

ICANN

Moderator:Chantelle Doerksen
March 1, 2018
10:00 am CT

Coordinator: The recording has started.

Chantelle Doerksen: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening, this is the BC Members call on Thursday, March 1, 2018. In the interest of time, there will be no roll call as we have quite a few participants and attendance will be taken by the Adobe Connect room. On the phone bridge, we have Markus Eke and Lawrence Olawale-Roberts. If there is anyone else who has just joined via the phone bridge and not the Adobe Connect room, please let your name be known now. Thank you. Hearing no other names, I'd like to remind everyone to please state your name for the transcript and with that, I will turn it over to Claudia to start the call. Claudia, please begin.

Claudia Selli: Thank you very much. Claudia Selli for the record. Thank you very much everyone for joining the call. You might receive in few minutes the RRSAC review, that the assessment report was published this week. There are seeking for comments and feedback by the 23rd of March, so I just circulated through the BC, but I guess we might talk it in - about it - in a few minutes. You have in front of you all the agenda, so in the interest of time and since we have a quite long agenda, I would leave the floor to Steve.

Steve DelBianco Thank you Claudia. You folks have all received a policy calendar, which we circulated yesterday and I would ask Chantelle, welcome back Chantelle, by the way, and you can all have the policy calendar in front of you. There's only one item on Channel 1 I wanted to call your attention to. There were no public comment submissions since our last call, because as you know, ICANN slows down the public comment process leading into each of its meetings, knowing that people are preparing for a meeting and travel.

What we did file, on February 27, is a joint letter, with the Intellectual Property Constituency, or the IPC and it was a letter to ICANN where we articulated some concerns with the verbally described proposed interim model for GDPR compliance in WHOIS. I just sent a note to all of you, moments ago, that ICANN published that proposed interim model last night, and what they published what I had described in the document and what we had anticipated and that means we are extremely disappointed.

The proposed interim model does not display the registrar's email and would apply to both natural and legal persons and registrars and registries could apply at anywhere in the world, not just to Europeans. The bulk access is available only on the public available WHOIS, not to the non-public, and there's really no description of a way for private actors, for cybersecurity or consumer protection purposes, to get into that certification list.

So I would suggest that ICANN has largely ignored the concerns of WHOIS users in coming up with what's in the public WHOIS and how broadly it's applied. So our work will be cut out for us because as Göran said in his blog, this is published in order to solicit reaction and more importantly, I think, to put it in front of Article 29 and DPAs to see whether they would approve it.

I wanted to let you know that we've worked very hard on this. Late in January, and again last week, the BC and the IPC held webinars with ICANN executives and staff in attendance where we respectfully but persistently harped on the need to have a registrant email in the publicly displayed WHOIS, limited scope and the application to natural persons but not to legal persons and I think I have to say that we've lost on all counts.

But ain't over. It ain't over 'til it's over, and we have time to muster a concerted response and we'll also be able to focus the BC's efforts when we get to San Juan, since the BC and the GAC are co-hosting a session on that. I'll get to that later in the policy calendar when we discuss what's going to be happening in San Juan.

I did want to do a special shout-out to Denise Michel and Margie Milam who have been really helpful as members of the BC working with the items, working with folks in the IPC. Claudia was also a speaker at the webinar we held last week, as was Tim Chen, from DomainTools. It was just a superb presenter of the need for WHOIS access, particularly a reverse lookup, to be able to mitigate cybersecurity threats. Susan Kawaguchi and Marie Pattullo have also been really helpful on those efforts.

All right, so that's it for Channel 1 publications since our last - I wanted to let you know about three open public comment periods. The first is the ICANN FY19 Operating Plan and Budget. That comment period closes on the 8th of March, so early next week. I wanted to thank Jimson for drafting a BC comment, it's only a page or so long. It's the first attachment to the policy calendar that I circulated yesterday. We do need comments back from BC members and in particular, the Finance Committee, before March the 8th. I'll stop here and see whether Jimson would like to say anything more about that draft comment and whether BC members have any questions. Jimson?

Jimson Olufuye: Yes, thank you, Steve. Well, basically, in FY19, ICANN began at cutting the budget with some of the key activities that (fund) needs, like CROP. So we trying to push back. CROP has been quite beneficial to the BC in growing our membership and recruiting new players. And also the staff fund, so we also emphasizing our earlier recommendation that staff fund - that needs to be adjusted through the appointing mechanism we have right now, maybe through the option proceed and the availability of funds that we have, so we just emphasize that, among many others. But I believe the CROP community will come up with more inputs as they go on but they - what they did this year, FY18, I was thinking about, 134, that isn't due. It was 140 that was put in in for but actually it's come into 134 and for FY19, they're proposing 150 each. So 150 is what is proposed and 150 flat on there also. Thank you, Steve.

Steve DelBianco Thank you, Jimson. Was there a continued budgeting for the couple of hundred thousand dollars for deployment of the open data initiative? Is that still alive? Jimson? Jimson? Is the ODI still alive?

Jimson Olufuye: Well, yes - concerning - as I said, the ODI - that's one of the key things that I would like to get when we meet with the - there at the San Juan. San Juan. Just like a number of cutbacks that is - a number of cutbacks for the ODI, I'm not sure. I've not seen it on printed (unintelligible). I've not seen it.

Steve DelBianco It is a very tiny number, it was only about \$200,000 and therefore it might not be available in the limited detail that's there. Jimson, I would ask a favor is if you could fire off an email to ICANN Financial to see whether - or even David Conrad to see if he will let us know that ODI is funded at the promised level in this budget, since it's not available in the actual publication. I'd appreciate knowing that. Any other questions? I see three hands up right now,

and these are questions only on the BC comment regarding the budget. We'll first go to Marilyn Cade. Can't hear you, Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: Thanks, Marilyn speaking. I'm hoping you can now.

Steve DelBianco We do, thank you.

Marilyn Cade: I just, yes, I just wanted to follow up that I have done comments, I thought I had sent them out but it turns out I had not. Thank you, Jimson, for alerting me to that. They're (unintelligible), I'll go through them with the Finance Committee and make some significant cuts, but I did earlier send a kind of a heads up to the Executive Committee about the work of the Standing Committee of the Council on Budget. And that is yet to be approved, of course, by the councilors, but that document is almost final and I put a small summary of some of the discussions in the email I sent.

I'm happy to take questions if anyone has them by email or follow-up in any way. The councilors - the Council is expected to send whatever the final document is without objection, so they won't be voting on it. They'll be cutting out any areas that they don't fully support. CROP is one of the topics that is still being discussed on whether it will be left in. All of the community support references might be removed and left up to the constituencies to address.

Steve DelBianco Marilyn, it's Steve. Thank you for that. I did read with interest your report on that, but we're really doing this backwards, through no fault of yours or anyone else, but the constituencies - if we had concerns about the budget, I would love to see Council amplify those concerns when Council puts its message in but given the timing, we're still several days away from approving the BC's own position on the budget, so even our councilors don't yet know

what to push for. And those of you on that Standing Committee don't know what the BC's concerns are, so I would say at a high level, you already hailed one of them, which is CROP but I would ask you to help us ensure that that we see the reserves funded and that we see that we maintain funding for open data initiative. Are there anything else that folks want to speak to? Go ahead, Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: Yes. Sorry, Steve, just real quickly, there is a paragraph that I'm confident will stay in the letter which addresses the fact that there may not be sufficient budget allocation for certain follow-on work or even policy development work, not with a figure put to it, but highlighting that as a significant concern and I share your point about the doing it backwards, but the terms of reference for the Standing Committee are really focused on the policy coordination and management role.

Steve DelBianco Thank you. Denise Michel.

Denise Michel: Hi. My line doesn't seem to be very good. Can you hear me okay?

Steve DelBianco We do, thank you.

Denise Michel: Great. I just wanted to note and I'll be sending some additional text for Jimson's consideration for inclusion. I think given that this is the Business Constituency, bringing some basic business budgeting and staffing practices and expenditure practices to the ICANN budget is in order. I'm particularly concerned that this budget has unrealistically optimistic revenue projections, given past shortfalls and declining revenues coming in from new gTLDs. I'm also concerned about the level of reserve funds and then finally there is exponentially increasing staff cost there. While cutting several projects and travel funds and other things at ICANN, they are substantially increasing staff

costs and so I think it would be very useful for the BC to provide some overarching comments and recommendations in that area so I just wanted to flag and note I'll be sending language right now to Jimson for consideration in the next draft of our comments. Thanks.

Steve DelBianco Thank you, Denise. Two things. Anybody submitting edits to Jimson's draft should send them to the entire BC-private, because at this point, we are just seven days away from the close of the period. All right, Jimson is the primary drafter, and will be in charge of incorporating it, but all BC members should see any comments that one submits. And the second thing, Denise, is regarding good audit and accounting practices, I wanted you to note in a Adobe Chat, I pasted the paragraph that Jimson has in there regarding a sustainability audit and draft report. Next is Chris Wilson.

Chris Wilson: Thanks, Steve. I raised my hand because I really want to just flag for potential consideration by the BC one additional item in the budget that I think we might want to just make a one sentence comment on and that is the zeroing out of ICANN support for the ICANNWiki and I know that this does not raise to the level of the same seriousness as open data initiative or other things the BC cares about, so I'm not going to pretend that it does, but I do think it's something that we should perhaps just raise a minor concern with in light of the importance, I think, of the Wiki, Amazon supports it, and how it's important, I think, too, for onboarding purposes for new members, et cetera and sort of consistent with our general philosophy of outreach and trying to get folks engaged with ICANN.

So you know, I don't know, if it again raises to the level of having our councilors push hard for it, but I do think it's good to be on the record as saying we're not pleased with the zeroing out. I think it's a \$100,000 line item and at least something general to the extent that we shouldn't be zeroing it out.

I'm happy to send a sentence around for everybody to look at, but I did want to just flag that for folks. If there is concern with us doing that, it would be good to know now, before I send something around, but wanted to make sure people are aware of it. Thanks.

Steve DelBianco Thank you, Chris. I'll signal my agreement and this would be a good time for anyone else to sound positive or negative with respect to ICANNWiki. I know it is the chat that their table at the ICANN meetings is one of the more popular spots because they give out that newcomer oriented brochure but it's also popular with ICANN professionals, ICANN regulars. All right. Nobody else in the queue on that? Thank you very much. Appreciate that.

The second open public comment period is the plan to restart the root Key Signing Key, or KSK rollover process. I told you about this on our last call, is that last September, there was a pause in the KSK rollover and now they have a new plan, open for public comment, it's only a couple of pages long, and I want to thank volunteers Denise Michel, Susan Kawaguchi and Stephanie, I think you were going to pursue some technical assistance and advice from your colleagues on the SSAC and that comment period, I mean, we have time, it's not until the second of April - it's a month away - but it would be good to think about that so that if we had a draft, we could discuss it while we're all together in San Juan. Again, thanks, Stephanie for making that outreach. I see people typing in the chat, I'll give you a second.

All right, the third is a draft procedure for these community gTLDs, those who obtained their status as a new gTLD as a community designation, and if you recall, a community designation meant that a community gTLD didn't have to compete with other strings that had been proposed by non-community actors and those communities are both in the new gTLD program as well as we had some leftovers from the sponsored TLD days. And if you recall, back in

October of 2017, we've commented on .museum, one of the legacy sponsored TLDs, their request to change their community designation and we suggested some concerns in a comment that Phil Corwin and I worked on.

Now, the draft procedure that ICANN has put out for public comment is only five pages long, and we should try to recruit some volunteers on this call to help with that. In particular, I would look for volunteers that are familiar with the process of community designation or whose day jobs put you in touch with the kind of organizations that want to be designated as community, to receive some preferential treatment in the next round. We also want to be careful that a community who takes advantage of the community designation doesn't simply change its spots the minute it wins the gTLD and shed all the registrant protections - registrant restrictions that were part of the way they sold it to the community to begin with. So I'm going to look for volunteers who will tackle this one. Again, it's only a five page process, it's one where the BC has a lot of experience and I put a link to the previous BC comment.

There are still hands up for Marilyn and Denise so are those hands to volunteer on this? Anyone else in the BC that has...

Marilyn Cade: Steve, it's Marilyn.

Steve DelBianco ...go ahead, Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: Sorry. I will volunteer to work with others. I have some background in working with communities and NGOs, but it's somewhat old. So I think there needs to be others that are more current than I am, that might take the driving pin.

Steve DelBianco Got it. I agree. Anyone else? All right, I'll come back to folks when we're together in San Juan to press for that. And that's all for the open public comment periods, and I did want to remind everyone that with respect to the GDPR and WHOIS, I have attached a link to a single page, I've done it in a Google doc, and it's a page that I continually update with elements that are relevant to the BC in the area of GDPR and WHOIS. So I don't paste the entirety of that document - it's now up to nine pages. I don't paste the entirety of that into the policy calendar, to make it a little easier for you to manage it, but I'm trying to update that document in real time. I'll do so today, with regard to the proposed model that was published, but it matches nearly exactly with what ICANN had told us they were going to publish last Wednesday.

I wanted to turn things over in Channel 2 to the GNSO Council and we have Marie Pattullo and Susan on the phone. Marie and Susan, over to you.

Marie Pattullo: Thanks, Steve. This is Marie. Susan will jump in if I forget something. As you know, we had the Council meeting last week. The most important things to report back to you guys is on the WHOIS procedure IAG, there was agreement from everybody to postpone the call for volunteers until June. Obviously that's because most people who have expertise in WHOIS are kind of tied up on GDPR right now and also we don't know what's going to happen, we don't know what's going to come in in May, so it made a lot more sense to postpone that happening until June.

Further to that, we - as you know - had a discussion when we were together in Los Angeles about the management of PDPs, about the timelines, about how things can get off the rails through no fault with PDP leadership and so at the forthcoming meeting in San Juan, rather than having the PDP leadership report on where they are, they've been invited by the GNSO leadership to come to the Council meeting to talk with us and us to talk with them as to how

we can assist them in the management of the PDPs, so not in the substance, on the timelines, as I say, on what to do if and when things get out of hand.

And the only other thing I would think to raise with you is that they, within Council, are discussing the post-implementation review framework. Now on the one hand, this could be a very dry, academic thing that doesn't really concern us, on the other, there were certain comments made during the Council that made Susan and I aware that we need to keep an eye on this to make sure it doesn't become a vehicle for anyone who's got a gripe just to demand yet another review of something, claiming it's not working without it being anything at all, without anything substantive.

Now that's pretty much all I have to report, but I think we still have Susan for the next two or three minutes. If you have anything to add, Susan, please do.

Susan Kawaguchi:Just real quick, thank you, Marie, that was perfect. You know, we did the - Standing Selection Committee nominated Raoul for the SSR2 and I can't remember if we talked about this the last BC meeting but we also made the recommendation and the motion that Scott McCormick was already vetted and approved by the Committee and should be - if need be - is ready and willing to serve on the SSR2, also.

Steve DelBianco Thank you, Susan and Marie. Any update on Council's progress at trying to convince the other AC and SO leaders to restart the Security Stability and Resiliency Review?

Susan Kawaguchi:That still seems to be stalled. One of the - the replacement of the GNSO candidate, James Gannon's seat was one of the stalling factors, we found out in January, which I didn't quite understand that. They felt like they needed that seat replaced before they could suggest other candidates from their own

communities which didn't really make much sense to me, but - so they were all relieved that when Heather delivered that news and then I know some sort of communication came out but it didn't seem to really make things move forward much.

Steve DelBianco Susan, it's Steve, our follow-up question. GNSO has sort of taken the lead in this, but we're only one of the many ACs and SOs, is there a particular AC and SO that's holding things up that we can gently nudge as we get into San Juan?

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes. I think if we could influence Alan Greenberg of ALAC. There seems to be - she seems to participate a lot, let's put it that way, in wanting to review the SSR2 team and then obviously, SSAC. But Rod Rasmussen, you know, the change of hands, you know, leading SSAC to Rod, I think, is a good thing for this situation, so if we could have more discussion with Rod, I think that would help.

Steve DelBianco Any other questions for Susan and for Marie? All right, thanks very much, and we'll proceed to Channel 3 and for this, Barb, I wanted to turn it over to you to start it off with respect to the upcoming work at ICANN - at the ICANN San Juan.

Barbara Wanner: Thanks very much, Steve. I'll try, I won't go through the blow by blow of the schedule since you now have it, Steve very kindly included as an attachment. I'd really just like to focus your time today on where the BC's input can help make the CSG meetings more useful or worthwhile to everyone.

So according to the agenda, again, that Steve attached - the proposed agenda for CSG meetings - it basically follows the format and the procedures that we

had for the Abu Dhabi meeting. Unfortunately our first meeting with Becky and Matthew is on Saturday at - it's scheduled at 8:30 am, however, we're trying to get that moved up to 8:00 am. The reason for that is, and there was a lot of discontent expressed in Abu Dhabi about this is that the Board has a workshop that begins at 9:00 so we would only be limited to 30 minutes. So the thinking is that because there will not be sufficient audio visual capabilities at eight o'clock in the morning that we would have a "informal" conversation with them - informal engagement from 8:00 to 8:30 and then focus the 8:30 to 9:00 period for priority items so that those who are participating remotely can have access to that conversation.

In terms of some of the topics we talked about raising with Becky and Matthew, again, SSR2 was mentioned and I defer to Steve and Denise and Susan and Marie, how they want to handle it, in light of the report that Susan just gave. The BC was asked to sort of do the lead questioning on that. In terms of the GNSO review, Tony Holmes, the ISPCP will lead that and then GDPR, Vicky of the IPC but I would encourage not to be shy on that either.

So I would appreciate some input as to whether we want to - how - the extent to which we want to explore the SSR2 problems, not only with our board members but with the ICANN Board and Göran in our other meetings. You're happy to - you're welcome to provide that feedback to me via email if that's easier.

Our closed...

Steve DelBianco Barbara, on that point...

Barbara Wanner: Yes?

Steve DelBianco ...before we move on, Barb, would you take a quick intervention? I think that the Board already messed up by hitting the pause button on SSR2 but at this point, it has nothing to do with the Board, right? It's entirely in the hands of...

Barbara Wanner: Right.

Steve DelBianco ...community leadership. We got the board to back off. So unless there's is a compelling reason I think the last thing we want to do is to discuss restarting SSR2 with ICANN. It's nothing to do with the management or the board.

Barbara Wanner: Okay great. That was my thinking as well but I wanted to, you know, get your feedback from the BC on this. So then Steve I would encourage you to collaborate with Vicky that in terms of how we want to discuss our concerns with GDPR Whois with Becky and Matthew.

Steve DelBianco Great, great.

Barbara Wanner: This also moves into our closed meeting with the - our CSG closed meeting which will be on March 11 from 5:00 to 6:30. That will be largely focused on preparing for our meeting with the board and will follow what we did last time what we did in Abu Dhabi which would be to devote 45 minutes to a common presentation on GDPR Whois concerns. And here -- and Steve I will keep you apprised of this -- there was talk about having a call among the three constituencies ahead of time because the IPC has concerns with the ECHO model which the ISPCP supports in the ISPCP is is not all entirely aligned with what the IPC and the BC favor for GDPR Whois. So that I think...

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco Barbara, ICANN published the proposed model. Maybe you weren't on the call. They publish it last night. And the proposed interim model is now the topic of discussion. There isn't any longer a relevant discussion of echo model or other model.

Barbara Wanner: Okay.

Steve DelBianco We now have ICANN's proposal. And that's what we need to react to.

Barbara Wanner: Okay very good. Then I will – I still think it would be useful for the three constituencies to have a quick call before Puerto Rico to get our messages aligned on how we present to the board. Then the Business Constituency will have 15 minutes for our own priority topic to raise with the board. On that note I welcome BC comments on what we should focus on.

Okay, all right in terms of our open meeting we have requested 30 minutes with Goran and then surprise, surprise GDPR also was - likely will be the topic that we'll focus on. But then this is something that the ISPCP wants to pursue process dependencies regarding the RPM and RDS PDP. I don't quite understand what they're getting at other than to say that they have concerns about where ICANN is headed with these PDPs would they be wrapped up before there would be a new rollout -- something to that effect?

But in any event we will also – we have also requested 30 minutes for the whiteboarding session with Theresa Swinehart and her MSSIT team for the strategic discussion. That would leave another 30 minutes for the CSG open meeting again would solicit BC feedback on how you want to focus that final 30 minutes.

I think it would be useful to have the finance team make a presentation in light of some of the issues that Jimson raised with respect to our comments on the budget. The NomCom has also put in a request to meet with the CSG and the BC. So I would welcome your comments on where you feel we should focus that final 30 minutes of the CSG open meeting. In terms of our...

Steve DelBianco Let's take a-- do you want a queue on that now? Does anyone want to give Barbara...

Barbara Wanner: Please.

Steve DelBianco ...some feedback now?

Barbara Wanner: Yes.

Steve DelBianco Any ideas for Barbara on the focus with respect to that?

Barbara Wanner: For the BC's 15 minute alone with the board?

Steve DelBianco Keep in mind it was yesterday or the last three days it was a couple of board members at the Internet Jurisdiction Conference and the board member for GNSO, Becky Burr is definitely I think the most educated board member with respect to GDPR and Whois. And so anytime we have with Becky Burr let's use that to probe deeply into the motives and process that's ICANN's using as well as understanding how we might influence adjustments that'll be made in the proposed interim model before it becomes the official interim model.

Barbara Wanner: Okay.

Steve DelBianco Now that...

Barbara Wanner: Okay.

Steve DelBianco ...may be more appropriate for the private time that we have with Matthew Shears and Becky Burr. Is that still set up for Sunday Barbara?

Barbara Wanner: No. As I said that is we kick things off with them on...

Steve DelBianco Okay.

Barbara Wanner: ...on Saturday the 10th.

Steve DelBianco Saturday then.

Barbara Wanner: Yes 8:00 to 9:00 very early in the morning.

Steve DelBianco Well then I would have to say that the GDPR discussion should be saved for Becky on Saturday and she - we'll get the most information back and then we don't have to necessarily do it in front of the full board. Any other ideas for BC members to help Barbara in the planning work that she does as our CSG liaison? Okay Barbara continue with your agenda.

Barbara Wanner: Okay then we move to our board meeting. We'll also I should note too in terms of the schedule well have a very early BC closed meeting on Constituency Day which is Tuesday. So we can also refine some of these approaches as well in terms of how we want to focus that board time. But in terms of our actual meeting with the board we've already talked about the 45 minutes devoted to GDPR and then we'll decide how we want to focus at 15 minutes.

I had proposed in our discussions at the intersessional with the ExCom I have proposed that we sort of ask a question that hopefully would engender more positive engagement with the board. And that is to simply ask of them what we can provide them in terms of information, interaction and so forth that would be useful and informative on the occasions that we have to engage with them at intersessional meetings, at ICANN meetings, et cetera.

And then a second question we might also focus on would again be the budget constraints. But let's see, I thought I saw some people typing in the chat but maybe not. So something for us to may be firm up when we have our closed meeting on Tuesday morning.

And then finally we'll meet with the Contracted Party House on the 14th of March and again I imagine GDPR Whois will also be the central point of discussion. Wolf-Ulrich probably will lead a discussion about the procedures for selecting board Seats Number 13 and Number 14.

Now so that's it pretty much for our CSG meetings. I just also wanted to add with the group that (Michael Carr and Nicholas) who I worked with on a transparency subgroup is planning a cross community session that will look at transparency in ICANN data and information. He reached out to the BC and wanted to know if anybody was interested in being a participant on that workshop. The basic format would be an introduction to open data to uses and benefits but I think he really wants the perspective of a business user. So if you would be interested in participating on that cross community session please let me know and I'm happy to put you in touch with Michael.

I also got a request actually from Donna Austin who is planning the - a cross community session on walking in the shoes of a data registry or I don't know what she calls it. But in any event she also is looking for participant from the

Commercial Stakeholders Group. Farzaneh will participate on behalf of the NCSG.

A Walk in the Shoes of a gTLD Registry Operator, that's the name of the session. And she mentions that a number of registry operators have volunteered to participate, .bank .berlin, .neustar, .pharmacy. She said there are two ways to participate, either actually be on the panel or to be prepared at the mic to ask questions from the floor. So I just thought I would mention that and encourage you to let me know if you have any interest and I can put you in contact with Donna.

And then finally just to remind everybody that there is a Webinar, sort of a pre-ICANN 61 Webinar in Washington DC. It's this afternoon at 2:00 pm. So there you have it. I can provide you with the link if you don't have it. And I think that wraps up my report Steve.

Steve DelBianco Margie Milam your hand is up.

Margie Milam: Yes hi. Can you hear me? Okay.

Steve DelBianco We do.

Margie Milam: Okay. Regarding the discussions with the board separate from GDPR I think it would be important to highlight what's going on with Port 43 and some of the throttling, severe throttling and in the – under the name of fighting spam because I just want to bring the whole BC to this issue. If we solve the GDPR issue however it gets done with the new model that doesn't necessarily mean that the information would still be acceptable if registries and registrars can use spam as a reason not to provide that information. And that's happened

already and I think it's an issue that we shouldn't let slide. So that would be my suggestion on something to address beyond the GDPR issue.

Steve DelBianco Thanks Margie. If you could come up with a sentence or two to document that and send it to BC private then we'd all be more familiar with the vocabulary so that we could translate Port 43 access to its practical application which is I guess bulk access for purposes of a lot of different uses but also what do you mean by throttling and do we have any specific instances we could site where registrars or Thick registries are "throttling access." And so can you provide us a quick email on that over the next couple of days?

Margie Milam: Yes I can.

Steve DelBianco That would be perfect. And Tim Chen if you've got access to particular examples of the kind of things that you described in the Webinar that we did last week that would be particularly helpful since we in the BC want to do everything we can to differentiate the consumer protection and cyber security threat mitigation that BC members do and let that be distinct from the more brand protection rhetoric that comes from the IPC. They're both users and legitimate users of Whois but the BC has the unique perspective. Any other questions for Barbara?

While we have Channel 3 on the screen in front of you I would ask each of you to turn to Page 3 of the policy calendar. And I've listed a proposed outline for the cross-community session on GDPR and Whois that will occur the Monday afternoon we're in San Juan. This is a session that was co-proposed, that is to say both of BC and the GAC proposed it. So we're going to be working it together on Monday, March the 12. And I'm sorry it isn't in the morning at 10:30 in the morning. So we'll have an hour and a half.

So on the screen in front of you see the proposed outline that (Manal) and I worked out. We were together at the Internet Jurisdiction Conference the last couple of days. So it starts off with letting hopefully somebody from ICANN walk us through the description of the proposed draft interim model. But I'll have strides done to capture what it is and then a gap analysis. And I have several parties who would present their perceived gaps. A European DPA will invite but God knows if anyone will speak up and attend. I know that registries and registrars, one of each presumably from Europe would speak. Law enforcement authorities, (Catherine Bauerbolst) or some other group and then business users of Whois. And that's where for instance Tim Chen your name came up as an ideal panelist for that. Tim will you – can I confirm you will be in San Juan on Monday? Excellent thank you.

We also have noncommercial. We have to include them as well as hopefully we get an At-Large user as well. So I'm waiting for some feedback from the GAC on this proposed outline.

The third element and final element of that session would be something I've done on a couple of other Webinars which is a quick reminder to everybody that interim means interim. Interim means it is temporary and there are three things the community can do just to wipe out and replace the interim model. And that is to resume and complete our work on the RDS PDP which automatically becomes mandatory for all contract parties to follow. It isn't as if they could ignore consensus policy.

The other is enhancements to the privacy proxy services, implementation that's - report that we're expecting next week. And then finally a new procedure for Whois conflicts with privacy law we're trying to adjust what the trigger is. That's the procedure that Marie talked about earlier. Any suggestions for the organization of that session or panelists? I'd love to hear

from you. If you don't have them now send to - reply to me via email so I can help to coordinate that session. Claudia back to you for the rest of the agenda.

Claudia Selli: Thank you Steve. Do we have the agenda? Chantelle can we put on the agenda please? Okay sorry so yes for the BC meeting in San Juan Chantelle is helping on these and we have sent out request for meetings as we consulted with the BC. So we're going to have for now a 30 minute the MSSSI strategic session with Nathalie Vergnolle and Theresa Swinehart on the BC open meeting, always on the BC open meeting in the afternoon from 4:25 more or less 40. We're going to have Xavier and the team joining. We're waiting for the confirmation but it should be okay.

And then we have David Conrad overseeing the afternoon from 5:00 to 5:20 still to be confirmed. And then we sent out a request for the meeting with Goran and John Jeffrey. We're waiting confirmation of the meeting. And also depending on the schedule we have also asked a meeting with other on SSR2. And Akram and Cyrus are moved to the BC private meeting because otherwise it was conflicted with the meeting with the ICANN board.

And then we are all submitting requests to the co-chairs of the Cross Community Working Group but we don't have a meeting confirmed yet. If I forgot anything please Chantelle or anyone else that has worked on that jump in but this is a rough overview of the BC open meeting. Are there any questions? No so I'll - I would then give the floor to Jimson for his update on the finance report.

Jimson Olufuye: Okay thank you very much Claudia. Let me begin by really thinking Steve and team for the last Webinar -- well-coordinated. Thank you. But the BC operation remains healthy with all members fully paid up. And talking about membership a lot of people informed of that membership has grown from 64

at FY '17 to 70 members and two new applications are under processing. I would like to thank the Andrew Mack led Credential Committee for job well done in an expeditious manner printing all new applications promptly. Thank you.

The new – the two new members that joined Mols of India and cPanel of USA. They've been added to our database. Perhaps by the time we'll having our next meeting they will be able to join us. The prep for the FY '19 invoicing round has started. We started the preparation and members can expect to receive their invoices at the end of April to preferably by May 4.

With regards to operation and with respect to the request for proposal we sent to the list earlier (speaking) of a (back up) opportunity of our Web site operation. We receive only one response and the ExCom is validating the feasibility of the proposal. Also the BC outreach plan for ICANN61 I believe is still on course though since Andrew Mack is on the call he'll give us an update is supposed to happen on Sunday March 11.

And from all indication Chris Mondini the Vice President Global Business Engagement is on the right for the event. So if Andrew is still on the call perhaps he can give us more information about the outreach in San Juan)though I know that there is some challenges. Andrew are you...

Andrew Mack: Yes Jimson I'm here and thank you very much. I briefly and I won't bore everybody with all of the details but many, many more challenges than we had expected. We had a lot of the things that could have been challenges have been including the fact that a number of the people that we are trying to work with have had problems with electricity and with cell phones and a lot of stuff. There's a - we were expecting a formal approval of this event last night when the – when Pablo Rodriguez who is one of the people that runs .PR and has

been our partner on this was to go to the Chamber of Commerce with the head of the Chamber of Commerce and members of his committee and meet and formally approve this.

What they found was that the Chamber of Commerce building is actually in such bad shape that they couldn't hold the event there. And in any case they're having tremendous – this is going to be the chamber's first big event since the hurricane and they're all excited about it and they are having real challenges getting their people to anything and making touch with their people. The business climate is such right now that businesses are very focused on survival.

I spoke with Pablo) at some length this morning and then with Chris Mondini. And basically what they said is, is that there is real interest on behalf of the leadership of the chamber but getting a big group of people like we would normally want to do is going to be very, very difficult if not impossible especially at this late date and especially with the problem, the physical problems both of getting to, getting a bunch of people in the room and the room that they might have available at this point in time.

So what they recommended was that we change the – Chris said that almost every one of the constituencies is having exactly the same problem with their crop outreach that almost all of them have been in the process of remaking their outreach plans for this meeting. And he recommended that since there's real interest on behalf of the chamber that we try to be flexible and use the opportunity to meet with the chamber's leadership in a series of one on ones, twos on twos and things like that which would be much easier to get together with the idea of building this relationship for the medium term. Everybody agrees that the San Juan chamber and the Puerto Rican, you know, Puerto Rican community is one that is good for us and a good fit for us. There's a lot

of overlap between key members of these – of the Chamber of Commerce and a lot of the key members of the BC including a lot of US-based companies that have a very big footprint in Puerto Rico and a disproportionately large footprint.

So this is what both Pablo and Chris have suggested. I think it's a good plan. I've sent out a – some revised ideas both to the Outreach Committee and to ExCom for their consideration. But that frankly the way things are right now in Puerto Rico.

I might also say that in the realm of everything they could have possibly been a challenge we also had - poor Pablo had a health scare which pushed us back a little bit. I'm giving you literally the information in real-time because I just heard a lot of this this morning. We've been pushing them as hard as we possibly can to get more information but in the light of all of the different things that are going on including the challenges that they're facing with power outages and such, you know, I – it's just - it's been difficult for us to push them any faster than we have. And so on my personal behalf on behalf of the Outreach Committee we apologize for not having more to you and more, you know, more finalized earlier. That was just the best that could be done under the circumstances. I'm happy to answer any questions.

Jimson Olufuye: Andrew? Is there a possibility that we can invite - we could send a letter to the San Juan chamber to invite them to an open meeting on March 15?

Andrew Mack: We could absolutely do this. The thought - it's a great idea. There are two places where there will be some members of the BC who will be in San Juan early. And one of the things that we're working on right now is to try to get a meeting between any of our people who are available Saturday, Sunday and the chamber leaders. There is also a – we've also spoken - Chris and I have

spoken about the possibility of getting members of the leadership of the chamber to, you know, to meet with us following the opening ceremonies because there's a high likelihood that there will be a member of their leaders there for the opening ceremonies. And that would be a good way and we will organize that.

Chris has also committed to getting us the contact information for anybody who is - anybody from the local community that is going to be attending as a business representative so we can reach out to them directly. And they – everyone believes that there's going to be plenty of opportunities for us to get to people on the fly. It's just the idea of having a big sit down with 20 or 25 people in the room which is what we had originally envisioned. It just is going to be logistically very, very difficult for them to do their part on. And so they recommended we don't try to pursue that at this point in time.

Chris has also committed there will be no cost to the BC of anything. We had already gotten his office's agreement to pay for anything that we were going to do on the – the planned Sunday event so anything that we would do like a cocktail if we can throw it together or coffees or other meetings are things that would fall well below that budget. So there will be no cost to the BC if we, you know, if we – assuming that we pursue outreach in San Juan in whatever form we can.

Jimson Olufuye: Okay yes. Thanks very much Andrew Mack. And lastly just to let members know that we plan a recognition section on March 15 for (unintelligible) from our officer and one of our - (formal) officers as well. So just to have that in mind. That's the recognition session. Let me know handover to Claudia. Claudia back to you.

Claudia Selli: Thank you very much Jimson. Anyone else any other point that you want to raise? No it seems that there are no other points so I will thank you very much for participating to the call and we'll see each other all in San Juan. The meeting is adjourned.

END