

**ICANN**

**Moderator: Chantelle Doerksen**  
**April 27, 2017**  
**10:00 am CT**

Coordinator: The recording has started.

Chantelle Doerksen: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the BC Members Call on Thursday April 27, 2017.

On today's call we have Adetola Sogbesan, Jimson Olufuye, Lawrence Olawale-Roberts, Hibah Kamal-Grayson, Andy Abrams, Chris Wilson, Marcus Eke, Barbara Wanner, Marie Pattullo, Steve DelBianco, Susan Kawaguchi, Jay Sudowski, Cheryl Miller, Claudia Selli, Cecilia Smith, Philip Corwin and Tim Chen and Andrew Mack who is just joining us and Ari Giovanco.

We have apologies from Beth Allegretti and tentative apologies from Arinola Akinyemi. From staff we have myself Chantelle Doerksen.

I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes - thank you and over to you Chris.

Chris Wilson: Thank you Chantelle. This is Chris Wilson for the record. Thanks everybody for taking the time to be on – on today's call, certainly appreciate it.

I am going to go ahead and in the interest of time turn to Steve for the policy calendar review – Steve.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you Chris. Steve DelBianco here and I think that Chantelle is putting it up. So everyone the policy calendar was sent out early yesterday. Chantelle has it on the screen in front of you. If anyone needs it email Chantelle and she will send it over to you.

Starting on Channel One for public comments we have two that we have submitted since our last call. One was on April 21st we got a comment on the Cross Community Working Group looking at using country and territory names as top level domains.

I want to thank Andy Abrams, Andrew Harris, Barbara Wanner and Nivaldo for drafting that BC comment which we filed on the 21st.

On the 24th of April earlier this week we got a very short comment where we endorsed the draft recommendations for standards and good faith when the community, the empowered community is exercising the new bylaw's powers to remove one or all members and directors of the ICANN Board so we didn't elaborate, we supported the common sense recommendations and that had been circulated to all of you on two previous BC calls

So now let me turn to the current open comment period. There are many of them of which seven I have highlighted for us to follow up on. The very first one is due tomorrow. Fortunately we have had a draft that has been circulated for quite some time and that was due to the good work of Jimson, Chris

Chaplow, Marilyn Cade and Jay Sudowski and I have added a few edits as well and then Denise Michel added an edit with respect to the Open Data Initiative.

Now the one I attached to the policy calendar reflects all of those edits but Jimson circulated just a few moments ago two additional sentences, two additional paragraphs which we are inserting and those are in response to something unfortunate that happened with respect to the BC's request for budget, to cover BC representation at Internet Governance Events, such as with the CSTD and at IGF and ICANN's Board this weekend is having an hour long discussion of how they are going to participate more actively at the IGF so we would have thought this would have been a slam dunk but apparently by inserting with this among the events we were pursuing ICANN's staff and looking at that on the budget basis considered that that one didn't apply so therefore they did not grant the request for budget that we had with things like the IGF and CSTD.

So in our comment Jimson has added that as a request. We followed up with Rob Hoggarth who suggested that we put it in our budget comment. We also added one other paragraph which is that in the future we want ICANN staff to remind the community that when they are submitting a budget request for outreach travel that they do one request for each event as opposed to lumping events together and falling into the same trap that befell the business constituency.

So thank you Jimson for circulating that. This is last call right now on this phone call of anyone who has any further comments on our budget request, budget and operating plan comment that we are going to file tomorrow. I will take a queue on that.

Great, I see nothing and thank you Jimson and everyone else. I will file that tomorrow.

The second Item I...

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: I am sorry, go ahead. Someone wanted to speak? Okay, the second one is a draft market study on the DNS Market and it is for the African Marketplace. Those comments close next week on May the 5th. Please mute your phone if you are not speaking.

Waudou thank you very much for drafting initial comment and yesterday Andrew Mack added some edits. The second attachment to the policy calendar represents the current state of the BC's comment and again this is due in about seven days so I will happily take a queue from those who want to elaborate on what is in the comment, the authors of it or others who want to ask questions. This is about the DNS Market in Africa.

The BC has taken an interesting tack on these market studies lately by suggesting that it is not really relevant how many registries and registrars ICANN established in regions. All that matters is the serving of registrants with available scripts, languages for the domain-ins that they want and they need to be able to use registrars who can present the terms of services, policies in languages and scripts they can read.

They also have to be able to accept payment in some countries where banking and credit card transactions are difficult for some registrants to use so all of these come down hard on Africa where there is a variety of scripts and languages used and where some nations have difficulty making online

payments for registration, hosting services and the like so we are focusing like the BC always does on the question of how do we serve registrants and in our case we look at business registrants and business users Andrew Mack.

Andrew Mack: Yes Steve, thanks very much and I don't know if Waudo is on the call but wanted to thank him for going through this in tremendous detail. I think both of us were – spent a lot of time on it because it is a pretty dense report.

By in large I think that our impression was that the report was pretty good. There were some real limitations on it given the fact that a lot of the data actually came from South Africa, that was one of the things that we are recommending to try to get much more data and information into the system on an ongoing so for BC members that want to take a quick glance at this one of the last things that we said should work that it would be worthwhile for ICANN to have an observatory so that there – that ICANN was very actively involved in in collecting data including from parts of the continent that are not typically surveyed as much especially...

Steve DelBianco: Andy you dropped off, if you are still there? Andrew are you still there? All right, Andrew's line was disconnected and operator is going to call him back. That is fine.

Meanwhile I will note that that comment needs to reflect the BC's emphasis on interest of registrants. We did so in the Middle East DNS Market Study and I will ask the authors to add that qualifier to the very top of the report.

All right, let's move on to the next one. There is a proposed change to ICANN's bylaws and it is in the section of the bylaws which we now classify as fundamental bylaws. These have to do with ICANN's mission, the core

values and the new powers that have been given to the community as a result of the transition.

So fundamental bylaws require approval by the ICANN community, the empowered community before they can become part of ICANN bylaw so on this particular case it is a rather minor change, probably a good one for us to practice this empowered community mechanism, a relatively minor change by which the board designates which group handles reconsideration requests.

So instead of the committee that used to handle them they are going to now move it to a new board committee and those comments close in about 12 days. Phil Corwin and I are currently on the list of the volunteers to draft the BC's reply on that and I do anticipate the BC will endorse the idea.

Now the BC has two relatively recent experiences with reconsideration requests and Phil Corwin do you have anything to add to that? You and I will have to get that circulated in the next few days.

Phil Corwin: Yes, nothing to add right now Steve, thanks. Andrew Mack are you dialed back in?

All right, we will move on to the fourth one. The – there is a very extensive report, well over 150 pages that was prepared by the Review Team required under the Affirmation of Commitments in the bylaws to review the new GTLD Program to see whether it promoted competition, consumer trust and consumer choice.

It is also looking at the application and evaluation process. That comment period is extended now due May the 19th and they 50 recommendations of which a certain category we are going to park over here because they have to

do with how future reviews might be done more efficiently so we don't have to put as much time into that but BC member Waudo is on the review team and giving us a head start of guidance on it and then we have a group – it includes Tim Chen, Tim Smith, Arinola and Susan Kawaguchi all of whom are working right now on drafting a BC comment and it circulated to that group a request to put it out to the full BC as soon as we can.

Now on last call we had on the BC Chris Wilson noted that Jamie Hedlund had done a blog post and it is exactly on point with recommendation 23 of this report so I would ask the authors to be sure that on rec 23 you take a look at Jamie's blog post and take advantage of whatever the new compliance director is telling us he is willing to do.

We had two other volunteers who joined on two calls ago, two weeks ago. Hibah was going to check with her colleagues at Google who had applied and detailed these so that we could add to our comments thoughts on the application and evaluation process was at a small part of the recommendations that are in there and if there were certain experiences that were obtained as a business applicant let's reflect them in our comments and we won't identify the company that actually submitted it.

And for the authors on that team - Chantelle has just posted into the chat a link to Jamie's blog post. Another volunteer from two weeks ago was Andrew Mack and Andrew we are looking to you to focus just on the comments, a recommendation that refer to the joint applicant support. This notion of providing financial, legal or technical assistance to applicants that would otherwise not be able to complete a winning application so with respect to Andrew and Hibah I do hope that in the next week you will be able to take a look at that and circulate among the drafting team your thoughts on those particular aspects.

Andrew I note that you are dialed back in and if you want to add anything more on the comment on the DNS African Market Study we will turn to you. I did want to say that after you dropped we noted that the draft you have for Africa does not include the same heading, the caveat that we had in the Middle East Market Study that we submitted just a month ago and that is the one where we lay out the BC's preeminent interest is in registrants, particularly business registrants and business users and I think that adding that to the top of your African Market Study Report will certainly qualify the nature of the rest of our comments. Andrew did you have anything more you wanted to add?

Andrew Mack: Yes, real quickly Steve if I could.

Steve DelBianco: Go ahead.

Andrew Mack: The – sure thanks. No question the caveat that you – that we had for the Middle East goes for all regions so absolutely okay with that. No, there is just the piece that I would like to draw the BC's attention to were around – where we go to specific comments on suggestions we have on – we had a two points on IP rights that were put forward and I just wanted to throw it out to the BC to get BC comments and they don't need to be on this call unless people would like to.

One, and I will just read them really quickly because they are here. One reads the report recommendation states that “requirements, if any relating to the compliance prior to registration of all intellectual property right's laws should be removed and rules should rather focus on addressing violations through alternative dispute resolution mechanisms after registration,” and (Waudu) puts the BC feels that this recommendation is not business friendly and not



necessarily limiting. Alternative DRM's are in many cases more expensive and complex than is dealt with in registration rules and restrictions.

The BC is of the view that this recommendation is only concerned with registration quantities rather than overall functioning of the system and should not be adopted and I wanted to throw that as when we are – there may be some nuance that we wanted – the broader BC might want to add.

The second one is – reads recommendation to remove registration restriction, page 16, “rules in place in some countries requiring domain names to match the business personal name of the entity runs counter to the BC mission of insuring end user confidence and trust in the DNS. In addition other studies have shown the positive correlation between registration restrictions and trust with the DNS.”

And for me I was a little bit confused by that and can see it breaking both ways where there is a trust value in having the name correspond to the applicant but at the same time leaving the – there is also a business benefit in giving the applicant broad opportunity to register for the name that they choose so I wanted to throw those both out to get people from the BC the chance to think about them and as you are giving us your comments those are ones that struck me as potentially outstanding that we might want to refine on (unintelligible) to. Thanks Steve.

Steve DelBianco: Andrew thank you for pointing those out. This is the second attachment to the policy calendar. We probably don't have the time to dive into both of them in great detail but Andrew brings up excellent points on this. The report recommendations themselves are what provoke us to react to the recommendation.

In one case the report is suggesting we drop a requirement that a registrant have previously complied with IP rights and my sense is that the BC would probably not support removing that requirement.

And the second one with regards to the name sounds as if something the BC could support because the name of a business may not match the name of the registrant.

Andrew Mack: Or the initiative or whatever they are trying to do, yes.

Steve DelBianco: Right, any further comments on that from BC members? Andy and Waudo and the rest of the members of that team let's give the BC members a day or two to respond but this is due May the 5th so over the weekend we will want to resolve how we feel about those and add the registrant interest caveat at the top just like we had in the Middle East study.

I see Marie typing in the chat. Marie did you have a point of view? And while Marie is typing I will turn to number five.

Number five on the new comments that are due is regarding a new GLTD subsequent procedure so this has to do with the procedures that ICANN will use for application and evaluation on new GLTD once the window opens again. It may not be another round - it could just be a continuous opening.

Now those comments have been extended as well and they don't close until the 22nd of May. There is a questionnaire that was circulated by the (PDP) Working Group. Thanks to Susan Kawaguchi who filled out in red text on the third attachment the initial set of answers that we could work up but there are many more answers needed in particular on those who experience the application for a new GTLD.

It had to go through the evaluation and even contention process so again I look at members on the call, folks from Amazon, from Google, from Microsoft who had experience filing applications and can shed some light on answering the questions in the questionnaire. We won't identify the company that submitted the answers. The endeavor here is to make sure we have substantive answers and make sure that if we open the next round for GTLD, for new GTLD's the business community can apply for the TLD's that are appropriate.

Andy, thank you for the comments that you have added to that as well - Andrew Mack I will note in the chat that Marie Pattullo is agreeing with respect to the two points that you brought up that we don't want to remove the first and we would be okay with removing the second.

Cecilia, you will be providing comments this week on the new GLTD subsequent procedures and I appreciate that, thank you.

All right, there are only two more in here. One is recommendations from the Cross Community Working Group for improving the SOAC accountability. This is due the 26th of May. I was the rapporteur for this group. It is one of the projects in Work Stream Two of the IANA transition and ICANN accountability.

This is a bylaws requirement for Work Stream Two and it required the CCWG to take a look at whether the SO's and AC's themselves are accountable and initially they left the question of accountable to whom to resolve that to say that each of us is accountable to the stakeholder groups and members that the bylaws set us up to serve and that we don't want to necessarily add a lot of

formal requirements to examine the accountability of us to the respective groups that we have.

There are about 25 recommendations in that report. I am familiar with them having written up so I am glad to answer questions for BC member son that comment but it probably isn't appropriate if I am the lead drafter of the comment. As Waudo did with the CCT I am happy to provide guidance on how that works but we will need volunteers. We have four weeks or so to go on this so I am not suggesting we have to get names immediately but this is about the accountability of each individual SO and AC to the people that it is designed to serve. I will look in the chat and see if anyone wants to step up and help.

And then finally there is a proposed renewal for the dot net registry agreement that ICANN negotiated with the dot net registry operator, Verisign. Those comments closed the 30th of May and their proposal surprised us and I think there was some – I guess speculation that they would change the ICANN fees, they did not. ICANN's fees are still \$0.75 a name.

ICANN at least did not try to implement the URS instead allowing RPM's and elements like that to be developed to the communities bottom-up process and they also retrained the price caps of 10% a year for dot.net domain registrations at the wholesale price level.

So a couple of surprises in the sense that everything pretty much remains the same on that Registry Agreement. Do we have any volunteers that want to take a look at developing the BC's comment on the dot net registry agreement? All right, I will come back to that on the next call that we have.

Just a few more items and then I will turn it over to Susan and Phil for counsel.

Phil Corwin: Steve, Phil here, I had my hand raised. On the dot net – because of time constraints I don't want to take the lead on drafting that comment but I would be happy to provide substantial input on the BC comment as we develop it.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you Phil. Is it easier for you to do a first pass and highlight the things you are concerned about or wait until the draft comes out from some other volunteer?

Phil Corwin: Or I could split the difference and talk with the primary drafter before a first draft is produced but as you noted, although there are new provisions taken from the new TLD Agreement and also I think from the Dot Org Agreement to...

Steve DelBianco: That is right.

Phil Corwin: ...modernize the agreement on the most significant and potentially controversial subjects it remains pretty much the same as the current agreement so – and doesn't make any significant changes in terms of the higher fee or price caps or inclusion of the URS so it should be a fairly simple comment to draft I would think.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you Phil, any other volunteers for comments on this?

Okay, happy to turn this over now to Susan and Phil to discuss the council channels and at some point it would be great, Denise Michel I know you are on the line as well to discuss some of the learnings from the call you had with

respect to data and access to the Open Data Initiative but first over to Susan and Phil. Thank you.

Susan Kawaguchi: Thanks Steve. This is Susan Kawaguchi for the record. Unfortunately Phil was not able to attend the council meeting so he, as you know, gave me his proxy and – but the first item up for a vote that day was the GACC communiqué, the response to the GACC communiqué by the GNSO Council and that was deferred – well not deferred but delayed and it is an email vote for next week specifically because everyone wanted Phil's input on the language responding to the IGO, NGO which Phil is definitely the resident expert in that.

So and Phil I know I haven't reached out to you just because I assumed you were pretty busy but I am assuming that you have seen some of that – that email thread and the language so hopefully.

Phil Corwin: Yes Susan I have but I had already provided some detailed additional proposed language on that portion of the response to the communiqué so I am not sure what more they are looking for. I reminded them of that.

Susan Kawaguchi: Oh okay, so they were, you know, it was very nice that the – all the council members just deferred to you so you will need to give me some input on how to vote once we see that – the final draft out.

We did vote on the Red Cross names because it was a very limited list and that was something that came out of the Copenhagen meeting. It was very narrow and defined and so we approved that.

There was also – we voted on the GNSO comment on the ICANN budget and that was sent off. The RDS Review Team, the standing selection committee

came back with a little bit of an aberration of the process but hopefully we can refine the selection committee process but anyway we – the selection committee views it as if we have foreseen that is not how it is written so I am hoping that another SO or AC will actually give the GNSO a fourth seat on the RDS Review Team but we do have ranked candidates and I happen to be number one which was nice.

And then so that will begin soon, the RDS Review Team and then we also discussed the CCWG IGS Charter. This is across the Community Working Group that has been around for a while but the charter was – did not conform to the latest standards for charters, for PDP's. There is also, you know, several council members expressed the concern that we didn't want the CCWG to cover details and issues that were really more appropriate for a PDP so we have asked for more details to be included in the charter.

And I think that was about it. I guess I will hand it back over to you Steve.

Steve DelBianco: All right, any other questions from members on the activities of council? As I indicated in the policy calendar we don't expect motions and agenda for the next council meeting until May the 8th next week and the next council meeting is May the 18th.

I did note in here the next generation registration directory service is PDP Group. We have several members in the BC that are active on that and then turning to Channel Three which is the Commercial Stakeholders Group, Barbara.

Barbara Wanner: Okay I have several items here so just bear with me as I walk through them methodically. Working I guess really from Chris's agenda. First and let me start first with Board Seat No. 14 just to report to the group that Greg Shatan

formally notified the NCSG of our interest in supporting the nomination of Matthew Shears to fill No. 14 seat noting that we were impressed with his contributions to both works to ICANN accountability Work Stream One and Work Stream Two noting that we think it is important for this person to be drawn from the community, from the house. And then asking that, you know, we hope that this sets a precedent for further cooperation on this seat going forward which I think was a very tactful way of saying kind of we defer to the NCSG this time around. We sincerely hope you'll respect that the next time.

Tapani of the NCSG got back to Greg quite quickly and basically we are asking the ICANN Secretariat to arrange a vote by Friday. The choices on the ballot will be Matthew, Markus and that's basically it. The voters will be 13 non-contracted party house counselors, six from the CSG six from the NCSG and then the NCA. And a candidate must secure at least eight votes. We are hopeful that this will be sort of an overwhelming acclamation in support of Matthew Shears candidacy. So that's where things stand on Board Seat Number 14.

In terms of the shaping the terms of reference for the 2019 GNSO review. We discussed that in yesterday's CSG call. I had forwarded both my original correspondence to ICANN and the board members reminding them that this was raised during the intersessional and our interest in proactively addressing this. Rob Hoggarth responded saying - acknowledging yes he recall, you know, everyone recalled that this was discussed at the intersessional and ask that we keep them in the loop in terms of how we organize ourselves to do that.

I forwarded all of that to the CSG ExCom for their further review. During the call yesterday Greg mentioned that it would make sense to form a cross community group to determine how we want to shape these terms of



reference. And that's kind of where things were left. No discussion as to who exactly would be on that Cross Community Working Group or excuse me that Cross Community Group.

And then Chris raised the important point that Renalia will be stepping down from her position as - in charge of organizational matters within the board. And that Leon Sanchez will be assuming those responsibilities. So we discussed finding an opportunity either via a special teleconference with Leon or simply button holing him at ICANN 59 just to bring him up to speed, share with him our views on the importance of being able to shape the terms of reference for the 2019 GNSO review. So that's where things stand on that.

I also participated in a planning call for ICANN 59. I would say generally there was a lot of discussion about the importance of ensuring that the sessions the high interest topic sessions are developed in a manner that ensures balance and diversity again reiterating a lot of the points that we raised at ICANN 58. There is a proposed follow-up session for the GDPR review. This precipitated that discussion within the planning call.

The registry group is hell bent to have a session on the GDPR. And I guess it's important to note that James Bladel, Vicki Sheckler and Greg all urged that any session that focused on the GDPR not provide the regulators sort of another opportunity to lecture us, death by PowerPoint, et cetera, but rather that this session be focused on solutions and developing a plan of action to address the forthcoming implementation of the GDPR.

So moving to the actual scheduling of sessions, indeed there will be one session devoted to the GDPR. There will also be sessions devoted to fundamental bylaws amendments. Let me see here got a lot of different paper here. Cross community discussion on the RDS requirements. Rejection action

petitions is the empowered community able to exercise its rights under the ICANN bylaws? There will be a session on that.

And then two sessions on the geographic names issues as well as the operational side of ICANN operations plan and budget. And finally a session on who gets – who sets ICANN’s priorities? So those are how the high interest topic sessions are evolving.

In terms of meetings of the CSG and the BC it looks at this point -- and Chris correct me if I’m wrong -- that there will be a BC lunch meeting on the 28th on Tuesday the 28th. In the planning call yesterday the CSG ExCom call yesterday there was interest expressed in both closed CSG meetings to enable us to discuss policy in a confidential setting as well as open meetings.

And the open meetings would enable us to follow-up with discussions with Göran hopefully a 15 minute section with him. Again bring David Conrad in to follow-up on the open data project. Jamie and hopefully the new consumer safeguards person and then also enable some sort of time it probably won’t be too long but with Becky, Markus and Matthew and hopefully in his incumbent capacity. So those will be held within the open CSG open format.

Okay there was also interest expressed in finding some time to meet with the ALAC since we have not met with them since ICANN 57. And I think that’s it on ICANN 59. Important calls on 8 May there will be an FY ‘18 budget call. I have the Adobe Connect information for anybody who wants it or I can simply recirculate it or perhaps Chantelle can recirculate to the BC. There is also a Doodle Poll out for in MSSSI call with the CSG, you know, to discuss strategy and priorities. That has not been determined yet. I think that’s it folks, happy to take any questions.

Chris Wilson: This is Chris. Thanks Barbara. I think you've covered the extensive waterfront of CSG activities so far and covered exactly what's going to happen I think at ICANN59. I think for folks that haven't were privy to the meeting in Helsinki it's a shorter meeting. And so there will be fewer CSG and BC activities at that meeting. In fact as Barbara Wanner: noted we'll have just one BC meeting during the Johannesburg gathering. It would just be for I believe just an hour and over the lunch period. It will be an open meeting following our traditional open discussion and policy counter, et cetera. But it will be - we won't have extensive meetings in Johannesburg as we've had - as we do in other ICANN meetings.

And so I know Steve you mentioned that we still got one more item in the Policy Calendar. I see Susan's hand is first and then maybe I'll turn to Denise to talk about ODI. Susan do you have a question?

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes. I was just wondering on the GDPR session and you may have said this and I just missed it. But who – what sort of data commissioners or who is the authority that's going to come and...

((Crosstalk))

Susan Kawaguchi:...at that?

Barbara Wanner: At least on the planning call that I was on whenever that was the 18th I guess the speakers were not determined. It was the bulk of the discussion was ensuring that it wasn't a repeat of what we had at ICANN in Copenhagen.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay.

Barbara Wanner: So that it would be more sort of solution oriented developing a plan of action but there was no discussion of specific speakers yet.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay because that would be interesting to follow.

Barbara Wanner: Yes okay.

Susan Kawaguchi: We want to make sure we got the right people.

Barbara Wanner: Absolutely, absolutely okay.

Chris Wilson: Thanks Susan. Denise I know you're up next I guess to discuss ODI but I also see that we had a comment in the chat about high interest topic sessions so perhaps we ought to turn to you real quick and if you want to articulate that.

Denise Michel: Sure. I guess for those who can't see the chat I thank Barbara for her update. And also suggested if the any of the ExCom people have an opportunity to provide guidance or input on the high interest topic sessions in general in addition to having a balanced panel which I think is key really none of the sessions today have left any, you know, reasonable amount of time for community discussion and comments.

During these high interest topic sessions there's been a bit that I think all of the sessions that we've attended have been really pressed for time and have cut off discussions and comments from the audience. So if they could be given more time or structured in a way to facilitate and allow for a more robust community discussion I think that would benefit everyone. Would you like me to move on to a quick update on the call regarding data with the CTO?

Chris Wilson: Yes please.

Denise Michel: So this was a follow-up from a joint letter the BC sent with the IP and ISP constituency supporting moving the broad infrastructure and aggregated data that ICANN has into the public sphere for unfettered sort of API access. We received a response a month or so ago from Göran that was, you know, pretty high level and in general lacking in my specifics.

So we scheduled a follow-up call with the three constituencies and the CTO David Conrad to talk in more detail. We with the number of people in the call we really didn't have time to get into a lot of detail. But David did provide again a more I guess specific overview and noted that the open data initiative is the sort of overarching program for a number of data related initiatives that they're undertaking that, you know, they have the IT, you know, ITHI and other programs are under that umbrella.

And they have a work plan and a time schedule. And they'll be holding a session in, you know, Johannesburg to go through all of the details on this. And in addition they offered to come brief our three constituencies and have a more detailed discussion. More data on compliance were specifically raised. And David indicated that unlike in the past they where they didn't have any access or cooperation from compliance that is changing. And they will be including compliance data in some of their data initiatives.

You know, he noted that similar to the (applicasy) expressed by our three constituencies they're also getting requests and support for public data from a variety of other groups within ICANN most notably the GAC with the several GAC communiqués that have included this issue At-large and other entities. And I think someone sent a link to the registry IP constituency related letter and then subsequent blog relating to compliance matters there so a lot going on in this space.

And David Conrad, you know, committed to having a more detailed discussion with our three constituencies in Johannesburg if we wanted and would give us a heads up on the public session that they're having. And finally he suggested that we – that our three constituencies have a discussion with the registry constituency regarding access to data specifically spec 11-3B data and some other data that is being proposed to be included in the public data to see if we can resolve some of the apparent disagreements about access, public access to this data, happy to answer any questions, thanks.

Chris Wilson: Thanks Denise. This is Chris. And thank you for taking the lead on that on behalf of the BC it's critically important work that David's doing and how it all ties together with the other work that's going on at ICANN including compliance. So very much appreciate your doing that. Any other questions or issues, concerns with regards to the policy calendar? Seeing none maybe Jimson we'll go ahead and turn to you for an update on operations and finance.

Jimson Olufuye: Okay, thank you Chris. Greetings everyone, this is Jimson speaking. Firstly, our members in respects of their FY '18 invoices by 4 May. We're not trying to be the notice before the end of February 17. And another (position) for payment of dues to be made.

Secondly, members to inspect the end of the budget, I beg your pardon, the draft FY '18 BC budget by end of May. So, should look forward to getting their first draft by end of May. And for your information we are currently working on annual returns following the BC's registration as a legal entity. So this is being handled under my purview by our General Counsel.

Chris, sorry Steve, mentioned earlier with regard to budget requests six of our - of the six budget requests we made, five were approved. And the remaining one has been reframed, as Steve mentioned, in a budget comments FY '18 budget comments.

The five that were approved were for policy consultants, you could recall that we pushed for policy consultant to assist with (draft) work in regards to policy, leadership travel for BC officers, and also leadership development for potential members of BC and leaders from developing countries two per meeting were approved.

Last year we didn't get this much approved actually. Last year we only have one per meeting. And the gentleman from Sri Lanka, a member now, benefited from that. So, in FY '18 we have opportunity to bring in two potential leaders from developing countries per meeting to our events.

Then the CROPP supports for outreach was also approved not for CROPP. And also a request for outreach material to be printed by ICANN was also approved. We do also have our Newsletter consultant that does most of our design but the actual printing is done by ICANN.

And the last one there was rejected as the consumer multi-stakeholder engagement. And we presume that focus on the IGF 2017 and (current on-going) work on the CSTD Working Group on the Enhanced Cooperation in Public Policy Matters Pertaining to the Internet. So that is with respect to finance.

In operations as one of the five service reps in the CSTD Working Group (enhanced) cooperation and obviously of the BC I'll be attending the third meeting of the Working Group next week in Geneva. It can be noted a

comment one new mechanism or a new UN government-only body to handle public policy matters pertaining to the Internet.

But business objected to this (unintelligible) the business sector investment of the Internet. So the Working Group is focused on finding the legal points permitting (involvement) for all parties. So, I will be bringing the voice of the developing countries business industry guides which are aligned with that of the BC.

Secondly, thanks to Arinola. We had this outreach in Uganda. I think that was yesterday, yes it was yesterday Arinola spoke on (our behalf), I'd say at a major event in Uganda as I believe she's in transit now. And so she's not on this call. So I expect that she will provide feedback at our next call.

And thirdly we plan an outreach to local businesses in Jo-burg on 25<sup>th</sup> of June or perhaps use the money (unintelligible) for it. The Outreach Committee is to make final recommendation and the coordinator the chair of the committee has been working with a member of the committee to firm up the plan (unintelligible). So Andrew is on the call. So Andrew do you want to chip in with respect to where we are on the outreach usables?

Andrew Mack: Sure Jimson. Thanks very much. Very briefly the outreach simply has been very active. Jimson mentioned the Uganda event. Marilyn also spoke at an Afghanistan event. And we're looking forward to reports from both of those. We were hoping to have some ICANN support for our proposed meeting on the 25th which is the day before the formal Jo-burg meeting starts. It - based on what we've heard from Chantelle and Riccardo it does not look like they're going to go for that which is unfortunate.



Our hope was to try to get that meeting to take place before the Jo-burg event so that anybody that we spoke to might be incented to participate. And we could get them into the stream and mentor and partner with them so that they would get the most out of the ICANN experience. What the Outreach Committee is looking at right now is to see if because we – because of the changes of venue we have a little bit more outreach money left over then was originally expected. So we were thinking of potentially trying to bump up our contributions to that and do the program that - or much of the program that we had originally expected to do at the venue on our own dime.

So we're going to be talking about that at the beginning of next week to try to figure out whether that's doable financial and will come back to the group with it. But we recognize that we've had a lot of success with Africa outreach in recent years. We want to build off of that success. And given that this is our only real opportunity and that Jo-burg is a fantastic venue for doing this we thought it was worth a real serious effort on our part.

One of the things that was very helpful is, is that the average committee we've got a proposal on the table. The Outreach Committee is going to be reaching out to those of you who were ostensibly on the program to speak to make sure that you will A be in Jo-burg on the 25th and able to speak. Not arriving on the 25th but also that you're still interested. And we'll be doing that all very, very shortly. So if you could give us a sense of that that's great we really appreciate it.

Another note is, is that we've got other Africa programs that are in the hopper. Lawrence has thrown out one and I have been working with Gabi Szlak to try to do a good bit more on the Latin America either this year the beginning of next fiscal year which are coming through. She's been really, really reenergized on that and is super, super helpful and complements to Gabi.

And so it looks like we actually have a fair amount in the hopper not just starting with Jo-burg but going forward through the summer and into the early fall which I think will hold us in very good stead. We're making a lot of progress on the outreach side. And very – the team is really energized and very excited about it. So thanks Jimson.

Jimson Olufuye: Okay, thank you Andrew. And so we look forward to more feedback on the Jo-burg events. I don't know if we have some - a few more minutes? I could note Arinola on the call. I don't know once you intervened concerning the Uganda outreach? Okay Arinola. Okay maybe she's trying to unmute. Okay I guess Arinola will be sending the report maybe we lost communication. I can see that I see a number of item on the AOB that was just come to Chris. Please Chris could you take it? Thank you.

Chris Wilson: Thanks Jimson and thank you for all your efforts. And thank you Andrew Mack as well on the outreach side. You guys are doing yeoman's work. And I know we'll have a great event in Johannesburg regardless of obstacles put in our way. And for what it's worth I intend to reach out to Chris Mondini and just let him know that, you know, it's sort of penny wise and pound foolish not to facilitate outreach for constituencies at an outreach event where the policy forum is policy forum and outreach focused. And I can understand why they would perhaps not want to have other policy events, et cetera, tacked on to the four days. But I think for outreach purposes it seems to me to make sense to be more flexible there. But hopefully we'll – they can – we can work on that going forward.

I want to go ahead and quickly the last few minutes turn to AOB. Quickly we're still in the open nomination period for the next chair of the BC. I think for those that may have missed it I had to step down. And we need someone

else to take over the role of chair. I think the nomination period closes I believe on Monday. Is that right Chantelle? I think it's Monday. I believe it's Monday. So we've got a few more days.

You know, for those that are interested in running that have questions about the role and what it entails please don't hesitate to reach out to me via either email or phone. I'm happy to talk to folks about it and give them the sense of what the job is all about. But I know we've got a lot of qualified and talented people on the BC who would be good candidates. So hopefully we'll get some nominees up by Monday, May 1. And then we can continue with the election process. But the goal is to have someone in place by May 29 which would give them about roughly a month ahead of the Johannesburg meeting to get ramped up. So that's where we are right now on the BC election.

As far as the BC charter update Jimson and I we had a phone call with Rob Hoggarth earlier this week. And he mentioned to us that the OEC the ICANN Organizational Effectiveness Committee is meeting next week where they will be presumably approving our - are looking at our revised charter with attaching recommendation of approval to send to the board the ICANN Board.

And that means Rob believes that barring any unforeseen hurdle that the ICANN Board will be able to approve our revised charter either in Johannesburg or shortly thereafter depending on time constraints. But so I think we're looking right now at the final approval by the end of June very, very early July. So that's good news from him. And if anything changes in that regard we'll let folks know.

That's it. Otherwise, you know, next meeting we have two weeks on May 11 same time. I hope folks can be able to dial in then and learn more about what's going on with some of these public comments and other things. So any

other thoughts, questions, concerns anyone may have? Okay seeing nothing then I thank everybody for their time and look forward to talking to you all in a couple of weeks. Thank you very much. Chantelle we can stop the call.

Chantelle Doerksen: Thanks everyone. Operator you may now stop the recording. Please remember to disconnect all remaining lines and enjoy the rest of your day.

END