ICANN

Moderator: Chantelle Doerksen
June 7, 2018
10:00 am CT

Coordinator: The recordings have started.

Chantelle Doerksen: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the BC
Members call on Thursday June 7, 2018. In the interest of time attendance
will be taken via the Adobe Connect room. On the phone bridge only we have
Margie Milan and Mason Cole.

I'd like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for
the transcript and to keep you phones and microphones on mute when not
speaking to avoid any background noise. With that, I will turn it over to
Claudia to begin. Claudia, please go ahead.

Claudia Selli: Thank you, Chantelle, and thank you everybody for being on the call today.
So in the interest of time, we'll need to start with Steve. The floor is yours.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Claudia. It's Steve DelBianco, your vice chair for policy
coordination. And thank you, Chantelle, for putting up the policy calendar. I
emailed it to all BC members. If any of you failed to receive it, Chantelle can
resend that document to you.

We only have one new comment since our last BC members call, and that was
on June the 1st, thanks to the drafting of Gabby Szlak, who put in a very brief
comment on the initial report of the review that was conducted of the

Customer Standing Committee charter. Customer Standing Committee was created to represent those who use the unique identifiers managed through the IANA contract that was transitioned from the US government to ICANN.

And that charter itself, while it may have seemed like a minimally important item, it could loom large in the weeks ahead, because the US Commerce Department has just put out a notice of inquiry asking about two dozen questions about the future of its policy with respect to the domain name system and the Internet.

And buried in there is one question, asking whether the Commerce Department should attempt to rescind the revocation of the IANA contract. I think that's there for political purposes but it's going to require a substantive supply, and that choice will be among those who will reply on that. And I will certainly cite the fact that ICANN has stood up multiple entities to replicate or improve upon the accountability the community that used to be there when the IANA contract was held by a single government. Thanks to Gabby for getting that done. Appreciate that.

Let me move on to the currently open public comments. We have five open comments and this will be relatively quick and easy for us to get through. The first is a comment that's due on the 10th of June, just a few days from now, and I circulated a draft two weeks ago. Thank you to Jimson Olufuye for drafting a comment on the RSSAC recommendations. So the RSSAC is the Root Server Security Advisory Committee, and this was a review conducted of that committee and its accountability.

Now Jimson I've attached it as the first attachment to the policy calendar today and let me just summarize is that Jimson's come up with some excellent agreement points that the BC is agreeing with the points of the review that the

RSSAC should be opened up to non-root server operators, such as those who run the Anycast providers. These are the ones around the globe who replicate images of the root so that Internet service providers, or ISPs, around the world can do their DNS services. So it's not just the A through Z root server operators. There's also Anycast providers.

And I think that another excellent point that Jimson reiterates is that those of us in the community don't really know much about what the RRSAC does in the community. The SSAC on the other hands is Security and Stability Advisory Committee is quite well known to all of us in the BC and the rest at ICANN.

They're very active and becoming more transparent about their work. But the Root Server Security Advisory Committee says very little. So this is about creating a better community-facing outreach program to improve its transparency and accountability. This too will be important to rebut any suggestions that the IANA contract should not have been transitioned.

Jimson, I'll open it to you if you have anything you'd like to add to that and I have a question for you. Jimson, do you believe that the recommendations of this review are going to be controversial? Will they be resisted or rejected by members of the RSSAC and particularly the root server operators? Over to you, Jimson. Jimson, not hearing you.

All right not hearing Jimson and all of you have the availability of that report, and please get back to Jimson and I and the entire BC by the end of the day on the 9th of June, two days from now, so that we can file this report as requested on the 10th of June. Thank you.

All right the next public comment is not due until the June - the 20th, and this is a comment from the BC on a proposal from the operator of .com, which is VeriSign. It's a proposal for them to allocate the single letter domain, o.com. There are already several single-letter domains allocated in com, net, and in many of the other legacy TLDs but there are very few allocated in .com at this point.

So what VeriSign has done is replicate a procedure used by many other legacies, which is the notion of an auction, but this is a bit unusual in that VeriSign is proposing that it receive about $8 a year from the owner of o.com, that instead all of the proceeds of the auction will go to designated nonprofit beneficiaries.

And in their proposal VeriSign named several beneficiaries in the neighborhood of child safety, groups that come up with international technical standards, particularly in developing countries. Those are in Exhibit A to the proposal that VeriSign put in, and while ICANN has seen and endorsed that list, it won't be disclosed until this proposal is accepted by the ICANN board.

So this proposal itself is the subject of public comment, and I want to shout out a big thank you to Zak Muscovitch, who took the lead at drafting a BC comment, which we circulated to the BC. We've had edits that have come in from several people, from Andrew Mack, Chuck Warren, Marilyn Cade, and then Claudia Selli. And the key was to distribute the comment to all of the members with 14 days of review.

So there is no more sort of behind-the-scenes private drafting team. So Zak, Marilyn, to the extent that you have reactions to Andy's public edits, those should be disclosed and sent to the - all of BC private at this point because we're in that 14-day period where the full BC looks at a draft comment.

I attached the very latest draft that was circulated to the full BC, and this was Andy Mack's edits to Zak, which were then endorsed by with a couple of minor edits by Claudia, and I saw Nat Cohen put a comment in, to which I replied. And I think it's fair to say that we ought to have a five-minute discussion, at least here in the BC. Again, we have several days left to do dialogue on the list but I would love to take questions from any BC members, allow Zak to answer some of those questions or to make point that he'd like to do.

So do we have any questions on the o.com proposal and the draft BC comment so far? Just raise your hand in the Adobe. I don't see any hands. Zak, would you like to say a few words about the drafting done so far and the evolution of where that comment is going?

Zak Muscovitch: Sure. So, you know, thank you everyone for the comments. You know, this comment may be slightly more controversial than we had originally anticipated but that's probably reflective of the broader debate about this issue. And I wouldn't mind taking a shot at reconciling some of the comments that we received, but it's going to be challenging, as you pointed out, Steve, but I think we can do it. And so I'll be - I'll reach out to Marilyn and Andrew and Chuck and everyone to see what we can put together in the next few days.

Steve DelBianco: Zak, this is Steve. Thank you for that. Do all of this on the public list though, because once the draft is into the - sorry, the BC-private is what I meant, so BC-private, because all members need to weigh with respect to the tradeoffs between certain perspectives you might have on a secondary market versus perspectives others might have.

I think there's been a well-supported perspective that there's support for VeriSign's objective, which they stated in their proposal, which was to maximize the dollars that go to the beneficiaries, and that includes a subsequent payment of 5% of whatever the bid was that would also go to the beneficiaries after the fifth year in terms of renewal.

Any other comments or questions? And Lawrence, I see you putting a comment in but you have to understand something, Lawrence. VeriSign is proposing what it wants to do with its asset, o.com. Their proposal is something that we can reject or support, but their proposal is that an auction service provider, and I believe they selected one, an auction service provider would screen potential bidders and select bidders partly based on their ability to pay and also based on the plans they have made to deploy o.com and not necessarily hold it as a speculator to sell to someone else but to deploy it.

And it's completely within VeriSign's right to do that. We can disagree and say it's not a good idea. I get you on that, but please understand that this is entirely within the proposal that VeriSign's put out and it's consistent with what biz, info and others have done with their domains as well. Any other comments from BC members? Looking at hands.

And, Marilyn, I would just ask that if you can base your comments off the draft that I attached to the policy calendar, which included Zak plus Andy plus Claudia, and if you come in on top of those edits, I think that would be the most constructive way to keep driving this forward. Appreciate that, Marilyn. Thank you, Marilyn, appreciate it.

All right we have three other public comments that are teed up right now. One is on short-term options on what do we do on the compression of time that there are so many specific reviews due in the year 2018. These specific

reviews are required in the ICANN bylaws. They came over from the affirmation of commitments, things like the security, stability, and resiliency, accountability, transparency, the Whois RDS review that Susan Kawaguchi is working on, and the new gTLD review, which is just now wrapping up.

Susan and Denise, because both of you are leaders on these specific review teams, I appreciated that you volunteered to help but I did note that with all the work you have to do, you did not volunteer as the drafter of the BC comment. You could just help provide some input. So we do need a drafter from the BC to come up with our comment on staff's proposal to how to adjust the timing of the short-term reviews and spread them out.

Do we have any volunteers? Folks that have been involved in reviews before would be helpful. This comment is due on the 6th of July. We've got quite a bit of time for that, a full month. So I'll circle back and continue to ask for help on that.

Number four is a draft proposal from ICANN travel staff on guidelines for community travel support. This is a situation where ICANN provides funds for community members to travel to ICANN meetings, intersessionals and other events. These comments close on the 16th of July, so it's something we can also discuss when we're together in Panama. And there's a 23-page guideline report put out by staff. Staff claims that they're trying to reflect the input they collected from the community back in January and December and also their own views, the views of ICANN travel support staff.

Now the BC provided input that I linked to that I want to thank Marilyn Cade for drafting it. There were several BC members who helped with that. But now we need volunteers to comment on staff's proposed guidelines for travel

support. So I'll take a queue. I see Marilyn's hand up. Go ahead, Marilyn.
Can't hear you, Marilyn. Not hearing Marilyn. Anyone else?

Marilyn Cade: Actually can you hear me now?

Steve DelBianco: Now we can.

Marilyn Cade: Thanks. Happy to volunteer to work with others. I think this whole issue about travel guidelines is written for us because it also affects cost of travel for ICANN org, and we have a number of examples, I'm not going to go into them, but we do have a number of examples where a necessary cost, that is travelers could come to a lower-cost location, that includes staff and board, but instead they travel to fairly high cost locations.

So when we look at the guidelines I'd really love to have some participation from other BC members because I think the guidelines can help us then influence what the budget is allocating, and in the end that affects our ability to count on ICANN for funding other activities and events that we care deeply about and need in order to conduct our own BC recruitment and outreach.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Marilyn. Appreciate that. Lawrence, thank you for volunteering as well.

And the fifth and final open public comment is not due until the 20th of July, and it's long-term options to adjust the timeline of reviews that this proposal from staff regards two kinds of reviews, not only the four specific reviews I mentioned earlier but also the organizational reviews. Those are reviews required every five years conducted by the ICANN board, where they review an entire AC or SO. For instance, the RSSAC review was done under that rubric.

Barbara Wanner, thank you for volunteering to draft that BC comment. Barbara, it would be great if when we are together in Panama that perhaps you have a draft ready for that. The same goes for Marilyn and Lawrence if it's possible prior to when we convene in Panama to have at least an outline where you think the BC comment ought to go, and I'll work with you on that. Barbara, your hand is up. Go ahead.

Barbara Wanner: Yes. Thank you. I don't really know that I could have an outline, Steve. It would seem to me that the - this review, the long-term options, would depend on what we propose for the short-term options. Do I - is my logic off or what? What do you think?

Steve DelBianco: The long-term options are - I say it's probably different because the short-term options is just adjusting to get out of the mess we're in right now and the long-term option is more about what changes do we make the bylaws and procedures to create more flexibility in the future. I think it would be okay to look at them distinctly, Barbara, but if your schedule is too crowded then it's fine to work on comments as long as we have them by the first week of July.

Barbara Wanner: Okay.

Steve DelBianco: And Kristin Doan, I saw that you put a volunteer in, and I appreciate that. And I assume that that would be for the travel support guidelines? Kristin, would you clarify which one were you volunteering for? Okay, travel support plus Kristin. Thank you.

Okay let's move on to the ICANN issue of the day, modifying Whois to comply with GDPR. I have here in the policy calendar an entire page of links for those of you who want to get up to speed quickly on where we stand. Now

the short story is that on May 17 the ICANN board approved the calzone model. It was a drafted in a rather top-down fashion by ICANN. They call that the temporary specification. We abbreviate that as a temp spec, and they are requiring contract parties to implement the temp spec.

And for the most part the BC is disappointed with what is in that temp spec and we're disappointed with what wasn't in it. Namely, there was no requirement to develop or implement in a way for accredited access to the non-public Whois fields.

One piece of good news, a week later, the European Data Protection Board, which is a newly formed body of all the data protection administrators, they issued a statement indicating they'll exercise some prosecutorial discretion when taking enforcement against data controllers under Whois. And that would include ICANN registrars and registries.

That sort of turns the temperature down away from a panic, and yet we still need to keep the pressure on ICANN and the rest of the community to develop a way for parties with legitimate interests, private sector and public sector, to get access to the non-public fields.

I want to channel now to channel two, support for our councilors. The previous meeting was the 24th of May, and I have in there a list of what was done there. But we have Susan on the phone. I want to turn it over to Susan to walk us through that and the extraordinary meeting of Council that happens next week. Susan?

Susan Kawaguchi: Thanks, Steve. This is Susan Kawaguchi for the record. We did have a Council meeting and we appointed Brian Beckham as the co-chair of the RPM and we also adopted the Standing Selection Committee charter and I'm

reaffirmed as chair. But that's been really good work in my opinion. I've really enjoyed that and I think it's been very helpful, especially in the (unintelligible) reviews (unintelligible) on the review team.

So before we talk about Tuesday morning and we were able to ask - we submitted a bunch of questions, pretty lightweight questions in my opinion, sort of on timing and support has the right to, you know, change the spec every 90 days, how does that work with an EPDD - EPDP. And they didn't have real concrete answers but at least we brought a lot of topics up that were - to consider.

So next week we have - on the 12th we have the extraordinary meeting, which is just another - an extra Council meeting sort of, for two hours to talk about what are we going to do, how are we going to manage as council this policy development process. Still haven't heard anything concrete from the registries or the Contracted Party House in general but mainly the registries were saying things (unintelligible).

And so I believe most of it is not - they were talking about some definitions or something on the threat of security and stability. I'm waiting for more clarification on that. So…

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

Susan Kawaguchi: Sure.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you. It's Steve. Two weeks ago when we had the call, you highlighted for us, you and Marie, that Keith Drazek of the registry constituency has said that it was possible some items in the temp spec might not be within (unintelligible).

We discussed that extensively on that call two weeks ago and then I followed up with an email showing everybody what is meant by this picket fence within the registry specification and then indicated that Margie, who had drafted some of that language, was quite confident that everything to do with Whois would fit in under a specific clause of the picket fence. Have you had subsequent discussions on Council and should we be concerned about that? Or is it just relatively minor items?

Susan Kawaguchi: You know, I really don't know. We have not had any real discussion and I appreciate your email and Margie's input. And Margie and I have talked about it also. She actually recommended pulling up the initial charter for the RDS working group, which really outlines what is in the picket fence too. So I probably will submit that to the council before our meeting.

They really, you know, Keith has said nothing, has not responded to me at all. Rubens Kuhl said it was something to do - it was only about 10% of the issues and it was probably not something we would be concerned with. I don't know what that means. So until we see them say exactly this issue here - this part here is not in the picket fence, then it's hard to push back on that. So, you know, my assumption is everything is within the picket fence and it's all policy. It should all be included and up for discussion. So does that answer your question?

Steve DelBianco: So, Susan - it does. Thank you very much. And you had asked yesterday to try to confirm what you and Marie would be focusing on on the 12th and we have a long - a lot of concerns with what ICANN has proposed to remedy GDPR, but I suppose it's not really fruitful for that to be front and center, instead focusing on how we can affect the outcome from this point forward. I put two

points in there that I would recommend based on what I coordinated with the BC.

And they focus heavily on the access, the accredited access and wanting for us to, well, take a victory when we can get one, and namely that is the requirement that RDAP will be implemented by registries and registrars. So that's the access part of accredited access. But we're really nowhere in terms of the accreditation part of accredited access, and I sensed your concern that it's possible that the temp spec, since it doesn't mention accredited access that it might not be included as part of this expedited PDP. And if not, we want to find a way to get it done either within the PDP or as an additional thread.

Susan Kawaguchi: I absolutely agree with that and there, in the board council meeting was a lot going on in the chat. You know, again Rubens Kuhl has said let's do the easy part first and then move on to the hard part. And I suggested let's do the hard part first and start with the (unintelligible), get that in place and we can do the easy part in a rush after. So, you know, I'm not sure how this all will pan out. Claudia has questions.

Claudia Selli: Hi Susan and thank you for all the work you and Steve are undertaking for this. I just wanted it's more of a comment. I just wanted to report a little but also, you know, the questions maybe that I'm hearing here in Brussels because a lot of conversation of course are going on on the Whois and GDPR. And certainly we, I mean (unintelligible) new where I also see a lot of companies are taking interest and we're raising awareness about Whois GDPR. And now I know that I understand that the commission is trying to find a solution for accessing at least the - some data or making some data public for the Whois registry. What could be useful, I don't know whether at BC we want to do it. I know that there are some resources there that maybe can help is also to make them understand why the purpose of checking that out and why they are

maybe critical to be published. I know that we also have some positions on why for example the geographical address is needed and then the purpose of the mail. I don't know if we want to elaborate on that or if you can keep – it's not our maybe remit to do that. I'm just trying to see what we can do be helpful transparency and discussion.

Susan Kawaguchi: I think anything we can do to get DPAs or anyone in the EU really to give an opinion on what should or shouldn't be – or well what should be included in the - and it could more in the public record would be helpful. It's, you know, the other side is consistently, you know, talking about levying the fines and the, and all of the privacy data laws that we don't have as you know, we don't have a lot of resources for, that really back parts of this and except accreditation. So anything, I would say we work this on as many fronts as we can.

Claudia Selli: Yes. So yes because I remember that Tim Chen I think also, we had some letters on this maybe if we can work on this ends as an after about maybe ICANN and the commission we can, I think it could be helpful in the discussion.

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes I agree. And one of the questions I have -- and it may be more of a process question and I shouldn't understand this better being on the council maybe – but there seems - my understanding of the whole temp policy process is to, is that we have - the community has the right to look at the temp top policy and say should this be consensus policy or not? If not then everything is open for discussion in this EPDP. Obviously with 12 months we have, you know, we're going to have to really work hard. It's a challenge but there is definitely a, you know, from the CPA a stance that no we're not opening, we're not fixing Whois. We're not opening this up. We're only talking about

the temp policy. And so the EPDP would be very limited so it will be interesting to see what that discussion goes on Tuesday.

The other thing on the boards, board council discussion Manal from the GAC was pushing on the accreditation issues and agreeing. She and I were running a lot in the chat. So we do have the GAC support on. The other issue is the GAC feels like they're ready and willing to participate as working members. There seems to be some, you know, since this is going to be a small PDP it, you know, is the way I envision it I see it panning out, you know, there's limited seats at the table, lots of observers and then, you know, obviously input from everybody's communities that the GAC will be limited in their representation and they're concerned about that.

And in this case I think well in all cases, you know, we had problems with the GAC not weighing in at the appropriate time. So I really wanted to encourage that. That seems to be a problem. Steve please go.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you Susan. Something I brought up in terms of leverage and this might be relevant to council. I believe the contract parties are concerned that it we can't get an accreditation model done through an expedited PDP well the only other way we can get it done quickly is to pursue a second attempt spec, a second attempt spec, not necessarily on the 90 day anniversary of the first one but at any time. With pressure from the business community and the GAC we would replicate the same process that was done for Calzone which is to bring an accreditation model forward that relies on RDAP and ask ICANN to do exactly what it did with Calzone on the temp spec to require a temporary policy lasting for up to year that would require the use of our accreditation model with RDAP until the community comes up with the placement.

I've heard no good argument to claim that that can't be done. I've heard plenty of people claim that we should do that but instead we should develop it within the community. Well that's what they want then let's do it as part of this EPDP. So I would invite you to use that as a leverage point, that if we're not going to do it in the PDP -- and I've written this down in the policy calendar as well – well then we will openly and aggressively pursue a second temporary specification for the accreditation part. I hope that helps.

Susan Kawaguchi: That does help. I think that is a really good strategy because really what would ICANN board's answer to that be? No, no, no, we can only do the part that, you know.

Steve DelBianco: Right, right...

Susan Kawaguchi: Takes away (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: Particularly if we can find laws and regulations that require access to nonpublic Whois because that could be the driver for a temp spec because we are in violation of some laws because our policies don't give legitimate users access to nonpublic Whois. Alex Deacons's...

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: ...agreeing with that strategy too. I had offered it weeks ago on the drafting team but nobody wanted to talk about it then since we were hoping the temp spec would have it something about accreditation. Okay it's not there. Let's go to plan B and talk about a second temp spec as a point of leverage. Now Susan did you want to comment on the other elements for council work? The

first one in there came from you yesterday which is Privacy Proxy Implementation Review Team.

Susan Kawaguchi: Right. I really think for the registrar sent a letter asking for suspension of the privacy proxy implementation and COA followed up with you know, opposing that. But I really think we need to have the BC weigh in on this because there's no reason to stop this implementation except that they're claiming, you know, there's too much work and things are changing. Well too bad. In my opinion it should move on. And it sort of stalled anyway. We haven't, we could have started in, you know, really finished this and gotten a draft report out if ICANN hadn't stalled on the fees they're charging. So and that's been installed since March really. So ICANN just the org is not providing any information to the registrars they need which is fine, not fine but I mean I understand why the registrars are complaining about the fee structure but we need to keep this one moving.

Steve DelBianco: Susan I absolutely agree. I'd love to be as supportive as possible so on the June 12 council call it sounds as if this won't be part of the topic. But if you want we could potentially draft a BC letter opposing the suspension. I have not seen the coalition for online accountability letter. If you can get your hands on that send it over and perhaps I can use that as a drafting point.

Susan Kawaguchi: Sure, I'll put that out to the list. And then just a side note I had rejoined the RDS Working Group and now I'm co-chair, but that's really probably just to wrap that up, that PDP up. So we're trying to figure out council needs to tell the PDP what's going to happen. And so we need - and Chuck Gomes actually retired so I was happy that he could actually take that next step. And I think that's it for me.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks Susan. Oh Barbara Wanner would you could Channel 3 regarding Commercial Stakeholders Group. I'll scroll it up onto the screen.

Barbara Wanner   Thank you. Basically very quickly we have three different meetings set up on the 25th which is Monday. At 9:00 to 10:15 we'll have the Strategic Outlook Session with the MSSI Group. You know, we've been talking about this for quite some time with them. But immediately thereafter from 10:32 to 12:00 also on the 25th we'll our session with – with Matthew and Becky and some of the topics that we'll likely consider for them would be again, surprise, surprise how to reconcile GAC advice on Whois with the temporary specification, what is the board perspective on any EPDP, solicit their views on some of the ideas that Steve has offered with respect to accreditation and access. And then also the point that Susan raised about the stall and the PPIRT. So those were some topics that we talked about that we might raise with Becky and Matthew.

Then on the 27th which is Wednesday at 3:15 we will have the CSG open meeting. We'll have a session with Goran and again pressing him on next steps for GDPR and perhaps some of the items we've talked about today, what they intend to do respect to the injunction they filed in Germany with respect to EPEG? Is that how it's pronounced, thoughts on accreditation generally plus confirmation that security, IP consumer protections will fall under legitimate interests, how the existing work on accreditation can be utilized and integrated. I would suggest again that we raise some of the talks we talked about today and then again press him about the PPIRT.

So those are some topics for Goran. I welcome any other suggestions that I would have to forward to Chantelle ASAP because I think these were due to board members and Goran for their own preparation. I think that's it for my briefing today. Oh also we will have about 15 minutes but either Xavier or

Samantha to discuss concerns about the auction proceeds program, some concerns expressed about insufficient controls and perhaps trying to rush it forward. And then we will also devote time because this could become sticky again for us with the Non-commercial Stakeholders Group about strategies for ensuring that our preferred candidate for the GNSO council chair who will succeed Heather how we pursue consensus building with them. Thank you. That's it.

Steve DelBianco: Barbara it's Steve. One last question is whether the CSG Executive Committee has given any thoughts to replacing Anthony Harris on the auction proceeds working?

Barbara Wanner Yes, and Tony Harris will be there at the meeting and to sort of to pass the baton. And we, they accepted our nomination of Marilyn to succeed him in that capacity.

Steve DelBianco: Great news, thank you. That's all for, Claudia that's all or the policy calendar. Back to you for the rest of the agenda.

Margie Milan: Steve it's Margie.

Margie Milan: Can I be in the queue? I wanted to comment on some of the GDPR related stuff but I didn't know if we'd have time to get to it.

Steve DelBianco: That was Margie Milan. Go ahead Margie.

Margie Milan: Sure and I apologize. I'm on the bus, so maybe some background. Just one of the things I think we want to focus on while we're in at ICANN in Panama City is to really highlight what we're seeing since the temporary policy has come into effect. And I don't know how many of you are really actively

involved in the enforcement of your company's brands, but we're seeing a dramatic decrease in information and cooperation. We're seeing registrars not complying with respect to requests related to privacy proxy. We're seeing responses that we need subpoenas to get access to the nonpublic data even though we're sighting legitimate purposes like infringement and anti-phishing activities. And so it's affecting us dramatically just in the last week. And I don't know how many people have really seen that.

But I would think that that's something we need to highlight at the board. You know, any discussions we have with the board in Panama we really have to identify what's been happening since the temporary policies have come into effect because it really is quite a different landscape right now. And so I just wanted to highlight that and following-up on Claudia's suggestion that we might want to prepare a BC comment if, you know, to I guess it was to the EC or to the Article 29 folks. If we do I think that's one of the themes we want to identify is what we're seeing and what the impact has been since the new policy's been adopted by the board.

Steve DelBianco: Yes let's make sure we document very carefully registrars or registries are failing to acknowledge and properly respond to legitimate requests. Documentation is going to be required for us to create the sense of urgency and scale and scope to drive this EPDP or to second temporary spec. Thanks Marjorie. Marilyn Cade?

Marilyn Cade: Thanks Steve. I just sent a tech I just posted. I'll interface with Barbara on a short summary just so we thank Tony and have a smooth transition on the – and then I'll volunteer to work with others to have just two, three questions for our 15 minutes with Xavier and Samantha and send them to the full BC so they're well prepared and they know what the concern and interest of the BC is and coming in able to answer our questions if that is helpful. Barbara?

Steve DelBianco: Sure.

Barbara Wanner   Yes that would be helpful Marilyn. Thanks.

Steve DelBianco: Okay over to you Claudia. Thank you.

Claudia Selli: Thank you Steve. So on my side, just a quick update on the ICANN 62 BC meetings, Chantelle has been reaching out to the, to Goran or the meeting is tentative and also to David Conrad. And he has accepted to come during the BC open meeting. And then finally as we requested to the, to reach to the registrar and they have not come back yet but Chantelle is following that up. So certainly I mean we'll keep you in the loop on the responses. And I think Chantelle correct me if I'm wrong that on Monday in late afternoon we have the Strategic Initiative Session, the 19 minute session with the Department of (MSSI) for those members who are available and interested. And yes I don't have further updates on the BC meetings. And I would then unless there are questions or comments I would then give the floor to Jimson for your date on operations and finance.

Jimson Olufuye: Thank you very much Claudia, greetings everyone. Sorry at the time it was, you have in every (unintelligible) but (unintelligible) not so much. Well onto the brief reports. The brief reports this time around, the final report is ready to be submitted and that is the draft BC FY '19 budget proposal. If there's any questions I will ready to take them.

And I want to use the opportunity to appreciate the finance committee, the Excomm and our, very vibrant secretariat for the supports provided and to all BC members well. Well the invites have gone out. We gotten feedback ensuring that members are interested in getting there quickly. I want to thank

most the board members being that they're responding positively. So the pay up rate is quite high so that makes it quite commendable.

Well there's been some feedback from ICANN concerning additional budget request. And I submitted a summary of that at the last meeting. Support for community activities been cut by 50% though a problem was initially planned to be totally eliminated with a fraction of it restored. So we already have provisions to bridge the gap so that we can still continue to do our outreach and engage the wider community. Also we got feedback on the auction proceeds and I send that out to the list. I think very key of the submission did submit that ICANN accepted is the recognition that the (unintelligible) is (unintelligible) have to finish their work and any kind of support from the auction proceeds will come to the working. So and we thank our members Marilyn, Adetola, Lawrence, that have arranged to keep a tab on that.

Okay well we got ICANN 62 so we talk about outreach. So I don't know Mark Datysgeld or Gabi or Andrew Mack is online so they can provide more information about plans for some outreach in Panama. Okay about the same here, can still entertain some questions. I think we have a few more minutes. Thank you.

Claudia Selli: On must sorry. Thank you Jimson. Are there any questions for Jimson? It seems a no. So next meeting will be held on the 21st of June. And if there are no other comments I will give you back ten minutes of your time and we will stay in touch over mail and speak to you soon. The meeting is adjourned Chantelle.

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

Steve DelBianco: Thanks all.

END