

**ICANN**

**Moderator: Chantelle Doerksen**  
**August 30, 2017**  
**1:30 pm CT**

Chantelle Doerksen: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Welcome to the BC Members Call on Wednesday, August 30, 2017. On today's call, we have Adetola Sogbesan, Andrew Mack, Alex Deacon, Andy Abrams, Cecilia Smith, Isabel Rutherford, Jay Sudowski, John Berard, Leana Melnichuk, Margie Milam, Marie Pattullo, Philip Corwin, and Steve DelBianco. We have apologies from Barbara Wanner, Billy Einkamerer, and Stephanie Duchesneau. From staff, we have myself, Chantelle Doerksen. I'd like to remind everyone to please state your name before speaking for the transcript.

Thank you ever so much and over to you, Andrew.

Andrew Mack: Great. Thank you very much Chantelle. By the way, you started off very clearly and then your line got a little muddled. Is that you, or is that us, or me?

Chantelle Doerksen: I'm not sure. I'll check on that.

Andrew Mack: No problem. Okay, great. If anybody can tell, by all means, do tell me. Thank you everyone for being here at the very tail end of the summer. I

recognize that it conflicts with some people's vacation. For those of you who are just getting back in the swing or who have children who are getting back in the swing, I feel you and I wish you a good reentry after what I hope was a good summer.

I also wanted to make two quick points. One was to thank everybody for what I know have been some really robust discussions around a whole host of different issues, including GDPR and WHOIS outreach, and a number of other things. We really appreciate both the efforts and the spirit of cooperation that everybody's shown and thanks so much for that.

And the second one is just a personal note to anyone who might have any family or friends who are affected by what's going on in Texas and Louisiana. The pictures are just startling and our heart goes out to them and by all means, know that we're thinking about you and the people who are important to you if you have people in that space.

I know we've got a busy call and we've got a lot to cover so I'm going to just turn this over to Steve straight away. Steve, for the policy calendar, over to you.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks, Andrew. Steve DelBianco here, talking to you all from San Antonio, Texas where it's 95 degrees, sunny, and dry so this is the lucky part of the state. Chantelle is going to load the policy calendar that I circulated just yesterday, about 24 hours ago. There were no new public comments posted since our last call. So I'll move immediately to the current schedule of open ICANN public comments and we have only got four of them so it should be very quick to get through this part.

The first is the statistical analysis, DNS abuse, and this is done by an outside consulting firm. It was done on a contract to the consumer choice competition and review team, the CCTRT, and Waudo Siganga is on that team for the BC. They were charged as part of the affirmation of commitments and now the bylaws, they were charged to review safeguards put in place to mitigate issues involved in the expansion of the GTLD space and that came from the affirmation of commitments in 2009. As I said before, we carried it over to the ICANN bylaws as one of these specific reviews that are done.

The report that was put together by the consultants, it includes -- I pulled out one conclusion, which was that "our findings suggest that some new GTLDs have become a target for malicious actors." But there is a lot in this report and the statistics that are there can be used to argue either way and the BC may not have a specific view to the new GTLDs but we always have a principled view that ICANN and its contracted parties should do more to mitigate DNS abuse that occurs on names registered, registrars, and in the zone files of the registries themselves. And we expect ICANN compliance to hold those contract parties to their obligation.

So I think that there's another color to this one because it will also affect the next round or the future round of new GTLD expansion, since that round itself is supposed to address problems that are identified by the CCTRT as well as several other reviews, including a GAC review of the last round of GTLD expansions. So I earlier today thanked Margie Milam for volunteering to draft this comment. And last week's call, Tim Chen, Stephanie Duchesneau, Waudo Siganga, and Jimson all volunteered and I thank you all again. Tim Chen has already circulated his preliminary thoughts on this.

So I pointed out some previous comments that the BC has done in that email and I indicated the first one, which was our comment on GTLD program

safeguards in May of last year. But I also included three recent comments on this CCTRT and our participation there. So I'll stop there and take a queue as to whether we have other volunteers or others who want to discuss this comment. We have plenty of time left. It's not until September 19th and we have a robust review team already in place, drafting team in the BC. Anyone want to bring up anything further on this?

All right, thanks again to those who volunteered. The second public comment closes the 2nd of October and it's about (unintelligible). This is a strange one but ICANN is proposing dates for the ICANN public meetings between 2021 and 2023. I'll stop now because Margie Milam has just put her hand up.  
Margie?

Margie Milam: Sorry, we're having a bit of feedback. This is Margie Milam. Can you guys hear me okay? I think someone else needs to mute because there's sort of an echo. (Unintelligible) study where increased focus and compliance is really easier and I think that's something that the BC hopefully might be able to support. And in particular, as you look at the notes that I shared, I think one of the things that troubled me as I read the report was the spin that the ICANN staff gave to the report itself. If you read the public announcement that was made, it really seemed to downplay some of the significant findings.

And so I would hope that that's something that we can also point out and that we can (unintelligible).

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Margie. Everyone please put your phone on mute, especially Marilyn. We're getting a lot of feedback.

Marilyn Cade: You might be, but that's because I'm asking to speak. I'm not sure why the echo is coming from my line. I can dial back in.

Steve DelBianco: Marilyn, please ensure that your computer speakers are off.

Marilyn Cade: How else would I speak?

Steve DelBianco: I thought you were using your phone because you talked about dialing back in.

Marilyn Cade: No, sorry. Am I allowed to speak or would you prefer I not?

Steve DelBianco: No, it's clearer now Marilyn. Please proceed.

Marilyn Cade: Thanks, Chantelle I'm not sure what (unintelligible) not here anymore. I'll volunteer to check in with Margie. I think that we as the BC, and Margie, so happy to see you engaged -- joining us. Special thanks to your employer for bringing you over to our side. Again, some of you may not know that Margie did a fantastic amount of work in the past on this issue. But I think we ought to add a little bit of history to this in our comments. I also think there's a real problem here when the ICANN staff that are paying attention to this are primarily from the business unit that (Fadi) created that supports the contracted parties that even has account managers for the contracted parties.

So it's very, very difficult for the rest of the participants in ICANN to keep up with that unless there's a concerted informational effort and I think it's really important for us to step up on this. So I'm not going to do a lot more but I will just suggest -- I'll check in with Margie. Perhaps we can provide a little bit of here's what happened in the past. Here's why this is important and here's why this puts ICANN at risk and why ICANN overall, and particularly, the board needs to understand that DNS abuse is growing. I just saw an announcement from the CTO at ICANN that noted the growth of DNS abuse.

So I think we may want to also take a look at what is going on in the overall risk and threats to the DNS And to the internet, and maybe put a few placeholder footnotes in, and references in on that as well.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Marilyn. All right, we'll move onto the next one. It's proposed dates for the ICANN public meetings in 2021 to 2023. It seems unusual to look that far out into the future but that's where we are. And the comments will close by the 2nd of October. So I would ask all of you not to do it on this call, but to send an email to the BC private if you are aware of any of their scheduled dates that conflict with key business meetings, conferences, or other national or religious holidays that are of importance and then the BC will be glad to collate all of that and put in a public comment. If I don't hear back from members of the BC with those kinds of concerns, we will not comment on number two.

Number three, which is a proposed renewal of one of these sponsored top level domains. This one is for the .museum space. They're trying to renew their agreement and in their new agreement, they will designate .museum as a community instead of sponsored, using the vocabulary that we invented for the last round of new GTLDs. Now, they do add provisions from the base new GTLD registry agreement. That was one that was just recently approved over some objections from the BC and they are bringing in some emergency interim operations. The WHOIS contact lookup will be turned on. They'll have IDN support at the second level. They'll reserve the names that are required under the new GTLD registry agreement. I bolded this key line, Phil Corwin. They're implementing URS or uniform rapid suspension, which is a new GTLD rights protection mechanism, which was not subject to any policy development or it's not completed yet within GNSO.

They also are adapting portions of the registry operator code of conduct and public interest commitments. I'll note that because .museum has been in force for about a decade, they are not required to implement any of the initial launch protections, like the trademark clearinghouse and notification systems that a new GTLD would. So I'll stop there and ask about BC members who are interested to volunteer to help examine this. We have commented on prior renewals where URS was implemented and so we'll be able to copy and paste a lot of those comments.

But if anyone has experience with .museum in particular as how it affects the business community, business registrar, I'd love to hear about that. I see two hands up, Marilyn and Philip Corwin. Marilyn, is that an old hand or new? We'll go to Phil Corwin.

Marilyn Cade: It's a new hand. Sorry, it's a new hand. I just want to ask a quick question and Phil may be able to answer it. When .museum was originally proposed, the population that could register was roughly about, I don't know, 5,000 potential registrants. A private museum organized by different parties wasn't allowed to register. Are they just trying to expand the population they can allow registration? And I see actually a better clarification. Andrew asked would museum (unintelligible) be able to be registrants? That's pretty broad as a definition. So I don't know if we want to (unintelligible).

Steve DelBianco: Marilyn, it's Steve. Let me invite you -- could you examine the unity designation in the new agreement to see whether it needs to be tightened?

Marilyn Cade: I'm not sure that we want to spend a lot of time on this. If it's not putting our interest at risk, I'm not thinking we should spend a lot of time on it but I just wanted to ask the clarifying question.

Steve DelBianco: Phil, over to you next.

Phil Corwin: Thank you, Steve. Three quick things. I'm happy to be part of the drafting team on this comment. I just don't have the bandwidth to take the lead on it with all my other duties. Number two, on the URS, we've seen this movie before. I assume we'll file our perfunctory objection of doing this and not wait on the RPM Review working group which is going to give -- has not yet reached the URS and is going to give it very serious quantitative and qualitative evaluation before deciding whether or not it recommend it become a consensus policy.

So once again, it's upsetting the staff doing this through registry agreement renewals but we know our objections have failed before and that the board has backed up staff. On the third issue, I'm not sure it is or isn't our issue but I have pasted in the chat the actual definition of the expansion of eligibility requirements and it's so broad, including any individual with an interest or a link with the museum profession and/or activity or a bona fide museum user. Well, I'm sure I qualify under that definition because I go to many museums.

I think the one question here is the definition of community we're familiar with when the new TLD program sets a very high bar and in fact, most applicants for community TLDs fail to pass that bar and it was set high to avoid -- because if you were indeed a bona fide community applicant, you didn't have to go to an auction if your application was a contention set. This definition of community is certainly at variance with the definition that's been used in the new TLD program and again, it's so broad, I think anyone in the world would be eligible to be part of this museum community.

So I think it does raise a question about whether it sets a precedent whether any sponsored TLD can become essentially through this broad a definition a



completely open TLD. I'm not saying that's right or wrong but I think that is the issue that's presented by the proposed definition of who would be eligible. That's all I had to say, Steve. Thank you.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Phil. I'll note that the community designation was invented from the previous round of new GTLDs because it enabled someone to be at the front of the line if there was contention for a string that they applied for. In other words, a community would get it without having to go to auction. That won't be relevant at all to .museum because they're not a new GTLD and that auction is long since over.

So I'm not clear yet what other community designations are necessary. But I catch your point about potentially looking to open up .museum to everyone and thereby escape even the sponsored TLD conditions under which they received their contract many, many years ago. Any other comments on the .museum and especially any volunteers?

I bet we have a lot of bona fide museum users in the BC. So Marilyn, is your hand an old hand or new? Not hearing Marilyn so we'll go on. Okay, the next one up is proposed changes to the charter for the NCUC. That's the non-commercial users constituency, the part of our compatriots in the NCSG, in the non-contract party house in GNSO. Now, it's always a little bit risky to try to tweak another party that's frequently in a position to block our initiatives in Council, but I would like to get a volunteer to take a look at the NCUC charter changes, especially with this in mind.

There are many businesses who run nonprofit operating concerns or NPOC is another group. They are also a constituency of the non-commercial stakeholders group and they've not been well treated by the NCSG in the past. And if there's any possibility about spotting things in the NCUC charter that

might advantage them over the NPOC when it comes to NCSG voting or eligibility, we would try to note those items. But unless there's something we feel strongly about, we won't comment on their charter.

All right, Marilyn, your hand is up again. What do you have in mind?

Marilyn Cade: So I read that right before this. I see John has also raised his hand. If we could get two to three people, we could have a conference call, go through it. I'll just say there's some interesting aspects in this. One, there's no reference I can find to accountability to the NCSG or to co-existence with the NPOC. There's some other interesting aspects. There's a section about the new accountable community. That's not a bad thing. It's kind of interesting. But I do think we ought to look at it because it looks very, very dominant in thinking about the SG that they're supposed to be in with no acknowledgement of others.

I see John and Tova also volunteered. So why don't we set a call up with help from our secretary and we can go through it? I agree, Steve, it can be sensitive but I think it's important for us to stand up on this.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Marilyn. We're going to move onto the next item there. We're done with the public comment list. Marilyn, could you go back on mute please? Thank you. The next item is not a public comment but instead it's a follow-up on ICANN's task force, its initiative to address the GDPR, general data protection regulations adopted by the European Commission and brought into law in May of 2018. Everyone in the BC is aware this is a high priority issue for us because the GDPR may or may not interfere with registrars and registries disclosing WHOIS information as they're required to do in the contracts that they already have with ICANN.

There are extreme threats that WHOIS could go dark next May and I think that's just rhetorical posturing. And on the other hand, we can't put our head in the sand and pretend that everyone will keep WHOIS alive and well the next May if they perceive they have exposure, legal threats and exposure. So for that reason, Susan Kawaguchi was designated to represent the business constituency on a task force that ICANN set up and that task force requested by the CEO was initially focusing on putting together a big matrix of use cases or legitimate uses of WHOIS, and with that use case, try to persuade European data protection regulators that we should get an exemption from the GDPR. Or failing that, the second part of the strategy and this is to you, Alex, the second part of the strategy was to -- Becky Burr said we would be able to show that these following uses are legitimate uses and therefore we don't even need an exemption because legitimate uses are allowed without consent of the individual under the GDPR.

So that's what ICANN has been talking about. But very little of what I just said is in writing anywhere. ICANN has not been very transparent about what the whole strategy is and this created an opportunity that Denise Michel first surfaced two calls ago where Denise was a little concerned about the approach that's being used by ICANN and aside from the matrix of use cases, the notion here was to do a letter to the Board and to management. It would be initially from the BC but I'm sure we'd invite any other party in the DSG or others to join, and it would make four particular points. And this is the draft letter, which Denise was good enough to draft alongside Stephanie Duchesneau with help from Tim Chen, Alex Deacon, Jimson offered one small edit. Alex Deacon also said he supported the configuration of text that Denise had in there.

But I'll ask Chantelle if it's possible, could you put up the PDF version that I circulated yesterday? Folks, we're -- there's no deadline on this because it's a

letter initiative from the BC but I would like to try to get closure today on what it is we're going to say in the letter. That is not the right document, Chantelle? So why don't you take that down. That is not the right document. It's the one I circulated yesterday if you can find it. If not, I'll send it in again.

If everyone checks your emails from yesterday, attached to the policy calendar, I included the latest draft that Denise circulated yesterday morning. Now, that draft includes some revisions that Alex Deacon put in to probe the Board for their strategy and backup plan. But it also was my attempt to reconcile a key paragraph, number three in here, which is the point that Denise initially made business then Stephanie Duchesneau of Google had a different perspective and that was supported by at least one other. Jay Sudowski supported Stephanie's alternate text. So the idea here was to try to come up with compromise text and I tried to do that yesterday. Denise accepted the compromise with a few tweaks and circulated it, but I understand that Stephanie was still not comfortable with it. And Andy Abrams, I think you're representing Stephanie's concerns today on the call because she could not be with us.

Chantelle is having some difficulties finding the letter so let me just read the key paragraph that is creating heartburn. In fact, I'll read it once and then put it in the text. It says that "starting from the position that WHOIS is compatible with GDPR, ICANN should complete and publish expert GDPR analysis that covers potential GDPR compliance concerns (unintelligible) by existing WHOIS requirements." Thank you, Chantelle. Folks, I'm looking at Point 3 in the letter. This is really the only point we need to discuss on today's call. We can move on with the agenda. So Point 3 in the center of the screen.

The question I believe, Andy is going to speak to this in a moment, of what Google's concerns are with that paragraph but I believe that paragraph represents consensus of others who have been in the drafting. Andy, to you?

Andy Abrams: Thanks, Steve. This is Andy. I think the letter looks generally good and thank you for everybody for their hard work on it. Our only real concern is with that Point 3. I think we respectfully proposed that we eliminate any sort of unilateral assumption whether or not WHOIS is generally compatible with GDPR from the outset. I think that's an outset that we want to look into and whether we look into an exemption or any sort of modification, I don't think we want to come from a starting point of full compatibility or non-compatibility.

Steve DelBianco: Andy, if I could summarize then, I believe you and Stephanie believe that the first clause in Item 3 should not be there. I believe you want to strike the words starting from the position that WHOIS is compatible with GDPR. Do I have that right, Andy?

Andy Abrams: That's correct. Thank you.

Steve DelBianco: That's great. Denise, over to you.

Denise Michel: Thank you, Steve. Can you guys hear me okay?

Steve DelBianco: We do.

Denise Michel: Great and thank you, Andy, for your suggestion. It would be great to wrap this up today. If we say starting from a neutral position, complete and publish a report, would that be acceptable?

Andy Abrams: That would. Thank you, Denise. I appreciate that.

Denise Michel: Great. Unless anyone else has objections to that change then I think we could move on.

Steve DelBianco: Fantastic. Thank you, Denise. From the beginning of the clause -- I'll read that back and then back to you. I'll read back what I got. "Starting from a neutral position, regarding whether WHOIS is compatible with GDPR."  
"Starting from a neutral position as to whether WHOIS is compatible with GDPR."

Denise Michel: No, actually I was suggesting that it read the following. "Starting from a neutral position, complete and publish expert GDPR analysis that covers potential GDPR compliance and then continues from there."

Steve DelBianco: Well, I'm glad you clarified that. So starting from a neutral position, complete and publish. Okay, back to you, Denise.

Denise Michel: I just wanted to provide -- to correct perhaps some context on this. This actually emerged from a series of discussions that the BC and the other two commercial constituencies also had at a few meetings in South Africa. That's really how this whole thing got started.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks, Denise. Any other comments from BC members? And are there any objections to the letter at this point? It's been circulated for over a week, BC members, and discussed on two calls recently. Are there any objections at this point for us to finalize this final edit and send it? I am seeing no objections and I am interested to know if we should pursue members of the IPC and ISPCP, this was something Alex Deacon brought up and thought perhaps he could run it by the IPC. If we choose to take that route, we will have to delay

sending it to management. I doubt that the IPC will respond very quickly so Denise, you had the best sense of timing on this. If it causes us to delay by up to a week, what is your view about whether to go to the IPC or to send it ourselves? Denise?

Denise Michel: Thanks, Steve. I think given the lack of really any formal process and the lack of notification from ICANN staff as to what they're actually doing, I would recommend that we move forward with this letter at this time and of course, share it with other constituencies as well. And if they want to do an additional document that they want the BC to sign onto, I think we can address that separately. I think it's more important that given an indication that by the end of August, staff would be taking some action as yet to be determined, it's important to send this letter now from the BC and then of course, be open to working with other groups that may share our perspectives and desire to contribute to this issue. Thanks.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Denise. I do think that will be the wiser course here. I am aware that in the Copenhagen meeting, Keith Drazek of the registries had put a motion in front of Council to ask ICANN to hire an independent analysis of GDPR compliance and WHOIS. And it was the IPC who spoke violently against doing that. I don't even remember the reasons that Paul McGrady had to do so but -- so it could be that the IPC would take some significant amount of time to get on board.

All right, so we will send this. Marilyn is suggesting copying the GAC chair. Any objection to that, Denise?

Denise Michel: Yes, I think it should be sent as is and then we can share copies of it or call the GAC and other group's attention to the letter. But this is a BC initiative and a

BC perspective and I wouldn't want to conflate it with whatever issues the GAC may have going on.

Steve DelBianco: Right. Thank you, Denise. So I will make one edit to the letter. We'll put a date on it and then I will work with our chair, Andy Mack, to send it to Crocker and Marby and after it is sent, ICANN will put it up on their correspondence list. But we, as soon as we send it, will probably forward a copy of what we sent in to the CSG and to the GAC Chair, the rest of the CSG Ex-Com and the GAC Chair. Thank you Denise, Stephanie, Jay, Susan Kawaguchi, and others for that. Appreciate it.

I'd like to move on now to the next one, which is Channel 2 Council. So as Chantelle is reloading the policy calendar, I will turn things over to Phil Corwin. The previous Council call was back on the 24th of August and I indicated in the policy calendar the two resolutions that were approved in council and then Phil can talk about the full calendar there. Over to you, Phil.

Phil Corwin: Thanks, Steve. As you noted, there were two motions approved last Thursday. One was to communicate GNSO's decision to the CCWG and other charter organizations that Council would withdraw from the CCWIG at the conclusion of ICANN 61, which I believe is March 2018 in San Juan, Puerto Rico. I know it's in San Juan. I believe it's March. So we've left a lot of time and we expect that the replacement structure that's compatible with ICANN rules will be proposed by that time.

The second motion was simply to approve the replacement of Emily Taylor by Norm Richie on the SSRT -- R2RT -- that's a tongue twister and pretty non-controversial there. We also -- we did have some Council discussion on the matter just discussed, which was review of the revised ICANN procedure for handling WHOIS conflicts with privacy law. We reviewed an August 1st



letter that had been received by the Council Chair from Akram Atallah and we got a short briefing from GDD staff and we're going to try to determine Council's next steps for reviewing the WHOIS procedure and its relationship to privacy law generally and GDPR in particular.

And then in regard to work team 5 of the subsequent procedures working group, which is the one handling geographic names, which has invited members of non-GNSO advisory councils to join the leadership of that work team, we had a good discussion. And there is an active monitoring by Council of that sub team's work as it proceeds. So we'll receive reports of what's going on there.

Having said all that, my impression from the call is that the sub-team -- and from other sources -- that the sub-team is having some difficulty in getting participation at the leadership level from non-GNSO ACs with the possible exception of the GAC. So we'll see if that's even an issue if that works and they get the other non-GNSO groups to engage with that discussion. So that's my report. The next Council meeting is on September 20th and we don't have yet even a draft agenda. Should have one by the next BC meeting in two weeks.

That's it. Any questions?

Andrew Mack: Great, Phil. Thank you very much.

Phil Corwin: Very welcome.

Andrew Mack: Okay. And now, I'm looking up (unintelligible) I realize (unintelligible). Sorry, am I getting feedback? This is Andrew.

Steve DelBianco: Marilyn's hand is up and she's off mute. That's when that happens.

Andrew Mack: Marilyn, would you like to speak? Go ahead, please.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you so much, Steve, for noting I'm the nosy contributor. I don't know what to do about fixing that. I just want to point out that I made a comment in the chat. As I represent the BC on the CCWG and Phil, thank you for your reference to the discussion in the Council. I just want to call attention to my proposal that we take some comments from BC members about the replacement mechanism. There's several BC members signed up for the CCWGIG. I'm the official member but I would really love if I could get more important from that from other members and I'm sure Chantelle will help me in setting up a call.

Andrew Mack: Great, Marilyn. Sorry about that everyone. I was on mute. Okay. So then we're going to move onto the next -- if there's nobody else who wants to speak on this topic -- we're going to move onto the next thing, which is the CSG report. And as Barbara is not here, I will give a quick one because there isn't a lot that has changed since last time. But before I do that, I'm going to ask Steve DelBianco, if you'd like to speak, you were on the MCPH Intersessional Call. Would you like to give a couple seconds about that call?

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Andy. This is Steve. I sent all of you a report from that call where we firmed up the date for the intersessional. Other than that, there wasn't much more discussed. I believe that we'll have our work cut out for us to try to get into that intersessional and find common ground with the non-commercial stakeholders group on how to do the next GNSO review, which is one of the key items where we thought we would start to remedy the problem of the split house voting and the structure that often frustrates business interests.

Thanks, Andy.

Andrew Mack: Great, Steve. Thanks very much. So as you all may remember from last time, we were trying to schedule a series of meetings for ICANN 60 in Abu Dhabi and I know that Chantelle has sent out information to everyone requesting that they give their dates of arrival and all of that. Please by all means let's do that because we want to make sure that we coordinate as much as we possibly can, both with each other in terms of meetings and also with some of the newcomers and fellows that are around.

Chantelle is going to post in the notes the list of meetings that we discussed. They're the same ones that I had mentioned before, a CSG open meeting, a CSG meeting with the GNSO funded board members, a CSG closed meeting, CSG GAC lunch, CSG contracted party's house stakeholder meeting, and a CSG NCPH meeting, which we're doing as a happy hour on November 2nd. And I recognize that one of our goals is to try to build that relationship a little bit. And so I encourage everybody who is there and can attend to help us with that and we'll try to continue to build that relationship.

I think that that's pretty much it on the CSG side and if anyone has any questions, I am going to turn it -- unless anybody has any questions, I would love to turn it over to Jimson for operations and plans. Thanks very much.

Jimson Olufuye: Okay, thank you very much, Andrew, and thank you Steve for that robust feedback. On behalf of all of us from AfICTA, other members of the BC would like to really commensurate with our members in the U.S. in Texas and the devastation of Hurricane Harvey with compliments and sympathy.

Well, at this point, about 90% of our members are paid up. So the remainder, the finance committee will begin to follow them up to see if they can still be retained. So we have some major members have already said they will join. But those we have not heard from, the finance committee by virtue of their responsibility according to the charter will begin to follow them up to implore them to remain.

Also, we have three potential members that are -- their membership is under review by the credentials committee. Thanks to the committee led by Andy, you're working very hard. So hopefully, once that review is completed, they will need to pay and they can then become full members. And in regards to membership, we're working seriously on the online application so that potential members will not need to use their phones. They can just fill the forms online. So Chantelle and I are working on Memberclicks to fix that.

On the elections, many thanks for members from participation in the recently concluded election about (unintelligible) participation or (unintelligible) close to. So that's good for BC. It's a good sign that our members are fully engaged. So thank you very much. And again, as mentioned before, officers election comes up in November and then this notice will go out in October.

And finally, I would like to recognize the outreach committee hard work on the FY 2018 outreach strategy, BC outreach strategy. BC outreach strategy have been very quite robust and has been leading some good results so they are working very hard. So Andy, our coordinator, thank you, Marilyn, Lawrence, thank you very much, Omar, and Gabi, with very robust support from Chantelle.

So I would just ask Excomm to please fast track it so can then be reviewed and approve so we can approve to wiki page. Because without that, we will

not be able to access all the support, outreach support that has already been approved in ICANN FY 2018 budget. So on this note, thank you. Back to you.

Andrew Mack: Great. Jimson, thank you very much for all of your comments. Thank you very much to Marilyn for everyone who contributed to the outreach document. I think it's quite strong. Would anyone like to make a comment on this at this point or on any of the things that Jimson has just mentioned?

Okay, I'm seeing no hands. Then if that's the case, I'd like to move to any other business and I see that we have in any other business, the need for credentials and finance committee members. I think we're close to the number that we need for credentials but we might need somebody else and I'm on a number of committees and could easily jump off of that one. I know we need another person for finance. Are there any other business items? Phil Corwin, please jump in.

Phil Corwin: Thanks, Andrew. I'll be brief. First, I was remiss in not prefacing my Council remarks by thanking all the members of the BC who voted for my re-election to Council. I appreciate the strong show of support and will continue to do my utmost to be the best possible representative for all of you on Council.

Second, in regard to the NCPH Intersessional in January, I will be on that. I did want to make BC members aware that immediately preceding that meeting, Council has scheduled a three-day strategic planning session, also in Los Angeles. They scheduled that without understanding that it was in direct conflict with the largest domain name industry conference of the year, which is Names Con, held in Las Vegas, and I have client obligations that will require me to be at Names Con for at least part of that period. So I anticipate I'll be missing about half of that council strategic planning session. They are

currently surveying council members to see which others have conflicts because of Names Con but they've already pretty much explained to us, staff has, that it can't be any other time. So I don't anticipate anything changing.

And finally, I wanted to advise you in regard to the next Council meeting, there's now a requirement, a new requirement for PDP working groups to base their policy recommendations in data analysis as much as possible. And the working group I'm co-chairing and are reviewing the RPMs along with J. Scott Evans is one of the other co-chairs, we've been working with staff to develop a data survey for data necessary to really make quantitative decisions about potential changes and efficacy of the RPMs, because unfortunately, no data collection was built into the applicant guidebook or into any of these RPMS when the new TLD program was created.

I can report to you that we're going to be submitting a request to Council before the filing date of September 10th and making a presentation to Council on September 20th requesting ICANN financial support to hire an expert on data collection and survey analysis to conduct this survey, because neither policy staff nor the co-chairs have that expertise. But that data collection requirement is going to be costly. Our initial request will be for a minimum of \$50,000 because of the very extensive data collection that will be required and it will also probably delay publication of our initial report for comment by some months.

So I wanted all BC members to be aware of that because it's coming up in the next Council meeting and it's going to affect not just our PDP working group but all working groups in the future because there is this new data collection requirement. Thank you very much.

Andrew Mack: Great. Thank you very much, Phil. Any comments on those? Phil, real quickly, I had one quick comment, which is the idea of using data is great but it exists in -- it's just an empty request if it's not clear what that means and what that looks like so I was wondering if they gave you any guidelines? And then I will also, before you answer, I'll go to Marilyn. You've got your hand up. Please.

Phil Corwin: Responding Andrew -- bad feedback there. The co-chairs, it's true, the directive does not identify the type of data we should be collecting for our working group's purpose. The co-chairs have spent many, many hours working with staff to develop a list of the types of data that may be available that would be of great assistance in making well informed decisions on policy recommendations. So really, we've done the heavy lifting of identifying both the type of data we'd be looking for and the sources it might be available from.

Andrew Mack: Okay. Thanks very much. Marilyn, please go ahead.

Marilyn Cade: Thanks. My comment was actually about something that was said earlier by Phil. Could Phil explain why the Council is holding a three-day meeting, what the topics are, and why this is funded by ICANN. This is quite unique. In the past, when ICANN funded such intersessional meetings, it was about policy development. For instance, I actually hosted, when I was a councilor, I hosted two of the policy development processes related to the new GTLD chaired by Bruce because the Council was the policy development body. This seems to be quite new and a three-day meeting is quite expensive. And unless there's a policy issue that the full bodies of the SOs, the SGs and the constituencies agree with, I think this is very interesting.

I think it deserves some understanding. Thanks.

Phil Corwin: Thank you, Marilyn. I'm not sure I can shed much light on this. I wasn't aware that this is being planned. The purpose as far as I understand it, is that it's to assist councilors to engage in strategic planning for issues and challenges in 2018 and the first notice that I got of it was a week ago when we received notice from the Vice-Chairs and staff that the meeting would be taking place and when it was scheduled for, and I immediately checked my calendar and noted that it conflicted -- that it was scheduled for the exact same days as the largest domain name industry conference held in North America each year.

And I conveyed that to council. But as to further explaining or justifying the purpose, I'm not in a position to do that at this time.

Andrew Mack: Well, thank you, Phil. Let's all take that under advisement. I think it's a good rule of thumb for us to be thinking about our time is a precious resource and whether -- just because we've got something scheduled, are we making the best use of the time and the resources that we have that could be otherwise potentially re-allocated. I'm looking -- I see Marilyn, is that a new hand or is that an old hand?

Marilyn Cade: Well, no. It's a continuing hand. I put in the chat, Andrew, really I don't like this at all. I think we need to ask a very firm question. The fact that our councilors learned about it after the fact is embarrassing to them and to us. I think we need to ask why is this happening and I'm not objecting to the council having a face-to-face meeting but the face-to-face meeting needs to be about policy issues, not about the strategic direction of ICANN. That belongs to the community, the constituencies, and to the SG. The policy council is about policy for the GTLD. And I think we need to raise that question and I really respect the fact that the intersessional will include our two councilors.



But I think this is really out of scope to have a three-day GNSO policy council meeting that has not come up from the bottom. Instead, it's been imposed I don't know by who and I'd like to know by who and to ask questions about it.

Andrew Mack: Marilyn, that's a fair point. Phil, can you help us get a little bit more visibility and perhaps circulate something on the list so we could get a comment going?

Phil Corwin: Yes, sure, Andrew. At the time that I received notice of the meeting last week, I forwarded that notice to the Ex-Com with a note that it created a conflict for me because of the Names Con scheduling. I'll dig up -- I can find that communication from Council and share it with the full BC membership.

Andrew Mack: Great. I think that Marilyn's point about the process has some real merit and let's get the facts and then we'll move forward from that -- on that basis. I am also mindful of the time and we've got two more minutes left in our hour. If anyone has any new issues they'd like to bring up real quickly, by all means. I'm not seeing any. I see Marilyn is typing in the chat. Okay, it looks like there's no more typing. So on that basis, going once, going twice, great. Thank you all very, very much for a very successful call and look forward to our next meeting, which is going to be on Thursday, the 14th of September. Thank you all.

Chantelle, I think we're done.

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

END