

ICANN

Moderator: Chantelle Doerksen
August 17, 2017
10:00 am CT

Chantelle Doerksen: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the BC members call on August 17, 2017. On today's call we have Alex Deacon, Allison Simpson, Andrew Harris, Andrew Mack, Andy Abrams, Ben Wallace, Kristina Olausson, Margie Milam, Marilyn Cade, Mark Datysgeld, Philip Corwin, Steve DelBianco, Tim Chen, Jimson Olufuye, Lawrence Olawale-Roberts and Marcus Eke. We have apologies from Barbara Wanner, Marie Pattullo, Opeyemi Onifade, and Susan Kawaguchi. From staff we have myself, Chantelle Doerksen. I would like to remind everyone to please state your name before speaking for the transcript. Thank you ever so much in over to you, Andrew.

Andrew Mack: Okay, Chantelle, thank you very much and thank you to all of the BC members who are here on the call. For those of you who are in the midst of an August summer, which I think is pretty much everyone but Mark, I'm glad that you're able to make it and hope your summer is going well. I wanted to put out a special thank you to the new people who have joined committees and to Mary Pattullo, who is able to cover a meeting scheduled at the same time as this meeting to take a look at the future of ICANN's meeting planning and all that. And so, perfect example of how the BC really steps up to pick up things

when we need to be in two places at the same time. So, many thanks with that. I know we've got a lot on the agenda and we want to make sure we get through it quickly. So I'm going to keep the welcomes to a minimum. Steve, over to you with the policy calendar.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks, Andy. Steve DelBianco here. I will welcome Margie Milam, who is now with Facebook and not ICANN staff anymore. And another fantastic addition to the BC. On the policy calendar which was circulated yesterday today and Chantelle has put into the Adobe window, we've only filed one additional comment since our last call on 3 August. And that is on 10 August we found a comment on proposed changes to the ICANN bylaws and GNSO procedures that were necessary for GNSO to exercise its right to responsibilities in empowered community. I drafted that, took some comments from a few of you sucking as well and we put that in.

Now, I circulated our draft very early on to the ISPs and the IPC. And the ISPs completely agreed with our comment and initially wanted to sign on as a joint comment if we can get the IPC to agree. With a few days to go before the deadline, the IPC -- Greg Shatan was communicating with me -- they wanted to take a sharper edge. In other words, they agreed with everything we said but believed that they should not endorse the voting thresholds since that might imply that they were endorsing that the Council have the role. So that is a harder edge than we took. And so therefore the IPC did their own comment and the ISPs basically echoed our comment and put it in themselves.

I did want to add that the IPC, at least Greg Shatan, the President of the IPC, he believes that the rhetoric that will frighten ICANN here is to say that there is a risk that Council -- acting on behalf of GNSO -- would be judged or challenged is outside of the remit of Council. I'm not a lawyer, but you know, I play one on TV. When I read their comment, I really believe that is a stretch

to suggest that the Council cannot act on behalf of GNSO, because GNSO often, through the counselors, we have Susan and Philip on the Council. The Council does represented an aggregation of the GNSO constituents. Who consult with us I hate the idea of requiring a majority or super majority of each house. I think it's ridiculous that noncomm reps broke on it. It's a stretch to me to say that there's legal risk to having Council act for GNSO. Happy to take a Q on that, Marilyn. Marilyn, you're up. We don't hear you, Marilyn. Still don't hear you, Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: But probably you can now, right?

Steve DelBianco: Yes, now we do. Go ahead, please.

Marilyn Cade: Thanks. Actually, Steve, I'm with Greg Shatan on this. And I say that because, like you, I'm not a lawyer, but I'm not going to comment about how many of them I've been married to because everyone on the BC list would burst into laughter. I too, play one on TV. I actually think there's something to this. I think at least – but you know that my very strong preference is that the GNSO executive committee speak for the GNSO and the policy committee stick to its nitting. I understand there has been other ideas brought forward that the job of the policy council did those, they did that, they were allocated the right to approve the representatives to the various reviews groups, but remember that we always insisted the names came through the constituency. So really, I'm with Greg on this. And I hadn't talked to him about it, but I think it's worth letting it play out and being cautious about saying we disagree, since after all - - as we all know -- those who don't play lawyers on TV play lawyers in real court. And I'd like to let this play out, because if they're right, and the policy council is overextending, then we create a vulnerability. While if we support the fact that the executive committee of the various constituencies own this, I think we're on much safer ground.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks, Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: And by the way – and let me just say also, I think were much more tied to the full membership. I'm not being critical of our policy counselors, but we elect them to do specific things. I've been one, I helped to write the rules. They have a huge portfolio. This is far beyond the GTLD policy. It's ICANN governance, and I think that belongs in the hands of the executive committee.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks, Marilyn. This is Steve. And as all of you know our comment made those points very strongly. Were we different from the IPC was IPC agreed with everything was said and then added that they thought there was legal risk. That's the part that I believe is potentially a little too legalistic. But our comments were very strong on the need for us to be vigilant. I pasted into the chat our concluding two sentences, where I think the BC can be way up front about the fact that let's watch the voting and the debate that occurs in counsel when GNSO is deciding what to do in the empowered community. And if we observed that the will of the GNSO executive committee is been frustrated, if the majority as being frustrated by the split house, or the presence of noncomm voting, when they don't represent anyone in GNSO, then were going to want to say that loud and clear. And will be there in the meetings, but if it happens, and Susan will be able to pick up on it as well. Phil, your hand is up.

Philip Corwin: Yes, Steve, Phil for the record. Thanks for doing a very good comment. You know, on the one hand it might've been better if we could've had a joint statement of all three groups within the CSG. On the other hand I think it's okay that IPC is a little bit further out there. As for what happened if this was ever litigator, who knows. Lawyers will argue that back-and-forth. And by the time we get the answer from the court, is usually too late. The thing that

concerns me the most, and I think this needs to continue to be litigated rhetorically within Council is the danger that an overwhelming majority within Council could have a position on an accountability matter and yet Council -- because of the requirement for the majority from each house for policy matters -- would be deadlocked and unable to take position. And I look forward to working with you and discussing how this concern continue to be raised within Council see if we can get something – some further evolution on how this is going to work. Thank you.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Phil. And that last, the one I put in the chat is the vigilance that we promised that we would do. And you're right, Marilyn's right. Let's play out. Who knows? If there's legal challenge, we'll let it happen. But it's not tack were taking. And Marilyn, you mentioned the fact of the noncomm appointees, they were designed to break ties on either house within GNSO counsel, that's it. And during the drafting team which I chaired, I brought that up a few times, but look, Council itself set up the drafting team and it had non-comm reps on it. They were not too keen on my idea that noncomm reps don't vote when counsel – when GNSO represents the empowered community. I tried. It was a past dependency problem in the sense that one's counsel had established a drafting team and stocked it with proportional representation of the way Council set up, it's very unlikely that were going to come back with anything other than Council answering for the GNSO. He pointed that out in our comments, so did the IPC and the ISPs.

Marilyn, your hand is up again. Okay, thank you.

I have one other comment on a prior filing. On the 20 – on the 7th of July we had commented on revised procedure for handling his conflicts with privacy law. And Cheryl Miller and Susan Kawaguchi have done a great job for the edits for that and drafting. Now the staff report is not as well as a letter from

Akram to GNSO. So, that a little later because Council is going to be discussing Akram's letter on that comment on the Council meeting on 24 July. So Phil, before you head into that particular meeting, be sure to review the BC comment that we filed on conflicts between Whois and privacy law.

All right, we move onto the current ICANN public comment page. There's only one open, that I believe is relevant to the BC. And it's a relatively new one. It was just posted this week. And it says, "The affirmation of commitments created a review team called the Consumer Choice Competition and Consumer Trust, or CCT review team. And the BC was very active at defining parameters and measuring metrics -- that review team on which Waudu Siganga serves -- Has asked staff to study a statistical analysis on how much DNS abuse is occurring in the new GTLD's versus the legacy GTLD's. And they prepared a report based on some statistical experts. So it's think with correlation coefficients and T statistics. But the ultimate conclusion is this, their findings suggest that some new GTLD's have becoming growing target for malicious actors. I have links to the report and to the public comment period. But it closes December - September 19. We have time, but may require some detailed digging in and tracking back to what the BC has previously said about malicious act – actions in the GTLD's space, and particularly in the new GTLD's.

So. I'd like now to solicit some volunteers. And it shouldn't be the same people that volunteer for everything that we do. But I want some volunteers you have a keen interest and maybe even some statistical background to help us analyze that. Okay, Tim Chen, thank you very much for volunteering. Appreciate that. Who else will join Tim on the statistical analysis for new GTLD's? There are a number of BC members who were quite active with respect to pricing problems, with respect to activities in some of the new GTLD's. This would be a great time to revisit those concerns. Any other hands

up? Stephanie, appreciate that. As Andrew indicates, this would be a good place for new member to contribute, particularly if your strong on statistics. Okay, seeing none I'm glad we have Tim and Stephanie. And Tim and Stephanie, I will circulate and copy of the BC team (teeing) this up by linking you to prior BC comments on this topic of DNS abuse. Okay, thank you. I may need to do an outreach to Waudo, because he's on the CCTRT and asking how that conversation is going inside. All right, that is also the current open public comments.

The next topic on the policy calendar is this GDPR our task force that ICANN established while we were in Johannesburg. And this is his task force launched by management to focus ICANN management's response to European data regulators on the general data protection regulation. And as we've discussed on prior calls, Goran believes that by documenting Whois legitimate uses, that he will be able to convince these European regulators who should be given a blanket exemption in the GDPR. Not many of them are confident that can be obtained, but we should do the work anyway since we could document legitimate uses of Whois to see whether Whois qualifies as a legitimate use without asking for an exemption, but rather saying it's compliant so therefore it doesn't need to be exempted. So, either way we needed to catalog all current uses of Whois. Susan Kawaguchi led the way for us on that by cataloging and recalling some of these use cases of Whois on work that has been done on the expert working group. And also Ben Wallis of Microsoft has submitted Microsoft's comments as well.

On our last call Denise Michel, who is on the phone line here, Denise Michel suggested we come up with a general letter on this Whois matrix. And that's apart from anything we want to do to assist with the matrix. But a general letter putting a broader context on this effort to try to preserve Whois. Now, Denise was joined by Susan, by Stephanie and by Tim to help the your draft.

And Denise circulated a draft of that level drafting team just yesterday. And I believe that drafting team will probably have something ready for full BC review before the end of this week. But I'd like to turn it over to Denise, Susan, Stephanie or Tim if you'd like to comment further on what you're thinking in terms of this letter. Denise, would you go next?

Denise Michel: Sure, can you hear me okay?

Steve DelBianco: Perfectly.

Denise Michel: Great. Yes, we'll have a letter for the full BC to consider by the end of the week. It's a letter to Crocker and Goran asking not only for full representation, but a more holistic and comprehensive approach to GDPR, and in particular that the for engaging with regulators that I can complete and publish an expert GDPR analysis, which fully explores how to preserve Whois as a contractual requirements and Whois as a public-interest system, that we ensure there is representation from the ICANN community and ICANN actions on Whois, including the BC members and other users who rely on Whois for a variety of important public interest activities. And that instead of starting from scratch, that last ditch effort leveraged the work product that the ICANN community has been engaged in for, well, over a decade now. So, that letter will be coming to you by the end of the week. Thanks.

Steve DelBianco: Denise, thank you. This is Steve. The draft on that final point you mentioned, this notion that they ought to build on the prior work. It's my impression that Susan did exactly that, Susan Kawaguchi, when she pulled all of the use cases from expert working group and dumped them straight into the matrix. So, I have the belief that by our efforts -- by Susan's efforts -- we have built on prior work. If you have something more in mind, Denise?

Denise Michel: Yes. So - and it was – well, we're very fortunate to have Susan on that hastily convened task force in South Africa. And she did indeed move the RDF PDP use cases into the task force. Cataloging a variety of uses, however, is only the first step. And Susan, and many I guess PDP members have also made this point. You need context and further the details about these use cases to begin to understand the construct and use of Whois. There's quite a concern. We talked about this a little bit in South Africa that the CEO and staff who aren't fully used to using Whois and are not familiar with all of its elements and constructs just take a list of these cases and start talking to regulators. And many of people express quite a concern about that approach. So were moving past our concern and complaint about that, too. In this letter we think offering a much more productive path for ICANN and the community.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Denise. Appreciate that. Now as I noted in the policy calendar, it doesn't look like as if there's a firm date. This isn't an official public comment, that this task force has invited commentary. And all I saw on their landing page was the words late August. So I'm not confident we know exactly what has to be in. And therefore, when your draft is finalized, when we send it to BC members, we will ask for an expedited review and comment, because I don't know for sure for when it's going to be due. And we'll endeavor to ask staff -- Theresa I believe is handling this -- to see if they have a firm to date. I'll follow up and figure that out after this call. Go ahead, Denise.

Denise Michel: Thank you, yes, thank you, Steve. I think an important distinction needs to be made here. This draft letter is not input on a matrix of use cases that's been published, rather it's a correspondence to the board chair and the CEO about the overall approach that should be taken on ICANN Whois and the GDPR. If members feel like there's something missing from the Whois matrix or that specific comment should be filed relating to that -- which is just one small

piece -- then I would recommend we do that separately and not complete the two.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Denise. So the current contextual letter to the board -- as you framed it -- we still should endeavor to get it in, I would think by the end of August. Since that's the way that things are moving.

Denise Michel: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: But I appreciate what you're saying. This is not a specifically a comment on the matrix. So that opens the possibility that if you spotted it, if any BC member believes that Whois use cases are missing from the matrix and have linked to it, put it in the policy calendar. Then this is a great time to add that to the policy matrix. And that should be done separately than the letter that Denise and her team are drafting. Any other comments it's on this? Thank you.

I have two brief notes there on the ATR T3 and were trying to get a BC member on that team. And then the security and stability and resiliency review team and Denise is a cochair on that team. There's a slot that opened up due to the resignation of another member who is also a cochair. And we should know by the end of this week with her Council will endorse any particular member of GNSO for that slot. And the hope is that Scott McCormick would prevail.

Let me move on to Channel 2, which is Council. And Phil, alternative to you. We have a couple of items that I put here to the policy calendar based on the draft agenda that was circulated early yesterday. Phil, over to you.

Philip Corwin: Yes, thanks, Steve. And Phil for the record. I will be giving the full report today. Susan's on vacation. I'll also be exercising her proxy on any of these votes on the Council meeting next Thursday. On the first item, which is the Council vote on the updated charter for this CCWIG and Internet governance, I'm going to devote a couple of minutes just giving background on this because I think it's important.

This is an issue that counsel has been dealing with for a year, close to a year. And that ICANN 57 in Hyderabad, we approved a motion conditioning our future participation in the CCWIG as a chartering organization upon a comprehensive review of that group. And we asked the CCWIG to provide a clear work plan with clear work dates, clear deliverables and by ICANN 58. And then we had that discussion in Copenhagen. And we engaged with the discussion with the CCWIG co-chairs regarding the report. And then on our call on May 2017 we continued our discussion. And then we continued up further and ICANN 59 in Johannesburg became clear that within counsel there was strong support for continuing the GNSO involvement in Internet governance. We're not talking about the GNSO no longer participating in IG related activities, but that pretty strong consensus that the CCWG was not the appropriate vehicle for such continued involvement, that it just didn't fit within the framework established by ICANN for appropriate missions for CCWG.

So we had a further discussion in our July call and we deferred to vote on this motion. And the actual motion, let me bring that up. I've got it right here. The result causes basically we think the CCWG. We emphasize that we recognize the importance of continued GNSO involvement and the ICANN community involvement and Internet governance related activities appropriate to ICANN's mission. We request members of the CCWIG and others to come together to explore a new framework, a new model that addresses the

concerns expressed by Council and submit that framework for consideration by ICANN 60 in Abu Dhabi. That's why we want to take action now to provide time to get that feedback. But we do provide clear notice in the resolve clause that the GNSO Council will withdraw the charting organization from the current CCWGIG effective at the conclusion of the Abu Dhabi meeting. And that's pretty much it.

Now there's been some discussion on the Council list in the last weeks. (Ray Fick) submitted what he characterized as some friendly amendments, which others did not regard as so friendly, which would have basically further postponed the Council withdraw from the CCW GIG. If there wasn't any plan on the table in Abu Dhabi. But the feeling among the majority of Council, I think, is that we need to provide clear notice that GNSO is withdrawing at the end of ICANN 60 in order to end further delay and force some action on adoption of a new structure. So, that's the back - I hope it wasn't too much information on an important issue. I'm sure it's important to many BC members that GNSO continue to be involved with and support involvement and Internet governance related issues. But the fact remains that under the rules for CCWG, it's just not the right vehicle for continuing that discussion within ICANN.

So let me stop there. That was a lot. See if there's any questions or comments and then go on to the rest of the things we will be doing in next week's meeting.

Okay, I don't see any so I'll continue. We're going to vote on a replacement for the GNSO member for these second security stability and resiliency of the DNS review team. This vote is necessitated by the withdraw of Emily Taylor from that group. We're not yet settled on who the replacement is going to be. Hopefully we'll have a name by next week. But it's a - right now it's a

placeholder motion with the name of the individual not yet there. So we'll see what happens between now and a week from now in terms of identifying the new member of that review team.

We're going to have a discussion, it is that the insistence of Paul McGrady of whether the GNSO should continue to be the generic names supporting the organization. Paul believes Generic is no longer the right term and it should be Global replacing Generic. So I don't know where this discussion is going to go. I guess if we're going to discuss replacing Generic, I'm not sure why we're not considering possible candidates for the other 25 letters of the alphabet, other than wanting to keep the G in GNSO. Paul wants this discussion and we'll have it on the calendar next week or 15 minutes. And we'll see where it goes, if anywhere. We're going to be having a Council discussion regarding the review of the revised ICANN procedure handling Whois conference with privacy law. And Steve, I noticed your comment from the call a few minutes ago. And I'll get up to speed and may well consult with you on our comments on that matter before that discussion ensues a week from now. Then we're going to discuss planning or ICANN 60, which will just be reviewing what's going to be on in a very full week in Abu Dhabi and what's on the schedule right now, what further parts of the schedule we need to fill in. And then we're going to, following the review next week, we'll be sharing the draft GNSO schedule with all the stakeholder groups and constituencies to facilitate planning, scheduling, and get further feedback.

And then there are two items on any other business I want to mention. One is an update from the CCWG accountability work stream. Two, and we'll hear where that's at, and I continue to participate in the jurisdiction working team, which is -- I'm not sure if it's going to get to full resolution of the issues before it or not. But it's now in the issue framing stage.

And then the other one, the chair and vice-chairs held a call last week with the two co-chairs of the PDP working group on Subsequent Procedures, which is looking at whether anything needs to changes in the applicant guidebook for the next round. And they have created a new work track, work track 5, to deal with geographic names issues, which anyone wake at the Johannesburg meeting that they've become a major somewhat controversial issue within the ICANN community, particularly in regard to certain GAC initiatives in that regard.

And this new work team 5, which is going to be looking at geographic issues, has invited members from the GAC, and ALAC, and other non-GNSO groups to be part of the leadership. And I'm speaking personally. Now, I don't have any problems with that, but as I explained in a fairly long email to BC members last week, they have not determined what the voting method will be in the end for that work team to adopt recommendations to report back to the full working group. And there's some possibility, I'm not saying it will happen, that they might decide to adopt the CCWG voting methodology, which involves one vote for each of the different groups, some of which are groups, clearly GAC and ALAC, which are not part of GNSO.

My personal view, which I shared with BC members last week is that the authority of these work teams is derived from the full working group and that the work teams have to follow the same decisional methodology that the full working group decides. I think it's also creating a potential for problems down the road if they use a CCWG type voting procedure in that work team if the working group subsequently decided to either reject or make significant revisions in their recommendations.

So I'll be looking forward to that report from the chair and vice chairs of counsel on their calls with their co-chairs. My impression is that we're not

going to know how that work team is going to make its final decisions until it gets to that point and I think there needs to be -- I would like to see and I've been seeking feedback from the BC -- that we send a clear message that they must use a decisional methodology, which is consistent with the bylaws and the GNSO operating procedures.

So I'll stop there and see if there's any questions or comments about anything that I went through in that report.

Andrew Mack: Phil, this is Andrew. I see Marilyn is trying to get in from the chat. Marilyn?

Philip Corwin: Okay.

Marilyn Cade: Sorry, can I?

Philip Corwin: Yes, go ahead Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: Thanks. Thanks so much, Phil. What a great and comprehensive report and oh my gosh, all the work that you and Susan are doing is absolutely so amazing. I fail to say that every time. A couple things. I wrote in the chat but I'll say it here. I strongly opposed the idea of changing the name from generic to global. There's actually no such thing as global TLDs. We fought that out when we established ICANN. That's a long time ago, 1998, sorry for boring people, 1999.

But every TLD resolves globally. This would imply that only those TLDs that this particular policy council is accountable for developing policy has global presence, which is frankly not true. Every CCTLD does as well. I think it has implications that Paul isn't even being sensitive -- aware of. So happy to talk more offline about why this is not a good idea. I just want to also note that

this is just a reminder. When we set ICANN up, we debated the term should we call it the International Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers or the Internet Corporation and these debates have taken place in the past.

I know that a lot of people, particularly from the contracted party house, are so new that they don't know anything about these past examinations. When we set ICANN up, it was called the policy council was called the domain name support organization and the domain name policy council, meaning both CTLDs and GTLDs. Then we spun that out and now have two.

I think there is implications here, again, I'll just say for implications around words that perhaps Paul isn't even thinking about, there will be councilors who go, yay, yay, rah, rah. I think we need to be very, very careful about what we think this conveys and why we would even consider taking up the time of a council that is already remarkably overwhelmed in its workload to debate something like this. Which would have to go out, in my view, to board level public comment.

Philip Corwin: Let me just respond, Marilyn, before we hear from Andrew that I appreciate your input. I'd be happy to get on a call with you before next week's meeting to get some further historical background on this. Let me say, right now, Paul is the only one who seems to think this is a significant issue but as a courtesy to him, we're getting -- after deferring discussion at past council meetings -- we're going to devote a quarter hour of discussion to him. I'm not sure there's any reason to change this. Particularly, there would be negative implications or fallout from doing it but right now, it's just a discussion. We're nowhere clear close to any kind of vote within council. I don't know if it will ever reach that stage. But I'd welcome further background on the issue before next week's call.

And Steve, before Andrew Harris speaks, yes, on item four, on the motion on internet governance, unless instructed otherwise by the BC, my plan would be to cast to the two BC votes for item four. We want the GNSO to continue to be involved in IG activities but we can't continue to defer a decision on this and participate in a structure that's not appropriate to the topic it's focused on. Andrew Harris?

Andrew Harris: Thanks, Phil. So just to come back to this proposal from Paul McGrady, this is the time I'm hearing of it so I haven't spoken to him, don't know exactly what's motivating him and the proposal. But I do have a suspicion. During the Johannesburg discussions on geographic names, there was at least one GAC member and others who seem supportive of this notion who were actively proposing that a third support organization be developed.

They were saying that CCNSO and GNSO isn't sufficient because you have a number of names that are evocative of geographic terms that are important to countries and they don't fit properly into either the CCNSO or the GNSO. And so the best way to be -- approach -- would be to make a new support organization.

So basically, claiming that terms like Amazon or others don't belong under the purview of the GNSO. And so my guess is that Paul McGrady is trying to find a way to come back at that and to try to push back on that sort of notion. I am completely ambivalent on sort of if the GNSO were to change its name to address that issue, what term would be proper? Certainly understand some of the points that Marilyn made but we certainly would be very supportive of anything the GNSO could do to prevent the outcome of a third support organization to try to address terms that governments think that they should have more say over.

Philip Corwin: Thanks, Andrew and that besides being relevant to this discussion on Paul's issue also relates to my concerns about the decisional methodology for work team five and subsequent procedure, which is going to be dealing with geographic names issues in GTLDs. Paul did make some remarks in the council meeting in Johannesburg and I don't recall him referencing GAC concerns. My faint recollection, I don't want to be held to this, is that his concerns and his suggestion was more rooted and related to trademark law. But Paul will be giving a fuller explanation and more developed explanation in next week's council call.

But again, as a courtesy and under council rules, when someone introduces -- when a councilor introduces a motion -- we can only defer the discussion for so long. We have to give some time to discuss it at some point and we're giving him that courtesy and this upcoming meeting, but I have not detected any groundswell of support so far within council for giving serious consideration to this name change. We'll see how things go in next week's discussion but thanks for the feedback.

Andrew Mack: Thank you, Phil. This is Andrew. Thank you, Phil and thank you, Andrew Harris. I really appreciate getting all of these issues out and sounds like this is one that we're going to have to track pretty carefully.

Phil, are we done on your side? I'm just mindful of the time.

Philip Corwin: Yes, I'm done with my report and thank you, Marilyn for the kind words about the work that Susan and I do and, again, happy to talk with you further on this generic to global suggestion before next week's discussion. That's it.

Andrew Mack: Okay, great. Thanks very much. As you can probably tell, I am not Barbara Wanner but Barbara is on a plane and I was on the CSG call and so I'm going

to give a really quick CSG liaison report based on a call that we just had with the CSG Ex Com in preparation for the Abu Dhabi meeting. The call went very well. A lot of alignment there. We agreed that we were going to take the MSSSI meeting, the multi-stakeholder strategy and strategic initiatives meeting as a teleconference so that we can get to it earlier and get more people involved.

Margie, I know that's a real area of expertise of yours and so we look forward to getting your input and scaling up on all those things around MSSSI, any insights you have. We also had some good work that Wolf-Ulrich is doing on behalf of the CSG to reach out and get us as aligned as we can be with the NCSG. They're talking about the Vice-Chair position and generally building the relationship. And we're waiting to get some information back on his side from the people that he's speaking with, but that seems to be going pretty well. He's speaking with Tapani.

And in terms of the meetings that we're looking for, we were trying to sort out whether we were going to be meeting with -- we wanted to meet with the two board seats that we are connected to and there was some question as to who would be the seated board member, whether it was going to still be Markus or whether it was going to be Matthew depending on when that meeting might take place, the third one being Becky Burr -- the other one being Becky Burr. I thought that was an elegant solution, which was to invite both Matthew and Markus. That way, we get the benefit of whoever is outgoing and whoever is incoming regardless of who actually has the formal board seat at that point, and we have a little bit more flexibility in terms of scheduling.

So I think that that will be a good meeting. In terms of the meeting with the Board, there's going to be no change in the way that we've traditionally done it where each of the constituencies has the ability to -- has effectively a 20

minute block. And so we will try very hard to coordinate on that so that we're touching on the key points but also reinforcing points that we have in common.

I think the last big thing is that we all agreed that this idea of having a breakfast with the GAC is a really good one and are working very hard to put that together right now. Chantelle is busy on the scheduling for us and I think the meetings that we traditionally had, we want to have. I think our goal is to build the relationships, especially after the slightly smaller, shorter meeting in Johannesburg. We agreed that the NCDH private meeting, the CSG and NCSG meeting, we're going to try and kick that to a cocktail, both for team building reasons and also because it's our sense that in a more formal setting that may have a tendency to exacerbate or to emphasize our differences of opinion. We want to do some bridge building.

And that's it from my side. Any questions? If not, I'd like to move on to Jason's report.

Marilyn Cade: Andrew, I have two quick questions. It's Marilyn.

Andrew Mack: Go ahead, Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: I propose we have breakfast with the board and the senior staff. It sounds like that the CSG didn't like that idea. Instead, you've decided to go with the GAC. I'm not objecting but I'm just going to make a comment. Scheduling with the GAC is very, very challenging. I did it for about six years at all the ICANN meetings. The Europeans hold coordinating meetings in the morning. So I just want to raise that as a -- and on the other hand, the GAC usually love to breakfast with us.

So I'm not saying no. I just wanted to mention that I had proposed that we explore breakfast with the board and the senior staff particularly since there will be new incoming Board Members and this would be a really good opportunity for us to acquaint the board members, the new board members, and the old board members, many of whom don't even really know our issues other than when we talk to them in the kind of a confrontational, this is our policy position, what the hell are you doing.

So just mentioning again, don't do board and the senior staff at ICANN 60, I would propose that we try to consider it for ICANN 61 because we really need to strengthen our own identity with the board and the senior staff. That's my first comment.

My second comment is you spoke so quickly, I couldn't gather, what are you talking about? You said there will be some other social events. Could you just repeat that again?

Andrew Mack: The question was whether we're going to have a sit down meeting with NCUC and it was the sense of the call that it would be there to do as a more informal cocktail and that's what I'm suggesting. That's what we're working on.

Marilyn Cade: And I would -- and I just support the more informal but it's not the NCUC, right? It's the NCSG, NCUC...

Andrew Mack: You're correct, Marilyn. You're correct.

Marilyn Cade: I just had one final comment that I wanted to make under AOB about the scheduling of the Intersessional. I'll get back and wait for that timeslot.

Andrew Mack: Great. Two quick things. One is you're absolutely right, we talked about as a GAC and board. I think there's an interest in both. I think the belief was that we were a lot more likely to get GAC to the meeting. But we're looking actually at both and I take your point completely that we want to have one this time and one next time. If we're doing GAC now, we want to do board next time or vice-versa.

The second thing, just a quick note that for the cross community topics, the number one topic that got put forward was our focus on GDPR. In any case, I know we're a little bit short on time and I wanted to get to Jimson. So Jimson, I'm going to send the word to you please for our operations and finance report. Thank you.

Jimson Olufuye: Yes, thank you very much, Andrew. Yesterday -- this is Jimson. Yesterday, we had our call and it was a very useful call. I want to really appreciate all members planning for election. Thank you. The election process already on since the ballots will be out to everyone shortly. Please act on it as soon as possible.

Well, regards to finances, about 83% of our members have paid up as of today. This is a call out. If anyone has challenges if you will let us know. Also, we have new members. So far, we've had about four members, new members so far, but after our last meeting, we have new member, Focus IP. This is in the U.S. And they are not on the call now but that's for us to know. And we really welcome them.

The credentials committee has been working very hard. I want to thank all members of the Credentials Committee with Andrew Mack of course as the chair. So we've been working hard in processing this with a lot of due diligence. They have a number of potential members they are considering

right now. So, we still have a number of interest expressed in being a member of the BC. So we appreciate all members for their outreach efforts.

Well, as I said, the election is already on. That is for the councillorship and the Nom Com. So we want members to respond as soon as possible as they receive the ballots. Again, the officers will come up in November. Notice for that will reach everyone effective middle of October.

So this is just a quick snap brief or me concerning operations and thank you, Andrew.

Andrew Mack: Great. Jimson, thank you very much. Thank you to the work of the credentials committee and for everyone who is not on the credentials committee, a lot of the hard work begins once people get into the BC and one of the things I know we all want to do is to bring people in, get them involved, get them on the calls, get them writing. And so we will be reaching out to you with the names of new members and hopefully, we can find good matches for them and do our own internal mentoring, and really get people engaged as soon as they join the BC.

I'm going to now turn it over to the community for any other business. It's 11:54. We've got six minutes so if everyone would be kind and keep their comments relatively compact. I see that we have Chantelle, it says volunteers needed for committees, credentials and finance. I know we have a couple of new members, one each from the credentials and finance committee. Are we still needing more, Chantelle?

So the answer is yes. So please, if you have an interest in joining either the credentials or the finance committee, by all means please speak with the heads of those committees and now, anybody else -- no problem, Chantelle.

Anybody else have any other business that they'd like to discuss? Should I see a show of hands.

Marilyn Cade: Andrew, it's Marilyn. I had my hand up.

Andrew Mack: Go ahead, please.

Marilyn Cade: Thanks. I wanted to comment about the Intersessional. Thank you so much, Steve, for posting the date. I don't think I'd seen that on the BC list. I want to make a comment about the importance of the Intersessional and I'm going to make a comment that I'm going to ask members understand it's a privileged comment. The scheduling and the timing, and the location of the Intersessional last year was driven by someone who is not even allowed anymore to be a part of the ICANN community due to very serious infringements of the code of conduct.

Yet the ICANN meetings team made two trips to Iceland to plan the logistics. Several of the people insisted on business class travel at the last minute. Although we had asked for an additional seat the last minute, we were not given an additional seat but the NCSG was. The -- I really think that also the Intersessional suffered significantly from not having the kind of senior access, senior staff, and CEO access in person or board member access in person.

So I'm delighted to hear you're returning to LA for the Intersessional but I think it's really important the Intersessional be first. I understand that GNSO policy council wants to hold a meeting with certain staff, but in my view, we really need to make sure the Intersessional takes place first since it is largely the executive leadership of the constituencies plus one and it's really different if you come in after the policy council where half of them are saying, pick us, we're in charge, and then you come in as the executive leadership, you're after

the fact. So I'm just urging that you -- that the CSG representative working with the planning try to really push this to make sure the Intersessional take places first.

The second point I'll make about the Intersessional is it needs to be open to at least observation and that means what happened in Iceland is some of us expected to be able to listen into your private meeting where the BC met and there was -- that was canceled at the last minute. Please don't do that again. Make sure that the members are able to observe and watch so that they're aware of what's going on. Thanks.

Andrew Mack: Great, Marilyn. Thank you very much and I am -- I think we will be well represented on that call as I believe Steve is going to be attending on behalf of the BCs. So points well taken. Jimson, real quickly. We're mostly out of time so your quick thoughts on this or another topic. Jimson, go ahead. I see your hand up. Chantelle, I see Jimson but I don't hear him. Do we know if he's still connected. Okay, they're trying to call Jimson really quickly.

In the interim, anyone else have another point that they'd like to make or should we wait a couple seconds and see if we can get Jimson back.

Jimson Olufuye: Can you hear me?

Andrew Mack: Yes, sir. Go. Please. Jimson, go ahead please.

Jimson Olufuye: Okay, just to say yes, I support what Marilyn said concerning the Intersessional. There is need to focus on engaging the top leadership. And also finally, to really thank Chantelle. Chantelle has been working very hard and we appreciate the quality support she's been giving us, all of us at BC, not

only the Excomm, but the BC as a whole. Thank you, Chantelle. Back to you, Andrew.

Andrew Mack: Thank you, Jimson. And I couldn't agree more. Thank you, Chantelle. She has been working very closely with a number of us. I know she has a lot of other responsibilities and we really, truly appreciate your help and your professionalism. I'm not seeing anybody else in the chat and I know everybody has a lot on their plate. So I'm going to give you going once, going twice, seeing no other hands, I'd like to declare victory. Thank you all for your attendance on this conference call and speak with you in a couple of weeks.

END