

ICANN

**Moderator: Chantelle Doerksen
July 12, 2018
10:00 am CT**

Coordinator: Recordings have started.

Chantelle Doerksen: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the BC Members call on Thursday, July 12, 2018. In the interest of time there will be no roll call, as attendance will be taken via the Adobe Connect room and the phone bridge. I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes, and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. With this I will turn it over to Claudia Selli to begin. Claudia, please go ahead.

Claudia Selli: Thank you very much Chantelle and welcome everybody on the BC call. I just wanted to inform the members that today David Olive and Theresa Swinehart sent out a message to the COSC's leaders to basically see whether there was an interest to have monthly calls and update on the GDPR, and of course the majority of the leaders were supporting this option.

So as more details come in of course I will keep you posted. On another note Jimson excused himself so from the agenda we will have – not his update but

Chantelle will circulate his report because he sent out to the ExCom a few points for the update.

So Chantelle I believe you are going to circulate to the list so that everyone is aware on Jimson's point, and for the rest we will have the usual agenda discussion items on the election as well.

The – and then I – that's it from my side for now and Steve I will leave the floor to you.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you Claudia. Can you hear me?

Claudia Selli: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: Great. Thanks everyone. Look at the policy calendar, which Chantelle is about to load into the Adobe. I emailed this yesterday approximately 24 hours ago. If anybody doesn't have it indicate it in the chat and Chantelle will forward – new one to you. There's only one item I have to report since our last meeting and call and that is on the 21st of June we submitted a list of questions. It wasn't a policy position but a list of questions. We sent it to the ICANN Board and the Org and they were questions regarding the temporary specification.

Most of these questions focused on how is it working now, not so much where are we going to go with the nonpublic WHOIS through accreditation models but how is it working for access to nonpublic WHOIS data today when requests are made with the accompanying legitimate purposes?

I want to thank Margie Milam for drafting those questions. Tim Chen and Alex Deacon and I provided some edits. We don't have a response to that and I don't think it'll come very quickly.

A lot of that work that's in that letter is work that we'll try to incorporate in the work of the expedited PDP to replace the temporary spec. Thanks again Margie.

Let me move on to the open public comments at ICANN and this may be a record. There are nine open public comments right now, most of which the BC will want to weigh in on.

The first one is due on the 16th of July so just a few days away. The good news is we already have a draft and two rounds of edits that have happened for it.

This is for the - ICANN's guidelines – their draft guidelines on community travel support. The BC did play a role at providing input to these guidelines and that was drafted by Marilyn with edits by many of you.

And then Jimson who's not on the call today circulated a first draft and made some suggested edits and I thought they were sensible edits. I circulated that to all of you with a request to reply.

Jimson has subsequently taken a look at edits that were offered by Marilyn and Mark Datysgeld and that is what I attached. It's the first attachment to the policy calendar.

Jimson's not on the call to discuss but let's see if any of you have any questions or suggestions on our community travel support guideline. We'll be

filing that comment on the 16th of July in substantially the same form as what I circulated with the policy calendar unless we hear otherwise between now and the 16th.

Let me turn to the second one. It's the open data initiative. I wanted to thank Denise Michel and Faisal Shah and Mark Datysgeld for volunteering to work on this.

I'm looking forward to getting a draft from Faisal, Denise and Mark in time to circulate it for BC member review. That comment period closes the 27th of July.

Are there any additional volunteers who wish to join the three that have already said they would work on this? This is a relatively easy comment since we're just trying to give ICANN an idea of the priorities of the BC as to which data elements should be developed first.

Denise I know – I think you have dialed in and I wanted to thank you for volunteering with everything that you have on your plate. Thank you for that.

And I do hope - Faisal I know you're on the Adobe and I hope you'll be able to work with Denise on that. Try to give her as much help as you can because Denise is overtaxed right now. Thank you Faisal.

Faisal Shah: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: Great. Thanks Faisal. Number 3 is the Dot Coop. Dot Coop is a sponsored top-level domain or sTLD and they may be the last one left who hasn't converted to the new base registry agreement.

And what we have here is an adoption of Dot Coop through negotiations directly with ICANN. We were not a party to any of those negotiations. They worked with ICANN and came up with a new registry agreement, and it looks an awful lot like what Dot Museum obtained back in March.

We had commented on Dot Museum last October on Phil Corwin's work and mine. Now Zak I wanted to thank you for volunteering to draft BC comments on Dot Coop.

That's also due the 27th of July. So Zak I see you're on the Adobe. I would hope that you could commit by - perhaps by Monday to have something ready to circulate to the BC. Would that be possible?

Zak Muscovitch: I don't think Monday but perhaps Tuesday or Wednesday, which should still leave sufficient time if that's satisfactory Steve.

Steve DelBianco: It is. Thank you Zak. The comments we put in on Dot Museum – we went into some detail and commenting on the notion that if you took a special purpose community-based TLD like museum and then opened it up to anybody who was a user museum, we said that it's not a community TLD at all when you do that; when you open it to virtually anyone with no validation or credentials of any kind.

But Dot Coop – let's be aware of whether that's also going to be the case in Dot Coop. I've done an exact parallel to Dot Museum but let's be aware of whether they have – trying to use this renegotiation process to shed any of their community priorities.

Thank you Zak. I'll look for that – or middle of next week. Okay we have a fellowship program, Number 4 on here, and these comments also close the 27th of July.

Marilyn and Mark have volunteered to draft BC comments but I haven't seen anything coming forth on that yet. We did a relatively detailed comment about a year – two years ago on the fellowship program.

But Marilyn and Mark - I would look for them to provide something. I don't believe either is on the call or dialing in today so I will have to follow-up with them directly.

Are there any other volunteers that want to join them? Any of you experienced in getting fellowship program benefits from ICANN?

Lawrence Olawale-Roberts: Yes Steve this is Lawrence. I will – I'm drafting something. I will attach it to what Marilyn and Mark has done.

Steve DelBianco: Would you please - thank you Lawrence. Would you please let Marilyn and Mark know that you're interested in help – to where they are? That'll help the process and copy me on that too.

Lawrence Olawale-Roberts: All right, thank you. I'll do that.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you Lawrence. That's half of the list. The rest of them are due the 31st of July or later. The first one on Number 5 I will handle. It's a very short comment on whether we agree with ICANN's options and suggestions for what to do with the Accountability and Transparency Review Number 3. We call that ATRT3.

Denise Michel is Chair of that and a lot of you realize that that – sorry, Denise Michel is Chair of the SSR review. But Denise had suggested to me that we did agree with ICANN’s suggestions on ATRT3 but we have to be sure that ICANN understands that this is not to set precedent, nor is it to allow the board and staff to believe that they can readily propose changes to this review team.

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: ...third ATRT review could be limited to the scope of reviewing prior ATRT3 – ATRT recommendations. We agreed with that because 9 of the 12 Workstream 2 projects were all about accountability, so it would put a significant drain on volunteers and staff if we had two parallel projects looking at new accountability measures.

So our comment will be short and sweet and we will embrace the restricted scope of ATRT3 and make it clear that this is not a precedential step. Any other comments on that?

Okay great, thank you. Arinola and Barbara volunteered to work on Number 6, which was the long-term options to adjust the timeline of the different reviews that ICANN does, and in this case we’re talking about specific reviews such as the ATRT but also the organization reviews, which are required under the bylaws every five years.

Number – attachment to today’s policy calendar -- believe it’s the second one -- is Barbara’s current draft. Arinola had volunteered to help but Arinola I don’t believe you’ve done any edits yet to Barbara.

This would be a great time to do that so we can put any edits in front of BC members in time to review on our next call. I want to see whether I can get a volunteer for the BC to handle Number 7.

This has to do with certain explicit list of Red Cross and Red Crescent organizations, and this is about second-level reserve names that may not be registered in any gTLD.

There will be an exception procedure there but this is a very specific list and it doesn't include acronyms. This is the kind of reserve names procedure that GNSO has to embrace, and we need to fill a volunteer from the BC to draft a comment on whether this list is appropriate and whether the process is done.

This is an amendment to a policy, not a brand new PDP but an amendment to an earlier policy to incorporate some new names. Any chance we can get a volunteer from the BC?

It's not due until the 31st of July. All right, I'll check back with people on that. We have only two more that are due in August and September. I won't get into the details on that but please take a look.

There's an independent review process implementation team. This is a very legalistic set of recommendations. It would be helpful to have any attorneys that are in the BC, especially those who have been through the independent review process or IRP at ICANN.

The whole point of these implementation improvements is to improve the way the IRP works when the community challenges the decision of Board or Org.

Any volunteers right now? Kristen thank you – volunteering for Number 8. I appreciate that. And Number 9 is something a lot of you have been anxiously awaiting as to what will be the procedures for the next round of new generic top-level domains.

So this has been called the subsequent procedures. It's a strange name for a PDP but what it's about are procedures that will be used for the reopening of new gTLDs. We'll revisit that on our next call.

All right, I have a substantial list of what's been happening on GDPR and I just repeated it here for those who want to get a quick catch up on where we are.

Since our last call – I'll scroll down to the next page so you see what's relatively current. I wanted to bring all of your attention to the fact that on the 5th of July the European Data Protection Board posted a new letter to ICANN.

I thought it was rather harsh and partially specific. It returned to two or three conclusions that the BC is probably not too happy about. For instance, the Data Protection Board said that any personal data even if it's for a legal person should not be publicly displayed.

They said you could display domain and addresses like admin@domain.com but not a person's name even it was for a legal entity. They said that accreditation models can be designed by ICANN or registrars or registries and promised that guidance on accreditation would be coming soon.

You all know that many BC and IPC members are working on a model for accreditation and access. I have highlighted Version 1.6 but by next week I believe we will see a new model that's been rearranged and configured in a

way that it looks a lot more like the proposal/the framework that ICANN put together before we all arrived in Panama.

This'll make it easier to compare, (conched) and perhaps even influence what ICANN's framework is going to look like for accreditation. I will next turn it over to Susan and Marie to talk about GNSO Council and – which has pretty much been working on the expedited PDP for replacing the temporary specification since we all gathered in Panama.

I've listened in on those calls and I'm really grateful to Susan and Marie for their work there, and in particular Susan Kawaguchi is representing the Commercial Stakeholder's Group on a drafting team within Council.

What are they drafting? They're drafting the charter for this expedited PDP and that charter will define what it can and must look at in order to have policy that replaces the temporary spec.

Susan I have a number of items here in the policy calendar that – to inform people on what you've been working on but I will turn it back over to you at this point.

Susan Kawaguchi: Thanks Steve and I don't think - Marie could not make the call today so - unless Marie you're on and I'm not seeing you. I know she had some challenges with her schedule this week.

So mainly what we've been working on since the ICANN meeting in Panama is the draft charter. We came to an agreement pretty much on the composition of the team, so each of the CSG - each of the constituencies who – will have two seats and one alternate so we are looking for members.

Mark just stepped forward. We need another actual member for a seat at the table and then someone to be the alternate to follow and always back up the others.

Right now the scope is still in flux. There's another round of drafting that's been done and another small group meeting next week, and then we will have the final draft and hopefully be able to vote on the charter at the GNSO Council meeting next Thursday.

So once that happens then the PDP will launch immediately. Whoever steps forward on the GNSO Council as liaison will chair the group until a chair has been agreed upon and that – they put out a call – Council put in a – out a call for expression of interest in the chair seat.

We're looking for somebody that can remain completely neutral so the seat of the chair will not count against any of the stakeholders or constituency. The leadership – GNSO Council leadership, you know, the chair and the two vice chairs and then Maxim and I who – I Chair the Standing Selection Committee and he is Vice Chair - will also sit with the GNSO Council leadership in making the decision on the chair.

So far I have not seen any names or any information but so far I've been told there are two candidates that have expressed interest. So we were able to get most of our asks into the charter.

It's still – there's still a lot in the charter that we don't agree with but we may have to live with, and that's why we need strong team members to be on this PDP to really direct the work.

What I did get put in place was previously the Contracted Party House wanted a strict sort of barrier or deadline for – or to start the work on access and they've all agreed to a staggered approach now.

So there are gating questions such as purpose that need to be answered before you could really work on access so it makes sense not to, you know, work on it out the gate.

We need to decide on these gating questions first but they wanted this artificial barrier or deadline of the – of a first initial report so it wouldn't - even been considered for discussion until probably December, which was way too late.

So for the most part it's been a really busy week. You'll see some of the things that we did in Panama on the – on Steve's policy calendar and next Thursday will be a big day to actually launch this PDP. Any questions?

Steve DelBianco: This is Steve. I had said in the policy calendar that it looked to me like you were pretty successful in getting into the draft charter a recognition that we needed to make an access method to – policies around access methods so that if and when the accreditation model is recognized by European authorities is legally clear, you know, ICANN can mandate Contract Parties to grant the accredited access via RDAP.

Would you characterize that as something you think you are likely to get in the final charter?

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes I think we will get that in the final charter. Contracted Parties House has real – has definitely agreed to that - not so much on the NCSG. But what I am concerned with is we have not moved some of the questions about vetting

accreditation authorities and getting in – what I would consider getting into the weeds on accreditation.

You know, I just do not think that ICANN can tell Interpol how to decide who they authorize and accredit for requesting information. You know, they – there will have to be some policies around that, but I'm afraid with the questions inserted that have not come out that NCSG will not take this and run with it so I'm still pushing back on that.

Steve DelBianco: Susan it's Steve, and I completely agree with your use of the example of Interpol. It will be ridiculous to everyone except the NCSG that ICANN would dictate how Interpol would accredit officers from various law enforcement agencies.

And if you keep bringing that example up I think people will understand that the GNSO Council of ICANN has no business trying to define accreditation mechanisms.

All it has to say is if and when somebody like Interpol or VIPO or somebody gets accredited and European regulators say that it's legally clear, then we want to turn to the Contract Parties and demand that they request – they respond. So, I mean...

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: ...I – well on the subteam. We're all trying to support you and the – sometimes the use of examples was helpful. Do you believe that the NCSG is isolated in their view right now?

Susan Kawaguchi: Not completely because those questions were put forth by Keith Drasek of VeriSign. And it – one other sort of funny thing or unusual issue or problem I see with the small group drafting team, because actually the whole Council started off drafting and then it came down to just a small team, is that the registrars are not represented on that small team. They are sitting back and allowing VeriSign to lead the charge for them. So I, you know, I've asked why they don't have representation and haven't received an answer but it – that just feels a little funny to me. So I'm not sure exactly what's the motivation there or the strategy is. But whatever it is, we have to live with it...

Steve DelBianco: (Elliot Nas) strategy that we heard about in Panama, the (Elliot Nas) strategy of going his own way with his own taco tiered access which is nothing but a handful of PowerPoint slides right now. But what I have found in conversations with contract parties is assuring them that there's no expectation that they would have to respond to tiered access queries unless it was demonstrated through an accreditation method that their response would not get them in trouble with European data protection authorities. That's what we mean by saying it has to be legally cleared.

Susan Kawaguchi: Right...

Steve DelBianco: And I think reassuring them over and over again that they would never have to respond, have to respond. They could respond voluntarily but they couldn't be forced to respond if it would put them in jeopardy of a GDPR violation.

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: Any questions for Susan? Susan thanks again. You did great work on that. And everybody and not just the sub team that has volunteered but everybody

is eligible to volunteer to be one of our two councilors or alternates. But that call will probably go out next week and so I believe we said so far Margie Milam has indicated interest. Thank you Margie. Is anyone else registered interested being one of the three spots for the BC? All right we need two more. So think about it hard. We'll be sending reminder emails. Susan fought hard along with Marie to make sure that we had two slots and an alternate. So let's be sure that we can fill them. At this point, I'll scroll up to anything else for council Susan?

Susan Kawaguchi: No. That's really it.

Steve DelBianco: Okay. Barbara Wanner, up to you now.

Barbara Wanner: Thank you Steve. This is Barbara Wanner for the record. Everyone has my report of our CSG meetings at Panama. So I won't go through the nitty gritty of what we talked about there. But I would like to draw your attention to a draft of the process for a non-contracted party house selection, nominations and elections for the GNSO Council chair. This draft was initially prepared by Farzaneh in the NCSG and I went through it and made a number of red line revisions. As many of you know one individual who is a member of the NCSG has made clear that he would like to run for GNSO Council chair and some of the provisions of that appear in this process seem to reflect that.

So there are two main concerns I have with it that I am going to – am quite keen to secure feedback from the BC. The first one concerns – I hope that's not me. Okay. The first one concerns point number four. They talk about a seven day deadline from the announcement of the timeline which we've blown past. So I'm not sure where things stand there. But also it talks about, you know, if the current GNSO vice chair wants to run for the chair seat that we select a focal point who will ensure that the stakeholder groups understand

the nomination timeline and initiate their respective nomination processes and so forth.

My principal concern with that point is that in itself would become an area of contention, that we would end up fighting over who the focal point should be rather than focusing on appropriate nominees for the chair position. My suggestion would be to tap ICANN staff to serve as the focal point. That was just my idea and I welcome other suggestions.

And the second major concern I have with this process concerns point number 12, which is the very last point, which it simply says if the SGs do not agree on a nominee by the deadline that they would put – that they will not put forward anyone and inform the GNSO secretary that they could not agree on a nomination, which to me just seems like, you know, where do we go from here. It suggests to me that by default the council chair would go to a member of the contracted party house. I can appreciate that this time around we may not have a problem with that at all but there may be a point in the future where we would have a problem with that.

So I would welcome your thoughts on how we move beyond that and really force the NCSG to not begin and just refuse to reach a compromise but give them an incentive to want to reach a compromise. So I'm happy to take any questions and I think I'd like to give everybody a week to look at this and then I will submit it to the CSG ex-com and just say these are the BC's thoughts on this process, see what they say, and then I think it would fall to Brian who will be chairing things at Barcelona to then send it back to Farzaneh as the CSG consensus revisions. Happy to take questions.

Steve DelBianco: (Unintelligible) one for me and then Marilyn Cade. The first I agree with your point on the danger of a focal point and I would invite you to use rhetoric

such as this. We could say that a single focal point is a single point of failure at getting information to all the groups. Staff is well aware of how emails, something we invested 20 years, that they can send emails to the respective chairs of each of the constituencies and know that those points will distribute the information to the respective members. A new focal point, especially with artificial structures like CSG is a single point of failure.

And the second is that these procedures have to do with nominations and I wanted to clarify that that is nothing to do with how we could vote if for instance if the non-contract party house is unable to agree on any nominee, it's clear that the constituencies and their councilors are free to vote on whoever it is that is nominated...

Barbara Wanner: Okay.

Steve DelBianco: So that – yes so none of this leaks over into committee votes at all.

Barbara Wanner: Okay.

Steve DelBianco: It's really about whether we think we have a house nominee. Isn't that correct?

Barbara Wanner: Yes I guess so Steve. Yes.

Steve DelBianco: Okay great. Thank you Barbara. Marilyn Cade.

Marilyn Cade: Thanks. And Barbara, it's Marilyn speaking. Thank you so much for boy do I remember these days when I was in your shoes trying to do this. It's so tough and thank you for doing this. I support everything Steve just said. I think it's really important to really make it clear that, you know, we may not

reach agreement on a candidate or as in the past we actually have decided that we would be better served by a very neutral contracted party house chair such as Jonathan Robertson was than by duking it out interminably within the house we live in.

So I support everything Steve has just said. I just want make – I just want to – I heard your comment about it would be up to Brian who would be the coordinator on behalf of the CSG. Isn't Barcelona too late for us to be actually making any kind of decision? Don't we need to really kind of be advancing before Barcelona?

Barbara Wanner: No. Absolutely and maybe this is where I don't have a clear understanding of when we pass the leadership mantle from one to the other. The ISPCP sort of led if you will the CSG, you know, through Panama and it was just my understanding since the IPC will lead the CSG for Barcelona that from the period between Panama to Barcelona, that would fall to Brian. But maybe I misunderstand. Can Steve or you or somebody fill me in on process there?

Marilyn Cade: Please Steve I'm just going to make a comment. It's Marilyn. We've mostly and Steve you and Claudia would need to comment on this. But up until now, we've mostly treated coordination of the meeting role as not necessarily being sub but the three CSG reps kind of being equal on all these decisions. Right?

Steve DelBianco: I believe that's right. It's more that when we take turns, it's taking turns doing the hard administrative work of scheduling rooms and times and figures for the CSG shared meetings, both closed and open. So I think Marilyn is right. It's more of an administrative more than a substantive role...

Barbara Wanner: Okay. Okay but in any event I feel that rather than presenting Farzaneh with three different viewpoints or three different sets of redline edits, I think it

would be more useful to present a consolidated set of comments or edits to her proposal from the CSG. What do you think?

Steve DelBianco: Yes.

Marilyn Cade: Definitely Barbara but I – Steve and I were both saying is you go girl. You know, there's no – you shouldn't – if you can lead on this Steve please and others, you know, comment but I think if Barbara can lead on this, I don't think you need to defer to anyone with...

Barbara Wanner: Okay.

Marilyn Cade: ...because that's just my view.

Barbara Wanner: Okay. Great.

Steve DelBianco: I mean Marilyn there's no need to be differential on. In fact, I know Brian would appreciate it. He hasn't given any mind share at all to these administrative and voting issues. He's focusing very tightly on who is in GDPR. So I have a feeling that he and the IPC, ISPs will appreciate the leadership that you're showing.

Barbara Wanner: Okay. Just based on our experience trying to work with the NCSG on board seat 14, you know, I will, you know, collect their inputs to this and send it to Farzaneh. But I'm not at all optimistic that we'll have something hammered out in time for Barcelona. You know, we still haven't seen NCSG approval of what we spent extra time on in Puerto Rico to try and work out on board seat 14. I didn't know whether my frustration concerning that was reflected in some of my edits, but I'm just sharing that with the group.

Steve DelBianco: Great. Marilyn's hand is up. Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: I mention only – sorry?

Steve DelBianco: Yes go ahead.

Marilyn Cade: If I could just very quickly. Since this is a BC only and it's on our private list, for anyone who's new, there's a lot of challenges to working with Farzaneh as a personality. She's a very deep and she has a very deep personal antagonism toward the commercial sector supported by her very close relationship with Milton Mueller and in many cases Barbara it is just almost impossible for her in my experience having known her very well and also been her mentor in an organization that a colleague and I launched in Lebanon, you know, it's really unfortunate that you're stuck with working with her and not able to include the leadership of the other two sub parts of the NCSG. So good luck and god bless you.

Barbara Wanner: Well we'll see what happens. You know, all I can do is give it my best shot and I'll keep everybody apprised. And thanks Chantelle. I see your note. You know, we may have to do. I'd like to reach out in particular to Vicky because I think she would provide some useful into this. Vicky Sheckler is part of the IPC as well as Tony Holmes who is quite frustrated with the – all the time we spent on board seat 14 for apparently not. So, you know, we likely will convene a call or try to convene a call with the NCSG and take it forward too. Yes we'll fall work as well for sure Steve.

Steve DelBianco: Barbara thank you. Any other questions for Barbara on CSG liaison? All right fantastic. I'd like to turn it back over to Claudia. We have some other administrative items on the agenda. Chantelle could you put the agenda up in the Adobe? Thank you.

Claudia Selli: Yes. Thank you very much Steve and one item that I wanted to bring up is first of all item 63. So we need to basically decide on the topic proposals that we want to give to the – to ICANN by the 27th of July. I imagine of course that GDPR will be the main topic that we would like to propose probably I guess access but I just heard that to the whole group so that we can then put something forward by the 27th. And the other point we need to decide on is the meeting request for the BC open meeting. This is due by the 18th of August.

From past experience, I think we shouldn't be inviting too, too many people but certainly it's a good occasion to have some exchangings in a lively manner. I think we tried - for Puerto we tried to have the registrar. Maybe can try again for Barcelona since we did not manage if the group of course think this could be a valued option. If not in any case, I'm open for – to listen to your suggestions. And we can have also the proposals and out by mail if for now there are no – there's nothing coming up. I see Marilyn with a hand's up or is this a former hand Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: No it's a current hand Claudia, thank you. Marilyn. I'm hoping that we might prioritize engagement with the high level attendees from the GAC in Barcelona. And I wonder if we could think about that as feasible for us. We don't yet know who they will be but we do know that there will be a number of high level attendees and the Spanish government is – I was just on a separate call where the Spanish government was talking about their outreach to ensure that they have high level attendance. I wonder if we could, you know, meeting with the registrars would be interesting but if we could engage with the high level government attendees, that might be something that's a real significant coup for the business constituency.

Claudia Selli: Thank you Marilyn. The only thing is that I don't know whether the high level government representative would be there when we have our BC open meeting. I don't know whether these fell in the same days because I imagine that they would come for the ministerial and then leave as soon as possible I guess. They wouldn't be staying for the length of the meeting. So it remains to be seen who's attending and whether, you know, the date and time can accommodate them which is probably I see it more difficult. But of course it's a good suggestion. So Marilyn I see that you're suggesting to do something separate than the open meeting, right? Okay we can discuss that...

Marilyn Cade: Yes.

Claudia Selli: We can discuss that, the way to do it and how to do it certainly. Is there any other suggestions for now for the BC open meeting? No? Okay. Then the other point that I wanted to bring – Marilyn, yes please.

Marilyn Cade: Sorry. I'm so sorry. I should have said this before. Marilyn. Should we consider the ALAC as a backup? Given that some of the issues we're very concerned, in the past ALAC has been a real ally to the BC's interest. If the registrars are not available, should we consider perhaps the ALAC as a backup?

Claudia Selli: Sure. Your suggestion is noted. Anyone has objections or comments on this? I see Steve is typing. I don't know if it's on this topic. Okay. Yes. Let's move on the election discussion. So for the election, we basically have the two elections upcoming. One is the GNSO councilor and the other one is for the nominating committee, the large business and the small business. Together with the agenda, you will have also the timeline. So the basically the duration of the term is two years and you have also people to talk to to understand a little bit the type of work and the – how heavy the work is.

So the nomination period I think was already – is already open since the 9th of July. We haven't seen – we haven't received any nomination yet. So think about that and yes you have all the explanation on the type of category as well for the nominating committee together with the agenda. So you can take a look at that. Any question on this? No I don't see any hands up or any comments. So for the – I don't know if there are any other business. Okay.

So the next meeting will be on the 26th of July and since then we will exchange. Certainly we'll keep each other update on the – by mail. If there are no other points, then I will adjourn the meeting. I see Steve and Chantelle are typing. Okay. Yes for the credential committee members, please stay on the call and okay I see that different people have a problem for the 26th of July. We will discuss it with Chantelle and see if we can reschedule the call. And otherwise the meeting is adjourned.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you.

Chantelle Doerksen: Thank you operator. You may now stop the recording.

END