

ICANN

Moderator: Chantelle Doerksen
June 8, 2017
10:00 am CT

Coordinator: The recordings have started.

Chantelle Doerksen: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Welcome to the BC Members Call on Thursday June 8, 2017. On today's call we have Andy Abrams, Steve DelBianco, Denise Michel, Jimson Olufuye, Barbara Warner, Jay Sudowski, Andrew Mack, Susan Kawaguchi, Arinola Akinyemi, Alison Simpson, Claudia Martinuzzi, Philip Corwin, Tim Chen, and Claudia Selli on the phone bridge. We have apologies from Cecilia Smith and tentative apologies from Marie Pattullo. From staff we have myself, Chantelle Doerksen. I'd like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you ever so much and over to you, Andrew.

Andrew Mack: Great. Thank you very much, Chantelle. And greetings from Brussels, all. This is Andrew and if for whatever reason I get off because of the connection here, by all means continue and I'll get back on. But a couple of quick words just to start us off.

First of all, again, I would like, on behalf of the BC, to thank Paul Mitchell for his work on NomCom, Lawrence for his kind offer to volunteer to join NomCom if we didn't have a large company representative, and Cheryl for picking up the ball. I know it's a lot of work and on a relative short period of time, and I wish to compliment all of the BC members for all their spirit and commitment. Thank you on behalf of the BC. First thing.

Second thing, I note that there's a going to be a report on the BC outreach event in Jo-burg. I just wanted to send a hats off to Jimson and other members of the outreach who worked very hard on that and to thank again the ICANN team for their support.

And the last thing is to thank Hibah for the work that she has been doing - she did on the human rights comment. I know it's going to be covered later but she and I had the chance to work on it. She did the heavy lifting on the first draft and did an amazing job and I just wanted to compliment her personally for that. And that's it. In the interest of using your time wisely, I'm going to pass the ball to Steve DelBianco.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks, Andrew. The policy calendar, which Chantelle will display in a moment - a little bit of an echo. Andrew, it's probably - thank you for muting, whoever did. Someone still needs to mute please. Thank you. Chantelle's brought up the policy calendar. You can all scroll through it, and if it's difficult to read in Adobe, please open the e-mail that I circulated on Tuesday evening.

This ought to be fairly quick, leaving more time I think for Jimson and for Barbara to cover their topics as well. The first thing I'll mention is that we filed two comments since our last call with the BC. The first is on May the 30th. We commented on the proposed renewal of the dot-net registry agreement. And I want to thank Mark Datysgeld, and Nivaldo who worked together on some drafting, and then Phil Corwin and I did some editing. And I think we had a pretty cohesive comment on dot-net's renewal.

Let me also say, on the 26th of May we filed a comment to support recommendations by a Workstream 2 project on SO and AC, that's

stakeholder organization and advisory committee, accountability. And in there, the BC supported the specific four themes or threads of those SO/AC recommendations. The BC has seen multiple iterations of that over the past four months, and in fact it was much the BC-driven remarks since I served as the co-rapporteur on that group.

Now let me turn to the currently open ICANN public comments, and I only have to cover a few of these right now. The first closes on the 16th of June so I'll be filing that next week. And it's a draft framework of interpretation for the human rights bylaw in ICANN's post-transition bylaws. Now this framework is the way in which the ICANN SOs, ACs, and staff will interpret the commitment to human rights that is embedded in ICANN's bylaws.

It's always been there as a notion of commitments but is now more explicit, but it isn't so explicit that we have any idea how to balance human rights against other obligations in ICANN's core values and mission and there's no firm definition of what are the list of internationally recognized human rights. So this framework I think does a pretty decent job of laying out how it is ICANN can proceed.

I want to thank Hibah and Andrew for drafting that. That is the first attachment to the policy calendar. And in it, I particularly want to point out that Hibah and Andrew have pointed out the ways in which the definition proposed in May of last year, proposed by the BC, was what was adopted in ICANN's bylaws. So we take some credit for that.

But then we go on to try to encourage ICANN and the community to stay tightly focused on the framework of interpretation and to avoid expansive interpretations of ICANN's obligation on bylaws. So I agree with everything that's in the comment but for Hibah and Andrew, and I wonder whether we

couldn't sharpen what it is we're recommending that they do. Because think about it, the rapporteurs for this particular working group will read the BC comment and they'll largely read it as agreeing with the recommendations.

And if we are perfectly comfortable with exactly what they've written, then fine, but if we would like them to sharpen certain points to draw a more bright line distinction between human rights obligations and human rights considerations, we've got to get it into the written comment or else we'll just get into the call and that says we support, and that may be fine. So, Hibah and Andrew, let me stop there to see if you want to add anything to the substance of that draft, and if others have questions please raise your hand now.

Hibah Kamal-Grayson Yes, this is Hibah. Can you guys hear me?

Steve DelBianco: We do.

Hibah Kamal-Grayson Okay great. Yes, I agree with you, Steve, that I would love to have some concrete kind of lines, and if any of the lawyers on right now are able to take a look, especially about, you know, the question of applicable law and just to help us kind of concretize some recommendations, I would be very grateful. So, yes.

Steve DelBianco: Looking for somebody to volunteering. And thank you for raising that, Hibah. Any other questions? And we need a volunteer of one of the lawyers in the BC who has a firm grasp on this notion of applicable law. In the draft that's put together, it's mentioned. It's right near the paragraph in the - near the end and we just want to sharpen that a bit as well as to say what we believe should be changed in the recommendation. Any volunteers on that? Thanks again, Hibah and Andrew.

Let me turn to the next item on the BC policy calendar under channel one. It is the release of geo names for six dot-brand TLDs. Now Andy Abrams of Google was kind enough to reprise the previous BC comments we've done where we support the release of geo names at the second level in the dot-brand gTLDs. And we first circulated this back on the 25th of May. I don't anticipate we'll make any changes because it's a rinse and repeat comment for us. Thanks again to Andy Abrams.

The third one isn't due until the 7th of July so we'll actually have an opportunity to discuss this when we gather in Johannesburg so we don't have to get too deep into it right now, but this is a revised procedure for handling the way Whois requirements might conflict with privacy law. This has been ongoing concern at ICANN and it gave rise at one point to waivers, to data retention procedures.

And a number of you know that registrars have been seeking waivers to certain elements of Whois in their contracts and their RAA and ICANN has a procedure to grant the waiver. This is an opportunity to reexamine how is that process working. And a lot of you understand that there are two other overarching things happening in the ICANN community at the same time.

One is the data protection, the GDPR, that will become law in the European Union this time next year and how that would interfere with Whois obligations. And the second overriding element is the development of the Registry Directory Services, or RDS, PDP. And so those two things are happening at the same time that we're just doing sort of a small examination here of whether the current procedure is working well.

I want to thank Cheryl Miller, who's drafted a BC comment on this. It's the third attachment to the policy calendar. Excellent job on this, Cheryl. Very

much appreciate the way that you handled that. And there'll be an opportunity for those of you who have a lot of familiarity with Whois to win on that. Now I think we had Tim Chen, who does a lot of work in Whois, Cecilia Smith at Fox. You both offered to provide some edits. Here's your chance.

Please pick up the excellent draft that Cheryl has, it's the third attachment, and just reply all so that we'll see edits that you think that you can make in the time that is ahead. I think that we also thought that Denise Michel, if she has some time, could also take a look at it. But we already have it circulated for member review and it's due by July the 7th. Any comments on that, Cheryl, Denise, Tim, or Cecilia?

Cheryl Miller: No. This is Cheryl. Thanks, Steve. Just let me know what else you need from me on it. Thank you so much.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Cheryl. And, Cheryl, I'm echoing what Andrew Mack said earlier. Thank you for stepping up to serve as a large business rep to the Nominating Committee. And the good news is you'll be in Johannesburg with the rest of your BC colleagues and the bad news is we probably won't see very much of you. I think that the NomCom assignment is going to keep you busy most of the daylight hours, but let's look for opportunities that we can interact even after the NomCom day is done for you. Okay?

Cheryl Miller: That sounds good. I think you're right on that, Steve. Thanks. Happy to help.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks again, Cheryl. The fourth item isn't due until July the 10th but it's an important one. This is the proposed implementation of the GNSO's recommendations for protecting these intergovernmental organizations and international non-governmental organizations, IGOs and INGOs. Think about Red Cross as a favorite example but there are hundreds of others.

And this is a GNSO recommendation for how to handle that in all gTLDs. This report comes from a policy team, an implementation team, on which there are no BC members. I did want to clarify though that Andy Abrams, Jay Sudowski have commented on the original PDP. Phil Corwin is co-chair of the PDP working group looking at their access to the rights protection mechanisms that are already in place.

So there's a lot of overlapping expertise and point of view in the BC on things like what about the Red Cross recommendations to protect them. But at the same time, we don't have anybody that's been following this very closely. We need a volunteer to take a look at these proposed implementations. It's not nearly as difficult as looking at a brand new PDP, it's an implementation of recommendations.

Can I get a volunteer? There's plenty of time to take this on and you're going to have plenty of support from people like Andy, Jay and Phil. Not even a bad one for somebody who's relatively new to the BC to take on.

Phil Corwin: Yes, Steve, Phil here. I hope I'm not the only one stepping up but I'm happy to work with anyone. I'd need to take a look at this. Anyway, I see Jay's willing to assist me. I can work with Jay on this. But given the relationship of this, both substantively and ICANN internal politics to the work of the working group I'm co-chairing, which is moving toward completion in the next two, three months, I need to look at this anyway. So I'm happy to participate in helping to draft a comment.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Phil. Thank you, Jay, for offering and for Andrew Mack. Let's try to get more than just the usual suspects to contribute. With these three

veterans on board, it's a great opportunity for a BC member to get involved, maybe even for the first time on a BC comment.

Again, this is not a strongly legalistic set of a comments, it's as Phil Corwin indicated, some of it's political, this notion of governments believing that they need special protections for things like .redcross or redcross.whatever and that GNSO's recommendations are that we think those protections can be afforded with a lot of the rights protection and challenge mechanisms that we've designed for other important brands and trademarks around the world.

As Jay indicated, this is a good thing to read on the plane on the way Jo-burg. Come on, let's have a volunteer who's not worked on a comment for the last year. A couple of brand-focused BC members who understand the way in which we protect brands with the challenge would be helpful too. Alison Simpson, thank you so much for stepping up, Alison. Appreciate that.

All right, let's move on then. I wanted to mention that Workstream 2 of the ICANN IANA transition had a number of projects and one of them was called improvements to ICANN's standards for diversity at all levels. And the at all levels literally means covering things from constituency and stakeholder groups up to SOs and ACs, ICANN management, and the composition even of things like working groups.

There's a transitional bylaw, since this came out of the new bylaws, that requires them looking at improvements, and there have been many of us who've been observers to the group looking at diversity. But they have only published six questions and they're looking for responses. It's not an official public comment period, rather it's a survey that they'll use to draft their recommendations.

Cheryl Miller, I get to mention your name again and thank you for drafting a BC reply. And, Jimson, thank you for those edits. This is the fourth attachment to the BC policy calendar. What I would prefer to do is to be able to finalize and submit that to that group after today's call. So please open your fourth attachment, if you haven't already looked at it. You'll see that Cheryl and Jimson answered the survey questions, indicating the ways in which the BC is attentive to diversity.

And, Jimson, I have a question for you. Do you believe we could mention in there specifically the dollars that the BC has allocated over each of the past two years towards the recruitment function of BC membership as part of the sentences where you describe that our recruitment is very attentive to diversity, both geographical, size of business, types of business, and viewpoints? I note that we come right up to the edge without actually indicating that the BC is spending as much as \$15,000 a year on the recruitment of BC members with an eye towards diversity. Jimson, you may...

Jimson Olufuye: This is Jimson. That is a good idea. I'll put some (unintelligible) in the larger sense (unintelligible).

Steve DelBianco: Jimson, thank you. If you will make that edit to the document I attached, the one I attached incorporated Cheryl's original, and then - and accept with your changes. So please work off of that one, and then circulate to all. And we'll give everyone a full day, a full 24 hours to review that before we submit. And I'll plan to submit our survey responses over the weekend so everyone will get a last call on that along with Jimson's circulated change to add the dollars.

Okay, I had only one more item and then we'll turn it over to Susan and Phil. ICANN is looking for volunteers on the third accountability and transparency

review. It's called the ATRT3. Officially that closed on the 2nd of June and they picked up quite a few new applicants. There are 24 applicants, and I've got a link in there to who's on board. But let me mention right away, none are from the Commercial Stakeholder Group, the BC, the IPC, and the ISPs.

So ordinarily we're very well represented on these review teams and here's an instance where we're not at all. My guess is that a BC member who's interested might still get in even though they've missed the deadline. And I'll note that just a few days ago, Adetola, not seeing you on the call today, but Adetola had said he's interested in participating.

So, Jimson, I know you Adetola so why don't you and I follow up after the e-mail and recommend that he put his name in now since they haven't actually picked yet and on the understanding that if they tell him the deadline is closed, perhaps we can intervene on his behalf. Any objections? Any concerns with that? All right. Jimson and I will do the follow up necessary for that.

Phil and Susan, over to you to discuss the council.

Phil Corwin: Yes, Steve, Phil here. This could be a very brief report because the last council meeting was 18th May. We've had a subsequent BC call discussing what happened at the meeting, and you've listed the high points here in the policy calendar, and we don't yet have the agenda for the next council meeting which will take place during Johannesburg. So there's not a great deal to report on or to discuss today. I defer to Susan if she thinks I've missed anything.

Susan Kawaguchi: No I think you've covered it. The only thing that is going on is I am chairing the Selection Standing Committee or Standing Selection Committee, I always get that wrong, to choose GNSO candidates for the review teams or any of the

roles that come up that need selection of a candidate. And right now we're working on the empowered community representative role and what we're doing is actually recommending to the GNSO the criteria in selecting that - the person or persons for the role.

And it just - it's been interesting that this committee is not all council members but there are council members but also other representatives from the GNSO community. And it's been a little difficult to get people to understand what the empowered community does and what this representative role should - will be empowered to do, which is basically communicate and nothing else.

So hopefully we'll have criteria to the GNSO by the motion deadline. And what we're suggesting is it be handed over to the leadership of the GNSO Council and they can decide which one of them would be participating as the representative and also provide alternate. If that person can't make the meeting, then one of the other, the vice chair or the chair, would fill in depending on who's the - takes lead on this.

And then I also strongly urge anyone to go ahead and apply to the ATRT. We've been really successful in getting our candidates on the review team and specifically the BC but we, you know, with the RDS review team, we really only have three seats but we were able to get four on the RDS review team from the GNSO. So more candidates out there means more representation for the BC. And that's it from me.

Steve DelBianco: Moving on to channel three, it's the CSG. So Barbara, that's yours.

Barbara Warner: Okay. And I also will be very brief. The schedule's up and Steve provided a link to it here in the policy calendar so you all have the schedules, or access to the schedule rather, for ICANN 59.

I would say in the last CSG meeting -- there's a possibility we'll have one more -- we discussed how to be strategic in terms of what - of who we invite and what we address in our CSG meeting. And it looks like we will have time with Matthew Shears to become better acquainted with him.

We will also have time with Jamie Hedlund and Bryan Schilling, the new ICANN compliance officer. I think in our - there may be, as I said, there may be another CSG call before Johannesburg where we'll focus on what we really want to cover in those meetings with Jamie and Bryan, not simply show the flag. I think that was a good point that Andrew made in that call that we should be a bit more transactional when we dress these meetings with senior ICANN staff. We'll also have David Conrad available for us to continue to press on the ODI initiative.

I think some other important issues that will be considered in the CSG not only in the open meeting but in the ExCom is the process for determining board seat 14. Of course we have Matthew in that seat now but I think there was a desire to get ahead of the curve so we don't find ourselves scrambling again as Matthew's term nears completion.

And the way we left it was Wolf-Ulrich would volunteer to draft an e-mail that would begin to engage the Non-Commercial Stakeholders Group in discussing this process. ICANN staff pressed us for some indication of how far along we were and we said not going to happen at ICANN 59, probably more towards the fall. But I'm sure there will be some discussion about that in your CSG meeting.

The CSG ExCom will also have a luncheon meeting with the At-Large stakeholders group, which will include Leon Sanchez. This will provide folks to educate him, socialize him on our interests in proactively shaping the terms of reference for the GNSO 2019 review. I know several of you were on the MSSSI briefing call, and I came away a bit frustrated, not really having a sense for the timing of when this will begin.

The person who briefed us that said, you know, the time - the GNSO review was not as hardwired into the bylaws as some of the other reviews. So we were not given any sort of indication as to when we could begin to expect any information at all from staff concerning the status of that.

So I think that's something we might want to press further in Johannesburg so we, in the CSG, know how to plan accordingly in terms of reaching out to the Non-Commercial Stakeholders Group. Steve has very kindly offered to cover for me in the CSG ExCom meeting with the At-Large group. So I think that is it for me right now. Thank you.

Steve DelBianco: Barbara, thank you. Hey, it's Steve. Thank you very much and I'll try to fill your shoes with respect to relaying back to the BC things that the CSG ExCom covers. I did want to suggest though that the organizational review, that is to say the review of the GNSO, it is described in the ICANN bylaws exactly the same as all of the reviews except for one, and that is the GAC, because in the case of the GAC there's no bylaw to require a review of the GAC.

But there is the very same language which looks at the effectiveness and the continuing purpose of the group, and there are no bylaws for any of the ACs and SOs that indicate that there should be participation in the request for

proposal. But we insisted upon that when we all met in Iceland, and three members of the board's organizational effectively committee were there in the room -- at least a few of them are still on the board of directors. We're going to press them on their promise to give us an opportunity to weigh in what's in that RFP, what's in the specification or terms of reference for the next review.

But let's go into this with both eyes open. Most of the rest of the GNSO is very happy with the current split house structure. I can tell you the contract parties are very happy with it and I - we know that the Non-Commercial Stakeholders Group is thrilled to have doubled their voting power as a result of the last restructuring.

So the Commercial Stakeholders Group, that is us, are the only ones who really feel the current system is not working. So therefore even if we got terms of reference in a study, let's manage expectations here. We are unlikely to get recommendations that will somehow change and adjust the voting in a way that's going to dramatically benefit the CSG. Now if anyone has a different take on that, let's hear it now because Barbara and I and the rest of the ExCom are going to have to work this issue in the months again. Thanks again, Barbara.

Barbara Warner: Sure. Steve, I just - I was a bit dissatisfied with the way that answer was, you know, Greg Shatan asked the question in that MSSSI briefing call and I kind of felt like ICANN staff dodged it. Was I the only one that got that impression or perhaps ICANN staff didn't - wasn't - weren't fully up to speed on that? I don't know.

Steve DelBianco: Yes. They are claiming that these organizational reviews will be subject to new procedures, operating procedures, which they have yet to even publish to

us, and they are trying to actually cover that MSSSI call with respect to all the reviews as if all reviews can be subject to the same set of procedures.

Our question was very different and I agree with you. They did not give us a satisfactory answer. I think we are going to have to press on that with Markus Kummer who is going to be leaving the board soon with Renalia who is there and also George Sudowski who is going to be staying on the board. So let's do that – we will do that when we are together in Joburg.

Barbara if there is nothing further can you move down to the policy calendar and we can send it over to you Andrew.

Barbara Warner: Go ahead.

Andrew Mack: Thanks I want to get off of mute. Thank you very much. Can you hear me now? Chantelle can everyone hear me?

Chantelle Doerksen: Hi Andrew, yes we can hear you.

Andrew Mack: Okay great thanks. Sorry I am – just this is the first I have used it this way. Thank you very much Steve. I agree it would be really useful to know what the new policies are going to be. I think that that is a pretty important thing to understand.

We are moving through the policy calendar and I believe it is our turn – it is Jimson's turn to talk about the parts of it that he is responsible for. I have got let's see, I have got invoices at the outreach event and feedback on the budget comments. Jimson do you want to pick that up?

Jimson Olufuye: Hi, this is Jimson. So I believe everyone has received the invoices (unintelligible). (Unintelligible) issue and (unintelligible). Talk about this outreach (unintelligible) for reducing (unintelligible). And of course (unintelligible). So we can assume it is quite safe (unintelligible) of the food and drink (unintelligible) three to four travelers. So I need to update the (unintelligible). I will move now to feedback and ICANN (unintelligible).

Andrew Mack: Jimson excuse me this is Andrew. I think a lot of us are having a hard time understanding you.

Jimson Olufuye: Can you hear me better? (Unintelligible) noise.

Steve DelBianco: Not really Jimson.

Andrew Mack: Jimson this is Andrew. We are hearing your voice fairly loud but not very clearly. And I don't want to miss anything that you are talking about. Can you possibly also add in the chat some of the key points that you would like to be making.

So if anyone isn't hearing clearly we would be able to pick them up and ask questions if they like? Thank you.

Jimson Olufuye: Okay (unintelligible).

Andrew Mack: Jimson I think that might better given that I have gotten a number of people saying that they are having trouble hearing you. Let me just make two sets of...

Jimson Olufuye: (Unintelligible).

Andrew Mack: Two thoughts from this side. One is that we really do appreciate everyone who is going to be in Joburg trying to make an appearance at the outreach event and being available for outreach. That is super important to our growth and to locking in some of our new members on the administrative side.

But I know we have been in the habit in the past. I am trying to share with Chantelle who is going to be there so that we can coordinate on the ground and take advantage of the fact that it is a relatively small team but we are very well coordinated.

So if people are – it is relatively short time until Joburg. If people could shoot notes to Chantelle confirming that they are going to be there and how we can reach them.

I think that would be super helpful and we will do our best on the outreach side to coordinate to make sure that everybody's time is well spent and we get the right bodies in the room to answer the right questions. Back to you Jimson. Thank you.

Chantelle Doerkseon: Hi Andrew this is Chantelle. I just want to note that the operator is redialing Jenson to see if we can get a better connection. Please stand by one moment.

Andrew Mack: Understood. Thanks very much Chantelle.

Jimson Olufuye: Hi.

Jimson Olufuye: Can you hear me now?

Andrew Mack: A bit better this time. Yes.

Jimson Olufuye: Okay so sorry about that communication glitch. Well I gave a link to the outreach event so you can get the information there. And I tried to appreciate our consultant and staff working on that, Joseph and Chantelle.

So now to the budget comments that was permitted and the ICANN staff response. We do know that in the empowered community we have the option of approving the budget and also rejecting it. So the project issue is very important as you all know. And it is important we pay attention to it. So concerning our own submission. Number one, we recommended that should be executive summary and that was accepted.

We raised the issue of the reserve funds, we are concerned that it is led by 50%. And we should not be at least 100% should be in reserve. That is 100% (of preceding year operating funds) should be available for (as reserves).

So the response we got is that the board working group feedback is expected on the subject matter. And then on the (proposed Data) Initiative I do not see any budget line. I talked about it is being taken seriously. So the response was that \$200,000 is being earmarked for the project itself and is submitted for license fees and software development.

Let me find out. Are you still with me? Can you hear me?

Andrew Mack: Yes, sir.

Jimson Olufuye: Okay great.

Andrew Mack: Jimson I think we can hear you.

Jimson Olufuye: Okay great. So we asked the question about why an increase in (staff) that is headcount projected for FY '18. An increase of about 55.6 full time employees which will be about 60% increase.

The response we got is that yes we do have the the specific objectives with the (strict objectives) and those defined (goals) ICANN organization in FY '18. So to meet those goals there is a need for (the head count to be increased).

I know that constituency did ask about details of the salaries and benefits as well as for staff. Because there was some kind of analysis made that on the average headcount is about 168,000 (USD) by full time employees. Giving about (\$4.5) million deal for 413 full time employees.

So the other constituency also noted that according to the Form 990 file, the ICANN outreach filing for Top 25 people is about \$427K. So, I suspect this might be issue that some (of the constituencies might take up) seriously. But generally, the salary of ICANN staff also include healthcare, disability coverage, pension and other benefits.

Then we need a solution (the first officers of the BC) should be considered for travel support and also for (CSTD) travel. This (was rejected) because it was mostly that there is FY – there is a plan in FY '18 to really do a thorough travel review so there is going to be travel process review in FY '18 and this will be put in perspective by that time.

But in the meantime, two extra travel slots we approved. Two (extra) travel slots were approved so that when the BC (Excomm) make decision to allocate that to any member that see as adding value – is active when it comes to policy work.

So I think the (many can) benefit on that. But the Excomm will have to determine the criteria for this going forward.

Then also we (unintelligible) about \$8 million appropriated for bad debt. The response was that whether it is dependent (practice). Our recommendation regards to additional budget review clause that is (required) additional process review that every request (unintelligible) so that was accepted.

Then the Ombudsman we noted that the amount appropriated for Ombudsman was higher this time around. So, we explained that it was because it is projected that an Ombudsman will need (outside legal) assistance. So because of that that is why the budget increase.

Well with regards to travel support we are concerned about travel support. (We wanted to) get more staff for travel support and to say it is not really for the basic travel or booking but it is more of support for our events, conferences and (people to be on ground) and so on and so forth.

Then the auction proceeds, the last question about auction proceeds they said yes. (It was not touched) and where it is noted in arrow in the budget that it will be corrected. Because in the budget it is selected that the auction proceeds, but there was nothing there in that column. So that will be adjusted.

Okay now we (reached out about) ICANN's Technical University. (This was a reoccurring theme) but there was nothing there. So it was explained that the ICANN technical is more of providing the (resources for staff) so that Staff can (improve on their) knowledge.

So on this one I think the type (of language can be change). Instead of ICANN Technical University maybe it could be changed to maybe ICANN

Knowledge Center. Because University would be something bigger than what we are talking about. So that could be an improvement there.

And also on the internet governance it is actually less than the \$100K just like the ICANN Technical University. So that is why I described (unintelligible).

And the other comment made was accepted that is where there was (nomenclature) challenge instead of FY '18 (they put) FY '17. So by and large, where I see the challenge going forward where the concerns I raised issues would be we have got to (the remuneration) of staff which was not fully provided.

Though, ICANN promised that it will provide those details going forward. So by and large from my perspective I think it is (responsible, but okay,) but details on planning the staff movement and staff salaries maybe a gray area that we might need to attend to going forward.

So I don't know if there are questions or concerns on this. Thank you very much.

Andrew Mack: Great Jimson. Yes, Jimson first of all, thank you very much. That is really great and these are – clearly there is a lot of work that has gone into this.

Before we open the quick queue because I know it is 10 minutes before the hour. I just wanted to ask you one quick process which is we have given our comment. They have given their response. Is there anymore back and forth or are we effectively at the end of this conversation?

We are just reacting – if we have comments – if we have questions at the BC would we then take them back to ICANN again? What is the process as far as

you know it?

Jimson Olufuye: Yes, I actually need to collate them and then the primary (unintelligible) collaborate with the other (stakeholders) and then (my output channel) will be through the GNSO because I don't know if there is any mechanism now to get back to them about some of the areas that is still not (satisfactory answers).

I will explore that plan and find out whether we could send the response (unintelligible). But the standard mechanism which Steve can further enlighten us it has to go through the GNSO process (where the drafting team) I think in place of (unintelligible). So (unintelligible) ready (with the CSG) to put the process together. But I will find out what this (is).

Andrew Mack: Okay super. So since we have people on the call. I know there is at least one person who would like to speak. Why don't we open it real quickly for comments on what Jimson has just put forward?

Marilyn you put in the chat that you would like to – like to ask a question. If there are others let's put in the queue and thank you very much Marilyn. To you.

Marilyn are you there? Okay well I am going to wait and see if Marilyn still is interested and able to have a question. If anyone else on the call – does anyone else on the call have a question for Jenson about what we have just put forward?

Otherwise if not I am going to send this to other...

Marilyn Cade Andrew.

Andrew Mack: Yes madam.

Marilyn Cade Sorry. I just wanted to say my word of thanks to Jimson. I do with him and with Chris as much as I can. And the amount of work that Jimson does on our behalf is absolutely phenomenal. So I hope that everybody is able to take a look at this great amount of work.

I had a question and a comment. I will make it very quickly. Originally and it has to do with the two new travel slots which it is phenomenal that they are being considered.

Originally when there was no funding at all and from ICANN to any travelers. We managed to convince ICANN when funding did become available that we should be given the option of splitting that travel support at our discretion.

So for instance, we were able to give the flights to travel to one traveler and the hotels to another and then informally we split the per diem. I am just – all I am asking is whether there are guidelines for these two additional seats or the ExCom will still be able to have that kind of flexibility or maybe we don't know that yet?

Andrew Mack: It is a great question. Jimson let me just see before we go because I know we are near the end of time. Is there anybody else on the call who has a question for Jimson so we can enter them both at the same time?

Going once. Going twice. Seeing no hands. Great Jimson to you.

Jimson Olufuye: Yes I think it is possible to exercise that kind of flexibility that we did before. So (it's a matter of communicating with the staff responsible). Of course I

think this time (Chantelle will communicate with them). So (I think this is possible, Marilyn).

Andrew Mack: Great thank you very much Jimson and I would like to echo what Marilyn said. We are all very appreciative of the amount of work and frankly the amount of heavy lifting on the details that you are doing.

Congratulations and thank you. And thanks for all the efforts that you are making. We recognize that sometimes the logistics are a little challenging with the line and everything. So thanks for sticking with it.

That brings us to any other business. And I am just going to take a quick look. We are five minutes of the hour. Does anybody else have anything on their mind that they would like to mention before we wrap up our call?

I see Susan is typing.

Jimson Olufuye: Yes Andrew this is Jimson. Just so this opportunity to thank Jay Sudowski for the feedback on the draft BC FY18 Budget Proposal. So just to encourage others to feel free to communicate with me if there are changes you want to add or want to adjust. Thank you.

Andrew Mack: Excellent thank you. And so I am going to put in one more plug for two items. The first of which is please do share your status vis-à-vis Johannesburg with Chantelle so that we can coordinate effectively with you both as ExCom as the BC ends of our outreach.

And the second one is I guess I am trying to echo Steve who I think had to get off the call. Which is for those of you who are not normal contributors and for those of you who are close with new members of the BC who don't often

contribute to comments. I can tell you as someone who has done a lot of commenting recently and I am not the one who has done the most.

We really do need new people to come in, share the wealth and share the work. It is not an impossible thing to do. People who are more experienced than you in BC land will help you and it helps us to learn. It helps us to develop new leadership, new talent.

Especially for people who are either, you know, new voices including new voices from the global south. We really appreciate your feedback and we would like to get you involved in making the comments. So that is all from my side.

We look forward to seeing you all on June 29th, next meeting June 29th in Joburg and thanks very much.

Chantelle Doerksen: Thanks everyone. Operator you may now stop the recording.

Coordinator: Please remember to disconnect all remaining lines and enjoy the rest of your day.

END