

ICANN

**Moderator: Chantelle Doerksen
4-26-2018
10:00 am CT**

Operator: The recording has started. You may begin.

Ria Otones: Thank you. Hello everyone, welcome to the BC Members Meeting on April 26 at 15:00 UTC. The recording has started. I'm turning it over to you, Terri - Claudia, sorry.

Claudia Selli: Thank you very much. I hope - there's a bit of an echo. Can you hear me now? Is this better?

Ria Otones: Yes, we can hear you now.

Claudia Selli: Okay, perfect. So thank you very much, everybody, for participating into the call. Before moving into our policy calendar, I just wanted to flag a couple of things. I put out - I sent out a call for the leadership development program. We are eight weeks in - I mean, eight weeks left to the leadership program and basically any request should be sent by six weeks in advance of the program. And up to now I haven't received any interest to the leadership development program, which is when we invite external leaders or CEO of companies to participate to the (unintelligible).

But I have not received any type of interest. We just risk losing this opportunity. And I also - there is also another opportunity for the CROP program, for the Latin America - I mean for the CROP program. Of course, Panama, it will be in Latin America. If anyone is interested, please let Excomm know as soon as possible, because there is a tight timeline. Otherwise (lose as well) this opportunity.

For the call I will leave on the floor to Steve for the usual policy calendar. And just in the order of things we have reversed the order and the CSG (will be covered) probably at the end - towards the end of the call as Barbara will join a bit later today.

Thank you Steve. The floor is yours.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you Claudia. Steve DelBianco here, your Vice Chair for Policy Coordination. I think the policy calendar segment of today's call will be relatively quick.

In the zoom, I have the policy calendar that I circulated yesterday and then sent an update this morning. The three items on the policy calendar are general one, that we have not reviewed since our last call, are on April the 25th, just yesterday, we commented on ICANN's proposal to try to replenish the reserve fund that ICANN has. It's short by \$70 million, if ICANN were to accept a 12 month of expense target.

I want to thank John Berard and Jimson who helped me to draft this initial comment. And then Denise Michel, Chris Wilson, Marilyn Cade all provided some edits. And we submitted it yesterday on time.

We pointed out the BC's general embrace of the idea that auction proceeds could be targeted to help replenish the reserve fund. But we do think that auction proceeds disposition should be left to the group that will define criteria and a process for the disposition of auction proceeds.

And that cross community working group on which Tola and Marilyn are active is only really midway through its progress. So it's premature to pre-allocate money from the auction proceeds before the community process is complete. Thanks again to those who helped with that.

The second is on April the 20th we sent a letter to ICANN Management Board with an intent of addressing the Article 3-9 Working Parties Letter to ICANN. And their letter had suggested that ICANN had some ways to go on its model. They expressed an interest in how do we accredit users for access to non public WHOIS, and that was a great opportunity for us to respond, to give ICANN some guidance.

I want to thank Margie Milam and Mason Cole who led the drafting on that. Paul Mitchell, Zak Muscovitch and I did some edits to really sharpen the concern about it and we put that into ICANN and the good news is that ICANN presented that letter in its meeting with Article 29 Working Party on Monday of this week in Brussels.

The outcome of that meeting is described in a blog from Goran which really didn't indicate any significant or concrete progress as a result of the meeting. But the BC along with the IPC continues to prominently press for the display of email address and public WHOIS and for an accreditation and an access model to the nonpublic WHOIS. That should be available (unintelligible) ICANN implements the interim model.

We also continue to support the idea of getting a forbearance or moratorium on enforcement, during which time the existing WHOIS policy would be maintained and enforced by ICANN.

The third item that we've submitted since our last call was on April the 18th when we commented on the SSAC's draft project plan for their proposed analysis of name collisions for the next round. Thank you Stephanie Duchesneau for putting that together.

Now I'm going to scroll down to the open public comments that we have right now and there are only a few that I need to bring to your attention and solicit some volunteers on. The first is, ICANN is proposing revisions to its bylaws, and these are only in a small regard.

They're revisions to the GNSO's voting thresholds, which are continued in the bylaws. These comments close on the 5th of May. This is a relatively small set of changes that are designed only for one reason, and that is to allow the GNSO to implement its role in the empowered community structure and processes that we created as a result of the transition, the IANA transition and ICANN accountability.

Barbara Wanner assisted and I appreciate that. I'm going to display briefly the current draft comment. I'm trying right now to display that, and unable to display that for some reason, so I'll go back to the policy calendar.

In our comment on this, our intention, what Barbara and I worked up, is a reiterate comments that BC submitted to the GNSO when it was considering how to adopt these new voting thresholds.

Throughout this process, where we were actually the chair of the working group, we said that the council itself shouldn't speak for the GNSO, since the relative constituencies and stakeholder groups in GNSO are perfectly capable coming up with our positions and then letting those determine the majority.

Nonetheless, we were outvoted and council has taken the role of speaking for GNSO, admittedly with the input of the stakeholder groups and constituencies.

So the BC's comment on this will reiterate our objection to letting council take that role. But given that council takes the role, we will support the thresholds -- which we actually suggested -- and we will therefore support the bylaws change.

Are there any comments you wanted to cover now? There's still time to reply by email to the draft that I attached to the policy calendar. Are there any comments that anyone would like to raise now? I see Marilyn Cade, your hand is up. Go ahead, Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: Thanks Steve, Marilyn speaking, and I want to thank you and Barbara. I think this is an extremely important filing to go ahead and make. And I think sometimes whenever we lose a vote in council, you know, we forget that after all, we are constantly building a record.

So I would - I want to congratulate both of you for this work. And I think it's important for us to put it forward and then to think about subsequent uses of this comment as we engage within the CSG itself, and then maybe separately with the ALAC or future discussions about this challenge, because we have (unintelligible) counselors to vote with input from the elected BC - sorry, from the BC members, but certain other of the constituencies have this kind of

free floating idea that the voting is not - is up to the individual. I'll reference the NCSG and NCUC in particular.

But congratulations and maybe we can use this for a CSG discussion if Barbara agrees, and also an NPOC discussion and maybe an ALAC discussion.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks Marilyn. Your intervention reminds me that Barbara and I should send our draft comment over to the IPC, and the ISPs, and encourage them to also file something similar. I think that's a good idea to coordinate within the CSG.

You mentioned the NPOC as well. Do you or others on the BC have a strong relationship with the NPOC Chair?

Marilyn Cade: I have a -- it's Marilyn again -- and I have a very strong relationship with the NPOC Chair. If you'd like me to reach out to her, my relationship is built on other work I'm doing with her, not related to NPOC but related to what else she does. If you'd like me to reach out to her, I'm happy to.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you Marilyn. Would you please forward her the current draft of our comment? It's the first attachment to the policy calendar and see if they're interested in sending something similar. And it would be fantastic to have the non contract party house have multiple comments along these lines, especially now that it's a bylaws revision. It gets the attention of more than just council. Thank you.

Second one up is the draft report on the second review of ICANN's nominated committee, which we call the NomCom. So this is a review conducted by an

outside consultant or expert, hired by the ICANN board as one of its organization reviews.

This has a long time been a part of the bylaws requirement of ICANN that every five years the ICANN board has to cause a review by an independent third party of the purpose of structure and effectiveness of each of the organizations defined in the ICANN bylaws. And one of those is the nominating committee.

So this is the second review and we in the BC are lucky to have three members of the BC on the NomCom today -- Zahid Jamil, Cheryl Miller and Jay Sudowski. I know Jay is on the call today.

None of those three participants can really take a very active role at writing the BC comment on this nominated committee report. Although we value their input, we need a volunteer in the BC to actually draft the comment and draw upon our three and others who are experienced for input.

In San Juan, Lawrence Olawale-Roberts volunteered to draft this comment but I'm unable to get any response from Lawrence, he's not on the call today. So we don't yet have a draft.

We have a little time. It's not due until the 7th of May, so there's two weeks (left on it) and yet we do need to get moving on it.

So are there any other BC members experienced with the nominating committee who would be willing to take over the drafting of a BC comment with the assistance of course of our NomCom members? Anyone?

Marilyn Cade: Steve, it's Marilyn. I need to ask a question, a clarifying question.

Steve DelBianco: Go right ahead.

Marilyn Cade: I guess I'm not actually sure that the present nominating committee members should be engaged in this, as this is a historical review, not really a current review, and they are burdened by significant amounts of work. I'm not objecting to their taking a heavy role. I'm just noting, having been on a nominating committee myself, that this period of time is pretty intense.

Steve DelBianco: Marilyn, that was exactly what I meant to imply, in that they cannot take the pen but can provide some guidance about parts of the review that they think deserves some attention. And they've all three volunteered to help with that, but not going to take up the pen, will not be listed at the (actors).

Marilyn Cade: Would you...

Steve DelBianco: The challenge remains, how do we get somebody to help pick up the pen here?

Marilyn Cade: Sure. So here's my proposal. If Chantelle could send a request to the BC list, asking every BC member who has been on the nominating committee to participate in helping to contribute to this review, I leave for Afghanistan on Saturday, I get back on Sunday, I will look at the work.

I obviously need somebody else to help out, but I will look at the draft. But if we could get...

Steve DelBianco: All right, I'll do that, Marilyn. I'll send a note to the entire BC, asking for those with any experience at all in the NomCom to please review the draft, review and contribute a response in an email to me. Then that email came

together, I can begin to pull a comment together if Lawrence doesn't step up.
Thank you for that idea.

Any other comments from NomCom volunteers? All right, thank you all. I
have one more to bring up.

The Work Stream 2 of the ICANN accountability and IANA transition has
been underway for almost a year and a half. And there are several BC
members who are active in there.

Work Stream 2 being nine separate projects, it could wait until after the
transition to be completed, but they're still very important in defining
ICANN's accountability to the community.

The final report...

Steve DelBianco: Andrew, I'll bet that's one of your wonderful boys making noise in the
background. Could you hit mute please? Andrew Mack?

Andrew Mack: Steve, I'm at the office. That isn't me.

Steve DelBianco: Okay, it sounded like your boys. Somebody's got their kids in the
background.

Andrew Mack: Sorry, they sound a lot the same.

Steve DelBianco: Okay. So this Work Stream 2 is very important and at this point we're not
making substantive changes to the recommendations. It's a huge report, and
the only thing we're being asked to do right now is to assess whether the
recommendations would clash and conflict with each other.

So I'm going to call on Andrew, yourself, Barbara Wanner, Jimson, Ellen Blackler, myself and Denise Michel who are the BC members and were active on some of those nine work streams.

So please review the final report and indicate whether you believe there are conflicts or contradictions that need to be addressed. If there are not, we will have a very brief comment indicating that ICANN should proceed to implement, provided that all the chartering organizations approve the plan.

That's all I have on the current policy calendar for public comment periods. I always include a little segment on here for the GDPR implementation, to finding a model for WHOIS that's compliant with GDPR.

I mentioned earlier some of the excellent BC work on those letters and I want to remind all of you that Version 1.4 of the accreditation model that we're working on with several BC members and IPC members was circulated yesterday and it's attachment number two to the policy calendar. That's Version 1.4

Again, comments are being sought on that draft and they're being sought by next Tuesday, the first of May, at which point Version 1.5 would come out. And there is an archive of the emails to accreditation available.

Denise Michel, Mason Cole, Tim Chen have been really active on this. Zak Muscovitch has contributed some ideas on that as has Paul Mitchell, Susan Kawaguchi -- we've got an excellent team -- Margie Milam who've all been active and need to stay active, continuing to move that.

I know we're running into resistance -- even apathy -- and I would even claim hostility by some who'd rather not have an accreditation model at all on May 25. Nonetheless we need to press on in service of the companies we work for and the members that we serve.

I see a hand up from Marilyn. Go ahead Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: Actually my comment is much later at the end, if you don't mind, to put me in at the very end of your agenda about an update on something that I think is relevant or probably comment. But just put me in at the end.

Steve DelBianco: Well Marilyn, I'm finished and was about to turn things over to Susan Kawaguchi and Marie. So if you want to tell us now, please go ahead.

Marilyn Cade: Thanks, I'll do it very quickly and I'm sorry I wasn't here in time to ask for an AOB. The CCWG on auction proceeds is moving forward relatively aggressively and I promised a couple of times to do a written report; hadn't been able to do that.

I just want to note that there is the idea pending that we - the CCWG auction proceeds would do a straw poll about what the mechanisms are to disperse the funds. One of the relevant issues for the BC is the issue of whether some of those funds could be allocated to topping up the reserve fund, which the BC has supported in a general way.

But there are also issues related to -- let me think about how I'd say this -- the fact that the designated member of the CCWG AP comes from a different constituency with a less than aggressive attendance record and with no outreach and engagement with the rest of the parties.

So if there's going to be a straw poll, I'm going to propose that perhaps Barbara could work with me and we could have a CC, a CSG, discussion about what we prefer so any straw poll would fully represent the input of the BC members on the different mechanisms and the impact on using parts of auction proceeds or topping up the reserve fund.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you Marilyn. Barbara's not yet on the call, so please do follow up with an email to Barbara about that and I appreciate you keeping us surprised on where they are on the auction proceeds group.

I did mention it prominently in the beginning of the call when I cited our comment on the replenishment of the reserve fund, where I indicated in there that the BC defers to the auction proceeds process to define whether and how much of the money goes to replenish the reserve. Thank you.

With that I'd like to turn it over to Susan and Marie for channel two on council. Go ahead Susan and Marie.

Susan Kawaguchi: Thanks Steve. This is Susan Kawaguchi for the record, hope you can hear me. Two main issues that I've been involved with -- pretty intently in the last couple weeks -- the council will be discussing is the 3.7 that was filed in objection to the curative rights working group, and we've sort of worked through a process because there's no process really available. And that will be brought to the council today to discuss, you know, is there a - do we just allow the working group to continue? Or do we sort of set different expectations and step in and help the working group come to consensus?

There's definitely not a clear consensus, but, you know, we've talked a lot to the different working groups - I mean working group members and there's

definitely different opinions of what the next steps with the - that should be taken. So the whole council will review that and weigh in.

The other is the RDS working group PDP. I rejoined as Vice Chair when AlexXavier had to step down. And that will be a council discussion also today. In prep for that, we had an interesting discussion yesterday between the working group leadership and the council leadership.

One of the things that came up -- which, you know, I may just have not been paying attention to -- is with the proposed interim models, whatever that is, whatever ICANN decides, there seems to be an assumption by the board an ICANN org that the temporary policy in RAA will be put into effect.

The contracted parties represented, that's on that call, seemed to be opposed to that, or very unsure of it -- let's put it that way. So I don't know if contracted parties will object to using the temporary policy action. But I thought it was interesting and something that maybe the BC should give some thought to, or maybe everyone has and I just missed it.

Steve DelBianco: Susan, would you take a question on that?

Susan Kawaguchi: Sure.

Steve DelBianco: It's Steve. The temporary policies provision in the registry and registrar agreements are really not a community driven process, right? It's my impression that the board alone, by its own vote, can dictate that a temporary policy is in effect for at least 90 days and the contract parties don't have anything to say about it.

Susan Kawaguchi: That may be true. And I'm not arguing with that. That seemed to me, you know, that's the way I read it. But they were saying that this does not fit the criteria, or may not fit the criteria. And they seem very unsure that that was the way forward.

I don't know what other way forward there would be, but, you know, and that ICANN currently is forcing all contracted parties to the conflicts of law, WHOIS conflicts of law policy.

If they make - announce changes, then ICANN is going to those contracted parties, saying, "You have to go through this process." We all know how that process - it doesn't really work, or at least that's what - or the contracted parties allege.

So there is, you know, it's just - I have not heard this disagreement before, so I thought I'd bring it to your attention.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks again Susan. Please, you and Marie just walk us through the rest of the agenda and then we'll move on.

Susan Kawaguchi: Marie, did you want to add anything? So there is a - okay, she says no. So there is a motion to recognize Stephane Van Gelder, which I think is - it was a very sad occurrence, and I think that's very nice of the GNSO Council to do that.

We'll also review the inner registrar transfer policy and get an update on the privacy proxy services implementation. There is a stalling point right now over fees to be accredited in that program.

So that's about it.

Steve DelBianco: Susan, anything to add on the SSR2 team and restarting that review?

Susan Kawaguchi: As far as I've heard Scott McCormick was added to the team and they're supposed to restart, I had heard, initially May. And then now it may have been pushed to - or maybe they're just all getting together in Panama. It's been pretty quiet.

Steve DelBianco: Okay. All right, thank you. We'll move on now to - Barbara Wanner is not yet on the call and will be able to chime in later. The only thing I'll add with respect to channel three is at the bottom of the screen and the bottom of the policy calendar.

And Marie is letting us all know that SSR2 is not on today's council agenda. That's right, Marie. I was sort of bringing it up to see if you guys had an update on that.

I did want to let you know that Marie this morning just circulated the latest email from ICANN staff indicating which cross community topic sessions have been scheduled for ICANN 62 in Panama.

The BC suggested across community topic on, well, what else, right, GDPR, accreditation and access for nonpublic WHOIS data, and there are two sessions in Panama scheduled on GDPR compliance and accreditation. The BC will try to take an active role at both of them. There are also two sessions on geo names at the top level and then one on the RDS WHOIS 2 Review Team. That's not the PDP that Susan was talking about, but a review team that Susan also serves on, required by the bylaws, it's something we brought over from the Affirmation of Commitments. So are there any questions or

comments on the cross-community topics? Okay, hearing none, thanks everyone. I'll turn it back over to Claudia.

Claudia Selli: Thank you, Steve. I'm - since Barbara is not there yet, I wanted to take the opportunity of talking about our activity in the ICANN62 so we have a schedule that you see open meetings for a session of 75 minutes over lunch. It has to be confirmed but normally it's on Tuesday and the first 15 minutes probably will be used for members to - I mean, have their lunch. Everybody should bring their own lunch and what I wanted to discuss with you is also how we want to handle it, in the sense, do we want to invite a guest speaker? I wouldn't invite too many people because we only have 75 minutes and I think it's very important that we have our policy discussion there, but probably we might want to invite, I don't know, either John Jeffrey or Göran or someone to discuss further GDPR and accreditation model. Maybe we could circulate some ideas so that we can send out the invitation.

The other question I had for the BC member is the (unintelligible) session on strategic initiative (unintelligible) that came to present us during Puerto Rico, so we are probably having one session at CSG level but I wanted to speak with you whether there is an interest where it's at BC level and if so, probably we won't have time to schedule it during our meeting, we will have to do it as an extra activity either probably late in the evening or very early. I don't know, but it's just something that I wanted to discuss with you all.

I see that Marilyn has her hand up. Marilyn go ahead if you have a question or comment.

Marilyn Cade: Yes, Claudia, thanks so much. Marilyn speaking. I hope we can find time to do it even if it's in the evening because I was taught coding back in the days where the phrase was garbage in, garbage out and I say that just - if we don't

get our views in, then you know, we're going to be overwhelmed by views that we might not agree with. I personally think it would be a good use of our time to -- and the CSG is not the same thing, as we all know, as the BC, particularly with some of the changes that have happened with the addition of a number of registries and registrars influencing the ISPCP. I'd love for the BC to have our session. I'll volunteer for an evening session even if we only had 10 to 12 to 15 members or even 10 members, I think we would help to influence the knowledge base, so to speak.

Claudia Selli: Anyone else has a view or a comment on these two points? And thank you, Marilyn, your point is taken on board but I would like to see also, I mean, I would like to have broad participation or at least, I mean, the majority of the members. I hope that we can all participate to that. If there are no other questions and no other points, that was my main question for Point 5 and I would leave that. In that case, I would pass the floor to Jimson. Jimson are you there? Can you hear me?

Steve DelBianco: I do hear you, Claudia.

Claudia Selli: Right. I don't see Jimson. I don't know if he's on the call or not or if not, if Barbara has - Barbara has joined?

Steve DelBianco: Tola's hand is up, by the way. Tola.

Claudia Selli: Okay.

Adetola Sogbesan: Yes, I can note you that Jimson is off - is not - he's not on the call.

Claudia Selli: Okay, thank you, Tola. Has Barbara joined in the meanwhile? No. Okay, I mean, it's - it's very - nobody else on the call. I don't know if people have other points to bring up. Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: Yes, thanks. Marilyn speaking. I did an analysis of the attendees that say - that I self-identified that they're with business for the Fellowship Program. The new - newly announced yet not consulted on Regional Fellowship Program. That was quite a shock to learn that all of a sudden we have a new Regional Fellowship Program and the next gen and I sent an email to the Outreach Committee, I know Andrew has been traveling and hasn't had a chance to respond, but I just want to mention that there are four or five actual real business potential attendees at this point, coming in through the Fellowship Program, the Regional Fellowship Program, and also I'm engaging, hopefully Andrew is going to be joining me with the Rotary Club of Panama and the local ICT association so I just wonder, Claudia, as we plan the agenda, since this is the policy format, but each morning, there's supposed to be an hour reserved for outreach. If the Outreach Committee, under Andrew's leadership can come up with a couple of activities where we could engage as we did in Puerto Rico, kind of uniquely but then separately with those business folks who are actually really potential members coming in through these other programs. Can we just put a program - put an idea forward to - through you - through Andrew to come up with an idea of how we would do that and then it doesn't take all BC members but maybe a few BC members could participate?

Claudia Selli: Yes, I think it would be great to have, of course, an outreach, engagement in Panama, so please put forward the idea. Andrew, your hand is up.

Andrew Mack: Yes. Let me just take - Claudia, can you hear me?

Claudia Selli: Yes.

Andrew Mack: Great. Okay, just wanted to take it off of speaker. Yes, that's - I that's right. Marilyn, I'm not sure which specific email you're referring to but - so please, by all means, re-forward it to me if you wouldn't mind but definitely, if we can get more different kinds of BC outreach events going, I think that that's absolutely the right approach. We talked about, on our last call, the idea of getting submissions from people in the BC, including people who are not on the Outreach Committee of suggestions of different kinds of programs that they would like to do, so we're not doing the same thing at every meeting. I think that that would be excellent. We're still kind of - I'm still hoping that we can get some fresh, new ideas.

We are doing one thing, which we referenced when we were in - we discussed when we were in San Juan, which is Gabi, Mark, and I put together a proposal for looking at a new model of participation, because we're obviously trying to get more sustained participation from people in the global south and we've been looking at that as - at Latin America as a potential test case of that and just sent in some information to the Ex Com to take a look at, based on what we've been quilting together. It flows from the conversations that we had at San Juan and conversations that we've had with Outreach. So I'd be very interested in - one of our hopes is that we will have a chance to interview people from the private sector who are attending the ICANN meeting or who are around the ICANN meeting in Panama.

I'm going to be down in Panama on the 8th, 9th and 10th and so if there are people that we would like to get that conversation set up with, I'll have a little bit of free time on the 10th to go ahead and reach out to some of them. So by all means, if anybody has contacts that they would like - even to begin that conversation. The goal of the research would be to really understand constraints to participation and whether we can, as the BC with some ICANN

support, try to create new models for participation that will be, frankly, easier for people in areas like Latin America so that we're asking of them something that they can actually do and so I definitely think that we want to use the Panama meeting to try to get to as many different kinds of people as possible and Rotary is an excellent place to start.

Claudia Selli: And then thank you, Andrew for the clarification and for the timing as well of your project. Ex Com has well received it. We didn't have the time, to be honest, to discuss it, but we will do it as soon as possible. In terms, it was 8, 9, 10, I suppose, of June, right? You will be in Panama?

Andrew Mack: No, I will be in - I will be actually in Panama 8th, 9th, 10th of May.

Andrew Mack: So if there is any set up that we can do, I'll have some time on the 10th and I was just throwing that out because I know that people are already thinking about Panama and I know that Marilyn has some people. If there's some follow-up that would be useful, I'll already be there and would be happy to try to dig in on that.

Claudia Selli: Okay, thank you.

Andrew Mack: Sure.

Claudia Selli: Any question or other comments?

Steve DelBianco: Claudia, it's Steve DelBianco. I just wanted to note that Andrew's proposal, which we've only seen on the Ex Com, would require that work begin within weeks in order to have deliverables in Panama, so I think the Ex Com would need to consider this in the next day or two, and since it's a budgetary

implication, we do have to circulate it to the entire BC membership for approval.

Andrew Mack: And to be clear, it's coming from Gabi, Mark and myself, not just from me by any means.

Claudia Selli: So since we will circulate it probably in the next days, if anyone on the call has questions for Andrew or the other people, Gabi, but I don't think she's on the call or Mark, please raise your hand now, because it's a good opportunity to discuss it. I don't see - oh, yes.

Marilyn Cade: Yes, thanks. It's Marilyn. I just posted to the list. Andrew, if - and sorry to use the full list but Andrew if you could just very quickly post this to the Outreach Committee because of course all activities about outreach, I think, you know, really deserve the significant endorsement of the full Outreach Committee. I'm sure you're going to get it but if you could post that, I think that would be fantastic. Not to slow anything up but just to get additional input from the full Outreach Committee.

Andrew Mack: Absolutely, Marilyn. You're right, if we're going to take advantage of this window with Panama, we've got to go pretty quick, so but we're obviously looking for the entire BC to support outreach. It's not an outreach proposal per se, if you know what I mean, because we're looking at trying to build a addition to our participation model but absolutely flows with it. I'll send that this afternoon.

Claudia Selli: Thank you, Andrew. Okay, I don't see that Jimson or Barbara have joined. Any other points to bring up now? Tola and Marilyn.

Barbara Wanner: Hi, Claudia. This is Barbara. Can you hear me? I have joined.

Claudia Selli: Yes, I can. I can hear you now. Barbara, you want to go ahead with your update?

Barbara Wanner: Okay, yeah, no, I can be very, very quick. Steve had and at least on the document that I see on the screen has indicated the top selections for cross-community topics. Of the priorities that the BC sent in, I would say two of ours were selected, of course being GDPR compliance and accreditation. We submitted a proposal as did the IPC, so we will try and join - I think we will try and join forces with them again in terms of developing this workshop proposal. The second one that we had also prioritized was an update on the RDS Review. So at least we got half of what we put in as priorities.

We have a CSG-Ex Com call on Monday, so I'll probably have more and better updated information for the group in our next call. I guess my only question at this point is I looked at - when Marie sent around to the Ex Com the GNSO's schedule - at this point it looked like we had a BC open meeting scheduled over a lunch hour and a CSG open meeting also scheduled over a lunch hour on one of the days. I can't remember which ones in particular. So I just wanted to ask for clarification. Do we want and need a BC closed meeting and when might we schedule that? It will be very tight. There's also the question of meeting with Theresa's group for the MSSSI Strategy meeting and how we squeeze that in. So just some issues that we might want to consider going forward and appreciate your input.

Claudia Selli: Barbara, thank you. Actually, I just - we just discussed that we could...

Barbara Wanner: Oh, great. I'm sorry.

Claudia Selli: ...for the - no, no, no - it's okay, but for the session, I just asked the membership, I mean the whole BC member to let me know where they like to do it, at BC level, and Marilyn was the strongest supporter of that initially but in that case, we will have to do it either - probably as an evening activity or an extra activity because we cannot squeeze it in. For the BC open meeting as you said, it's going to be a lunch hour and the closed meeting - we can do it early in the morning, eventually, but we want to have support for that or - yeah, because we will have 75 minutes over lunch for the BC open meeting. I will discuss this with Chantelle and see whether that we can do that as well. She's not on the call today.

Barbara Wanner: Great. Thanks, and I apologize for the reiteration. Thanks.

Claudia Selli: Thank you. Any other comments or points? No? If not - oh, Jimson yes, I see you are now on the call if you want to give your update.

Jimson Olufuye: Okay, thank you very much, Claudia. Let me apologize, I had some glitches on my side. (With some issues on communication) but I'm glad I'm connected now. Well, I just wanted to, I don't know if you have discussed this, about ICANN's response to budget comment, the FY19 ICANN budget comment. Marilyn did send something to the list and want to provide a quick summary for members concerning the response to comments.

Well, in all there were 20 comments from community groups. 20 comments from, sorry. 20 community groups provided comments and also 19 individuals. And the comments were submitted into themes covering 184 specific comments. Our comments focus on several things, namely ICANN Reserve Fund, revenue projection, concern about growth in a fast number, and then ICANN capacity to fund new priority projects. And then about CROP, we're concerned about CROP costs, we talk about that and also proposal to

cancel the NCPH that is not part -- of the Intersessional as a trade-off to the (restoring the) community projects, like CROP. And then lastly we talk about the need for high level (executive summary of) funding. Okay, so - can you hear me? Can you still hear me?

Claudia Selli: Yes.

Jimson Olufuye: Oh, okay. Great. So on the ICANN Reserve fund, we of course talked about the risk involved with the (unintelligible) replenished and we -- ICANN responded (by mentioning yes,) that it's the broad working groups that ought to look at the risk scenarios and they actually produced the replenishment strategy which we also commented on.

Then also on the revenue growth or the revenue projection, they say challenge we have seen that revenue is coming down, why staff is growing, but ICANN responded that well, yes they only depend on 18 month projection, 18 month in advance projection and that they were continually doing a review of the revenue (unintelligible). (Unintelligible) well, they spoke about staff being moved from (new gTLDs) of the program into the normal, business as usual ICANN vision.

So and they gave some statistics about 1,200 new gTLDs that they're managing now, and now that the oversight of the IANA (as respect) to the community, so there's more responsibility. It won't do that revenue is (flattening) out with more responsibility, more work to be done. We have already (about) 8,500 new registrars. And the response to that, in respect to capacity to fund new (priority) projects, well, there was no talk about that.

We had big concern about ODI, how will it be funded. GDPR, which is the (unintelligible) issue, the workstream 2, and ICANN said nothing about that,

so I am concerned about that and I believe all of us would be concerned that ICANN said nothing about that issue that many other SOACs raised.

There was also a question of CROP. It appears they've made up their minds to cut CROP and special budget requests. We may have to look inwards to - in our own FY19 budget to see how we can take care of some of the outreach activities which we use CROP to do.

And on the Intersessional, yes, they welcomed our proposal to cancel FY19 Intersessional but they say they'll need to consult with the other groups, with the other constituencies -- to know if it is a broadly agreed (raised) position. So if it's broadly agreed, that would be great.

And lastly, they - the executive summary - we already talk about high levels of the summary, but that is being provided from what he said with the introduction and the highlights on the budget request. So far there are some things missed, and some responses that were not clearly made, but we will still look at the details of it and I know Chantelle provided some quick summary and this will be provided to our members shortly. That is quickly from my side with regards to the budget review. More review will be done shortly and the outcome of that will be provided to members. Again, sorry that I missed (the earlier) session and I have to rush this presentation. Thank you. Back to you, Claudia.

Claudia Selli: Thank you, Jimson. I see Marilyn has a hand up, or is it an old one?

Marilyn Cade: No, it's a current hand, thanks. It's Marilyn. I want to thank Jimson for the more thorough review but I'd like to posit an issue, particularly because Barbara is on the call now, as a major concern that I have. I am aware, through internal conversations that those explanations that we're dissatisfied

with are written directly by different department heads or I don't know what we would call them, different, you know, entities. So those answers are not coming from Xavier, they're coming - they're written by people from Sally's group, et cetera. I think overall the answers are extremely - the summary answers are very unsatisfactory and buried in the responses is an announcement that ICANN created a new Regional Fellowship Program, with no consultation, with no input from the community, so they're shifting around the ICANN org staff and this is Sally Costerton, they're shifting around where the decision are being taken, but we're losing the support for the community-facing programs like the special projects, like CROP, et cetera.

So I just want to note that I think this is something that we should be collaborating with others who have concerns. There is huge concerns about staff growth that come from every part of the community, that's basically been ignored. I did post to the group ICANN's analysis that there were questions, not that there were objections. I think this is going to take more work on our part so that we can come up with a relatively clear message to the Budget Working Group and the board members who support that, there are four, so that we're being listened to, not just the BC, but the entire community.

Claudia Selli: Thank you, Marilyn. If there are no other question or comments, then I'll adjourn the meeting. Anything else? No? Then I would close the meaning, we'll stay in touch by mail and up to the next call. Thank you, everybody, for participating.

END