

**ICANN**

**Moderator: Chantelle Doerksen  
September 14, 2017  
10:00 am CT**

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening and welcome to the BC Member Call on the 14th of September 2017.

On the call today we have Andy Abrams, Jimson Olufuye, Steve DelBianco, Mark Datysgeld, Andrew Harris, Susan Kawaguchi, Claudia Martinuzzi, Maria Pattullo, Alison Simpson, Chris Wilson, Philip Corwin, Stephanie Duchesneau, Marilyn Cade, and Andrew Mack. We have listed apologies from Barbara Warner and John Berard. From staff we have myself, Terri Agnew, and Chantelle Doerksen will be joining us here shortly.

I would like to remind all to please state your name before speaking for recording and transcription purposes and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise.

With this, I'll turn it back over to Steve DelBianco. Please begin.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Terri. Could you please load the policy calendar, the updated one circulated last night? There were two of them sent yesterday. I was able to update once I saw the final agenda for the council meeting. And, Terri, just let me check to see if you've got the right one loaded. Thank you, you do. I appreciate that.

So on Page 1 of the policy calendar, we only posted one comment since our last BC meeting and that was the 31st of August. We sent a letter to the ICANN CEO and the board. This was regarding the overall approach that ICANN is taking to try to reconcile the general data protection regulation, or GDPR, with Whois. Denise Michel, thanks to you for leading this effort, and I think you had excellent collaboration from Stephanie Duchesneau and Susan Kawaguchi.

That went up on the 31st of August. It's on the ICANN website under correspondence because it wasn't a public comment period and the board has not yet responded to our letter itself.

Let me move to the current set of open public comments. We have four that are open right now. The first one is a statistical analysis of DNS abuse. Terri, I'll ask you to please load the PDF I circulated this morning, which is a clean copy.

This is report prepared by outside consultants at the request of the Competition Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review Team. We call that the CCTRT. This is a review team created by the ICANN affirmation of commitments and then later into the bylaws. It's a review of the new gTLD expansion and it includes a look at whether we've enhanced those elements of choice, competition, and trust but it also is charged to review the safeguards that were put in place to mitigate issues involved in the expansion of the gTLD space.

So on that particular question, the CCTRT asks for outside experts to prepare a report. And it's a lengthy report that does an analysis of findings on that conclude with - including this conclusion that new gTLDs have become a growing target for malicious actors. I wanted to thank Waudu Siganga, who's

on the CCT review team for doing the initial draft, and then Stephanie Duchesneau, Jimson, and Margie Milam have added edits to that document.

Now Waudo, as the primary drafter, forwarded the latest to BC private this morning, and what I've asked Terri to do in the Adobe chat is to load a clean copy since those of the rest of you on the call, it's a little difficult to read through all the different edits. The clean copy is only four pages long. It's there on the screen in front of you.

And the reason I want to discuss it on this call is that this comment period closes next Tuesday on the 19th of September. So it is fine to do back and forth on e-mail for the next four days, but I am much more interested in hearing feedback from those of you on the call and those who have made comments on the edit while we have the document loaded.

So I'll take a queue for those of you who've made edits that you want to talk about. Margie, you had at least one comment that didn't result in an edit. And I did want to reiterate something that Margie Milam said in her edits that this document, the audience, the primary audience for our comment is the CCT Review Team.

And in the best of all worlds, our comments would direct the CCT Review Team to emphasize certain elements of it and when they come up with their final recommendation on whether safeguards have been adequate. So Marilyn Cade, you're first. Go ahead.

Not hearing you, Marilyn. Unable to hear Marilyn. So if you want to put it in the chat, Marilyn, that would be fine as well.

Marilyn Cade: Can you hear me now?

Steve DelBianco: Yes now we do.

Marilyn Cade: Okay sorry. On one of the bullet points, I'm just going to suggest we use instead of bullets numbers. That'll make it easier for all us to comment. But. That's why I took the floor. There's a bullet that reads, "While the introduction of new gTLDs does not appear to have increased the aggregate amount of abuse in the DNS, there was an observed decrease in the number of malicious registrations in legacy gTLDs."

But that bullet, I think we should remove that because that bullet actually is not meaningful. The big point is the next bullet. "New gTLDs experienced a rate of abuse almost ten times higher than the rate experienced in new gTLDs."

So we need to fix that. Maybe it means ten times higher than the rate in legacy gTLDs. I'll spend more time on this but those two bullets kind of stuck out to me. I'm not going to spend a lot of time on this but back in San Juan, the last time we met in Puerto Rico, I presented a major report on cyber squatting and kiting and abuse. And, you know, I think we need to continue the mantle on this.

But those two bullets -- and I'll spend a little more time on the rest of it -- those two bullets stuck out to me: one to be deleted, one to be clarified. And, again, I'll send my comments by e-mail.

Steve DelBianco: Marilyn, when we do, I mean at the end of this call, I will circulate another draft that includes revisions that have been accepted by Waudo and the team so that we can pick it up from there as opposed to having all the edits from the

last three days in the way. So I'll circulate that after the call. But thank you, Marilyn, for those comments.

Denise Michel, please? Not hearing you, Denise. Denise, are you there? While Denise is trying to get off of mute -- I bet we caught her during her morning commute -- I wanted to indicate that Page 2, 3 and 4 of this four-page report are where the real meat is because the BC is making four specific recommendations, starting at the bottom of Page 2, the overall statement.

We ask for complete increased compliance scrutiny on registries with the highest abuse rates. We ask for future abuse studies to be conducted, and they would include additional breakdowns of abuse by TLD and by registry. We ask for linking of incentives for good practices to handle abuse. This is a theme the BC pursued in an earlier comment. And then finally we asked ICANN to endeavor to address abuse effectively. And the hope is that all of these would be well received by Waudu and the rest of the CCTRT and make their way into their final report.

When the final report comes out from CCTRT, it will also be subject to public comments. So the work that's being done here, we'll be able to dust it off and bring it back in on our public comments. But by far the most effective way that we can steer this ship is to have the CCTRT embrace some of our comments in the way that they make their recommendations. It's a lot easier to get that changed now than it is to try to prevail during a public comment period.

Denise, are you able to connect yet? All right. Not hearing - Marilyn Cade asks in the chat if there are SSAC reports that would support us on any this. My guess, Marilyn, is no, that the SSAC has not done extensive analysis of the new gTLDs specifically, but we'll check on that.

Chris Wilson, the new clean copy, I'll send that right now, but if you give me a chance I'll send it after the call to incorporate something that Marilyn brought up, and I'll send that clean copy around. I promise to do that after the call.

Waudu, since I have you on the line too, I inferred that since you circulated the edits from Stephanie, Jimson, and Margie, that you as the drafter were comfortable with those edits as those stood. If I've got that wrong, Waudu, be sure to let me know -- on chat is fine.

Denise, if you have voice you can say it now. If not, we'll go to Stephanie. Go ahead, Stephanie.

Steve DelBianco: I think we just lost Stephanie. Denise, are you there?

Stephanie Duchesneau: Can you hear me?

Steve DelBianco: We do. Go ahead.

Stephanie Duchesneau: Sorry. It just took me a minute to connect my mic. While I don't want to edit live, I just want to strongly disagree with Marilyn's concerns around the first bullet. I think the conclusion about there being no change in the aggregate level of abuse is one of the most interesting and important findings from the report, without sort of challenging the fact that there are impacts on distribution relative to - like relatively speaking between new gTLDs and legacy gTLDs. So I really don't feel comfortable removing it.

And having spoken with colleagues internally who sit on the SSAC and the CCTRT in reviewing this, to both of them that was one of the most interesting

conclusions to come out of the report. So I have a hard time sort of wrapping my head around the argument that it's a meaningless finding.

Steve DelBianco: Stephanie, what Marilyn did indicate the very next bullet probably has a typo in it. The new gTLDs (unintelligible).

Stephanie Duchesneau: Yes, and that I'm happy to take a look at. It was the point about the first bullet that I didn't really understand.

Steve DelBianco: I understand, and it's not for us to omit something that was actually in the report, and it does provide a counterpoint, a counterbalance too. Stephanie, anything further from you?

Stephanie Duchesneau: That's it. I still have to take a look at some of the subsequent edits to the draft but I'll do so.

Steve DelBianco: Fantastic. Thank you, Stephanie. Denise Michel, do you have a voice connection yet?

Denise Michel: I hope so. Can you hear me?

Steve DelBianco: We do. Please go ahead.

Denise Michel: Great. Thank you. Yes, I think it's important to keep in mind that the purpose of our comments is to provide additional perspectives and especially advice to the CCT Review Team for their follow-on action on this report. And so unfortunately Margie had a conflict and is not able to be on this call. She had a number of suggested additions to the comments and we look forward to working with her, our colleagues, on evolving this draft as well.

I think overall though I wanted to just share a couple of observations. I think overall that this report doesn't really deliver on the promise to discuss the effectiveness of the safeguards that were introduced by the new gTLDs programs. And I think if those safeguards were effective, we would expect to see a lower level of malicious registrations in the new gTLDs than in the legacy gTLDs.

The opposite though is true, which I think at the very least deserves more focus and some recommendations from the CCT Review Team on safeguards needed to ensure effectiveness.

I'm also concerned about the methodology that was used in the report. I was disappointed to see that they were using a sampling methodology of gTLD data rather than actually scanning the entire zone. You know, given the initial results that we found with this report, I think that it's, to me, an indication that we need to do a - have a different approach, a more deeper research that scans and analyzes the whole zones for TLDs.

And I think I'll leave it there, but I think the BC in particular is an important voice that can add more specific ideas for the CCT Review Team to consider as follow-up actions on this DNS abuse study, both in repeating the study in a deeper and richer way annually and also taking some of the conclusions and lessons learned from this report and making sure that they're effectively incorporated in the CCT Review Team's final recommendations. Thank you.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Denise. Denise, as you indicated, this report does not address the adequacy or effectiveness of mitigation but only the presence of abuse. And given that they concluded there is a higher abuse than in the legacies, that says that, to the extent there were any mitigation techniques, they haven't been effective enough to stop a significantly higher rate of abuse.



I do think that your point about the statistics though we should ask you that after I send around a new clean copy you'll be able to go to Page 4 last paragraph, which is the endeavor to address abuse effectively, and that would be a place where you could add a line or two to that paragraph with your recommendations for subsequent work that looks at the effectiveness. Because you're quite correct, this is not an effectiveness report but a statistical incidence report that has some implication about effectiveness for sure.

Did you want to come back on that, Denise?

Denise Michel: Yes that's a good point, Steve, and we'll definitely provide some more text for consideration on that. And that actually reminded me of another point. It's obvious from this report that more information is definitely needed about the correlation between price and abuse. This is something that the business constituency has raised before in public comments on other and related topics.

Clearly the researchers didn't have systemic access to prices offered by registrars and, as a result, this element of the analysis is quite underdeveloped despite the clear indication for several year now that giving away domains or offering domains for extremely cheap prices leads to a significant spike in abusive registrations, a lack of access to this data and - including - not including this data is an important omission.

So I think there's some additional advice that the BC, which we've given before and can also give on this point, as well as how critical it is for ICANN staff and researchers to have full access to the data that's needed to fully understand what's going on in the gTLD space. Thanks.

Andrew: Hey, it's Andrew. Are you still there?

Steve DelBianco: Yes, Andrew. Thank you. So I see another hand up for Mark Datysgeld. Go ahead, Mark.

Mark Datysgeld: Can you hear me, Steve?

Steve DelBianco: Try it again, Mark.

Mark Datysgeld: Can you hear me now?

Steve DelBianco: Mark, if you're on a speakerphone or something, please pick up. It's too noisy to understand you. Mark, while you're getting organized try to - please hit mute. Mark, could you hit mute, please? Thank you, Mark. While Mark is getting sorted out, I wanted to ask that if we have criticisms of what was done, let's try to couch those in terms of recommendations for CCTRT to remedy the criticisms in the work it does in its final report since it's unlikely that these consultants would fix the shortcomings in a report they've already completed.

So, Mark, if you have an adequate we're happy to have you go on voice. Go ahead, Mark.

Mark Datysgeld: Can you hear me now okay?

Steve DelBianco: Yes it's extremely difficult to understand, so try, and I'll stop you if it's too hard to hear you. Mark, can you put it into the chat please? And please understand, you'll have an opportunity to respond via e-mail over the next four days as we finalize the BC comment.

Terri, would you please -- or Chantelle -- would you please reload the policy calendar and I'll go to the second one. The second item is a comment that's

due the 2nd of October, so it's quite a ways out. And that is where ICANN is asking for feedback about proposed dates for ICANN meetings between 2021 and 2023.

And I asked members of the BC to let me know if you are aware of conflicts with holidays or other business meetings that far out and if you do, I'll be happy to gather those and send an e-mail - a note in a reply from the BC.

The next one is the proposed removal of a sponsored top level domain called .museum. We discussed this on our last call. Comments closed the 3rd of October. And in the new agreement, we get rid of the designation of a sponsored top level domain and instead we call it a community top level domain and it brings in several provisions from the new registry agreement, including uniform rapid suspension implementation, about which the BC has a position and we'll be able to articulate that.

Phil Corwin has volunteered to help review and make some BC recommendations. I know we have time on this but it would be helpful if other BC members would assist. Phil Corwin carries a very significant load for us as our councilor and a member of a couple of working groups. Who else can assist in the review of the .museum agreement? Phil Corwin, your hand is up. Go ahead.

Phil Corwin: Yes thanks, Steve. Just for the information of other BC members, the part of this proposed renewal relating to URS is fairly easy to draft. We can just lift the language from previous comments on URS coming in on renewal agreements while the RPM Review Working Group is still considering the URS and whether it should be consensus policy.

The meatier issue here is that ICANN GDD in this renewal has adopted a definition of community which is at very wide variance with the very tight definition of community that was used to review new TLD applications under the proposed definition of community. And this renewal agreement, it would include people who use museums, that is people who go to museums.

So essentially it's converting what was once a sponsored TLD into a pretty much a wide open TLD, and that's the new aspect in which assistance would be greatly appreciated, given my council work and my co-chair role on two working groups. Thanks.

Steve DelBianco: And Mark -- thank you, Philip -- Mark Datysgeld just answered to Andrew that he'd be willing help as well on that. Do we have any other volunteers? All right. Thank you very much, Phil.

The fourth one are changes to the charter for the Non-Commercial Users Constituency, the NCUC, and the NCUC dominates the Non-Commercial Stakeholders Group that makes up half of our Non-Contract Party House in GNSO. All right, if we do comment on that we have volunteers from the last call, which included John Berard, Marilyn Cade, and Tola. All said they would volunteer on looking over that charter change to see whether the BC would have a point of view on that. So I'll stop to see if John, Marilyn, or Tola, do you have any initial thoughts on that. And if not, I'll follow up after the call to prompt an initial draft. Okay not hearing from - go ahead.

Adetola Sogbesan: Hello?

Steve DelBianco: Go ahead, Tola.

Adetola Sogbesan: Okay. Yes we had to - we had a call. We've gone over two different initial drafts. (Unintelligible) submitted the initial draft (unintelligible) this meeting but we couldn't do that for some reason. But also before - immediately after this meeting we'll be able to put in the initial draft. We got a draft already we're working on.

Steve DelBianco: Okay that's fantastic, Tola. Thank you and John and Marilyn for that. We'll look for that after the call. Take your time.

Okay that's it for the current list of comments. Let me next move to the GDPR and Whois. The first part of the policy calendar on this was a recap of the work that begun in Johannesburg on a task force, a matrix of user stories and use cases, and of course the letter that Denise Michel, Stephanie, and Susan put together.

We also noted that ICANN management just earlier this week posted an update on GDPR and Whois. There's a link to it in my policy calendar. Now that update comes from management, (Teresa Swinehart) and (Akram Adalla). And they no longer seem to call it a task force but rather set out a series of things that are going to be moving ahead on this, including a panel on GDPR at ICANN 60.

So the Business Constituency was among the groups who requested that the high interest cross-community topic at ICANN 60 include a GDPR session. Our wishes were granted, right, and so we now have a panel that's going to be on Friday the 2nd of November on GDPR.

Now we were only among the groups requesting it. The opportunity is in front of us though to take a significant leadership role in planning the panel, how to structure the topic and who to invite as panelists. I want to remind you that the

IPC, the ISPs -- Tola, I think you need to hit mute -- the IPC, the ISPs, the GAC and the ccNSO are all interested in this topic, and it was the ALAC that helped to lead a session at the previous ICANN meeting on GDPR.

This is an outstanding opportunity to discuss whether members on this phone have ideas about whom to put on to that panel and how to structure it. I'm not saying we'll get our way but we can take a leadership role. I'll take a queue on how we might do it. I'll start by seeding you with a question.

We had a European Commission attorney on the very last panel at the previous ICANN meeting who I thought was very articulate about interpretation of the GDPR and I'm wondering whether we want to have her invited back for this panel. If those of you that were at ICANN 59 can weigh in, I'd appreciate it.

Denise, I see your hand up.

Denise Michel: Yes. Thanks, Steve. Yes I think (Abigail Slater) was a useful panelist the last time we had a GDPR panel, which I think we had her on the panel which was the meeting before the last meeting. I think another potential option might be Susan Kawaguchi, who's also a co-chair of the RDS PDP Working Group that has been very involved in this issued as well as of course being a counselor and a BC member. And I'd be happy to continue to brainstorm on the BC e-mail list on this matter.

I'd also like to use this as a stepping off point comment on the GDPR, the CEO's GDPR blog post. I think -- and thanks, Steve, for bringing that to our attention -- I think it's stunning in its disregard for the BC's comments - letter that we sent to the CEO and the chairman of the board. I think a topic that should not be put on the BC table, so to speak, is what do we do next.

So we have a very explicit letter that was sent to the CEO and the chairman of the board on this topic. We haven't received a response. So although it hasn't been that long, but at the same time, with very specific opinions and recommendation from the BC, the CEO chose to apparently ignore that and post a blog that in part runs counter to what the BC thinks should be done in this area.

So I think I would recommend that we have a BC discussion or perhaps a discussion on the e-mail list of what would be the appropriate next step for the BC on this matter, particularly on the matter of how the community works together and how the staff is coordinated with the community and its interactions with EU regulators on this issue. And that could be anything from having the BC chair post a comment on the blog post and send an e-mail to the CEO on this matter.

To putting this on our agenda and the CSG agenda and asking for the chair and the CEO to come address this topic with us in Abu Dhabi. But I would suggest that we not wait for Abu Dhabi to be more active on this issue.  
Thanks.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you Denise. We have an opportunity to try to tee up the agenda for the session. And if we do that we could make it so that part of the session talks about how are we going to solve this problem?

And then part of the session talks about what the solution might be. That would give us an opportunity to go into that community perspective we had in our letter.

Susan Kawaguchi, you are next.

Susan Kawaguchi: Hi thank you very much. So one of the things we are finding on the RDS working group and so we have (unintelligible) analysis that will be distributed next week. We are waiting for the final draft of that and so everybody will see that.

But a legal analysis of the GDPR and based on the questions that the RDS working group posed to the DPAs at the ICANN 59. So those in my opinion are (unintelligible) questions but it is what it is.

So some of that will not – that analysis came out in a way that is not as favorable for the BC stance in my opinion. It is not final so I can't share that with you yet. But I really think that if there is a panel at the next ICANN meeting that it should also weigh on consumer protection.

So if we can find an expert in EU consumer protection then that might be a way to balance a panel put on by ICANN.

Steve DelBianco: Yes that sounds brilliant. So let me put a call out to anyone on this call about whether we know an articulate and knowledgeable consumer protection advocate. Maybe even an (unintelligible) from the European theater. That is a great idea Susan. Thank you. Go ahead.

Susan Kawaguchi: No problem. And then last night late I received an email through – I am on the RDS review team. And Alan Greenberg who chairs the team forwarded an email to the – to all of us.

And it was an invite from ICANN to all the SOs and ACs and I don't know that the BC has seen this yet. I don't know if it just went to the GNSO



Council or to James or it was actually broken down to all the stakeholder groups.

Inviting representatives to a meeting in Brussels with the DPAs the first week of October. We found that we had an RDS call earlier this morning and found this interesting and (Catherine) from the PSWG also noted that yes, the DPAs were meeting Brussels that week along with the review team enough. We are not meeting with them. But we are going to be there basically at the same time.

But she thought it was very ambitious to think that the DPAs would take the time to meet with ICANN and parts of the community. But that invite is out there so we need to I think forward that to the BC. I should have done that earlier.

But they were...

Steve DelBianco: Please do.

Susan Kawaguchi: What was that?

Steve DelBianco: Please do. I was going to say please forward that right away and then I will start a separate thread for us to organize how to structure the panel and to try to take the lead on that and who to invite.

But remember we can't do this alone. ICANN staff, let us know again this morning they will not allow a single group to run one of these cross community topics. It has to be collaborative.

In fact that was a complaint that BC had two meetings ago when a single group, the NCUC organized an entire panel on taking down illegal content. So I think we will have to collaborate with others but we still need to come with ideas that we can start the conversation with.

Susan Kawaguchi: Right. But also this meeting that may or may not happen first week in October in Brussels we should make sure there is adequate representation.

Alan has already requested that review team members we will be in Brussels also be included in that meeting if it happens. So I am there for the week anyway. I can attend if it goes forward. So we have got two different things we need to work on. The representation of the BC at that meeting in October and then the panel.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks Susan. I look forward to your follow on note with respect to the October meeting. All right everyone let me move to the next item which is contractual compliance and consumer safeguards.

You realized that ICANN has hired a new person in charge of consumer safeguards. His name is Bryan Schilling. We met him at the BC meeting when we gathered in South Africa.

He followed up to that meeting by reaching out to the BC for more information. He realizes we feel strongly about it and had a lot of specific information. And that is where I attempted to get him to understand that consumer safeguards is part of the affirmation – it is in bylaws.

And in way it keys things up for the CCT review team. Bryan had just announced this week that they are going to hold a Webinar on the 25th of

September on his initiative to address complaints such as the one that we brought up.

He has three items that he wanted to talk about. First is to do inventories of existing safeguards. The second is types of DNS abuse that would fall within ICANN's agreement and this would be very helpful for the BC to weigh in on.

And then gaps. Gaps between ICANN's capabilities that has to be filled perhaps by other entities within the community.

That Webinar will be on the 25th of September. I have a link to the announcement in the policy calendar. I would encourage any and all BC members concerned about consumer safeguards to join that Webinar. We don't have to go in there with a single BC position but it would be better if a lot of BC members would contribute.

Out of that September 25th Webinar, Brian will then tee things up for how he presents at ICANN 60. Thank you.

The next item on here was the accountability and transparency review. ATRT Number 3. There are 26 applicants for the 21 slots and Tola, (Anatols) is our BC nominee.

Susan you chair the committee that is making the recommendation and there is a resolution coming up at the next council meeting. Do you have anything to report on what the committee may recommend?

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes. We had nine GNSO candidates and so recommended seven although only the Top 3 are guaranteed seats. Unfortunately, for Adetola and I tried really hard Adetola but he was not selected in the Top 3.

As you know, I mean we have had pretty good representation from the BC on review teams. What I am concerned about with the selection committee is that they seem to support known players more than our known community members, more than sort of providing the balance of gender diversity and geographical diversity.

And, you know, we need new people to step forward and do this work. And that is happening but I could not convince them that we needed to you know at least put one newer person in on the Top 3.

So that list went out to the GNSO Council yesterday. So and I am trying to remember. (Frank), Stephane Van Gelder and one more and I am just blanking on the name but Top 3.

But I will keep harping on the fact that gender diversity and geographical diversity and the fact that we need to give opportunities to newer members of the community that may not be as well known. So that they can spread their wings and learn the ropes and have the opportunity to participate.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you Susan. The opportunity sometimes emerges because in other of the ACs and SOs the declines to put people in.

For instance, let's suppose that just for sake of argument the address supporting organization only has one or two nominees for this. If that is the case, then slots open up and it is the chairs of the ACs and SOs that have the opportunity to fill those slots from nominations like the one that GNSO is putting in.

So the GNSO may get more than just three especially if you make a strong case for that. I appreciate it.

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: That is it for the policy calendar part in Channel 1.

Marilyn Cade: Steve?

Steve DelBianco: Go ahead sorry. Marilyn is that you?

Marilyn Cade: This is Marilyn I just had a question. Yes it is. I have a question. Let me turn my printer off. I have a question quickly. Thank you so much Susan for what you have tried to do in bringing a new member forward.

But can I just ask you and it doesn't have to be real time. But could you post to the Web. Stephane Van Gelder is not a BC member and has not been now for a couple of years. He is actually an officer in the contracted party house.

I am not being negative. I am just asking you know were any of the three nominees from our house and from our (unintelligible)? Because if not, I think we need to start thinking about a different approach to make sure we have experts from our community nominated as independent experts if we can't get them through the formal process.

Susan Kawaguchi: I agree with that.

Steve DelBianco: Independent experts is something that they would have had to have chosen. So the GNSO doesn't make that decision about the independent experts. And Tola was the only CSG member to be among the 26 original nominees.

So Susan let me ask you to respond to anything else Marilyn asked in the chat because we are going to run out of time and I am taking up the calendar.

The last item I have before turning it over to Susan and Phil on Council is to let you know that BC member, Amazon posted on Circle ID this week regarding a request for the board to take action on the dot Amazon and some IDN TLDs.

And Amazon explains the extent to which it followed the guidebook and attempted to work out concerns that certain governments raised and is asking ICANN to move forward with a decision.

So that is worth a good read. I put a link to it in the policy calendar. That is worth a read by every BC member. And it is something that I think comports with the BC's attention to the guidebook. Suggesting that if an applicant followed the guidebook and scored well, that applicant deserved a chance to get their domain name.

Any comments on that from Andrew or Chris? Okay let me move to Susan and Phil.

Marilyn Cade: Steve? Actually Steve before you move forward. It is Marilyn. I really object to the BC engaging in any comments about an individual award of a gTLD.

So let me just put that on the record. Not picking on anyone but we are not – we are the user community. We should not be spending our time on advancing other issues which companies are more than welcome to advance through the official process.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you Marilyn. You are quite correct. The BC is about process here and if a company followed the process and scored well and has addressed objections then the process should be followed. That would be the only extent of BC interest in an individual company's application.

So Susan and Phil would you please take over for Channel 2 on Council. You will see that I put in prior resolutions from August 24th. We have already covered those so you can probably just jump to the limited agenda items for the 20th of September meeting.

Phil Corwin: Thank you Steve. Phil here. BC members can see what is on the draft agenda for the next council meeting for 20th of September, next Wednesday.

But I wanted to call your attention to one in particular. This is Item 4. It is the data collection request from the RPM review, PDP working group. I am one of the co-chairs. J. Scott Evans of the BC is another one of the co-chairs.

This is about a new acronym you should all be learning called the Data and Metrics for Policymaking, the DMPM. And the Fall of 2015 Council approved all – and adopted all of the consensus recommendations from the DMPM working group which basically said that to the maximum extent feasible working group policy recommendation should be grounded in data.

So that is and subsequently a form was created for submission to council to keep it updated on working group use of data as well as any requests for additional support needed. So that is what we are doing here.

We are the guinea pigs. We are the first working group to submit this form for council approval in the form of a motion. And also what we are doing is

also consistent with recommendations of the CCT review which talked about the need for data based recommendations.

We have gotten some pushback particularly from the subsequent procedures, working group and from some members of the council leadership who were concerned not so much about the money we are requesting which council won't decide that.

We have asked for \$50,000 to engage professional survey design and collectors to collect the data we need to make recent judgments on Sunrise registration and trademark claims RPMs. But the fact that this might delay a subsequent round.

First of all, we are trying to comply with this new data policy here. And we don't think this will delay somewhat of reaching final recommendations on Sunrise and claims notices. But while this survey work is going on we can be turning to the URS and using our time on that.

So there will be some gap. We don't know how much gap there will be between us and subsequent procedures. But also preliminary work on a subsequent round can go forward before our final report if adopted.

But this is an important test for the council of whether it is going to really back up this DMPM consensus recommendations and approve the motion from the first working group that is submitting this request.

I am working with the other co-chairs and staff to prepare basically an executive summary of our request. That should be done today and I will be happy to share it with BC members.



But this is first time test of this new DMPM recommendations and we will see what council does. I am hopeful they will approve the motion which will present by Heather Forrest, who is council liaison for our working group. But I will be speaking to it and the other two co-chairs will also be on that part of the council call to answer any questions.

I don't have much to say about the other items on next week's agenda. So I defer to Susan whether she has any comments on that or anything else going on in council.

Steve DelBianco: Susan?

Susan Kawaguchi: I think that is it.

Steve DelBianco: Fantastic. Thanks everyone. Apologies for having the policy calendar take so much time. Andrew back to you.

Andrew Harris: Thanks very much Steve. Thanks Phil and Susan. It has been a rich conversation. I know we are really time stretched so I am going to try to go briefly.

Chantelle there have been a few small updates in the CSG planning for Abu Dhabi. Do you want to talk very briefly about where we are in terms of the schedule?

Chantelle Doerksen: Hi Andrew sure it is Chantelle. I am just opening up the schedule now. In terms of since when we last provided the meeting list during the last meeting. I can confirm that the BC is going to have their open and close meetings both on Tuesday.

We closed the first session from 9 to 10:15 and then the open session being from 1515 to 1630. So the BC will have two blocks with a 15 minute break.

And then on the CSG side we have a CSG open meeting for Tuesday at 10:30. We are going to have a CSG meeting with the GNSO board appointed members.

The GNSO appointed board members on Saturday, October 28th. That has changed it is no longer going to be from 8 to 8:50. It is only going to be 8:30 to 9 am due to board schedule and the (unintelligible) 8:30 which the meeting team (unintelligible). Unfortunately that has been shortened to 30 minutes.

We have a CSG closed meeting for Sunday, October 29th at 1700 to 1830. Then we have the CSG GAC one which is now being confirmed for Tuesday lunch period 1215 to 1315. There is a tentative (unintelligible) stakeholder meeting on Wednesday from 10:30 to 12.

And then there is a tentative meeting for the CSG NCPH which we are looking at doing Thursday evening if that overlaps with the wrap up cocktails. So more information will be forthcoming on that.

And once these are finalized which should be within the next couple of weeks we will be setting up the schedule (unintelligible). Thanks and I am happy to take any questions on that.

Andrew Harris: Okay can I suggest in the interest of time that you just pass around that schedule as it is to the membership for any comment. I am just mindful of the fact that we are getting near the top of the hour.

Anybody have any – if anybody has any quick questions drop your hand up right now. Otherwise I am going to pass it over to Jimson for a somewhat abbreviated operations and finance report. Jimson please go ahead. Jimson are you there?

Chantelle Doerksen: Hi Andrew it looks like Jimson might have been disconnected. The operator is calling him back.

Andrew Harris: Okay. Okay, okay. Well why don't we give it another 30 seconds real quick because he has got a big role here. In the – while we are waiting for Jimson does anybody want to post in the chat any other business that they are looking – (unintelligible) that they have got on their minds?

Okay seeing none Chantelle can we get Jimson back?

Chantelle Doerksen: They are dialing him now. It should be about one minute more if that.

Andrew Harris: Okay thanks very much.

Jimson Olufuye: Hi this is Jimson.

Andrew Harris: Yes sir please...

Jimson Olufuye: Can you hear me?

Andrew Harris: Yes please if you can go ahead give us a brief update on operations (unintelligible).

Jimson Olufuye: Yes thank you Andrew. It just happens that (unintelligible) that I am connected. I got disconnected so I have to be connected back.

I don't have much on my slate. Just to say that about 10 members are yet to really respond to renewing their membership now. So we are still following them up. And by the next meeting we could finalize on the state of membership in terms of the members in (unintelligible).

But (unintelligible) if anyone still have an issue in order to let me know. New members yes we have new members (unintelligible) committee. So far about five new members just (unintelligible) will join.

There are new members of committee and that emphasizes the need for us to focus on our (unintelligible) to (unintelligible) some to exit and also some coming (unintelligible) organization.

Then on elections, after the election is scheduled for November. A notice should be coming out as (unintelligible) announced middle of October, next month.

But there is a decision (unintelligible) verdict concerning whatever can bring this forward. Because of the professionals (unintelligible) better to start early so that new officers that are (unintelligible) secure visas and have enough time to secure it.

Because once officers – or elections finishes in November maybe 8 to 10 (unintelligible). So those who will be posted on the final decision by next week.

Okay so that is briefly about that. Maybe Andrew can speak to some other outreach events that are coming up. Thank you.

Andrew Harris: Sure thank you Jimson. And just to clarify your last question. The issue that we are trying to finalize is whether or not we move our BC elections forward so that we harmonize with the ICANN calendar which is requiring that we get people together for things like the intercessional.

Where we can't say who is going to be part of that until later in the year and we need to know. Is that correct?

Jimson Olufuye: Yes, yes basically.

Andrew Harris: Okay. Well if you could forward that to membership so that we understand exactly what is at issue and what our options are. That would be great. I would like to avoid – put ourselves on a calendar that makes this as easy as possible for the BC to be fully represented. Because I know that that is a big issue for us.

I am going to give two quick breaths some things that are happening on the outreach side. BC has been asked to participate in outreach event in Brazil. (Navaldo) has said he would like to attend and they have asked me to attend via remotely, via Skype which I plan to do.

And so we will get you more information about that as soon as it happens. That is planned for the 25th of September.

And lastly there is a new BC outreach plan that is going forward and we have gotten great responses from some of the members of ExComm. If you are an ExComm member who has not commented please, please get your comments in.

We would like to finalize that by the end of the week if we can so we can move forward. We appreciate all of the work that has been done by the outreach committee and the (unintelligible) to give us a lot of good work.

That is all I have for – yes Alan we should get together a written proposal for the outreach. From my side there is no cost. They just asked me to dial in.

In terms of any other business. Do I see any other hands? We are right at the top of the hour then. I am going to say thank you very much to everybody. We are covering an awful lot.

Let's try to use the list as much as we possibly can to get some of the reporting out as early as we can so that we can use these times to focus as I think we have done nicely today on the issues that are in question.

And let's keep moving forward. There will be a lot of things coming forward over the next few weeks as we prepare for Abu Dhabi. So be looking in your inboxes. Thank you all very much and have a great day from my side.

Marilyn quick hand up. Please.

Marilyn Cade: I just think that Chantelle has been gathering information about who is attending. And even if she can't comment now perhaps we can just ask her to post that update. Thanks.

Andrew Harris: Great suggestion. To the extent that you know that you are going to be attending Abu Dhabi by all means please get that in to everyone. The more and the better we can coordinate when we are at these (unintelligible) meetings face to face the more effective we are going to be. Thank you. Great point.

Great then Chantelle thank you very much for – I think we can stop the recording. And appreciate everyone's time. We will be speaking with you soon.

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