ICANN

Moderator: Chantelle Doerksen
June 21, 2018
10:00 am CT

Chantelle Doerksen: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Welcome to the BC members call on June 21, 2018. In the interest of time, attendance will be taken via the Adobe Connect room. On the phone bridge only we have Kristin Doan, Margie Milam and Jimson Olufuye. I'd like to remind everyone to please state your name for the transcript and to mute your microphones when not speaking. With that I'd like to turn it over to our chair, Claudia Selli to begin. Claudia, please go ahead.

Claudia Selli: Thank you very much and thank you very much everybody for being in the call. So for today's agenda is the usual one, so we'll have the policy discussion with Steve, council update with Susan and Marie, the CSG reports from Barbara. I will report on the organization of the ICANN 62 BC meetings.

And then last but not least we have Jimson updating us on operation and finance. If you have any AOB point that you want to put on the agenda please let me know so that we can take it at the end of the call. And in the interest of time I will leave the floor to Steve for the policy discussion. Steve the floors is yours.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you Claudia. Steve DelBianco here. I sent a policy calendar yesterday and Chantelle is displaying it in Adobe right now. Since our last call there have been only one filed comment by the BC and that was filed yesterday and

it was our comment on the proposal to release O Dot Com, a single character domain at the second level in the Dot Com registry.

And I want to thank Zak Muscovitch for his initial draft and then Andrew Mack, Marilyn Cade, Chuck Warren. Nat Cohen did a comment on e-mail and then Claudia and I did a number of edits that Zak agreed to.

And so I think it was a challenge to get consensus from different points of view but we did so. And a big thank-you to Zak on the role that he played. And that comment was submitted yesterday.

Since it was a comment on changes to a registry agreement pursuant to an RSEP we do expect that ICANN staff and board will review the comments and then come back with a decision shortly. I don't think that we'll learn who the nonprofit beneficiaries are nor will we learn who the trustee and the auction provider are unless and until this RSEP proposal is accepted by the ICANN board. Any questions?

Seeing no hands I'll go on to the current list of open public comments. We have several that are open and only a few that are very current. So the first one is that ICANN is trying to make a short-term adjustment to the timing for specific reviews. And they initially had two reviews in mind, but they have scaled it back to just say the current accountability and transparency review team, which is actually the third iteration, this is done every five years.

So we call it the ATRT and because this is the third iteration, we call it ATRT3. And what ICANN staff has proposed are three potential ways to manage the timing on the acknowledged problem that we have review overload in 2018.

As your representative on the Cross-Community Working Group for the ICANN IANA transition, the BC supported the position that we argued which was that Work Stream 2 of the transition had nine accountability and transparency projects. And we're going to be discussing them in detail when we meet in Panama because we are finished with our recommendations and trying to get community approval.

Since so much of this Work Stream 2 work was on accountability and transparency, the CCWG with BC's agreement had recommended that ATRT3 only look at whether prior recommendations from ATRT 1 and 2 have been implemented.

That is a hefty bit of work. There was support for this position in the CCWG. But when the chartering organizations of ICANN came together, they didn't want to be unduly constrained. And that leaves us in a mess.

The ATRT3 to my knowledge hasn't met yet and simply because of this expediency that we are still in the middle of approving very substantial accountability and transparency recommendations and in looking at volunteer fatigue I would recommend that the BC support the alternative, one of the alternatives that they come up with, the alternative of limiting this particular review – and only this one – to the implementation of prior ATRT recommendations.

So I'd like to take a discussion on that since that one is due shortly and I want to be able to reply to that. It closes on July the 6th. We will be able to discuss it more in Panama but does anyone have any comments at this point? Go ahead Denise.

Denise Michel: Thanks Steve. Yes, can you hear me now?

Steve DelBianco: Mm-hm. Yes.

Denise Michel: Thanks Steve. I appreciate your clarification on ATRT in relation to the Cross-Community Working Group efforts on accountability. In this particular case it may well make sense to avoid duplication and to ensure that the ATRT addresses issues that are not being - have been addressed by the Cross-Community Working Group.

However ICANN, as we have seen, has always like made an effort to significantly curtail community-led reviews across the board in various ways. So I think part of the statement also needs to include a strong endorsement of the basic model of accountability and WHOIS, SSR and competition reviews and the importance of maintaining the structure we have and allowing these reviews to be independent and define their scope as is needed at the time that they actually convene. Thanks.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you Denise. The alternative we're endorsing is one that arose from the community and not from the board or management. And we're going to have to clarify that abundantly so that this is a community-driven decision.

I will draft something that I'll run by you so that we can discuss it when we all gather in Panama. Any other comments on this? Sure. Great, thank you.

The next comment is due the 16th of July, and it's a new set of comments on guidelines that ICANN has issued for community travel support. This is when ICANN provides travel funding for community members to get to meetings, not just ICANN meetings but also things like intersessionals and other face-to-face meetings.

The BC provided a significant amount of input that was drafted by Marilyn Cade with a lot of help from Gabriel, Adetola, Jimson, Barbara, and Lawrence. But now we need to comment on the actual draft guidelines that ICANN staff has derived from the community input.

As you all know, staff itself doesn't always take all comments on board, and many times they have to deal with comments that are conflicting. So they have to make a decision. So that's why it's so important for us to go through. So I'd like to turn to the team from the BC who worked so hard on this earlier and see whether you can help us to get through that.

And we can discuss it in Panama. It's not due for over three weeks so we have the time. But can I get some volunteers on that? This is Number 2 on Community Travel Support Guidelines. I'm looking at Tola, Jimson, Lawrence, Gabi, Omar and Marilyn.

Jimson Olufuye: Steve this is Jimson. I'll take a look at it.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you Jimson. Given that you guys worked so hard on the earlier input it ought to be relatively easier for you than for others to pick it up.

Jimson Olufuye: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: Marilyn will contribute as well. Thank you Marilyn. If you're not speaking to the meeting, please put yourself on mute if you're not speaking to the full meeting. Thank you.

Let me move on to the next one. This is again the timing of reviews. This is a recognition that the two sets of reviews, the specific reviews like the ATRT

and SSR2 that Denise is working on, that those reviews are supposed to occur every five years.

There's a separate set of board-mandated reviews that have been in the bylaws for over a decade where every five years ICANN hires a consultant to review the ACs and SOs, other than the GAC that is.

Those reviews tend to space themselves out or combine on top of each other based on completely random elements of timing. And the idea here is to come up with long-term options to have the flexibility necessary to adjust it so that not too many reviews are happening in a single year.

And I am very grateful to Barbara Wanner for drafting a BC comment on this. It's a first attachment on the policy calendar. Arinola, you've also volunteered to help but I understand you haven't had a chance to submit your edits to Barbara yet.

This is a couple of pages long. It's a relatively brief comment. The general tone that Barbara has here is that we do want to create the flexibility as long as the community is the one controlling the timing. Any comments on that now? This is not due until the 20th of July. Barbara thanks again for your work on this. Is there anything you wanted to add Barbara?

Barbara Wanner: No, no, that's okay. I just welcome everyone's comments. I was really just trying to get something on paper for people to review. So not intending to think this through for the BC. You know, I really welcome everyone's review and input. Thanks.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you Barbara. Comments 4, 5 and 6 are all due at the end of July, July 27. But now is the time to start thinking about who can volunteer to help the BC work out its position.

The first is on the open data initiative, the data sets and the metadata, and in particular ICANN org is seeking input on priorities for doing their work on publishing data sets.

The reason priorities are so important is that in ICANN's tight budget framework, things that are ranked high are the ones who will get funding. So to the extent the BC is going to be interested in following through on our significant attention to the open data initiative and transparency and fact-based policy making, I shouldn't think it would be difficult to find a few BC volunteers to work on this, Number 4, on the open data initiative, data sets, and metadata.

I'm positive we have BC members that are strong on data-based design and data operations. Can I get a volunteer?

Denise Michel: I'll help.

Steve DelBianco: Denise Michel? Thank you Denise. Appreciate that.

Faisal Shah: Steve this is Faisal. I can help too.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you Faisal. I will circulate some of the earlier BC comments regarding the ODI data sets. Thank you both.

All right, there's one on the Dot Coop. This is one of the - I think perhaps the last of the sponsored or community TLDs. This agreement is coming up for

renewal. And as usual, ICANN org has done bilateral private negotiations with the operator of Dot Coop.

And they've come up with a registry agreement that's very similar to what Museum obtained in March of this year. Now we commented extensively on Dot Museum based on work of Phil Corwin and I. And we do need a volunteer. Phil's no longer with us. We need a volunteer to help draft those BC comments.

I can take the first stab based on what we said about Dot Museum. But I would like to see if there's any help that can be provided. Zak, you would help me with Dot Coop? Thank you very much.

Zak Muscovitch: Yes. My pleasure.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you very much. All right and the final one is the fellowship program. Marilyn Cade has already responded on list. Thank you Marilyn for reading the policy calendar. And I appreciate that, so Marilyn has volunteered to help on the draft on the fellowship program.

But certainly any BC members who have been beneficiaries of fellowship, you need to help Marilyn draft this BC comment. You know who you are, those who've gotten fellowship as you're way into the ICANN environment.

And Mark if you said you're writing your comment already, that might be one that you're doing on your own behalf. But please also if you can help Marilyn develop one for the BC as well. Great. Thank you.

All right, let me quickly move on to GDPR, typically the topic we discuss and spend an awful lot of time on. A lot has happened since we last had our call.

We were focusing on our last call on the temporary spec that ICANN had issued and focusing on the work of GNSO Council who's going to launch an expedited policy development process, so we abbreviate that as an EPDP.

Council can write the charter. Council will determine the rules on a consensus basis to come up with an expedited, which is a fast-tracked PDP so that it can come up with a policy to replace the so-called temporary specification approved by the ICANN board.

Those temp specs can be renewed by the board three times at 90-day intervals. But after one year the temporary specification is supposed to go away. And it's supposed to be replaced by the work of the GNSO Council, which is what we are formed to do.

Noe in the middle of all that, the European Data Protection Board wrote a letter to ICANN indicating that it would take some prosecutorial discretion while ICANN was working very hard to come up with GDPR compliance. That's something that we had worked towards.

And then also a German court had originally denied ICANN's injunction when ICANN sought to force a registrar to collect the technical and admin contacts in addition to the registrar. That injunction was rejected but ICANN appealed the case just this week.

And they're looking to get a higher court so that it could require registries and registrars to collect the information which is a precursor for being able to access it later on.

I really wanted to call all of your attention to the SSAC, the Security and Stability Advisory Committee, put out a report. I have linked to it and given you a couple of key points right in the policy calendar.

They released it on the 14th of July and it's a very authoritative and pretty hard-hitting piece of work where the SSAC is advising ICANN's board - please go on mute. Somebody's typing. Please go on mute if you're not speaking please.

The SSAC is advising the ICANN board that they need to work new principles into their contracts with registries and registrars about legitimate users who have to be able to gain access to the registration data. And they believe that the expedited PDP should ensure that security practitioners and law enforcement have full access as allowed by law. It's a very strong document.

It was one of those reasons that I invited Rod Rasmussen, the chair of the SSAC to be on the high-interest topic panel next Tuesday in Panama looking at accreditation models going forward.

And then finally on June 19, just earlier this week, as I described to all of you last week, ICANN decided to do for accreditation and access something similar to what it had done on GDPR compliance, and that is sort of a top-down community informed that ultimately a top-down proposal from ICANN on how it believes accreditation should be handled.

That might be an instruction to the community to take up a PDP. It might be in the form of another temporary spec that the board would have to approve. It might even be a modification of the temp spec for Calzone that was issued last month.

We don't know how it's going to progress but that will be the primary topic on the Tuesday panel in Panama. So I have included the temporary - sorry, I have included the policy proposal and a chart comparing it to two proposals for accreditation.

One is the one that all of you have helped us with for the IPC and the BC. And the other is known as (Philly Special) which was put out by Mike Palage. Mike was a former ICANN board member and a former BC member for many years. And he will also join the panel in Panama.

I'll stop there on GDPR and ask Chantelle if you wouldn't mind bringing up the Margie Milam draft letter. This was circulated by an e-mail from Margie Milam this morning. This is an effort to help inform the board for the work they need to do when we gather in Panama.

And again the board meets starting I believe tomorrow in Panama and over the weekend. So this is an effort not so much to advocate for brand new positions but to put plain and simple questions in front of the board that we'd like them to be able to address when they meet with the BC when we gather in Panama.

And all of these questions relate to the temporary spec that the board approved. So you can all scroll through this document. But please also if you check your last e-mail from Margie Milam, you'll see that the document is in there.

The one I'm displaying is accepted the track changes that came in from Tim Chen. And I want to thank Tim for doing that good work. Margie, Tim, I

think this is an excellent letter. I did want to call your attention to Question 18, Question 18 in your letter.

Question 18 says, "What specifically are ICANN's plans for support for the important items listed in the annex?" Well one of the items listed in the annex was of course the idea of accredited access. So I am going to invite you to consider whether we want to rephrase Number 18 in a way that acknowledges that org at least has proposed something with regard to accredited access.

But there are other future community action items that might need to be addressed. You don't have to make the edit but Margie, Tim, please consider whether we want to in some way explicitly acknowledge with regard to accreditation, at least that further community action item has a track of its own.

I think it's an excellent letter and I particularly like Question 19. It's outstanding. I'll take a queue. Any BC members want to weigh in on this draft letter. I am not treating this letter as an establishment of BC policy positions.

Instead I'm establishing this letter as a list of questions that will help us to inform policy, although nearly everything in this letter is drawing upon the work that BC has approved and has done already in the area of GDPR. Margie, your hand is up.

Margie Milam: Yes Steve, yes I think that's fine to clarify the language that you raised in Question 17. This draft came out before we actually saw what was happening so that's a good catch. We can make that adjustment.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you Margie. Any others? All right we are going to try to get this letter out today since we definitely want the board and staff to have it in hand before they gather in Panama. We'll post it to the BC comment page but it is a list of questions and not a set of positions. Margie thanks again.

Chantelle would you please re-display the policy calendar? I'm going to lean heavily on Susan and Marie to describe the council meeting that occurred two days ago. It was a special meeting on trying to do a charter for the expedited PDP. And I think that will be the main topic of council when you gather in Panama as well.

So I'm going to scroll up to the extraordinary meeting under Channel 2 – that's on the screen for all of you to see – and turn it over to Susan and Marie our counsellors. Marie I don't hear you, please. I'm not hearing any voices from Marie so I'll quickly walk you through what's in here.

They had an extraordinary meeting of the council way back on June 12 to talk about temporary specification. At that point, it seemed as if some of the contract parties were not too keen on discussing accreditation as part of the EPDP.

But oh how things changed when ICANN org published earlier this week their proposal for accredited access. When that happened, the very next morning Council held this call to develop a charter. And most of the call was members of Council from the Contract Parties expressing a lot of concern that ICANN org was coming up with a proposal that should have been left to Council.

That was quite surprising turn of events because now they're playing process and playing roles because suddenly org is trying to be aggressive on the issue

of accreditation, something we had advocated long and hard. So Marie I see you're ready to go with audio so I'll turn it over to you.

Marie Pattullo: Thank you. Can you hear me?

Steve DelBianco: Yes.

Marie Pattullo: Great, thanks. Sorry that I couldn't make the extraordinary meeting on the 12th. Unavoidable crash. The meeting this week I know that you and many of our other colleagues listened into. Thank you for what you said about it already. What we have is what we have and what we have is some people who want the scope of the EPDP to be very, very restrictive.

That includes a question mark over what is and is not within the picket fence, translation what we can and can't actually do at the community to affect an individual commercial contract between ICANN, the registries and registrars.

Now Susan and Denise and I think everyone is of the opinion that everything in the temp spec is within the picket fence. The registries and the registrars do not agree. That question was put to the board. The response from the board was we haven't had time to talk about that yet.

Then came forward this unified access model that ICANN published Monday into Tuesday which created quite a lot of heat. Nobody knew it was coming. Is it going to be part of the same EPDP? Is it going to be a different EPDP, blah, blah, blah, blah, blah.

Rolled up into this is how do we actually get EPDP itself up and running? Now that includes competition. It includes scope. It includes will this access

model be in it or not. So theoretically most of the call on Tuesday was actually about that, about drafting the charter for the EPDP.

I say theoretically because most of the chat was about substance. The charter, the main issue that we have at the BC so far is ensuring that we get enough bodies in that group, in the working group.

Now the working group if it's going to get its job done cannot include thousands of people. Of course not. But they are trying to limit at the moment the full members of the working group to be three per SG. So we'd have one from the BC.

We would like that to be a minimum of two, so a minimum of six for the CSG plus an alternate. We're getting pushback on that. We also believe that the GAC ought to be involved. And I -- this is a very personal thing -- think it should be two, one from the EU and one from not in the EU, although the newest news on that is apparently the GAC want five. Who, we have no idea.

So what we've done is appoint various well volunteers. There are various members of the councilors are going to step up and start looking at how this (unintelligible) is going to work. And there's going to be a session on Monday at 5 o'clock that's going to go into this. Our very own Susan gets very involved in that of course. Thank you (unintelligible) Susan. Meanwhile there's also a draft letter that's being put together from the council to the board that looks at three things. The first is the access model, what is it, how does it how does it fit, what do you want to do, what want us to do with it? The second is the question I just raised about a picket fence and the third budget. If we've got one, what is it? So Steve do you want to take it from there?

Steve DelBianco: Thank you Marie. Margie Milam had been on ICANN staff when the particular picket fence paragraph was discussed and we've covered it on each of the last two calls. There's a clause in the picket fence discussion that says that access to registrant data is well within the picket fence. And I am not worried that accredited access could turn out to be something that's not within the picket fence. Will it be something that can be just justified as an expedited PDP, don't know? Can the board vote the ICANN org access model as a temporary specification, I don't know for sure but I believe the picket fence will turn out to be the least of our worries on that. Margie your hand is up please.

Margie Milam: Yes Steve, and I just want to share with you what I shared with Susan. Essentially if you take a look at the PDP for the RDS next-generation Whois that was suspended and you look at their charter obviously everything in that charter was in the picket fence, it covers all of these issues. It was a very detailed charter that was pulled together so that's - the argument that is not within the picket fence just flat out falls. And so and hopefully we'll get past that but it's just frustrating that there's hurdles everywhere when we really need to focus on getting this work done and getting it done quickly. And I know Steve you've been talking about the concept of whether this should be another, a temporary spec for accreditation. I think that may be important for us to pursue given the dire need here and the issues we're seeing with trying to get access even in these last few weeks.

Steve DelBianco: Margie it's Steve. I would agree that if we can show evidence that there is urgency then by all means we should join with the governments and push hard for another temporary spec. But I also believe that because we're part of the GNSO Council that we need to also dive in and insist that the expedited PDP include a track for the development of an accredited access model. In the best of all worlds if ICANN is pursuing negotiations with European governments

and the commission and DPB they should be part of the discussion. That should be considered staff support for the councils expedited PDP. So we need to pursue parallel tracks both PDP and temp spec because both are necessary and each one will pressure the other to deliver something that we can actually use. Any objections to that as a suggestion?

Great, thank you. And Barbara Wanner let me scroll all the way down to your section on commercial stakeholders group. Barbara over to you.

Barbara Wanner: Thanks Steve I'll keep it very brief. Everyone knows, pretty much knows what our agenda of meetings are as the CSG in Panama. I'm sure Chantelle will recirculate that agenda. So what I'd like to update you on today are two issues that we will want to discuss in the CSG open meeting. And that has to do with finally approving the procedure for the selection of board seat 14. The NCSG and hope to get final text for us before Panama. I had yet to see it yet so we may have to discuss that as well and further tweaks there.

Secondly though and I know this was very definitely was a priority for Wolf-Ulrich we have to determine a process for selecting the GNSO chair within the Non-contracted Parties House. Farzaneh has provided us with a draft to begin that discussion so that if time does not permit at Panama I think probably what the CSG will do is convene a separate teleconference to sort of talk through these issues but I wanted to give everybody a heads up that these very important leadership related issues will be discussed in our CSG meetings. So that's it for me today. Thanks.

Steve DelBianco: Great. If there's no other questions on the policy calendar I can turn it back over to Claudia for the general agenda.

Marilyn Cade: Steve it's Marilyn. And I have a question…

Susan Kawaguchi: I'm sorry I was…

Steve DelBianco: Go ahead Marilyn and then I understand Susan has just turned us so Marilyn and then (Susan).

Marilyn Cade: Thanks. I just wanted to - I had a question for Barbara. Just generally what's your assessment of a draft? We've been very well served by our present GNSO Policy Council chair. And I'm not going to make a comment about the effectiveness of one of the vice chairs because that's really up to her to share with us. But are we – do you feel like we're in pretty good shape to be able to continue to support Heather for a second term or do we need to be worried about maybe doing some engagement with the NPOC?

Barbara Wanner: I really don't have a sense for that right now Marilyn. Please correct me if I'm wrong Steve and others but it was my impression that Heather was prepared to step down and pass the mantle onto someone else. Do I understand that correctly?

Susan Kawaguchi: This is Susan Kawaguchi, Barbara.

Barbara Wanner: Yes.

Susan Kawaguchi: Heather's termed out.

Barbara Wanner: That's what I thought, okay.

Susan Kawaguchi: So she cannot run. She and I…

Barbara Wanner: Okay.

Susan Kawaguchi:	…I think Donna Austin are all termed out for this, you know, come October we're all off the council.

Barbara Wanner:	Okay, all right well then I'd say that we should – this could be challenging then because I understand that one individual in the NCSG is quite keen to be elevated to chair. But then I have also heard comments favoring a member of the Contracted Party House who would do a very good and evenhanded job in the leadership position. So I think maybe this is something we want to talk about privately among ourselves within the BC and then privately still within the CSG before responded to this proposal by Farzaneh.

Marilyn Cade:	And I'll just make a follow-up comment quickly I'm sorry, again it's Marilyn. I'm trying to be delicate here because this is a comment about the - let me make it about the work effectiveness of someone in the vice chair position who I've worked with for many, many years. And his ability to carry a heavy workload and deliver on time is extremely challenged so I just share that for anyone. I know the counselors are very familiar, I'm very familiar through work with him on the CCWG, IG and its elsewhere. And it's I think effectiveness and also balance as you just said Barbara is going to be incredibly important.

Barbara Wanner:	Well if you - yes if you see Marie's note in the chat I think that's cause for optimism but I've also heard other people in the BC, in the CSG articulate a similar point of view. So I don't think it will be difficult to build agreement among the CSG for what - for the candidate we'd like to see go forward. And I prefer to leave this to further discussion in Panama among ourselves. But your points are noted on the record Marilyn for sure. Thank you.

Claudia Selli: Thank you. If there are no other questions maybe we can continue with the agenda.

Steve DelBianco: Susan Kawaguchi…

Claudia Selli: Okay.

Steve DelBianco: …joined. Now Susan we covered, Marie and I covered extensively the June 12 meeting, this week's PDP charter discussion and worked through the discussion with Margie about the priorities for counsel to pursue in parallel a PDP on accreditation while we continue to work with ICANN org on a top-down potentially a temp spec for accreditation. So if you have any questions on that I guess Marie and I can reach you afterwards. But back to Claudia.

Woman: Thanks Steve.

Claudia Selli: Thank you Steve so just to go on to the ICANN 62 BC meetings, Chantelle has requested meetings for our open BC meeting with Goran and John Jeffrey. This has to be confirmed and it would be at 9:00 in the morning. Then we have confirmed David Conrad or Matt Larson for to discuss the open that initiative discussion. And then we will have also the presentation of the, our BC ALAC project by our members. And I think the Contracted Party House that we have requesting a meeting with has declined the meeting because they, their agenda is full so unfortunately will not be able to see them in Panama.

                  We're going to have as I also said the other time in the previous call the MSSI initiative is scheduled if I'm not mistaken for Monday afternoon. And then last but not least I wanted to recall to everyone that we're going to have our outreach BC meeting which is scheduled for the 25th at 6 o'clock. We have

19 people registered but please register yourself and try to attend. The more member we have, the better of course.

And also I wanted to point to you to an email that Chantelle sent out, it was on yesterday and it's concerning the elections. We have a couple of positions that are going to be, I mean that our vacant. Two seats are on the NonCom and the other is the GNSO counselor position. So if anyone has an interest please take a look at Chantelle email and there's - the whole process is outlined there. So I don't know if there are questions but this is all I had to update you with. And if there are no questions I think I see Andrew hands up. I don't know if it's related to…

Andrew Mack: That's right Claudia. Just one quick note, actually two. One is to, I know that Gabi couldn't be on this call because she had a client meeting but I wanted to complement her. She's done a ton of work on the outreach program and it looks like it's going to be really great. In the past we've had such great BC participation. I know that this is a smaller meeting but really appreciate everyone who can be there to be there.

We're also very aware that there is an INTA meeting at 7 o'clock and so will try to get there and get it going on time and get you out the door. For those of you the need to be at that meeting we'll - we're conscious of it. I unfortunately will not be able to be there. I had major surgery on my left knee unfortunately, a soccer injury and I'm stuck at home for a little while. So everybody have a great time in Panama and I'm sorry I can't be there in person anyway.

Claudia Selli: Thank you Andrew. If there are no other comments or questions I will leave the floor again to Jimson.

Jimson Olufuye: Thank you very much Claudia, greetings to everyone this is Jimson speaking. Well, Mack please get well soon. Let me begin with the update on the elections. As Claudia talked about it yes, two NomCom positions- for small businesses and the large businesses- is open, and for the councilor seat currently being held by Susan with time needed to the seat to be vacant by 2018. So, according to the timeline that had been transmitted to us on the list and the mission (proposed) that is 9th July. So you don't need to send anything now. We'll just take notes from one day 9th July 2018 the mission will open and then to close by Monday, 23, July 2018.

And candidates get named as usual. We expect that to be during the week of Tuesday, 24 July and Tuesday 31 July. And thereafter as we normally do on the BC members call with candidates that is by August 4. The time for that will be determined, communicated. And then we'll have our voting on August 2 on Thursday which will close by the following Thursday, August 9.

And election results will be announced by the ExCom on the Friday, 10 of August 2018. And so that the winner for the councilor will be ready to take and so I think by ICANN 63. And also the NomCom representative to take their own seat for that time as well.

The election which shall be conducted by the Secretariat, Chantelle. And by the way thank you Chantelle for all the great work on it. Then I'm sorry a reminder that officer selection for the position of the chair, the Vice Chair Of Finance and Operations; and Vice Chair of Policy Coordination and serve the reps will also come up later in the year, the last quarter as usual according to our existing policy. And that will come up in October November period so that the new set of officers will be received by the fourth week in January 2019. For this case that will come okay, from October.

Secondly, I want to use the opportunity to appreciate the members' very responses in responding to the new invoices sent - members have been obtained pretty well moving forward the expiry of the current fiscal year. And that is highly commendable. But just in case you have an issue with your invoice please let me know or Invoicing secretariat and let them know.

And we got two new members like the opportunity to also welcome Chris Oldknow of Elipe, the newest member. Chris you are most welcome and this brings membership tally to 76. So with this there'll be an improvement in the draft BC wide budget proposal to reflect this addition. And talking about our BC draft BC wide budget proposal a final addition will be submitted to us here in the course of the weekend. And then the ExCom will meet in Panama to approve the BC charter.

Yes we already got some attention about the outreach, want to thank Gabi, Mack and of course Andrew Mack as the chair also but he has spoken about it as well also - to also Claudia so want to encourage all members to be there. It's coming up I think at (unintelligible). But then there'll be ICANN reception. So there is a private room close to the reception where we will have the outreach engagement with guests between 30 to 45 minutes, drinks and some light speeches.

We also have Chris Mondini coming in of the Global Business Engagement for ICANN and CAPATEC, the local counterpart. So after the outreach that - if you want to join the main ICANN reception so look forward to seeing everyone be in Panama here.

And then there is just last a notice sent out by Chantelle on Meet the BC. So I'd like to encourage every one of us to complete that. It doesn't take more than ten to, ten minutes to tidy up your details not also bad at all so would like

to (unintelligible) corporate responsibility, provide up-to-date information about our members, our membership representatives to the general public in the spirit of transparency, as you know. Well I don't know if there is any questions, now willing to take any questions. Thank you.

Claudia Selli: Thank you Jimson. I don't know if there are other points that member wants to bring up? It doesn't seem so so I would close the meeting, adjourn the meeting.

Marilyn Cade: Claudia?

Claudia Selli: And the next - yes, sorry it's Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: Right, please…

Claudia Selli: Yes Marilyn, please go ahead.

Marilyn Cade: Yes thanks. It's Marilyn. I just had a quick question. I wonder if we might add to our agenda when we're meeting face to face our own plans to take advantage of the fact that there will be high-level GAC meetings in Barcelona. And I had done a proposal before. I'm not putting it on the table. I'm just suggesting that it would be good for us to brainstorm while we're together how we might take maximum advantage of the fact there will be a number of high-level GAC, sorry government attendees joining their GAC members. If we could just add that to the agenda. Or…

Claudia Selli: Do you mean for the 28th or…

Marilyn Cade: Well sometime when we're together in - at ICANN 62.

Claudia Selli: Sure. Your point is noted Marilyn.

Jimson Olufuye: And Claudia I have the question. This is Jimson.

Claudia Selli: Yes, please Jimson go ahead.

Jimson Olufuye: Yes just so every one of us like it's basically responding to the NTIA inquiries, are we responding to the NTIA inquiries? Is NTIA released from inquiries asking the public to comment or has it passed? I don't know?

Claudia Selli: Steve I guess the question is for you. Although I think I don't know and we'll hear from Steve but I'm not sure it's in the remit of the BC but I'm happy for Steve to jump in. Okay maybe he's probably Steve is on mute. We will clarify Jimson that within but I'm not sure whether we would do that as BC as otherwise we should be responding to a different notice (transdiction) but it's too - it's related to ICANN so we can see also what he thinks.

Any other question or comments? No? If there are no other questions I would adjourn the meeting and we will see each other in Panama on the 28th of June, well certainly before that of course but to the - our BC open meeting. Thank you very much everybody for participating. I wish safe travels to all that are coming to Panama and with the others we will certainly hear from each other on remotely.

END