likely to oppose that, we would trust.

There are as you say, other interests who will and that's why we had, if not posted because of client confidentiality at least the participants be required to state either the interest or the position that they are representing.

And we're not saying this is taking off bits in order to then decide whether the structure is right, we are saying look at what we believe are the substantial issues that have been raised and that we have identified. At that stage determine whether the structure you have can be improved and if so how.

Elisa Cooper: Stéphane, Ron and Steve, sorry.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks, Elisa. This is Stéphane Van Gelder. Hi. My question is - and I hope I didn't miss this because I came in halfway through so if I did these just tell me to shut up. But on the leadership succession planning, which I think is very important for bodies like the GNSO, did you or have you covered recommendations that would help with leadership succession planning?

I chaired the GNSO a few years ago and I worked with a system that's the system in place today of two vice chairs and a chair. But that system happens almost by accident in that there are elections or selections from each house for the vice chairs and for the chair is elected by the Council but these people may not have ever had leadership training of any kind or any experience of both the Council or the GNSO itself. That is a possibility.

There's no succession planning of the leadership structures built into GNSO today. So I was just curious as to whether that was something that you either addressed or could.

Richard Westlake: Thank you. That's a very interesting question. And given that leadership and sharing are absolutely core business of ours outside what we do with ICANN, they're very good questions I think as well.

What we have done is that question, that recommendation around training and where we talk about individual needs being identified we would certainly see that as including sharing for taking training -- training rather for taking sharing roles.

Beyond that, no, we haven't specifically addressed how would you go about the succession. We are hoping that by broadening the base of the pyramid, which is what the large bulk of our recommendations are about, reducing perceived barriers to participation which Anglo-Saxon English speaking people may not even be aware of so many of them will be unconscious

barriers that people like, for example, myself wouldn't be conscious of but they are quite clearly barriers to people who find it difficult to participate.

So we're trying to address some of those. By doing that we would hope to develop a level of energy which will, in a way, start to force some succession planning because it will be bottom-up driven, which seems consistent with ICANN, rather than top down and having to drag volunteers, which is the standard volunteer, how do we get replaced on the board.

And I'm sorry it's so wintry for you, we're from New Zealand and its winter for us as well so we don't feel too bad.

Colin Jackson: I'll just add one other point on that if I may which is that we are open for public comment at the moment on the report. And if you believe that there is something which should be in the report on this subject I'd urge you to ensure it gets included in the public comments.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Maybe I can just respond to that by saying that you need this is part of the public comment process. I think that we have a fundamental floor that whenever someone suggests something we say, make a public comment. We may not have the time to do it. I think this interaction is precious in that it's an opportunity. I'm telling you now that I think you need to take that into account. I may be wrong and it's just one voice. But I think it, you know, we can't just let it happen by accident.

I agree with widening the base. I agree with the cultural difficulties but I think that doesn't answer the fact that you know, I was vice chair and then share and that helped me immensely. Jonathan, my successor, the current chair, was not a vice chair and I know he found it difficult at first. Doesn't mean he hasn't, you know, gotten up to speed it's just about how can we make it as simple and effective as possible. Thanks. Sorry to take up so much time.

Richard Westlake: And my colleague has written your point down.

Elisa Cooper: Steve.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you. Steve DelBianco. On Page 96 and 97 of your report - and (unintelligible) going to bring it up for us right now. You did us the honor of acknowledging that we have significant problems with the CSG structure and what is forced on the Business Constituency.

You wrote, "The CSG is a mix of constituencies that are diverse and divergent interests. A number of interviewees expressed concerns that constituencies were established to allow decision-making at the appropriate level. And yet the board requires our disparate views and interests to be amalgamated artificially into a common stakeholder group position."

So I'm reading that thinking they got it. And then you said that we expressed those concerns, that the board has required us to have a single set of views and that the concept of that CSG is becoming meaningless and frustrating. So I read on to recommendations engine made no recommendations, didn't speak of it anymore. So while we are grateful that you acknowledged our frustration with that, it didn't rise to the level of making recommendations.

So I would just invite you to consider what potential recommendations would you have made and you decided not to or do you have advice for us to solve the problem you helps to document?

Richard Westlake: So that, I have to say, is an extremely good and amazingly fascinating question because we only, a little while ago, were sitting in a room where we were having precisely the opposite perspective argued as, very forcibly, the fact that we had acknowledged this was seen as almost heresy. And there was a very strong -- and we pushed back on that, well to agree that no, it only fragments the stakeholder group voice and dilutes it.

Now, to be quite honest, we've put it there because we think it is an absolutely valid perspective. If I could say, take that on notice as well as to whether it should actually lead to a recommendation. But we certainly have noticed it. We've raised it there. We've knowledge it is an issue for this constituency, some of the constituencies within the Commercial Stakeholder Group. And that other stakeholder groups argue precisely the opposite view.

Elisa Cooper: Not within our stakeholder group.

((Crosstalk))

Richard Westlake:(Unintelligible).

Elisa Cooper: No, we've talked about it and nauseum that we have unique perspectives. In fact we petitioned to have separate meetings with the board. So we feel pretty strongly that we have these unique perspectives. Ron.

Ron Andruff: Thank you, Chair. And Ron Andruff for the record. Thank you, gentlemen, for slogging through this with us because it's really important and you obviously, now understand after all these many months, just how nuanced these things are. And certainly sometimes you feel like a boomerang in so much as that you talk about here comes back and hits you in the back of the head from someone else. So it's very difficult and we do appreciate that.

You mentioned a moment ago, and I come to my point, you talked about as much as we could add new constituencies we could dissolve old constituencies. And that kind of struck me. It struck me from the point of view that the only new constituency that's evolved in my time since I joined ICANN about 15 or 16 years ago is the NPOC.

And they are slowly, slowly getting their seats in the various places. One place they don't have is, for example is the committee that Stéphane chairs and I'm the chair elect, that's the Nominating Committee. There's no seat for

them at this point and that needs to be changed. And we're trying to find a way to make sure that that does.

But when you talk about dissolution of a constituency I'm kind of wondering how that would work. I mean, even if I think about -- if I use the BC as an example, we are big business, large business and small business. So one might say as we advance the small business issues aren't being dealt with as much as the large business issues so maybe you might have a split there. So I could sort of see that kind of a scenario, you know, that's a very hypothetical one.

But I don't understand the dissolution of a constituency because that would certainly push us into a reform. But how do you see a dissolution of a constituency?

Richard Westlake: Ron that is again, a very good question. When I look at the constituencies that are there at the moment I would have to say I find it quite difficult to think of circumstances in which any of them might disappear, might become ineffective. They can certainly evolve, the issues they're dealing with will evolve but that's not to but that's not to preclude the fact that five years from now there may be a constituency which comes in which after a period of time does become redundant.

So we do have to leave that door open I think. You know, the facsimile operator's constituency, hypothetically, two or three years from now who cares?

Ron Andruff: So it's a placeholder kind of thought, that's - I understand that. Thank you.

Colin Jackson: I would also add that in the example you gave, Ron, let's say that there was a small BC and a large BC successfully founded. Then I'd argue that this one should ride off into the sunset because you've got -- its space is now covered by two different constituencies.

Elisa Cooper: Zahid.

Zahid Jamil: Okay, thank you so much for coming and speaking to us. I'm Zahid Jamil, I'm a former councilor of the GNSO from the BC and I come from Pakistan. First a comment on your opening remarks regarding the fact that the structure is so young and really hasn't been tested and we've got to give it time, is probably the least of the most, you know, of the evils that we have in front of us.

I have to say having worked in the Council; I don't share your view on that. I would say you need to speak to more people in your interviews because you might get different views on that especially people who have worked with in the GNSO, I think I'd encourage you to do that. We think it's worse than what was earlier. So that view is not shared. But we can go into that in further detail.

I had a question which is more substantive around scope. If you go to the ICANN website on GNSO review 2014, let me read out what it says when the RFP was floated.

"The objective of the review is to examine organizational effectiveness of the GNSO," which is in your RFP, "including its structure components," etcetera, etcetera, etcetera. So the review is for the effectiveness including the structure. My question is - and that's exactly what it says in the bylaw, Bylaw Number 4 of the ICANN bylaws says, and let me read that out, I lost it, where did it go? Performance.

And it says basically the review should also include any change in the structure or operations if it is desirable to improve its effectiveness. So the structure has a direct relation to the effectiveness, the effectiveness on its own is not important. Any change in structural operations that is desirable to improve its effectiveness.

And then I went to your RFP itself and I didn't see the word structure in there but I didn't see an exclusion. And then I went to the recommendations in the draft report where your scope paragraph says, "But any discussions on structure are not part of this review."

So I'm a little - I'd like to just understand the bylaws require structure review, the initial RFP page talks about structure review if I understand it correctly, and then we don't have that, it's been carved out of your report. So I just wanted to get some clarity on that. Thank you.

Richard Westlake: Thank you for the question. I think it's a valid one certainly. I think where we came from, if you'd actually read the report there is, about Page 117 or so, there's about three or four pages where we do address the effectiveness of the structure. And we also are quite specific in there as to why we have not recommended changes to the structure.

We were, in the briefing in the overall agreeing of that term -- our terms of reference, told that he was not a structural review and that we were to review these other aspects. But because so many people did get actively involved we felt it was necessary to address it. But again, I come back to the point, we said yes, this may well need to be addressed, we certainly commented on the fact that it's complex. We've commented on the fact that it leads to tensions and that there may be some other structures that are more effective or more - and more efficient because one or the other may be the outcome.

But then it took an awfully long time to get to this one and it would take I think more than, if you like, more than one chapter of our review to develop a new structure for the GNSO which would go -- which would provide an overall better outcome in terms of substantive development of policy around TLDs.

Zahid Jamil: I have a follow-up on that. First a question, it would be nice to know who it was that said that this would not be part of it, was that the GNSO, was it staff, that would be one question of mine. But sort of - sorry?

Richard Westlake: If I recall correctly, and I'm sorry, I am sort of digging into my memory here, Larisa Gurnick would be delighted to answer your question.

Larisa Gurnick: Thank you. Larisa Gurnick. To clarify that point, what was listed in the RFP referencing structure perhaps would have been clearer defined as structural components meaning the review was intending to look at the GNSO as a whole, the GNSO Council as well as the various components of the GNSO and the effectiveness of those components and how they operate in fulfilling their various respective missions.

There was some question about this actually before the Westlake team even got started with their work that came from the GNSO Review Working Party. So somewhere in the chat (Sharla) will be posting a link to a set of questions that was asked by the GNSO Review Working Party to the Structural Improvements Committee on this point and they provided some clarification.

So I invite you to take a look at that - clarification from the Structural Improvements Committee essentially said that Westlake was not to propose a new structure that was not part of the mandate. But that their review and the assessment of the effectiveness of prior review recommendations which were implemented as well as any new work that they did would inevitably touch on the question of structure and those questions of structure and how to make it more effective as the recommendations were proposed and eventually accepted would most likely become part of the implementation process.

Zahid Jamil: So just as a follow-up, it's really odd, I would, again refer to what Marie's concept was that as we implement we would then review structure sounds sort of backwards to me, one. Second, it would be nice if you could get some

clarification on this point of where you got that because I know that you are going to go back and probably say well we were asked not to do the structure and exclude that so there would be some information on where that information -- or that instruction came from. Thank you.

Elisa Cooper: Stéphane then John Berard.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks very much, Elisa. I just want to back up Zahid's comments. In every single discussion that I've heard about the work you're doing, that point has come up. Please correct me if I'm wrong but I think every single time from any part of the GNSO community people have told you we'd like to see some structure, at least some work, proposals, whatever you want to call them, in the work you're doing.

And every time I've heard that put to you, we've had this kind of response of, you know, actually I don't even understand the answer I've been given. It's meandering all the way, all around the single point. Sorry to be so brutal about it. But there's - it's a simple question. We want something in this work that addresses the current structure, whether we like it or not. And we don't understand why it's not in there because to us it's in your mandate and even if it wasn't you'd do well to put in there because it's the glaringly obvious thing that needs to be done.

Richard Westlake: Two sides to that response, I think. One is that, yes, there were a significant number of comments around the structure that it was specifically mandated that there - this was not to provide a recommendation of a new structure. That was the specific instruction, that it would not provide a recommendation as to new structure.

We did provide comments. It acknowledged that there would be comments on the structure and therefore that would be necessary. We have done that. But we have also made the point quite clearly - and I don't think it was going around the woods at all - to say that structure is not the first or, in our view,

the primary issue. And it is a distraction - it can be a distraction. The substance is what we've addressed in our recommendations.

Once the substance has been addressed, it is perfectly valid then that the GNSO should look at its structure, but as a separate and probably subsequent or parallel process to the implementation of the recommendations. And I might also just add, and we did quote this in our report, there was a significant number of people who said do not touch the structure, it is not the biggest issue; there are plenty of other much more important things and this is just a distraction.

Elisa Cooper: John Berard.

John Berard: John Berard.

((Crosstalk))

John Berard: Thank you. Fingerprint technology. When I believe it was the Singapore meeting, not the last one but the one before, when Ray Pzlak came to the GNSO Council to talk about the start of this review process. Ray made it clear that his intention as the lead board member was for this to be essentially a set of checkboxes reviewing the activities of each of the constituencies and the stakeholder groups to see what they did and where they did it and how they did it and if they get it.

And he was clear that there was not to be a structural review aspect to this. It was under, I believe, pressure from an initially that GNSO Council at that time, and then everybody else essentially piling on, that the notion of a structure review actually took some form which is reflected I think in the partial assessment that the report makes with regard to structure.

The difficulty that I have from eight -- now I'll make a comment -- is that you can play with that constituencies from here until Dublin. The difficulty is

presented in the composition of the houses. And so if there are constituencies that dissolve or others that arise, the problem, I believe, as I have heard it for the last few years from my colleagues here is that it is in the way in which the houses were artificially created that prevents things from sometimes not even getting an airing let alone a decision.

And so point of information, I think Ray's intention at the start was that structure be a word but not an outcome, that it was beginning with the GNSO Council and then others that caused it to - the aperture to be open. But that's ultimately what you offered is not even a palliative for what most people feel is the pain.

Richard Westlake: Thank you. Now you'll have to help me with the details here but I recall that a part of the GNSO, possibly this constituency, wrote to the board, the BGC or the SIC, recently requesting specifically that structure be placed on the agenda for this review. Am I correct on that?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Richard Westlake: I believe that took place. And I believe that the board committee wrote back and said it's not on the terms of reference but feel free to do it yourselves. I paraphrased but that's my understanding.

Elisa Cooper: Any other questions, comments? All right, well I'd like to thank you very much for your time. We appreciate it. So we are...

Richard Westlake: And I appreciate that you are applauding when you don't agree with us.

Thank you.

Elisa Cooper: Okay. So we are going to move into our policy discussion. And Steve DelBianco who's just done an amazing job for us this year and many years previous, yes, will be leading us and then I think we'll take the issue that Marc

Trachtenberg had raised with us, we'll hold that to the end. So over to you, Steve.

Steve DelBianco: Yeah, thanks Elisa. The policy calendar was emailed out early this morning or late last night, I don't even remember which but it's up on the Adobe Connect for those who are following at home and you can see it here on the screens in front of you. The first part of this is to quickly knowledge - and I know that this isn't news but this is the way I try to acknowledge the incredible contribution that a lot of you make at drafting and editing comments. And without that recognition I fear I won't be able to tap you for the next assignment.

So the first was to thank Andy Abrams, Phil Corwin, Andy Mack and Jim Baskin for the dotTravel Registry agreement comment. That went in on Sunday. And it doesn't exactly agree at all with our colleagues in the CSG, the folks at the Intellectual Property Constituency, and a few of them were quite taken aback.

But I would agree with Phil Corwin, I feel like this is one of those very principled statements that the BC made that however much we appreciate RPMs like the URS and would love to see it protected and expanded, we didn't think that the way to do that was to jam it on an existing TLD operator when they happens to have their contracts come up. So we've raised some process concerns.

And I would join Phil to say I'm proud of the way the BC took a principled stand. It's one of our best written comments in a long time because it articulates both are substantive issues but are process issues as well. Any comment on that?

David Fares: Thanks, Steve. And definitely agree with everything you said. I just like to clarify one thing regarding that URS adoption by dotTravel and that is our statement was clear that this was -- it seemed that ICANN was trying to impose this on dotTravel. And if they are -- I don't think -- I know we as a

company do not agree. If a registry were to adopt additional protection measures voluntarily in their negotiations with ICANN that there's anything wrong with that.

It's more about trying to impose this from a top-down perspective. And I think our comment walks a fine line there. And appreciate that we did walk that fine line. And just want to make sure that that's where we are in particular going forward that's where we will remain.

Steve DelBianco: That's helpful. And Phil just walked in so, Phil, Andy and Andrew Mack, think about whether the letter, as written, makes it clear or if not should the BC consider it, that if in fact dotTravel picked up the phone and said look, guys, we want that in there. Thanks for your defense from being imposed, we appreciate that. But, guys, we wanted in there.

If that happened I don't think the BC letter changes at all. And the BC then wouldn't be surprised that it was then adopted in the agreement. I think David is basically asking about voluntary versus imposed.

David Fares: Because I think anyone who is negotiating a contract with ICANN right now is confronting a bit of a challenge because ICANN is not willing to negotiate terms with the parties with which they're negotiating. And there is -- and any contract negotiation there has to be a back-and-forth. And if in that back-and-forth there is a general agreement to adopt additional protections I don't think we have a problem with that. I know my company doesn't have a problem with that. We have a problem with ICANN imposing obligations on contracted parties.

Phil Corwin: Yeah, let me jump in, and sorry I came in on the tail end, I got called by a reporter and it was discussing certain things with her. You know, I understand the letter is quite clear that this is about procedural issue and about the propriety of staff saying ICANN decided that these should be -- these terms should be the starting point for contract negotiations. I can't remember my

source but I have been told that they were -- there was nothing voluntary about the acceptance in this process.

And the letter, you know, that Andy and Jim Baskin participated in and Andy Mack and then was circulated several times was quite clear that if and when there's a proper PDP after the issues report is received that this constituency, I'm aware, would probably support imposing the new TLD RPMs. But if the question about if you let ICANN staff do this this time they'll do it again. And they can -- all their power comes from contract negotiations so if you can let them say we think the starting point for your renewal should be this and you think its policy implications that should come from the community, it shouldn't come from staff.

David Fares: That's helpful because I think you used the same words that I used, Phil, and that I was imposing. I think if there is willful agreement to adopt additional protection measures between the parties, that's a different circumstance.

Phil Corwin: Yeah, personally I have -- I've been thinking about is it okay to volunteer to put in the new TLD RPMs if we didn't have the situation where I can staff decided that for the sake of consistency that should be the starting point for negotiations. I've been thinking about that weather that should not, you know, its okay -- I don't know personally for me or for my clients and I don't know what the BC answer would be but that's not the situation we have.

We have a situation where ICANN was quite clear that they decide that contracting staff - it wasn't the board. I've talked to policy staff, they were, as far as I know, they were not consulted. They certainly didn't consult with the community. It was some people in the GDD decided that for the sake and consistency -- if consistency, number one, consistent with the bylaws is more important than consistency between contracts.

And if the consistency of contracts with the overriding principle there would be no new RPMs for new TLDs because we'd be stuck with the legacy ones.

David Fares: So, I think we're in the same place.

((Crosstalk))

David Fares: This was a narrow process point where ICANN was imposing something and that's where the BC's position is so that's very helpful. Thank you, Phil. Appreciate that.

Phil Corwin: And the letter I think was quite - was purposefully clear that this was simply about proper procedure and not about the substance of whether those RPMs should become applicable to legacy TLDs was about how that decision should be made.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you. We're going to turn to Andy Abrams next. But let me suggest this though, David's question is a little simpler, Phil. I think our letter is very consistent and specific on process. But if in fact the dotTravel Registry operator represents that they want to do it our letter is sort of off the table. We have nothing -- we have no complaint with them voluntarily entering something. I'm just trying to be black and white about it.

I realize there's never anything as black and white if ICANN comes to you and says this is the starting point and wants to negotiate and hold you to it. And it would be difficult for us to know the truth of whether the applicant - I'm sorry, not the applicant but the operator was truly voluntarily taking it on.

David Fares: All I'll say, you know, I don't know what they'll come out and say. I don't expect them coming out to say, we had a gun to our head, you know, they twisted our arm. I found out in the last week that there is a great deal of, you know, fear among contracted parties about getting sideways with contracting staff and about an inordinate delay or even having their contracts put out for rebid if they don't go along with what they're being asked to do.

Steve DelBianco: Andy Abrams.

Andy Abrams: Yeah, I agree with you 100%, Steve and David. My objection ends if it's voluntary. My only objection is if it's an imposition top-down by ICANN, you know, I think substantively the URS and other RPMs would be good for legacy TLDs. And I think it was entirely process versus substance.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks, Andy. Anyone else on this topic? Fantastic. Phil, Andy, Andy and Jim Baskin, thank you very much. Great comment.

Next one up is then June 14 we also commented on the release of country names and territory names and a handful of brands, Komatsu, Rico, Sony and a couple of non-brands, Andy Abrams, again, amazing work adapting a consistent BC position and then Andy does what he's done so many times for us before, he adapts it to the particulars of the TLDs that are being released and tries to make that differentiation between those that are dotBrands and those that are not brands, for which there's a difference in the BC's approach.

Andy, I just want to thank you for that. Are there any questions here in the BC about the work we've done on that? And seeing none I'll tell you what, we will continue to apply that, and I'll lean on you, Andy, because you do it so quickly. Thank you.

Andy Abrams: Happy to do it.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you very much. We also commented on the Registry Stakeholder Group charter amendments. And J. Scott, thank you for that draft, short and sweet, to the point. We got those in. And we also filed, in the earlier part of June, extensive comments on the CCWG proposal on enhancing ICANN accountability.

Aparna, Andrew Harris, Chris Wilson, Claudia and many other BC members assisted on that. And our comments - we are acting very well organized. And

then after we submitted them, 24 hours later, I was on the other side, right, analyzing comments and responding to them along the way. And no surprise I found all our comments to be pretty reasonable.

But we have 50 comments to analyze, and that was before we arrived here on Friday to find out that ICANN has another hundred 56 that we need to get through. And we'll do that.

And event on May 20 we had filed comments on the second draft proposal of the community working group for the IANA stewardship transition. I have more coming up on that later in the agenda because Phil and Susan have to vote tomorrow at Council on a motion to endorse and except and support that final proposal.

So what I sent along with the policy calendar for each of you was just a couple of pages where we compared what the BC asked for in the naming proposal to what the final proposal said. And in some cases they accepted, in most cases I'd say that the BC's concerns were addressed. But we just want to give Phil and Susan a clear indication about how to vote tomorrow on that resolution.

All right, let me turn to the public comment page items. There are seven up here and they all have dates that are far enough in the future we don't have to get too wrapped around the axle. And having said that, the first one up there is the one we have discussed so far about the schedule for these reviews.

This comment is due next week on July 2. And this is not on the substance of the reviews, it's on the fact that there are so many reviews this year that are driven by the bylaws, both the structural type and date Affirmation of Commitments type that staff decided to spread them out a little bit in a scheduled fashion.

We have never had a volunteer, on the last two weeks of calls, no volunteers in the BC wanted to raise an issue with it so if there are no concerns that BC will probably not file on this one. I don't feel the need to endorse it or differ with it. Was there anybody who had anything to say about the first item on public comment with respect to the schedule?

Great, seeing none. Number two on there is the RAA Whois accuracy report. Tim Chen, who is not with us today, and Susan Kawaguchi volunteered to draft one of those. And this is the Whois accuracy program specification review. Now, Susan, those are due next week and we need to get cracking on that draft. It is still something you think that you and Tim could work on??

Susan Kawaguchi: Well, I think what I said as I would help Tim. So so...

Ron Andruff: That's in the transcript.

Susan Kawaguchi: Yeah, exactly. So I have not heard from Tim but I'll reach out to him and see if he's got a draft and then I'll send him some points but probably not until Thursday.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you. And there are other members of the BC here in the room or on the phone who have enough experience with this item, this is the Whois accuracy program, which is part of the 2013 RAA, Registrar Accreditation Agreement. Who else has even the tiniest bit of experience with the Whois accuracy who could help to prepare a BC comment?

Susan Kawaguchi: Actually, if you go to that link there's just some basic questions that staff is asking and so if anybody has any sort of input just on those questions that would be a great place to start.

Steve DelBianco: Susan, may I add, we don't have to answer all the questions, you may decide that just two of the questions are relevant to the BC and let's get those

answers in. Now Tim - send Tim a note, see where he's going on it and let me know what I can do to help on that.

Elisa Cooper: If Tim doesn't help I'll help.

Steve DelBianco: Oh great. Thanks, Elisa.

Elisa Cooper: If Tim doesn't help.

Steve DelBianco: They're due next week so we would have to get cracking on those and get them circulated.

Susan Kawaguchi: Sorry.

Steve DelBianco: We - in almost all cases allow 14 days for review and comment. On issues for which the comment is too substantive and not controversial the Executive Committee can approve an abbreviated review period and we would certainly consider that. We rarely make it any shorter than four or five days but the Executive Committee can take that under advisement.

All right, the next one up is due July 7, not much longer after. And that is the Privacy and Proxy Services Accreditation initial report. So this is an initial report on how we're going to decide which firms are authorized to offer proxy and privacy services under the new RAA.

Proxy and privacy are the way that an entity could hide its identity from Whois except under certain circumstances. Now they've got a report together on how one accredits the services who offer this privacy and proxy and those comments are due the 7th.

Ellen Blackler, not here with us today, right, and Andrew Harris, thank you very much, have volunteered to draft on that. Have you given it any thought so far or can we provide some guidance?

Andrew Harris: I can tell you that Ellen is spending her time back in Washington DC working exclusively on this. She and I have been in touch and she's going to take the first stab at it. But we're going to work to get it done in an appropriate time to let folks review it. But we haven't talked substance yet.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks, Andrew. The end of this week would be a great target. And even if it's a rough draft you know that I've often circulated a rough draft and others will kick in. But I can also help you by reaching into the archives for other things we've posted on this topic. I'll do that. Or did I already do that?

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: Okay, I will do that then. Thank you. And let's move to the next one which is the pair of comments on the dotCat TLD and the dotPro TLD. So first thing I'll say - first thing I'll say on that is we may end up recycling the comment that we did on dotTravel if we don't hear something different from the dotCat and dotPro operators about whether they are welcoming the URS or not because the comment that Phil, Andy, Andrew and Jim did on dotTravel applies equally here. And that point was mentioned explicitly in the letter.

So I believe that everyone in the BC should be under the expectation we will file the same comment for Cat and Pro unless we hear otherwise. And for that reason I'd be looking for a volunteer who could do some outreach to those registry operators even if it's a private confidential outreach, and ask them, is this something you are volunteering to do? And if so we might change the way our comment goes in.

Does anyone know the operators of Cat? That's (Abriel Ariel), right? And dotPro. Any hands for people with personal relationships they could use for Cat or Pro? Thank you, Elisa. Elisa will make a little bit of an outreach. Let's try to tell them we're going to keep it confidential. We just need some guidance on where to go on that.

Are there any other comments from BC members on the substance of what is Cat and Pro? And not necessarily the imposition of the URS but with respect to their contracts. Do we have substantive concerns on renewing Cat and Pro? All right, seeing none that's only going to be a process point just like Travel.

I've already discussed Number 6 on here, the draft review of the GNSO. Those comments aren't due until the 20 July but we've already got a crack team of Laura, Marie and J. Scott who have volunteered to draft. And we just covered that topic here with these folks.

Please pay attention to Page 96 and 97 where they discussed this whole CSG problem for us and the fact that they didn't give us a recommendation. We want to make sure we put that in the written comments and remind them that they told us they would do something on it. Okay? Great

The seventh one up here is the release of country and territory names. This was just up yesterday, Andy, looking at you again, to see if we can come up with a recycled version of your comment on this.

Andy Abrams: Sure, happy to do it.

Steve DelBianco: Fantastic. Thank you very much. All right, we are going to move next to the Channel 2 where Phil Corwin and Susan can lead us through it. You'll see what's on the screen, if you roll it up a little higher for Channel 2; we've got a link to the agenda and motions. And all I pulled out of here was the key items that I think would merit some discussion here today. So our councilors understand where we're going. Phil and Susan.

Phil Corwin: Just go down the list. Is Susan here?

((Crosstalk))

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes.

Phil Corwin: Oh there you are. You're too close. That's why I didn't see you. Yeah, feel free to jump in. The first one I think is noncontroversial. I think we had J. Scott and other members on that working group. I think we're all generally very pleased with the work product and I don't see any reason to oppose or even discuss the adoption of the Policy and Implementation Working Group's report and recommendations.

Frankly, I don't know much about the Translation and Transliteration gTLD Contact Information, what's in there. Do you know, Susan, or does anyone else in the room...

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: This was reviewed Saturday. And the BC's recommendation on mandatory translation is not going to be followed. So their report does not agree with one of what I thought was the key recommendations. And, Susan, I believe you were the principle author of our comments on that. So should that actually, in your opinion, lead us to oppose this recommendation?

Susan Kawaguchi: So that was going to be my question, I just could not remember it so thank you. I mean, will we agree that, you know, that translation is not mandatory, I mean, if you really look at it it is very difficult and there's a lot of issues with translating or transforming.

And - but, you know, this motion would leave it up to the person seeking the information so you would receive it in whatever format, whatever character set that the registrant has submitted it in and then you - it would be up to you to use Google Translate or hire a translator or whatever and make sure that it - that you actually have - you know, received something usable and identifiable.

So I think our recommendation way back when was to have two different, you know, like an ASCII and then their own character set so.

Steve DelBianco: J. Scott.

J. Scott Evans: I think this is one of those - this is J. Scott Evans for the record. I think this is one of those positions where I know we asked for the perfect system but the reality is in any business record context you're going to have to translate it yourself. So it's not like they're imposing on us some sort of obligation that's never existed in the history of doing investigations and doing business internationally. This is something that exists everywhere.

I get it that we asked for the perfect system but we didn't get it. I think we look unreasonable if we throw big kerfluffle about something that is so technologically challenging. If it was just flip a switch and it's really easy, I think it's - we should push hard. This is not that easy. And when there's that much pushback I think we should waste our battles on something that is more unique to this space and is not something that businesses that are sophisticated should already be accustomed to having to deal with.

We're not giving them something new to deal with. We're just not fixing a problem that we'd like to see fixed. But, I agree, if I was running a registry that would be really expensive and difficult and it's fraught with error. It's fraught with error. And am I then taking on the obligation that if it's screwed up I've now created a problem that I have liability for? So I get it.

And I just think we should go with the flow on this one and - this is not one to waste our, you know, our - it's like with dotTravel, right? We took a stand. We could have sided with everybody who wanted something else. I think once in a while you just have to say this is just the cost of doing business and move on.

Steve DelBianco: Susan. Thank you, J. Scott.

Susan Kawaguchi: And I agree with you basically. I would love to get it my way. But I think we've all dealt with this with the ccTLDs anyway and it's - there are ways of figuring it out. I think the higher level that we need to ensure is that the information is there and it's consistent. Yeah. So I would say we just go along with it is what my personal...

Steve DelBianco: Susan, I would ask you to draft a sentence or two or a statement you can make prior to you and Phil casting our vote. And it does sound as if the - the sense of our room, unless I hear from anyone else, is that we would support the motion but you would indicate your concerns and have our concerns seem reasonable and then having the BC be seen as reasonable because we're going to go along with it, we're not letting the perfect be the enemy of the good in this case. Does that sound all right to everyone? Great, thank you very much.

Phil, back to you, we're talking about the Item 6, the motion on the next round issues report.

Phil Corwin: Yeah, this is a motion for a - to go forward with an issues report under the Council voting guidelines. It's - even if we have unanimous strong opposition from the CSG to this we still couldn't stop it and we don't have that. Unfortunately, while what's on the screen says Bret Fausett accepted this friendly amendment, late this morning we got a notice from Bret that his group - the Registries - rejected it.

They believe it's - the additional language we're proposing is not germane to an issue report even though it's about the issue report, you know, taking into account that there are future dependencies including the Affirmation of Commitments review. So I leave it to the BC. I think - I don't think just being silent is an option.

I think we either vote no, just say we tried to word something out that we thought was reasonable and we thought it was accepted and then it was - the decision was reversed by the other party or we express concerns and make clear that the next step after the issue report, which would be proceeding to PDP, that we want to lay down a marker that that PDP is going to have to be dependent on certain reviews being completed before it can be completed because of a general concern that not that we're necessarily opposed to a second round but there's concern that we're - ICANN is rushing forward too fast toward it without adequate consideration of the consequences and performance of the initial round.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Phil. We're going to take a queue and discuss this because the BC's challenge now - I see Marie, okay, the challenge for us is let's work backwards for how we might vote on this, whether we would tilt at windmills introducing amendments, what kind of tactics are available to us but keep in mind what the end game is here.

Phil started by saying that even if we wanted to we couldn't block it. And that's a big if. It's my sense, as your policy coordinator that the BC was not unanimous in its desire that there shouldn't be an issues report. What gave a lot of us pause, because many in the BC want to see another round that improves upon what happened the first time.

But the resolution doesn't just ask for an issues report, which is completely appropriate. The resolution has a second resolve clause which reads, "in addition to covering the required elements of an issue report, ICANN staff is also requested to provide options on how the subjects can be organized and worked through in a potential future PDP."

And I don't even know if that's customary for an issues report to have that in it. But that was a red flag that said that the intention here is that as soon as the issues report comes back it tees the ball up to move directly into a PDP.

And so the BC said well, if we're going to be talking about a future PDP here in a motion, let's additionally suggest that it shouldn't end until the other affirmation reviews that bring information on the next round can be taken into account. And I have to give a lot of credit to Bret Fausett, he's with the Registry Constituency, he accepted our friendly amendment, late last night, came back with an improvement on it that even expanded it to cover other reviews. And then the Registries shut that down this morning.

Their argument, well I'll let Phil look up Bret's argument and inform people on it. But this notion of timing and what has to be considered is something we're going to have many more opportunities to visit because the issues report itself will actually come back and vote the draft and a final which is where this staff scheduling come in.

We are going to participate on the Affirmation of Commitments review of the new gTLD program giving us many opportunities to keep pointing out, hey Council is doing a PDP on some problems in the next - for the next round and they need to be told to look at these issues that are surfacing in the Affirmation review.

So we will have at our disposal tools to bring things in to that issues report and to bring things into the PDP if and when it begins. This isn't our last chance to make a difference on that. So I had asked Phil to read Bret's rationale. Phil will do that and then in the queue I have Marie, and J. Scott.

Phil Corwin: Yeah, the message that Bret sent to Steve, Susan and I late this morning reads, "The constituency has instructed me not to accept the amendment as they believe it is inappropriate for the creation of an issue report. Their process argument is that timing should be something that is discussed in the creation of the PDP, not at the request for the issue report. Under our bylaws I'm required to follow the instructions of the constituency. I will discuss the rationale with you at a private moment. I don't think it precludes you from making the point you wanted to make after the issue report is prepared."

My personal view is I don't think it precludes us from making the point in the Council discussion tomorrow even if we don't offer the motion.

Steve DelBianco: So in the queue I have Marie, J. Scott and Stéphane.

Marie Pattullo: Thanks, Steve. This is Marie. It was - it's really a general point that I know that - okay - (unintelligible) in chair, can you hear me now? General point that I know some people want us to fast, some people want us to go slow but - can you hear me now? Okay, working?

I wanted to quote from Crocker this morning just because I think it could be important to us for the - what we decide to do and how we decide to do this. When you made all the points that you made at the table he came back and said, "From a longer term perspective this is the exactly the kind of thing that needs to be studied in greater depth. In order to do that study this may cause us to pause longer than some people would want to get into the second round." So we have that on record.

I'm not coming out here to say pro or anti but certainly from AIM's perspective we want it to be done correctly. And if we already know some issues are a problem we'd like those to be resolved before we just start recycling the exact same issues all over again. So I just wanted to put Crocker's words into the record here.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks, Marie. J. Scott.

J. Scott Evans: This is J. Scott Evans for the record. I hearken back to economic studies that were done after a decision was already been made that we were going to expand the gTLD program. And it didn't matter what the economic study said. And now we're in a situation where we've been told that there is - all this data that's going to be looked at and they're going to look at all these situations. So it seems to me all that information that's not available yet would inform us

to make an intelligent issues report and to really look at these issues intelligently.

I see the train leaving the station again. I think that today Fadi said to Susan four or five times, you gave us this, you told us to do this, so I sort of think we need to make a record that we can point to and say, in fact, we said don't, we voted no on an issues report. Because we want to be able to report to the record every time we have a chance to do input to say that we need to do the studies that that's been a consistent message all along.

I don't want it to be you're voting yes over here but no over here. I just think that the way (unintelligible) today we need to have a pretty good accurate record to point to when they say well you told us this is what you wanted meaning the GNSO and we're a part of the GNSO, so that would just - cautionary notes I would put out.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you J. Scott. But to clarify, an issues report isn't policy, the issues report is the precursor to move into a PDP. And so I realize that an issues report alone isn't policy. But it does frame the policy that will be made in the PDP. Stéphane.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Yeah, thanks Steve. Stéphane Van Gelder. Well actually J. Scott said what I was thinking. I'll expand on it. I was sitting in the board discussion this morning and feeling increasingly uncomfortable with what happened. And I actually - I may run contrary to what other people think in the room but I actually think Fadi's answer was the right one. I think our request was the wrong one.

I think we went in there fighting occurrences of what's really happening and then the board turned around and said, what do you want to do about it? And we're kind of stumped. And Fadi was able to get in there and say what he said about policy. We set ourselves up for that fall.

You know, the GNSO is something that we're part of. The new gTLD process is something that we supported. I couldn't agree more with J. Scott, this is an - we tried to work it out, you, Phil, myself, were in the room the other day. We talked to Jeff Neuman, we talked to Bret. Maybe Bret, you know, did have a good willed intention to make this happen, maybe he didn't. But what the result is we - the door's been slammed in our face.

So now I think we need to make a statement that we don't agree with it, that we think the train shouldn't leave the station without a drive in it and that we think it's too early. And the only way to do that is to vote against this as an issue report just to highlight what you said, an issue report may - I mean, it's semantics whether it's part of the policy development process or not but what it actually is is the first step and you know if an issue report is done there's a high probability the PDP follows.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Stéphane. Zahid and then Susan.

Zahid Jamil: This is really a question, Steve. And there is supposed to be review of the first gTLD round. Can you remind me when that's going to be? I mean, is that going to be - how is this going to interplay with that?

Steve DelBianco: The whereas clause in front of you is our suggested whereas clause. And it describes the Affirmation review. In addition to that - so just read that review, that's the Affirmation review. There's also a GAC requested independent review one year after the 75th TLD went into the root. I don't know where the GAC is on that but this whereas clause, Zahid, answers your question precisely. That won't be done until 2017 at the earliest.

Zahid Jamil: So we're having an issues report before that is fine. I guess.

Steve DelBianco: Well no, it isn't. I mean, it's a legitimate point is that the issues report would be from the perspective of the GNSO. To be clear, the Affirmation review is not GNSO, if everybody, it's worldwide, communities. And when they

Affirmation review is done, this is something the BC help to contribute so many metrics to if your call on consumer trust, consumer choice and competition.

When it's done it will go right to recommendations. There will be public comment on the recommendations. But you realize that it out of the GNSO's hands. The recommendations to write to the board of ICANN and the board can jam on through staff based implementation and the GNSO doesn't even get to do policy development.

And I believe that every single member of the Registry Constituency would say that's why we should own it, that there is a dilemma. If we want to own it through an issues report and a PDP well then shame on us if the PDP happens before the affirmation comes back with all the problems. We are setting ourselves up to fail in this gives our councilors and opportunity to catch them in the contradiction.

By not forcing us to wait for the Affirmation review we are likely to have the same problem where the board will jam implementation without GNSO even getting a chance to see it. So if we were to raise that principle point tomorrow and try to argue for why that amendment needs to be there, if you offer the amendment it will fail common it won't have the votes I think. And if it failed it would explain why you could then vote no. And the record would show that the BC is not obstructing the next round.

The BC wants to be sure that the next round lets the GNSO develop policy that's responsive to the true problems and concerns experienced in the first round. It would be that kind of a principled statement that it would lead to a no vote if we follow Stéphane's advice.

And I have Susan and Zahid, you don't?

Zahid Jamil: No that's all.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: I have Susan and then Ron.

Ron Andruff: A footnote to what you just said.

Steve DelBianco: All right go ahead, Ron.

Ron Andruff: Thank you. Thank you, Susan. I just want - you went over it very quickly and radically very important point. If you were at the heartbeat of the metrics and all the development of that. And I am sitting as a co-chair with Jonathan Zuck on that we're working through. So there's a lot of metrics, there's eight \$1 million study to get benchmarks on what does the new gTLD program or what do -- gTLDs in general look like to the people on the street all around the world.

We've never had any benchmark studies done. So there's a lot of metrics studies that are actually in process, not completed yet, apart from this OAC and so forth. So I just want to make sure that Steve said it but really understand, there's a lot of other elements out there that are being reviewed, being studied. And until all of that data comes back in and we really have some benchmarks on metrics, consumer trust and so forth, then we can start moving forward with some of these things. So that's another element I just wanted to make sure that didn't get past us. Thank you.

Steve DelBianco: All right. And we want to move the queue up a little bit quickly to get to the point of getting Susan and Phil clear advice as to where to go. Susan, you're up next.

Susan Kawaguchi: The one concern I have is that this all came out of -- this motion came out of a discussion group that was put together. And I'm not sure has anybody participated on that discussion group from the BC?

Steve DelBianco: We've asked for volunteers for about nine months. We've been to one or two meetings and we haven't been represented well and that's our fault and no one else's fault.

Susan Kawaguchi: I get that. But there is over 100 issues that they've identified. As I went through them, and I haven't looked for a month, and pricing was one of the ones I was concerned with. But so with the process with the issues report will we have a mechanism to feed other issues that were not identified into that issue report or is -- I'm afraid that it's going to be slanted that the ICANN staff is only going to rely on those 100 issues that they identified.

Steve DelBianco: I would say that they were being really formalistic. They'd say, well, if it wasn't in the list we're not going to do it. But that's not likely to be the case. I would ask you to stand that Excel sheet, find at least three issues that aren't in there, would have been there have be participated.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay.

Steve DelBianco: You can bring them up tomorrow and say, please keep the Excel sheet open for two or three weeks...

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay.

Steve DelBianco: ...and we'll contribute more. When you make a request like that it's really staff who just needs -I mean, staff hasn't even decided who they're going to assign to the issues report. And you can ask the staff if it's going to be a while and we come up with additional issues we'd like to know if those issues can also be put into the issues report queue.

Now if you do that you're asking for a confession of some kind, if you do that in the context of about to vote no on the motion it may not go so well.

Susan Kawaguchi: Right.

Steve DelBianco: So if you can find a few but if you can't find any then don't go there.

Susan Kawaguchi: Right.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Susan. Anymore?

Susan Kawaguchi: Yeah, let me just really quickly. I had a conversation with a couple of staff members last night and they were concerned about this motion. They definitely do not want to see it be, you know, this delayed until after the AOC, which I think we're off that. Yeah, we're not asking for that. But they were very concerned that the AOC be considered before this PDP closes.

Steve DelBianco: They agreed with that? Good.

((Crosstalk))

Susan Kawaguchi: They agreed so.

Steve DelBianco: And remember, the BC never said not to start the issues report.

Susan Kawaguchi: No.

Steve DelBianco: All the BC said is that the timing of the PDP that comes later has to be consistent with the conclusions coming out of the AOC.

Susan Kawaguchi: And all the other metrics like Ron was saying.

Steve DelBianco: No, no, no. Ron's metrics are the AOC review. Ron was describing the components of that review. All of those metrics we put together are part of the AOC review.

Susan Kawaguchi: Well actually they were - I'll go back and, yeah, there's a - because they'd actually mentioned a couple other things so let me go back and check that out.

Steve DelBianco: All right, Elisa is in the queue. I'm looking for any other hands. Okay, Elisa.

Elisa Cooper: So for clarification would the issues report only be completed after the last TLD is delegated?

Steve DelBianco: No...

((Crosstalk))

Elisa Cooper: No, they would start now. But with the issues report -- okay. I mean that's pretty concerning because frankly like six months ago I had no idea where we were heading and if we would have liked started the issues report six months ago we would have totally missed a very big issue. And God only knows seriously what's coming like really.

Steve DelBianco: Well to you what, I'd like to ask you if you could potentially help Susan on the exercise of looking at the Excel sheet of issues and finding three or five that are missing because that's the kind of a substantive change we will prevail on. We will get back in because they haven't even staff to the people yet.

If Brett were to -- if you were to bring up a couple of issues that need to be there but aren't and the others pushed back tomorrow I think we won the day because we've explained that they're deliberately ignoring legitimate concerns. And it shows that this thing really is being railroaded. And that might be a strategy to take.

So I'm going to suggest that from the conversation that it looks as if our default position is we will potentially identify items that were missing, we will raise concerns about the way this is teeing up a PDP. Well suggest that we pursued a friendly amendment that followed on the existing resolve clause and would have done nothing to slow down the start of the issues report or the start of the PDP and would only have allowed the GNSO PDP to take on board things that come out of the Affirmation.

You make that statement; you say we wanted it to be a friendly amendment. It wasn't. So we're going to propose it as an amendment. If you do that and it fails you explain why you would vote no on the main motion. So that's a three-step process. And I want to see a show of hands about whether we think that's an appropriate guidance for our councilors. How many think that's the appropriate way to go? I don't see -- only two hands so -- for hands.

All right so that doesn't carry. We didn't get any support for that. I don't know exactly -- all right, I'll do another ballot but pay attention, let's just get this done. How many want to pursue that plan of action? All right thank you. Hands down.

How many think it's a terrible idea and we do something else? All right thank you very much. Sorry to get impatient there but we've got to move. So we should work together on what that next step would be. Back to you for the next item on the agenda.

Phil Corwin: Okay that's the -- stop moving us if I can read it. Motion to approve, proposal from the CCWG on Transition of IANA Stewardship on Naming Related Functions. I guess we're voting for it. I think it's already gone for the ICG customer is this even...

Steve DelBianco: No it has not, Phil. This is the motion...

Phil Corwin: Okay. This was the motion that was...

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: To support it. And we offered a friendly amendment to say that the bylaws should be adopted prior to the transition but that other implementation items had to be committed to in writing and would be done in no less than a year. And we made that as a refinement because the bylaws of the options are quick and easy and by golly they should be done immediately before the transition.

And if they have to then create that PTI, the post-transition IANA corporation, I realize that the filing of corporate paperwork, setting up the new employee arrangements for that PTI IANA employees, that could take longer. And that would be implementation that's not a bylaws related item.

So we offered that as a friendly amendment and I never heard a word back from Robinson. But staff asked me yesterday for a copy. I sent it over to staff. What have you seen on the list so far? What's going to be up for voting under 2C - 2C in the motion?

Phil Corwin: Susan, do you recall seeing anything on that in the last 24 hours?

Steve DelBianco: Right, so it hasn't been changed yet. It was offered as a friendly because we didn't believe that it was absolutely essential given that the language in 2C already says that implementation would either have to happen by the transition or be committed to and happen in no less than a year. And we took the word "implementation" and split it into adoption of bylaws immediately and implementation later.

Susan, have they given any update yet? All right, Andrew Harris is in the queue.

Andrew Harris: Thanks. I mean, as far as that amendment does it's sensible in my mind. I'm curious, Steve, for your thoughts on supporting this proposal prior to the CCWG Accountability's proposal also being accepted knowing that so much in the CWG's report is contingent on those accountability mechanisms.

The answer that I've heard from Jonathan Robinson in other meetings is that the CWG's report already bakes in contingency for the accountability mechanisms so you don't need to give contingent support. You can just give support and that contingency is already there. But I'm wondering about your comfort with that.

Steve DelBianco: I would be comfortable with the motion to support the CWG's plan. And I don't think it will slow down the ability to get the accountability enhancements more like what you're thinking, will actually increase the likelihood we'll get enforceable accountability enhancements, because their dependency is explicit in their report.

Andrew Harris: So you're not worried we run the risk of sending the CWG forward and then having the CCWG report completely de-fanged.

Steve DelBianco: I don't think so not because the CWG report is in. If it gets de-toothed and de-fanged it'll be because of what happened this morning at the CSG meeting when he gets overly lawyered and we create here fear and concern within the community. Congress, the US Congress is going to back the community. The question is what is the community going back?

We have more of the risk that the community itself won't settle on enforceability then we have someone else taking it away from us. Think of the timing this -- okay cool. The CWG on naming is being dumped in now with the numbers and protocols. And so the ICG is going to mix those together and put out another proposal at the end of August for public comment. So through August and through most of September we have another chance to

comment on the three-part proposal and whether the BC would want to support it.

At about the same time later in September, does the CCWG will be issuing our report. So those things will pass together and will hopefully converge in Dublin and we all support them together. So there are multiple bytes left at this. And you raise a fair point that we don't want to lose any leverage and it might well be this gives us a slightly more leverage to the extent that the CWG insist on having six elements of our community powers to be in place before the transition could occur.

I have a queue I think. David, go ahead.

David Fares: If the question actually. Is the ICG obligated to incorporate the CCWG's proposals in what it ultimately submits to NTIA such that the CWG report will go forward but it will not -- nothing will be final from the ICG and tell the accountability work is incorporated.

Steve DelBianco: The answer is yes but not the mechanism you suggested. The ICG doesn't care about accountability per se, if ICANN will have to pair up the IANA transition from the ICG, that's the names, numbers and protocols. And they have to pair it up with the accountability proposal, claim and document that they've been supported by the community and then hand them to NTIA.

And that's because NTIA insists they want the package together. I think that Larry Strickling reiterated that on Sunday night that he wants the IANA transition functions and he wants the accountability together to come over as one package. So that's what drives them to be combined and nothing about the ICG. Anyone else in the queue?

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: Two C. So Jonathan Robinson is the maker of the motion looks as if adopted our amendment. He now says that 2C, are required by laws and amendments will need to be adopted before the transition, is exactly what we said, and that's all of the required implementation has to be completed before the transition or if not there will be a reasonable anti-revocable commitment that implementation would be complete within a reasonable period of time not to exceed one year.

So they adopted our friendly amendment verbatim on. And they said that in the event that the accountability mechanisms fail to meet the conditions in the stewardship report that GNSO Council has to formally reconsider any revisions to the stewardship final proposal that can be made because of such failure. So Andrew, they've updated the motion to include a conditionality if we don't deliver the six elements of accountability they need, they need to reconsider. Susan, thank you for that. Would you send that to the BC private and we'll all have it?

I think that everything we've discussed here at this table indicates the BC should agree with those amendments. And are they friendly amendments by the way from the maker? Is that from Robinson? Okay so, folks, no surprise then, that BC is going to support, especially because they accepted our amendment. Any other discussion of that item?

Fantastic, we're moving right along. Phil. It's just a discussion comment no motion is necessary so I believe will have discussed that to death this week.

We have a presentation coming up in about 20 minutes on that, 15 minutes.

Phil Corwin: Right. I think we all generally feel it's going in the right direction and that you're doing a great job on it.

Steve DelBianco: Check with me in hour.

Phil Corwin: Discuss concern -- Item 9, discuss concerns over ICANN's response to the IPC request regarding the dotSucks registry. I'm kind of chagrined that it only mentions the IPC and not the BC action on dotSucks.

((Crosstalk))

Phil Corwin: ...just a discussion and I think we are well versed in that.

Steve DelBianco: We're going to jump to that because you remember that Elisa had given us a request to Spec 11. In a moment I'll ask to load that Spec 11 - please don't do it now because if you look on here on Item -- underneath Item 10, councilors looking for comments on two character TLDs at the top level. And I don't find anything in the BC position history about whether we thought it was essential to have rules about two character top level like 3M, a company, right? XO, like XO Communications. How about FB as in Facebook, right?

We haven't taken positions one way or the other on two character. And this is sort of an informal request from Heather Forrest, who is the IPC councilor to say, should we start to identify issues about what rules should be there. You say there are now two character codes allowed because country codes would want to reserve all the different combinations for new countries that might be spawned.

On the other hand, we might say that a number character combination like 3M could work. But if we go down a certain path we could foreclose an FB for Facebook, we could foreclose and XO like in XO Communications. I don't think we're going to have anything concrete for Council tomorrow. And I don't really know whether you're even going to have a discussion on it. But we need somebody from the BC who might take this on as an issue to look at.

Anyone interested in giving a little bit of time to this? It's only a three page document, very easy to work with. I attached it to the policy calendar last night. Anybody with two character company names?

Elisa Cooper: I don't but I would say this, like as a business person is this really necessary to even be talking about right now? I just would ask a question. It just seems ridiculous to me. We have so much to be working on. Everybody knows, you know, two letter TLDs our country codes. Can we like not talk about this right now? That's really my opinion.

Steve DelBianco: Susan.

Susan Kawaguchi: I think one of the issues though is the GAC is talking about it. So if the GNSO doesn't have a stand then the GAC may run away with it.

Steve DelBianco: You're exactly right. The GAC would love to see all the two character alphanumeric lock down and locked away forever. And if we feel otherwise this is the time we have to weigh in with our concerns.

Susan Kawaguchi: Well, I don't feel otherwise.

Steve DelBianco: Okay, so unless someone takes that on the BC would have no position on that one. So while we're waiting, we have nine more minutes I think before the CCWG folks come in. I wanted to turn to you, David, anything you want to discuss with respect to the general CSG role that you fill?

David Fares: The only thing I forgot to include in there is that just remind everyone that there is be NCSG breakfast tomorrow. It starts bright and early at 7:15 so don't be out late tonight kids.

The only other thing is that I think that we had agreement that after the meeting with the board this morning that we should propose to the CSG that we write to both Steve and Fadi and suggest that we get three hours, because we didn't have sufficient time as constituencies to go through our issues. I think we would commend them on the new format because the new

format worked well. But we just need more time. And if there's general agreement with that I will raise that with the CSG - the CSG folks.

Steve DelBianco: Yeah, we should ask. Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: I'm not going to object to - Marilyn Cade for the transcript. I'm not going to object to you're asking but you might want to take a quick look at the allocation of slots just so you have your logic down for why the CSG gets three hours and hypothetically, since I haven't looked at it, the NCSG only gets X amount of time. Just so your argument...

((Crosstalk))

David Fares: Marilyn, I'm sorry, I missed which that you mentioned?

Marilyn Cade: I think you are taking - if you take three hours you're taking up three hour slots out of an eight hour day so I was just suggesting dig through what that's going to mean to the schedule so you can maybe head off some of the debates.

David Fares: Yeah, I think I'll put the -- I would put the onus on the board since each other constituency gets an hour that each one of our constituencies gets an hour and they can figure out how to re-jigger the agenda to accommodate that.

Steve DelBianco: I hope that we don't have unreasonable expectations that this will be well received request. So let's phrase it - phrase it respectfully. I would beg you - David is saying no. But let's phrase it respectfully and will not have an expectation and it's mostly to indicate it really felt rushed today. It might be that 45 minutes each might have made all the difference in the world instead of 30 minutes each.

David Fares: I think we should ask for equality and appreciate any additional time we get.

Steve DelBianco: Fair enough. All right, I'm going to turn over to Elisa now because at the beginning of this session Elisa shared with us a note from the IPC and then Elisa emailed it to all of you. It was the one regarding the dotSucks pricing and whether the dotSucks pricing is something we should challenge in light of what's already in the mandatory Specification 11 which is called the public interest commitments that have been signed by Vox Populi.

And what you see on the screen in front of you is Page 97 from the Registry Agreement, the second page of Spec 11; please look at Item C in the middle of the screen. I think that's the cause, right?

Elisa Cooper: Yeah.

Steve DelBianco: That's the clause that they would like us to cite as one that drives some alteration of the pricing policies by the guy sitting at the end of the room, John Berard, Vox Populi. So I'll turn it over to you, Elisa.

Elisa Cooper: Yeah, so I really see that a number of members have given their approval. So I guess I would ask, you know, do we have enough people, can we go ahead and say that we would also want to sign on to this?

Steve DelBianco: It would be my opinion that -- is there a timing at which they want a lever?

Elisa Cooper: Yeah, like I think they're looking for something immediately because I think they want to go back. And I think there was a particular board member who had asked.

Steve DelBianco: Look at the timing. But I would suggest we would do an email list. We can ask for a show of hands in this room and record that that we ought to email the entire BC - private...

Elisa Cooper: I did.

Steve DelBianco: Yes, they did you ask for votes?

Elisa Cooper: No.

((Crosstalk))

David Fares: Elisa did circulate it. There have been about eight responses -- 8 to 10 responses so far in support of the BC being associated with the comment.

Steve DelBianco: Then what I will do right now is quickly do a show of hands and I'll record the number and then I'll do a reply all suggesting that we have eight in favor, we have 15 in favor in the room, please indicate by tomorrow. So let's see in the room is how many are in favor of signing on to that letter? Stéphane.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Before we take the vote can I - I'm sorry to delay proceedings but I'm unclear on what do we want?

Elisa Cooper: We want them to be able to take some action. We want to point...

Stéphane Van Gelder: We want the board to take some action?

Elisa Cooper: Yeah, we want to point to this language and say look, in Specification 11 there is some language that says that the registry operator is supposed to be operating in a transparent manner with general principles of openness and nondiscrimination by establishing and publishing and adhering to clear registration policies.

Well, you know, they've gone back, things have changed, little, you know, not clear to me actually what was going to be in the sunrise premium list until we saw the sunrise premium list. So like people were kind of forced to register during the sunrise because there was like a threat that your name was going to be on there. Well lo and behold it was on, I mean, for the most part the

names were on their actually. But we didn't know. Like to me that's not - that doesn't adhere to those principles.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks, that's helpful.

Steve DelBianco: So I will send around a full review. But I would like to record in here for those who were in the BC room what was...

Marilyn Cade: Steve?

Steve DelBianco: Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you. Marilyn Cade. I continue to question why does Business Constituency always wants to align itself or identify itself with the IPC. If the Business Constituency, business users, have a point of view then I would suggest we express that point of view and take a vote among the members on what we say.

I really am uncomfortable, particularly after only two meetings ago when we frankly, all three constituencies, jumped up and down in a corner and took time in our time with the board to explain that we are different entities and we have different concerns. So I'm not by any means questioning what you say in the position you take but I wonder if you can't just take it as the Business Constituency?

Steve DelBianco: Thank you Marilyn. So I have a small queue I think in reaction to what you said there. And let me see who the queue is. David Fares, Cheryl and Phil. David.

David Fares: I think that Susan did a very good job this morning of explaining what the rationale is from a business user point of view regarding the challenges that we are confronting as a result of the pricing policies. It was not necessarily --

it was not presented as an issue related to trademark, it was an issue around the integrity of the ecosystem and consumer protection issues.

So I think we did address this issue into perspective from a business user. It just happens that the end result is the same but from a different perspective that the IPC is looking at it. I often think that we speak stronger when we speak together.

Elisa Cooper: Cheryl.

Steve DelBianco: Cheryl.

Cheryl Miller: I would agree with that. And I recognize that I'm a newer member of the BC but if there is an issue that different constituencies have an issue with and there are areas of commonality I don't see there being anything wrong with being able to express that. And I do think that, you know, I agree with David's point, Susan did do a really good job this morning about explaining the consumer side of it. And we just both happen to care about this issue. I mean, different companies are caring about it for different reasons so.

Steve DelBianco: Elisa and then Phil. Okay, Phil.

Phil Corwin: Yeah, when I walked into the room and hour ago there was a discussion of dotTravel and how the BC taking a very principled stand regarding procedural issues on the dotTravel registry renewal agreement had upset people in the IPC. And I think you know, when we have a different opinion we're not afraid to take it.

But businesses are trademark owners and when there is a convergence of interest and agreement on an issue I think we shouldn't refrain from working together. And that may strengthen the position. I did want to comment -- I have no objection to the section 11 argument or joining with the IPC on that.

I did want to note, and I discussed it with Elisa this morning when I wrote about the dotSucks controversy back when I can sent a letter to the FTC, there is a broader issue that's not specific to the differential pricing issue which is the fact that, as I related to the board this morning, other registries are now changing their pricing policies.

I know that the famous four, where they'll give you a brand protection for only \$500 a year but they set some prices up to \$10,000 per year. And I would suggest -- in the article I suggested that ICANN said this morning, what you told us not to put any restraints on pricing and what can we do and what are you asking for.

I suggested in the article something we could ask for, I think it needs to be developed, which is ICANN's board - ICANN fought very hard into new TLD Registry agreement to - for Section 7.6 which allows the board with the power to approve special amendments on applicable registry operators when it's just, "justifiably substantial and compelling reason in the public interest."

And that term is defined to mean a reason that is justified by an important specific and articulated public interest goal that is within ICANN's mission and consistent with a balanced application of ICANN's core values as defined in the bylaws.

So there may be a possibility of drafting a separate letter which suggests on the fact that we're seeing very high pricing for trademark terms at many registries, that this might be inappropriate area where ICANN could consider a 7.6 special amendment. It separate from this but I wanted to just mentioned in this discussion that option may be out there. They shouldn't preclude us from going forward on the other argument now.

Elisa Cooper: And I just wanted to say, shame on me because I know this part of the contract really well and, I mean, so when, you know, Marc Trachtenberg said like we could use this like, I mean, I wish I had thought of it but they did so.

Phil Corwin: And to complete the that, (unintelligible) could specify that pricing for names registered in the trademark clearing house which would encourage much broader use of the clearing house and make it a real rights protection mechanism rather than a mechanism that's being used to target trademarks for high prices.

Steve DelBianco: All right so I'll ask either anyone who would object? Aparna?

Aparna Sridhar: Just - we don't object. I think the one caution I would just add to this discussion is this is obviously a very unusual situation. And the language in Spec 11 is fairly open-ended. And so I think it's appropriate possibly for this piece but we're not -- I hope in this group we're not approaching this as sort of broad price regulation or regulation in all cases is necessarily the answer.

Steve DelBianco: I would certainly agree with that. I should ask, is there any objection noted in the room, realizing that I will only count the numbers that come in by email. There have been nine indications of support thus far. And I just want to record in the email to the rest of our membership that if they haven't voted thus far were there any objections in the room to signing on?

So we have one objection in the room. Okay thank you. So I'll send this around to the BC giving us until noon tomorrow, Buenos Aires time for those who haven't voted by email to please do so. And that will allow us to have very strong indication about whether, by noon tomorrow, whether we could sign on. Thank you very much. And I think we are done with this segment, the policy segment. Break time.

Elisa Cooper: I wish. I think I saw Thomas Rickert walk in but I'm not wearing my glasses but I'm pretty sure...

((Crosstalk))

Elisa Cooper: Yeah, oh there he is. Welcome. Thank you for joining us. I know that you are here to talk to us about the CCWG. And I think we have some slides.

Steve DelBianco: The same ones I had to load this morning in the CSG. It was the town hall - town hall PDF.

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: Just in case you need the pointed one.

Elisa Cooper: Oh I'm sorry, I'm sorry, I'm sorry. And I told you that he didn't have slides. Yes sorry, no. Too much.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks very much to both of you and welcome, everyone. In fact, we've chosen not to come with a deck of slides but we do have slides in the backpack if we need them. However, we do think that since the BC has spent so much time analyzing what we did since we have huge participation particularly from Steve, you while know what we've done, you all know what happened since we closed the public comment period and when we started analyzing comments. So we think we make the best of our time if we just try to answer the questions you might have as much as we can.

Steve DelBianco: No, I think that's great. You guys have been amazing as co-chairs trying to keep us on an even keel and focused on the point of arrival of enforceable community powers. It's been a heroic effort and I know we'll probably have a few more toggles between now and the point of arrival. Prior to you coming in, we endorsed the CWG Stewardship's final report because counsel is voting on that tomorrow and the BC will be supporting the amended motion for that.

And we haven't yet, in the BC, discussed the CCWG in any great detail at all. This morning the entire CSG was in this room, and I would say that's a fraction of the people here were in attendance. And there we focused on

linkage between the CWG, the side with our six bullets on it, Slide 19 I believe it is. We talked a little bit about the voting powers.

And there were a number of IPC members who were concerned about the enforcement mechanism. But we didn't really spend much time (unintelligible) general overview of examples about how one would use these new powers once the bylaws were changed.

So I would invite you two to give your perspective on what's really happened since Friday morning and a new model that you're finding as you go around the ICANN meeting I think we're finding that there's less resistance to the structure with this new approach.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks, Steve. I guess the lessons that we've learned from the public comment period and from the discussions that we had on Friday I that we need to work more in three areas. We need to work more in three areas.

And that's good because in the other areas, i.e. the community powers are such, the work that we did on reconsideration and the IRP, we got broad support. So obviously the community joins us in thinking that the recommendations that we came up with will substantially enhance ICANN's accountability.

But the three areas where we obviously need to explain better and to provide more substance are to be more -- to work on diversity, so that's being made a task for our group not only as an aspiration but also how to operationalize diversity at all levels, openness and flexibility of the recommendations, i.e. if we come up with a model where the SOs and ACs, i.e. the community that's empowered, how do we deal with future situations.

Let's say that constituency for providers or companies working in the area of Internet of things, we don't have that yet so we might need to adjust. And will the system be flexible enough for accommodating those needs?

And the third area is the actual legal vehicle for exercising community powers. And that's the point, Steve that you alluded to. And the model that we came up with, that's our current thinking, it's not yet carved in stone so please don't perceive that as a definitive solution but just as a snapshot of where we are at the moment.

There has been a lot of hesitation that we make changes to the existing SOs and ACs. So we will leave, at least in the initial phase, the legal status of the SOs and ACs entirely untouched. They don't have to do anything. There are groups who already think that they have legal personality. Others think they don't have one. And we don't care.

It's not for us to decide. Everybody can say what they are. They will have voting rights. Those voting rights can be exercised according to a scheme that we need to further develop as we learn which groups actually want to weigh in. And the SSAC, for example, has chosen not to vote but to maintain their advisory role.

But if we find out at some future point in time that the board chooses to ignore the community's wishes, if the board chooses to ignore the outcome of an IRP, then we could switch on a more formalized method with more authority and that would require only one of these groups to pass a resolution that says we have come together to exercise community powers under the bylaws.

And the bylaws would mirror that. By doing so we would have enforceable rights, i.e. authority to ultimately enforce those rights in front of courts. But let me be clear, courts are a matter of last resort. We will build in additional layers before people can invoke court procedures to help reduce the risk to actually be forced to go to court.

So I think in a nutshell it's more or less a hybrid model where we go with the status quo. We can go more formal and have full authority and later stage. It

is sufficient for one group to do that, not all groups have to follow. And even those that don't follow will still have the same impact with their votes as if they chose to change to a different status.

And we will make sure that the wording covers that so nobody should be afraid that if they choose not to go forward that their impact in these community voting mechanisms will be diminished.

I think I should pause here and hear whether there are more questions.

Steve DelBianco: Thomas and Leon, in the town hall meeting yesterday there was a pointer to made on diversity. And we missed the chance to answer it with the slide in front of us. Diversity was the first point you brought up. Do you see the little blue dots in the circle of 29 votes? There was actually a rationale for why we started with five votes each for the major ACs and SOs.

And I think it was because the GAC has five regions. Sorry, Andy ALAC has the same five regions. I hope they're the same. But the point is they have five each and it was seen as a way to accommodate their participation in the voting structure to say that they would have five votes and that way to regions could vote differently than the other three are perhaps the ALAC would have all five votes in the same way and that's fine.

So that five automatically extended here to the ccNSO and the GNSO. And in the GNSO. And in the GNSO it'd be up to us to figure out how those five votes get allocated because we have really stakeholder groups that boil down to four stakeholder groups and we have to figure out what to do with the fifth vote.

Thomas Rickert: Being rooted in the GNSO the number four would certainly jump to mind. But being a NomComm appointee, I would say the first vote could go to the NomComm if one chose -- so I think we could make use of the votes. That actually the first point, Steve, that you mentioned is an important one.

We wanted to reflect diversity and the need of the advisory committees in our proposal. And in fact this has been an offer. We wanted to place every of these groups on equal footing. Certainly we give SSAC and RSAC less votes than the other groups for the reason that their mandate is somewhat different and their constitution is somewhat different. But the idea was that in this new era with this new scheme we would actually allow for everyone to play the same role and not discriminate any group.

It now turns out that SSAC and RSAC will likely pull out. SSAC has made this very clear this morning when we met with them. There are discussions inside the GAC that they have difficulties with exercising votes; they have difficulties with legal status. They want to -- they have a very clearly delineated limits on (unintelligible) matters. So I wouldn't be surprised if they also chose to take a different route with this but that's yet to be seen.

I think it was on us to give everybody the opportunity to be a part of this. And we will have to allocate thresholds, the composition whether it's going to be block votes or not depending on that community power involved and depending on the groups that are actually going to be part of this.

And also let's make this very clear, if, let's say, the three groups chose to take an advisory role only what we will have to ensure, and I think this isn't sufficiently clear in our report is that by doing so we will not mitigate their impact. So if SSAC, for example, issues advice you will remember that we will have by law language making security and stability part of ICANN's core values or mission and therefore if the board chooses to ignore what SSAC has advised then that might be a violation of the bylaws. And that could give people standing to use an IRP.

So then by mandate there might not even be a need for SSAC to have a voting power on the budget which is none of their business anyway. And that route could be taken for the other two groups as well. But we have to make

sure that we don't find ourselves in the position where the GAC issues advice and the community then put out of existence the liaison mechanism that is currently in the bylaws between the board and the GAC. So that must not be diminished.

And I think if we communicate that clearer than maybe the individual groups will have an easier time finding their place in this new system.

Steve DelBianco: I have a follow-up while I'm waiting for a cue to form. And a follow-up comment did you meet with SSAC or RSAC today?

Thomas Rickert: SSAC. RSAC is later today.

Steve DelBianco: Later today. Well I would just be interested in a definitive answer about their decision not to participate in any of these voting powers, did it have anything to do with perceived complexity problems that we have obviously relieved with the Friday proposal? So would they reconsider under those simpler entry points?

Leon Sanchez: Yes, Steve. This is Leon Sanchez. No, their take on this is it doesn't have to do anything with a perceived complexity or anything, they just want to remain advisers. And we also made it clear that should they need to reconsider at a later stage they would be able to do that so they could weigh in any time. So it's a very flexible model that really tries to be not only lightweight but flexible so everyone is happy with it.

Steve DelBianco: Twenty-nine goes down to 24 without SSAC and 25 without SSAC and RSAC. If it turns out that the GAC would prefer not to alter their current status it drops to 21.

Thomas Rickert: If I may? I guess there was one angst in the SSAC that we would try to influence their current charter to augment their remit. So they were afraid that they could be forced in a voting scheme to speak to issues of budget or

others, which they don't want to. So nothing to do with complexity or perceived complexity they just want to maintain focus, they want to have an impact that they see the current vehicle for having that impact as sufficient to account was their mission.

Steve DelBianco: Seeing hands up. Sebastian.

Sebastian Bachollet: Yes thank you very much. Sebastian Bachollet, a member of the CCWG. I don't want to take the time for, it's your turn from the Business Constituency to express. But I just want to pick up one sentence because I think it's - I did agree with strongly.

It's not because the SSAC wants to keep its advisory role, that they will not participate because the other advisory committee may stay with the advisory role but become part of this group. Its two things different. It's to be part of this process that they are thinking not to - and maybe we need to think about how we can have them on board and maybe it could be a liaison role.

But I don't want to answer this will be the CCWG discussion but just my point was the sentence, as I am coming from an advisory committee I will not abide this advisory role but maybe we will participate. I hope so. Thank you.

Steve DelBianco: And if we ended up with ccNSO (unintelligible) and GNSO and ASO, we'd have four groups, two SOs and two ACs. We went at that point, represent the G side and the CC side, and we represent that At Large which uses all kinds and the numbering group so we'd have all of the naming and all of the numbering.

And there have been questions from the board about whether the lack of participation by some, without undermining the legitimacy of it? But I for one feel that if we had ccNSO, GNSO, ASO and ALAC we've covered the global community of either registrants and end-users, whether you're a CC or a G. Is there anyone here who would feel this model loses its legitimacy if GAC,

SSAC and RSAC decided they didn't want to vote? We haven't heard anything so far but we're just checking with that.

And, Sebastian, since you're here, we were talking about diversity earlier.
Were you here for a discussion?

Sebastian Bachollet: I just arrived for the CCWG report.

Steve DelBianco: Right, and at the beginning of that Thomas said that one of the first - one of the three things we've heard and trying to respond to our diversity. I then pointed out that the reason there is five dots in there was the geographic diversity of the GAC and ALAC, ccNSO and ASO, so that the five regions that they naturally work into date would work there.

But you have been the most vocal proponent of other forms of required diversity in the area of age and gender, for instance, which I think you brought up earlier. And this would be an opportunity if you want to articulate how would we enforce rules like that with a voluntary and participatory body?

Sebastian Bachollet: Thank you, Steve, for the question. I am not -- as you know, I am not too much on the question of enforceability even one of my main question about what we are doing and proposing for the CCWG. I am more about the trusting model.

And I think that we need to ask and to improve in each and every committee the gender balance, for example, the age balance and so on and so forth. I looked yesterday a photo about the universal acceptance I was thinking oh, my God - I have no God, sorry, but there is just man. And how we can have a universal acceptance with no women. The world can't be like that.

It's a specific topic where the photo was just man, sorry. And that's -- we need to try to find how we will help to improve this diversity. But it's true, at the cultural level, at the language level, at the gender level, at the age level,

we need to improve that. And I know that there are part of the community who are doing a lot in this direction and the other must follow.

I am not sure that we need to say that -- how we enforce. I'm not yet there. I think it could be first voluntary, hopefully they will follow. Thank you.

Steve DelBianco: Appreciate that, Sebastian, but please do note that the current idea that's being proposed is also voluntary. If these 24 or 29 votes were to block a bylaws change we are counting on the board to follow the will of the community. There is nothing mandatory about the votes. It's only if the board defied the community voting that you look to enforcement. Enforcement is the last resort, not a first assumption.

Other questions for our co-chairs? Suggestions? I have probably bored them to tears on CCWG over the past several months. More than likely this is my fault and not yours.

J. Scott.

J. Scott Evans: Just one little point. You made a point earlier that if GAC, SSAC and RSAC pulled out there would be 21 votes, there actually would only be 20 so we would need to handle the problem you don't want to have an even number of votes you want to have an odd number so that you can always get the majority.

Steve DelBianco: Since none of our powers are simple majority, they're all super majority common it might well be that 75% of that 20 is 15 and we could end up being okay. Great, I think that's all and I want to thank the co-chairs for the amazing job you've done so far and good luck in your next briefing.

Thomas Rickert: I know our time is up but let me use the opportunity to thank Mr. Stress Test himself for his outstanding work. You know, when we are doing our work we need to make sure that we are not creating additional risks, that we're not

creating unintended consequences but yet come up with a system that is sufficiently robust to safeguard ICANN against all the contingencies that we've identified.

And Steve and his colleagues have done an outstanding job in that fashion crafting the stress tests, the methodology and turning around every request that we had in no time. So you can be happy to have him here. Thank you.

Leon Sanchez: Thanks, everyone.

Elisa Cooper: All right, thank you so much. I see actually Nick Tomasso just walked in and I think we are actually ready to hear from you so if you want to come up to the frontier. So the next topic we'll be covering is just a quick 10 minutes on the 2016 meeting schedule. And I have a copy of -- and I think yes, we just pulled up.

So I think that there were some questions that folks had about the new meeting schedule so we've asked Nick to come here just for 10 minutes. And maybe you can - hi -- maybe if you have your questions for Nick and maybe Nick can share with us kind of the feedback that you've gotten so far and especially some of the concerns that you're hearing and what you think we need to be thinking about for the new meeting schedule.

Nick Tomasso: Well I'm happy to begin. Nick Tomasso for the record with ICANN. We have been working on a new meeting strategy, as I'm sure you know, for quite some time, and I know you have as well. Most recently we had a meeting with the community leaders, the SOs, ACs, SGs, Cs, Friday to further discuss Meeting B and to try to put some parameters around that meeting since that's the one that seems to be most contentious and confusing.

I'm happy to report that later today that community leaders will be getting a document, basically a Buenos Aires schedule where we've commented out all the meetings that would not take place in a typical Meeting B moving

forward. So I hope you find that very helpful in your analysis and discussions as to how you build your schedule for Meeting B.

Meetings A and C, as you probably know, while there are some nuances as to how we would run those meetings, Meeting A look somewhat similar to a typical ICANN meeting with the exception of breaking the public forum into two sessions, one earlier in the week, one later in the week. And Meeting C is an extra day; it's our annual general meeting and will have some additional content, public outreach, media, etcetera.

I'll stop there and see if there are any specific questions that I can help answer today.

Elisa Cooper: I think most of the questions or concerns that I have heard are around Meeting B. And so this is it, it's a four day schedule. So what I've heard is that it will not be possible though to have any meetings prior to Day 1 or after Day 4, is that true?

Nick Tomasso: That is correct. It's important to mention that this schedule and a new meeting strategy was developed by the community. And when they thought about what was necessary and they got feedback from each of their SOs and ACs and SGs, this is what they came forward with as the ideal recommendation.

It's very important to note that much of the clutter, if you will, and the conflicts, which is why the strategy began to evolve in the first place, have been removed from Meeting B. No opening ceremony, no public forum, no board meeting, and no GDD sessions, no high interest topics etcetera.

So we're really thinking about changing the name of this meeting, and of course I'll need to do a lot of additional work with the ICANN leadership and the community to do that. But we are thinking about it as a policy for them now, not an ICANN meeting because to continue to collect an ICANN meeting sets an expectation that it's not designed to meet.

Elisa Cooper: Any questions? No? Okay well -- oh no, Phil.

Phil Corwin: It's not a question but it's a concern I've heard from a number of people. And I don't know that there is anything you can do about it, we'll just have to see how things go although it might impact the selection of the site for the four-day meeting.

As I understand one of the rationales was that this would be a shorter meeting with fewer participants which would allow it to be held in venues that are big enough for the big meetings. But I know I was delayed by a day in getting down here. My girlfriend was delayed by a day getting -- many people I've talked to was delayed by 12 to 24 hours getting here, some have still not gotten their luggage.

And if a smaller -- let's say we were going to a smaller venue in Latin America where we had to connect through Buenos Aires - I've heard concerns from many people saying that the travel time to and from the meeting may be longer than the four days of the meeting.

I don't know what we do about that. But I would hope that air travel connections and the percentage of delays are factored in when sites are held so that we don't have, you know, if you show up one day late for a six or seven day meeting it's one thing but if you show up on the second day of a four-day meeting and your luggage doesn't show up until the day you're leaving or maybe not even then, it's quite a difficult experience.

And it has nothing to do with the format but just with the targeting of smaller venues, which by definition will have more difficult air connections.

Nick Tomasso: And that's a valid point. When the Meeting Strategy Working Group designed this the goal was to absolutely put Meeting B in locations that have always

wanted to hold a meeting but have been unable to because of the limited size of the meeting facilities that they have in that country.

That said, we won't always put it in that type of location. And one of the things that I'm struggling with right now is what is the attendance at this meeting actually going to be. While we said it certainly is a shorter duration, I'm not entirely sure it'll lead to fewer people at this. Certainly for the inaugural one.

So we're very conscious of what you've just described and we're working on locations now, actually the ones I'm considering today are more mainstream accessible locations than the smaller more remote locations.

Zahid Jamil: Possibly an unrelated point but I think it has to do with being able to get access to these meetings. I got my visa on Thursday. I had to be here Friday. Difference between me and there was 54 hours, it's not going to make it. And ICANN travel consistency didn't help at all. I'm sorry; I got to get that on record. Zero help. No calls, no emails to anybody. And I was a NomComm member. I mean, you can imagine the rest of the membership of the BC, for instance, if they're trying to get here. Nobody cares.

It's very important that we have people in travel constituencies and people helping with logistics understand what it takes for people from different parts of the world to acquire access and visas. It's absolutely clear that the people I was dealing with had no conception what is required for a visa application because it took them approximately 45 days to actually get their documents together at the ICANN travel constituency, which is (unintelligible). I'd already mailed my application a month and a half ago.

So it - when you do smaller venues and smaller places like this or smaller days, it becomes extremely crucial - just taking Phil's point - that we get the logistics and the accessibility for policy development people to just get it right.

Nick Tomasso: I don't manage travel but I'm very disappointed to hear that you had that type of experience and I'll pass along your comments to those who do. We are aware of visa issues. And as we look to the future and we're able to start booking ICANN meetings further and further and further in advance, we're also going to be launching the website for those meetings earlier which means that you will have ample opportunity to access visa information and visa accommodations.

So the host letter, I can letter, etcetera, looking at a hotel you'll be able to do all of that easier. And one of the things that I understand was a bit of a holdup here was the confirmation letter from the hotel.

Zahid Jamil: Just a quick comeback, I don't want to make this too lengthy discussion. But there's got to be some commitment from either the host that there is a process to make this expeditious. Let me just tell you what the bottom line the embassy told me - and I had to get my foreign office to do this.

They simply said to me in a meeting when they eventually met the ambassador he said, why did you apply through the ICANN process? For God's sake are you nuts? You should apply for a tourist visa. You've been there before, we've given it to you before, we called you into do this. I said well, that's what the NomComm told me to do. I just didn't want to be wrong. He said please to do that again.

And they were -- I have an email which has documented from the embassy officially to the visa applicant saying this is the problem we face with the ICANN, not even the local host. So getting information on a website comment now. You've got to have a commitment either from the host or from the government. And we are trying to outreach to governments, right, that's what we're doing at ICANN. If you don't have that, please don't hold the meeting there.

Man: If I may come in? Absolutely, Zahid. I applied two months, you know, before this meeting, two months. And I only got visa about a day, you know, to this event. And I know with UN event like IGF they do have agreement, just like Zahid said. You know, I think ICANN is a global - we are a global organization. And we need to engage them to make our events more streamlined, process of getting visa more (unintelligible) and we are given adequate respect because there was like no respect.

But I was just wondering what was going on, talk to (unintelligible), you know, about this issue. So and for planning purposes. Okay. So I think we need to work on that. Travel - the travel team they are trying really but I think at the top level something to be arranged to make the four day format - and even though that format more efficient and more friendly.

Elisa Cooper: Anything else for Nick about the meeting schedule or related to the locations or? Yes.

Sebastian Bachollet: Sorry I stay here. It's Sebastian Bachollet. I was the chair of this Meeting Strategy Working Group. I just want to be sure that when we talk about smaller venue plus it's not - it's maybe a good big country but there is no the facility with three board rooms and so on and so forth. The idea it's not to have less participants, it's to have less demand on the facility.

And the question of the visa will be the same for A, B or C, it's a global issue. And it was something we take into account. It's complicated because for some people when you go in US it's difficult to have your visa. For some people it's when you go somewhere else. Then it's - and even to come to Europe and to (unintelligible) it's not easy to have a (unintelligible) visa.

We are not an international organization, hopefully. And the last point is that you know there's the four -day meeting was to be able to, for example, we came back here. We could have go to Santiago Chile or to Lima, it's not

much more travel if you take everybody coming from east, west and south and north.

But it's a large country, not big as Argentina. But where we want - we would like to try to go that's a meeting team who will do that. But really it's to try to keep the fact that we still go in Africa and in Latin America and not to go to just the three part of this world. Thank you.

Elisa Cooper: Thank you. All right thank you so much, we appreciate it. Let's see, next up Sandra. So Sandra is here to tell us a little bit about this I can leadership training program. And we've sent a member to attend in the past and I think this is a program which will be running at the Dublin. So I think we'd like to see if we can identify somebody that's part of the BC who can participate in this program.

Sandra Hoferichter: Thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak to you. My name is Sandra Hoferichter. I'm from the ALAC and I'm also the chair of the ICANN Academy Working Group which exists since the beginning of 2011. And one of the results of this Academy Working Group is this third leadership training program which is the third in a row since three years.

Next slide please. So we started here two years ago with an experiment in Buenos Aires in the same hotel. And because it was rather successful there was a second edition in Los Angeles and now with a third in the row we can consider it as more or less a tradition.

Next slide please. If the program for incoming and current leaders. And this is really important that we have a good mixture between those who are ICANN veterans and those who are incoming and are going to take their seat for the next one or two years.

It's a three-day program directly prior to the ICANN meeting in Dublin from Wednesday to Friday. And we do not spend the days with each other, we do

also some social things during the night, for instance last year we visited together a cooking school which was quite a lot of fun with board members, GAC members, Business Constituency members and the ALAC are doing some joint cooking. And this helps all so socializing quite a lot. And this is actually one of the focuses of the summer school to better get to know each other, to learn from each other, to exchange, to connect, discuss, network, and then make it much more easier to collaborate in the future.

Teaching means that we are not - I mean, everybody who is participating have a certain expertise and we might ask those people to facilitate a session on the topic matter where they have a great expertise on. For instance, policy development processes is something which needs to be explained for an incoming leader and which is received different in all communities. And there are lots of (unintelligible) around and so these things are going to be discussed there.

Next slide please. This is the distribution of seats as it was agreed in the Academy Working Group. The Academy Working Group is an open group but it had always participation also from this constituency. I remember Marilyn Cade was very active in the past setting up this program as such. And so this distribution of seats was agreed by the broader community and it proved to be a useful thing. This means for your stakeholder group, for the Business Constituency there is one seat assigned and this is among the one which is here in the GNSO.

Next slide please. So this is the program structure from last year. And the content will be up right after this ICANN meeting. We are going to revise the program according to the feedback we receive from the participants in the past. This is a mixture between facilitation skills, training where you somehow learn as an incoming or as currently leader to organize meetings, to run meetings, handling sometimes also disruptive behavior, and mediate conflicts and all these things which happens at ICANN and which is sometimes difficult to deal with.

And this is also very much customized to ICANN issues so we are going to have these things in an environment which is really very trustful. Last year for instance, we had the two new board -- new incoming board members participating and this was extremely valuable for those common at least as well it was my feedback.

Unfortunately there is no one who is -- who did participate in that program so far. Because it will actually be much more easier that others convince you to participate in the program that I'm doing this. I'm not sure Jennifer Standiford, was she with the Business Constituency?

Elisa Cooper: No, it was (unintelligible).

Sandra Hoferichter: Yeah, I do remember with the curly hair, right. Yeah, that she's not here right, right now?

Elisa Cooper: No.

Sandra Hoferichter: Okay. So I would very much invite you to identify within your community one participants for the next leadership training program. I have all the important information here on these postcards. We opened up the registration form, it's not an application form, it's more or less a registration form because we expect that your community will agree on the participant and it's not the Academy Working Group or ICANN staff for somebody who is going to decide who is going to take place. So it would be actually good if you could nominate one of these participants.

Important to know is that this program does not cover travel costs but the hotel costs will be covered, of course food as well. And participants will also receive a small stipend for these three days which is comparable with such a daily allowance you get when you're on the ICANN travel fund.

I would ask you to ask me questions.

Elisa Cooper: Hi. How long is the program? I know this isn't based in Dublin but is it an annual, like a yearly commitment or what's the time -- full-time commitment?

Sandra Hoferichter: It's a full-day program for three days. It's Wednesday, Thursday, Friday right before the ICANN meeting. We are -- this is challenging for some people to stay away for another three days from their families and businesses but those who participated they found it really useful in order to get sooner on speed.

Zahid Jamil: Just wondered -- it's not a question it's just that I know Sandra for several years. She has been -- just to say how good this program is. Apart from the fact that I've heard from many of the people who have attended, is an excellent especially -- it doesn't necessarily mean you have to be a newcomer to attend this. You could be somebody who's been in this process for a while and just don't understand other constituencies or SOs.

But with the IGF training that you've done over the several years with Wolfgang Kleinwachter, it has been one of the best processes. And so this would be very similar to that. I just wanted to say I'd encourage anybody to just participate. Thank you.

Sandra Hoferichter: Thank you for the praises, Zahid. So that you mention it's really the case not only for incoming leaders but also for ICANN veterans. For instance, last year Tony - Anthony Harris participated. I mean, he's truly one of the first people at ICANN and he could contribute so much and he also told us it was so valuable for him to get to know these people because we sometimes we staying way too much in our own (unintelligible) and this is actually the moment where the horizontal collaboration between stakeholder groups could be and should be improved.

Elisa Cooper: So, Gabby, but just to let you know its Camille Stewart from Cyveillance who had attended last time. And she actually sent out an email to the list saying what an excellent experience it was. Gabby and then I saw someone else, oh Andy, yes.

Gabriella Szlak: So this is Gabby Szlak from Instituto. I think I also participated in the program - in the first one in 2013 here in Buenos Aires. And likely I wasn't there from the beginning because I realized I had - I was living in Chile at that time so I had to travel, you know, so I only participated one day. But it was really worth it. And I also - if anyone has a question I'm happy to answer questions and I also agree with Zahid, it's not only for newcomers. So actually it's good to have people that are not newcomers to actually have better conversations and it's more interesting so thank you.

Elisa Cooper: Andy.

Andy Abrams: I just had two questions. Number one is headed you decide on three days? Because I can think for a lot of people that may be very difficult adding three days on to an ICANN meeting. Is there any possibility, since we're talking about shorter meetings of also potentially having a two-day version? That was -- what? Maybe fast food then.

And then the second question is just generally who are you trying to attract? You know, what does success look like in the sense of are you looking for a certain kind of diversity, geographic, gender, you know, what is the perfect world for you?

Sandra Hoferichter: Let me answer the second question first. We are not looking for gender or geographic, we are looking for stakeholder balance because this is about ICANN. And your community is going to decide who will be the next person. This can be somebody who is new to that stakeholder group either selected by the NomComm or appointed or somebody who is going to take over a working group soon or the chair itself. So this is -- it should somehow a

person who has to be in a leading role in the future. So this is the scope in order to get them the tools to really facilitate sessions affectively.

We know three days is a long time but it was four days for the first time so we shortened it already. And to be honest, there is no way to shorten it even more at least not with this program as it looks at the moment it might change, in the future when the program might change according to the needs of this community we always adapt just this to the feedback we get. But at the moment the three days are really necessary.

Elisa Cooper: All right, any other questions for Sandra? Thank you so much. It looks like a great opportunity.

Sandra Hoferichter: Thank you. And I leave the postcards with you; you have all the relevant information here (unintelligible) to further information.

Elisa Cooper: All right, so we are sort of getting closer to being almost done. I think I saw Nora walk in, is that right? Or not? No. So I think we are still waiting for Nora Abusitta who wanted to speak with us about the development of public responsibility. But she is not here yet.

So I think we can go ahead and move to our Any Other Business and when she comes in will turn it over to her. Yes.

Steve DelBianco: Steve DelBianco. One small item of all other business involves J. Scott and Paul Mitchell with Microsoft. Someone you all know, Khaled Fattal, runs a multilingual Internet group and he put on a program last week here in Buenos Aires on cyber security, cyber child protection, and new global political cyber online threats. And it was very well attended. And I heard some rave reviews from people that were there.

And I note that both Microsoft and Adobe our sponsors and participants of the event great and he's got one coming up soon but I was hoping Paul could tell folks about and let us know what you think it's worthwhile for BC members.

Paul Mitchell: I was going to let J. Scott go first. But, I mean, I guess the short answer for those who are involved in trying to be global and reach out in a global way is that this is one venue for participation that is attempting to be inclusive in ways that most other conferences and venues don't or aren't.

And, you know, we're, among other things, we operate globally and we are increasingly trying to globalize our services is one of the reasons we're focused on the universal acceptance work especially coming at it from the EAI perspective.

I think what Khaled has managed to put together is something that does stimulate engagement and it stimulates a little noticed where he doesn't. And I just -- from that perspective I can, you know, commanded to those who have the opportunity and time. J. Scott, taken away.

J. Scott Evans: I think that, you know, it handles a range of different issues that, you know, are outside of really DNS management. They have to do with, you know, ubiquitous resource that's used across cultural lines, geopolitical lines and sort of coming to a common understanding of, you know, what the rights and responsibilities or obligations are as you participate in an online world.

And I think some of the things were set up as debates where there were just, you know, thought leaders debating what responsibilities there are because, you know, if you're a platform provider, you know, that there may be situations where certain people may very well take a position that it's a breach of someone's privacy but a mother of a lost child who's missing see that very differently.

And so debating what those are and what the different cultural norms are and just -- it started exploring a lot of different ideas that I think we tangentially touch on here and people may be involved in different parts of their business with.

But I think it really did have focused discussion of some pretty tough issues. And it's an opportunity to participate and to get your voice out there and involved so you raise the level of awareness in your own organization. So I think it's a good effort. We were glad to be, you know, a sponsor of this first effort.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks, J. Scott and Paul. It's September 2 and 3 in Johannesburg South Africa. Thank you.

Elisa Cooper: All right, I know we have some other items for other business that we are visited here by Nora and she is here to talk to us about the development of public responsibility. And I know she's got a slide to review with us to take it away.

Nora Abusitta-Ouri: Thank you. I will not take too much of your time. It seems like you guys are very busy. And I just wanted to meet everyone and give an overview of the department and what it does.

We are a relatively new department. We focus on programs that help better engage with the community and give the community stronger tools to participate more effectively act ICANN. The focused areas were taken from the regional strategies and they were identified by the different communities as areas of need.

So currently were focusing on education, on the next generation or use, and then on participation and global Internet cooperation and development. We have a fourth area of which is our unofficial area and we call it the incubator which essentially starts new programs either for the global stakeholder

engagement team or other teams and spin them off so any tools that are needed on the content side to make our engagement better and more effective.

On the education front we have an online learning platform that is currently operational. It hosts a lot of content that's mainly done by the community. All we do is manage the platform and curate the contents. We would like to see more content from this group. I know there is a wealth of information here that we just need to get a hold of. Of course if anybody has extra time to teach a course online that's even better.

Also on education we provide a lot of the content that is used for academic outreach. We also collaborate with universities on specific courses that touch on what we do. So as an example we're working currently with (UST) on an (unintelligible) course that will be launched in March.

Supporting the next generation, the department oversees the next gen program, the fellowship program and the newcomers. I just came in from presentations by the next gen program that was sponsored by Microsoft, so thank you very much for that.

It is really fascinating to see how much these young people between the age 18 and 30, how passionate they are about the Internet and having really an active role in it. So I encourage you to talk to them. The one idea I had today, as I watch them, was to invite this group in particular to go and see them because it's really a great way to engage with the future community of ICANN.

And then finally on participation and global Internet cooperation, we oversee the relationships that ICANN has with different groups like the World Economic Forum, like the NETmundial initiative and so on.

I'm here more to listen to your questions if you have any or listen to your suggestions. But I have an ask from you, we really need your help, like I said, on the education front to give us some of your content. We need you to support a lot of our next gen and fellows by talking to them, I'm mentoring them and explaining to them what ICANN does and how it really relates to the business world because that's what they're interested in really.

Thank you.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks, Nora. When it comes to supporting the next generation this is a whole new meaning because, well for me, it's mostly meant college tuition is supporting the next generation. But this puts a new twist on it.

We have a lot of material in our trade association video graphics presentations we give to legislators and lawmakers but it's hard for me to know what you mean by content. Are you looking for video narrative, multimedia, PowerPoint deck with accompanying notes and whether the subject matters that you feel that you need in your inventory that you don't have?

Nora Abusitta-Ouri: First about the form of the content, we take anything so a PowerPoint, audio, videos, anything that you have we curate to make sure that it's easier for the user to consume. Areas of need, I think we don't have much on business and so anything -- so currently we have anything from ICANN 101 to how to survive an ICANN meeting to Internet governance basics. So any basic information that you usually provide your stakeholder group would be great on there.

What we're doing currently is the we are studying the catalog - or the inventory we have and we are identifying gaps. So I will come back to you and say, I specifically need XY and Z if you have it.

Man: Looks like an incredibly useful program so I be happy to talk about things we do in cybercrimes and security so there may be stuff I can share. I had a question on the NETmundial initiative exactly, could you describe more in sort of deep dive into what it is that you're doing in that so we can have a better understanding?

Nora Abusitta-Ouri: I think this can take all day but I will be very brief. So as you all probably know, I can was one of the partners that kind of jumpstarted the initiative. Currently we are...

Steve DelBianco: We know.

Nora Abusitta-Ouri: I know that you know. We are currently responsible -- or we take part in the Secretariat of the initiative currently. And we are members on the council. So the first phase of the initiative ICANN, the World Economic Forum, and CGI.br really got together and jumpstarted it.

Where we are right now is we're still supporting part of the Secretariat for the work of the platform itself and we have a member in the Coordination Council. If you want more on what's happening with the NETmundial initiative I think we should have another conversation. It's a long...

Ron Andruff: You can send it to Steve.

Steve DelBianco: And you better have the conversation quickly because it's not altogether clear NETmundial initiative will be around very long.

Nora Abusitta-Ouri: I'm just the Secretariat, I can't comment on that.

Steve DelBianco: Don't move to a new city for this job.

Elisa Cooper: Other comments or questions for Nora?

Gabriella Szlak: Just one thing. This is Gabby Szlak from Instituto. I don't know you personally, I wanted you to know that I was a fellow once, that's the way I started at ICANN. So anything I can help you with or I'm always available. I'm a fellow in my heart still so.

Nora Abusitta-Ouri: It's great to hear these stories. We did a paper on -- we called it Where Are They Now? On fellows and how they ended up either, you know, in different organizations that are currently very active in ICANN or even ICANN staff. What we're trying to do in this department is create a more comfortable entry point to ICANN so the next gen program is really the introduction before the fellowship.

What we're looking at for the next year is what happens after the fellowship. So we want to make sure that the journey is a more comfortable journey for the newcomers. But I'm glad to see that there's active fellows here.

Jimson Olufuye: Nora, just to let you know we have some content right now, maybe I can give it to you perhaps can be of relevance.

Elisa Cooper: Thank you so much, nor. We appreciate your time.

Nora Abusitta-Ouri: Thank you.

Elisa Cooper: I write so I think we're almost done unless there -- I think Jimson had something. Does anyone have anything else for AOB? Jimson, over to you.

Jimson Olufuye: Thank you, Elisa. Well, just to a lot of that ExComm printed some materials. We have BC business cards. You do know that we expressed commitment to doing outreach in (unintelligible) domain so we have some cards printed to make this easy. So I would like to (unintelligible) every one of us to pick some cards, maybe 5, 10 or as many as you want. We printed actually 1000. We have used part of this in Zimbabwe. We used it in Abuja and we intend to use in (unintelligible) in September.

And of course the newsletter is out so you can (unintelligible) even for our offices, for our records and for friends, at our visitor's desk, let them know what we're doing in the various offices. So we have quite a number here. Please feel free to pick. And then also the FAQ sheet, we have some FAQ sheet printed this time around.

Also to use the opportunity to appreciate Andre Mack and Marilyn, they (intervene) by video conferencing that last outreach and it was well received.

And lastly, to let you know that we are following over the success of the summit we had in Cairo last year with great awareness created. So we are having (unintelligible) - no in (unintelligible) September 1-3 focusing on the impact of ICT for development in Africa. I will collaborate with a number of you, already some, that we would like you to (intervene) in some of our sessions in (unintelligible).

So I also thank you in advance for your continued support (unintelligible) what we do together collaborating AfICTA with our summit in Africa and with business outreaches. Thank you.

Elisa Cooper: Thank you, Jimson. Anything else from anyone? No? Well thank you so much. I appreciate everyone's support. And remember, we have tomorrow morning, as David mentioned, we've got our breakfast that starts 7:15. It's in the agenda. And then we also have our closed meeting at noon which (unintelligible) will be very interesting. We're going to be meeting with (Lorene Capen) from the FTC. She is on the Public Safety Working Group that's part of the GAC. And that will be from noon to 12:30.

Normally when we meet on Wednesday we only just prepare for the public forum. This time we're going to have another speaker. And then we will take hopefully just 15 or so minutes to prepare for the public forum. So thank you so much.

END