

**ICANN**

**Moderator: Chantelle Doerksen**  
**August 9, 2018**  
**10:00 am CT**

Ozan Sahin: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is the BC Members Call on Thursday, 9th of August 2018. In the interest of time, there will be no roll call and attendance will be taken by the other reconnect room. On the audio bridge we have Adetola Sogbesan and Kristin Doan. If there's anyone else on the audio bridge could you please let yourselves be known now?

Lawrence Olawale-Roberts: This is Lawrence Olawale-Roberts, I'm also on the audio bridge.

Ozan Sahin: Sorry, I couldn't get that name, do you mind repeating your name please?

Lawrence Olawale-Roberts: Lawrence Olawale-Roberts on the audio bridge.

Ozan Sahin: Thank you Lawrence. Anyone else? Thank you, hearing no further names I will turn it over to BC Chair, Claudia Selli to begin. Claudia, please go ahead.

Claudia Selli: Thank you everybody for being on the call and so, just to start I wanted just to let you know that cross funding are available for ICANN 63. I will send the information right after the call and in order to be able to access the cross funding which is in region travel, the BC needs to plan, an outreach plan, I know that there our outreach committee is working on that and the outreach

plan is to be introduced by the 15th of August. I know Marilyn is working on that, Marilyn a quick question, do you think you would be able to present the plan by the 15th of August or the outreach committee will be able to?

Marilyn Cade: Claudia, thank you for asking, yes, I'm sure we will be able to, I just have to make some changes that Chantelle called to my attention, but the Outreach committee has it and I'm hoping I'll get the changes out today. I'm hoping we can get it to the full executive committee and the full BC by later today. Just to be clear, it updates our previous plan that takes into account the budget changes that – and the other changes in the CROP program which limits it down from five to only three.

Claudia Selli: Okay, thank you very much for that and Steve, I will leave the floor to you now for the policy discussion.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks Claudia, I sent a policy calendar around to all of you yesterday, there – it won't take us as long to get through it because there are only a handful of currently open public comments. I've just concluded with several members of the BC the expedited PDP or the EPDP for the temporary specification. So, I do hope that Margie Milam and Mark Svancarek can join our call and give us an update on their perspective on how that's going at some point during the policy calendar session.

So, since our last call we've actually filed five additional public comments. So, this is the time where I want to acknowledge the great work of the volunteers who put it in. On the 27th of July, our last call was on the 26th, but on the 27th we did a comment on the renewal for the dot co-op sponsor registry agreement and thanks to Zak Muscovitch for drafting that, that same day we also did a comment on the open data initiative or ODI datasets and meta data thanks to work by Denise Michel, Faisal, Mark Datysgeld. and

Mark Svancarek, Claudia and Tim Chen provided some great edits as well, thank you.

On the 31st of July we filed a response on the short-term options to adjust the timeline for the ACRT3, that's the accountability and transparency review team number 3, out of that specific review we commented that it would be appropriate to have them focus their scope on only previous ACRT recommendations. So, I drafted that with help from Denise Michel.

On the 31st of July we also did a comment on long-term options for adjusting the timeline of both the specific reviews like the ACRT, but also the organizational reviews required under ICANN by-laws. Barbara Wanner did a wonderful job on that draft and nobody had any significant edits.

Okay, finally on the 31st of July, we did a comment on ICANN's draft proposal for this new fellowship program approach that they're pitching. I want to thank Marilyn Cade and Mark for doing the work on drafting a BC comment, we submitted it, it was a few days late but I had notified staff that it was coming in, and staff seemed let's say open to the idea of working our comments in when they analyzed the rest.

So, thanks to all of you for the great work on those comments. We currently have, if you'll scroll to the second page of open public comments, and I guess I have scroll control so I'll do that. Of the four open public comments that we have in front of us right now, let me get to the right spot here, sorry, okay, of the four open comments that we have right now, only one of them is due imminently and that's the one on August the 9th. That is the comment on the independent review process or IRP implementation. It was an oversight team as part of a cross-community workgroup on the ICANN transition.

We came up with a set of draft recommendations and we are making a very tight comment with regard to just one aspect of those recommendation and we think needs to be maintained. I want to thank Kristin Doan for drafting the BC comment that we circulated on the 2nd of August, I had circulated some minor edits on the 6th of August and then Chris Wilson of Amazon added some edits on the 7th of August. And that is the document you have, it's the very first attachment to the policy calendar. We need to finalize that comment on today's call so that we can submit those comments on time.

So, this is a great opportunity for you to open that comment that I attached to the policy calendar, it's the first attachment, you'll see edits in there from me and from Chris Wilson at Amazon. This would be a great time to hear comments from anybody who worked on the drafting or has questions for the drafters.

Okay, fantastic then, hearing no other comments I will submit that as is a review, sorry, I will accept the changes and submit it on the 9th. We only have three other public comments that I figured were worthy of BC attention, there are others in there that are of a rather obscure nature and the three that are available don't close until periods in September. So, we don't have any great urgency to jump on those right now, but I did want to thank Vivek Goyal for volunteering to draft the BC comment on one of the most significant open comments, which is the next round of new GTLDs. And Vivek, I'd like to send you a little bit of a set up on that based on previous comments that we've done. And to do that Vivek, I'm going to suggest I need your email address and if Vivek is not on the call to provide that, I've asked staff to provide me with Vivek's email.

Okay, the other open public comment that I know will get some attention would be ICANN's strategic plan for Africa. And it's a 2016 to 2020 plan,

we did comment on the previous plan with work by Waudo, Andrew Mack and by Lawrence, I know who's dialed in. We do need a volunteer to draft the next BC comment on the Africa strategic plan. Can I pause now and get a few volunteers? This is volunteers for a plan on Africa and its comment period closes on the 5th of – on the 10th of September. Is that you Lawrence?

Lawrence Olawale-Roberts: Yes, we can do that, I'll volunteer for that.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you Lawrence, anyone else?

Andrew Mack: Steve, I'm happy to comment on – to work on the Africa study.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you Andrew, appreciate that. And Jimson is in too, go ahead.

Marilyn Cade: Steve, it's Marilyn and I'd like to propose that the full outreach committee also at least offer edit as all of the plans at the regional level, they do influence the other regions and sub-regions so, maybe we could just ask the whole outreach committee to be available to provide comments.

Steve DelBianco: Yes, the outreach committee along with all members of the BC are encouraged to do that, in best case, the outreach committee gets involved in the drafting as opposed to reviewing and editing, either way, the participation would be welcome.

Okay, fantastic, thank you. There's only one other open public comment period on the technical use of the root zone label generation rules, that also closes in September and this is about these non-Latin scripts, there are several in there, the Hans script, Arabic, Kamer, Latin and Serrilic, it's a highly technical proposal on the study and I really think that if we've got an expert

who can handle those particular script technical challenges, it would be great to get a volunteer on that.

That's it for the open public comments, I then have a rather lengthy section addressing the comment period in front of us right now, which is how to adapt who is to GDPR. As all of you know, the ICANN temporary specification is in effect right now, so, there's an expedited PDP, policy development process to kind of figure out how to create consensus policy to replace the temporary specification itself.

So, we had two bold volunteers in the BC, Margie Milam and Mark Svancarek, they have been at it for two hours already today on a long conference call, there are now two calls a week, at almost two hours in length and a lot of preparatory time between calls, particularly of filling out surveys so that the team can access where there is consensus or where there is not consensus.

So, at that, I wanted to open it up to all of the BC members that are supporting Margie and Mark and Margie and Mark themselves to give an update to the BC membership on where we are going, what kind of challenges we're facing, and what other kind of support we can provide for you? Margie?

Margie Milam: Sure, this is, yes, sure, it's Margie, Mark unfortunately is on another call, it's four hours of calls with the group plus we have to twice a week submit our comments to different parts of the temporary spec. So, they've basically divided up the temporary spec into different sections and then we go point by point and agree, disagree and put in our rationale so, fortunately I've got great support from others on the BC, but it's a lot of work and I appreciate all the input that we've received. Steve and all, would it be helpful to share the BC submissions with the BC after it's posted so you can see what we've said?

We're essentially trying to be consistent with all of the prior BC comments up until, you know, the PDP being launched.

Steve DelBianco: Margie, it's Steve, let's do that after we finish the first round of the surveys and your right, I've been trying to ensure the way in which we fill out the survey is consistent with prior BC positions. So, let's wait until we get them all pulled together and then we'll submit the whole group to the BC membership.

Margie Milan: Okay, that sounds great. And just so you can understand my observations so far, it's very difficult to really advocate for BC positions, the NCSG is dominant in these calls and so, what you find is that the NCSG members will take up the mic most of the time and there's very little support for some of the things that we've been advocating for all of these, you know, these last few months. We're doing – we're trying to do our best to explain our rationale for why we're asking for certain things, but just so you know, it isn't looking very promising. Kurt is the facilitator and he's actually serving in a role beyond a facilitator, he seems to be actually making decisions on things which in my view is problematic because he's, you know, as we know him in prior roles as a decision maker at ICANN, it's a very natural thing for him to take that position and there are times when he'll make some conclusory statement on how he views it which in my view, doesn't really – isn't really consistent with the role of facilitator.

So, we'll have to decide at some point whether we want to raise that and I'm just trying to think of what some of the issues are, for example, the issue of searching beyond just the one single domain name, the reverse who is type capability, that's not getting any traction at this point in the group. The only supporters we have on that are SSAC and the GAC, but it's going to be a very

difficult issue for us to push on. We'll keep pushing on it but that already is coming – becoming very apparent. We're also planning for a face to face meeting in September of two days in Los Angeles at the end of September so, hopefully we'll get a lot accomplished there. Any questions?

Steve DelBianco: Yes Margie, it's Steve, I think we have to remind members that this PDP is using the GNSO consensus rules and it's supposed to avoid voting but even if it came to voting, it's clear right now we are not likely to have a majority let alone a consensus for some of the positions that we've been seeking. So, you have the really thankless job of trying to claw back a few of the elements that the BC wants in the face of I would call it, significant opposition from the NCSG led by Milton Mueller and the contract parties are happy to have the NCSG be the one that pushes back on the BC and IPC, but I don't think the contract parties are likely to vote our way on some of the controversies that have come up thus far.

So, there is what I've observed as a well-coordinated effort on the part of the NCSG and the contract parties to keep this very limited in scope and to ensure that it doesn't go towards the direction that we're seeking right now. So, we have our hands full and we may have to try to find ways to pressure, bring pressure outside of an EPDP, we are unlikely to achieve consensus there on the views that we want to advance.

Margie Milam: Right, and in particular the issue of access, basically the NCSG refuses to consider the access issue until later and in fact, threatened to boycott discussions if we went in that direction. So, it's a very difficult time right now and we're doing, you know, obviously, we're doing the best we can but the way the whole PDP is structured is not really helpful for us because the cards are stacked against us because of the large constituency of NCSG members on those calls.



Steve DelBianco: And it may well be that the PDP generates recommendations that don't bear the support of the business constituency in the IPC and therefore, would lack consensus in that direction. So, I think that it may be necessary at some point in this process for us to be sure to register that we would not be a part of a consensus if we didn't get anything that we're seeking because that too is a small point of leverage.

Margie Milam: Totally agree, and just so the members understand, we're fighting to even keep what's in the temporary spec, it's clear that certain groups are trying to cut away from what's in the temporary stack. And so, I'll give you an example, like the question of whether ICANN compliance should have access to who is, which in my view should be a no brainer, we had to fight really hard to explain why ICANN compliance needs access to who is information, it's literally step by step everything in the temporary spec is up for discussion with I think the intended goals from the other participants of cutting back what's in the temporary spec.

Steve DelBianco: Even cutting back on the agreed upon scope for the EDP, even though they voted for it. Susan Kawaguchi, your hand is up.

Susan Kawaguchi: Thanks Steve, I just thank so much for doing this Margie and Steve and Mark, even though he's not on the call, and I can't even imagine what these discussions are like and so, I really appreciate the fact that your taking on the battle. I was also wondering, I noticed I haven't had time to really follow this, but I noticed that Rafik is vice chair and GNSO liaison and I know Steve and I went back and forth a little bit about that, but I was wondering if that still continues? Has there been any objections and I think that's a really bad precedent and it goes completely against GNSO process, in fact, I was, you know, I was liaison or I am liaison for the curative rights IGO NGO PDP that

just filed its final report that is a complete mess, and early on in that, you know, Phil was a co-chair of that and also one of the BC counselors and I was like why am I a liaison if Phil knows everything about this?

And it was clearly pointed out to me at that time that oh no, no, no, we need the liaison to be independent and not be the chair because if there's a complaint about the chair, you know, the liaison takes – has a role there. And, you know, in the last few months with the work, the curative rights PDP, you know, I had to step in and override the chair's decision and make decisions with the GNSO counsel leadership that were not agreed to completely by the chairs and so, I think it's really important that we have a distinction that there is a different liaison, I don't care if Rafik wants to be vice-chair, I mean, you might care, but, you know, he needs to pick one role or the other. But I didn't know whether we wanted to fight that fight but I did feel like I should bring this up on counsel just as a process question. So, I wanted your input on that.

Steve DelBianco: Yes, Susan, this is Steve and before Margie kicks in, I too counseled against making this a battle line that we would draw, I had agreed with the ALAC that we had a situation where Kurt Pritz, the chair really started this problem because he decided prior to even the first meeting of the EPDP, that he'd like Rafik to be the vice-chair. And put that out for any objections is how he basically phrased that, puts us in an awkward position deciding whether there would be an objection for Rafik in that role and I think we were able to succeed a tightly constraining how Rafik would handle the role of vice chair if there were for instance, concerns about the way things were being led.

The situation about whether he was the counsel liaison, I guess is a decision that's up to counsel and there was a lot of discussion on whether he could do both roles or not. And I will say to you that we've constrained the conditions and set some expectations for how Rafik is supposed to handle things, that

hasn't been our problem so far. Our problem really starts at the top with the way the chair is handling things and continues all the way down the line because of the opposition we're getting from the NTSG, IP, ISPs and the contract parties.

So, it's still my view that it isn't worth fighting a battle that would distract from the substantive issues we'd like to cover. That's just more to my feeling, and Margie and others who have been on these calls, do you think we need to try to remove Rafik as the liaison to counsel? Margie?

Margie Milam: Steve, I don't like it but I agree with you, we have so many issues to battle and I know Rafik's style, he tends not to get involved and he doesn't spend a lot of time in, you know, doing a lot of analysis, so, you know, it may be harmless, I think we wait until we see some indication that it's causing a problem, but in my view we've got so many battles to attack, I'd rather not be fighting on everything and unfortunately, sometimes some of our colleagues or people that agree with us don't speak up and it really is Mark, myself, Alex that are speaking up on the side and so, we just don't always want to look like we're objecting to everything.

Steve DelBianco: Yes, obstructionists, we don't want to be obstructionists.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay, so, then I won't broach that at the next council meeting, though it is completely against process. So, I mean, I really think in so many ways the deck is stacked against us.

Steve DelBianco: Susan, you might make a note during counsel, make a note of the fact that him being liaison and vice chair doesn't seem to comport with process and ask your colleagues on counsel whether this indicates that we are changing our precedent. And so, you bring it up as a query about precedent more so than I

have a specific objection to Rafik doing this. And I think that might be a way to approach it and you doing it on counsel is perhaps better than us doing it in the middle of the EPDP with all the other people on that call who would really object to the BC heading down that path in front of all those people.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay, because it really is a process question, you know, and, you know, I've seen it several times, you know, the answer has always been a wait, wait, wait, you're in the leadership of that PDP, no, no we've got to change that, since you've accepted that role. So, I'll – I will be very careful in the way I bring it up then because – and I do think that you may need the liaison, now whether or not another, you know, NCSG member steps forward to be liaison, I don't know, you know, it may not solve the problem of NCSG but at least it would have somebody that was not playing two roles that are conflicting in my opinion.

Steve DelBianco: Okay, any other comments on the EPDP before we move to counsel? Margie, thank you again, you're carrying a lot of weight on that and we all want to be as helpful to you as we can. I think we're going to try to do a call later today to talk about the next stage of the survey. Alright, channel two is counsel itself and I did want to point up on the policy calendar on the screen in front of you, I've listed the five items that I highlighted from the council agenda for the next council meeting which will occur on the 16th of August. So, Marie and Susan, if you'd like to talk to our colleagues about the items that are highlighted for counsel.

Susan Kawaguchi: Marie, do you want to go first?

Steve DelBianco: She said no, go ahead.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay, sorry I expanded your policy, challenge you hear so I couldn't see that.

So, we will have a final report on the protections for Red Cross things and all PTLDs, and the high-level review, I think we're okay, I think it would not be the time to object to this but if other BC members, you know, have different input that would be good to know.

And I think Marie's probably paid more attention to the GNSO review implementation report and – but that seems okay to me as I noted on the EPDP section, you know, I am liaison to the IGO NGO for the period of right PDP. And it's a mess, the PDP sort of went off the rails and very few members, it was definitely capture by one section of part of the community and it – the report makes recommendations that are completely against GAC advice, GAC didn't really participate in this PDP so, what's on the schedule for this time is not a vote, we will not be voting, we'll be discussion what's going on behind the scenes as the more concerning thing, Cherine is, you know, very concerned about this report so is Goran, counsel leadership and including me have liaison had a call yesterday with Goran and Cherine and David Olive and Cherine is advocating that we have a facilitated discussion about all of this with the community, small group from the community, not necessarily the same members of the working group and we – that the GNSO does not adopt these recommendation.

Does not punt to the board and that basically my view point is they basically just want to re-do the PDP but in two sessions, one a phone call and one face to face that's in Barcelona, that sets a horrible precedence in my opinion because okay, so GAC didn't pre-board and agree but the community came to some sort of decision and has recommendations.

It's going to be a real challenge for the GNSO counsel so it will be interesting to hear the other counselors and their input and I'm not sure how if the board

and ICANN org is allowed to say no, we don't like what the PDP working group came up with, these recommendations don't work and so therefore, we're going to use a different mechanism to decide. It might be appropriate in this space because of the complex issues, but it's just a horrible precedent. So, basically, it would remove a lot of legitimacy to the PDP process -- in my opinion. So I would like to hear people's input on that.

And then we have the CCWG and the WHOIS conflicts of privacy law probably won't get much attention because it's completely - you know, I mean, it's just wrapped up in GDPR.

Steve DelBianco: And there are two things on the agenda where I believe you guys have to make a vote. And Marie has got something in the chat, and then I see Marilyn's hand up.

Marie, did you want to go next? Not hearing you, Marie.

Susan Kawaguchi: And just to Marie's point, Phil was the co-chair along with Petter and they both filed minority statements, but - and they encouraged - because there could - there was no agreement on the recommendation at all. And that's what goes up - completely up against GAC advise. We encouraged all members who wanted to, to file minority reports.

As far as I know, George Kirikos -- which was really leading the charge on this -- has not filed that. I'm, sort of, waiting for George to file litigation, but I don't know if he'll actually do it. He was claiming he was going to take further legal action against ICANN and everyone involved, so wouldn't be surprised if he named me. He definitely, you know, had a vendetta against Phil. So - and staff, it was pretty abusive at times. So, you know, I'm not sure how the GNSO Council can manage PDPs more constructively, but I think

we're - you know we may be seeing some of this in the EPDP which - you know the same types of behavior that is - we're just not going to develop good policy this way.

Marilyn, go ahead.

Marilyn Cade: Thanks. Marilyn speaking.

I just wanted to note that, this is actually not the first time where we have presented a counsel-supported PDP and then found that major changes were directed. And even the original gTLD policy recommendations where we had a consensus for a more managed lower number and a priority of IBMs and community-facing gTLDs. And that was over ridden by ICANN -wasn't ICANN (unintelligible) but by ICANN and actually by the chair of the board and by the CEO. So this isn't the first time.

I'm not saying it's a good precedent, but I just want to know that it's not the first time. I think there's been a couple of other times when the board has intervened with information about how a PDP recommendation is countered to get policy advice. And has tried to inform the community that this would mean that the GAC would - sorry, the board would then be in a difficult position to accept the PDP advice.

I'm just going to say one other thing, I too had been, personally, sued by George. The good news is...

Susan Kawaguchi: Oh. Oh.

Marilyn Cade: ...that was back when I was chair and he was not being delegable to be a BC member. But the good news is that John Jeffrey took very seriously that we

were not independent agents, and it was ICANN's problem not ours. So I just want to mention that Susan, so if that's in any way helpful to know.

Susan Kawaguchi: Well I'm not too worried about George, myself, but, you know, it could be an interesting thing. But it's good to know, I'd be in good company then. You know I just - he can do whatever he wants and I'll respond or have ICANN respond. So - but it's just an example of how difficult things can be and, of course, a lot of that same behavior is going in the RPM working group. So that one has challenges.

And thanks for the reminder on the gTLD PDP because - you know and the board changing things. It's - you know I'm not really - I don't agree with the fifth recommendation that came out. It wasn't really - there was no complete consensus on that. And I think that something needs to happen, I just don't know what the process should be. Because my first response was, "Well facilitated discussion with whom?" You know I can only represent the BC, so don't come to the GNSO and say counsel leadership will make a decision here. The GNSO of counsel has to.

It's back to process -- in my opinion. If we stick to the process and figure that out then, I think, we're in a better place. Cherine did not like my viewpoints and - but I was just, you know, stating matter-of-factly what the issues could be long term, so.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Susan.

Marie, anything to add as our other counselor?

Marie Pattullo: No, that's fine with me. Thanks, Steve.



Steve DelBianco: No, thank you both for all the work you put into that.

There was one other item that I circulated to all of you back on the 24th of July. It was a draft letter, was going to be a joint letter between the BC and the IPC, a letter to ICANN (org). And we were going to regard and bring up ideas for the next steps for the accreditation and access model for non-public WHOIS.

During that six days of review period, no BC members raised any objections. But at the conclusion of that period, the IPC came back to us and said, "You know what -- on second thought -- we have some edits we'd like to make to that letter." I am waiting on Brian Winterfeldt -- the IPC President -- to give us edits that the IPC has approved. I don't want to put a letter back in front of all of you in the BC until I know that the IPC is comfortable with this one. So look for that in the next few days and we'll allow the BC several days to review prior to submitting that as a joint letter.

Mason, anything else you wanted to add on that?

Mason Cole: No, Steve. I think the IPC may be wanting to submit a letter of their own. So it may end up being just a BC-only letter. So they may withdraw their signature on that letter and we (unintelligible) to submit and (unintelligible).

Steve DelBianco: Okay the emails I exchanged yesterday indicated that they were considering the tone. So I don't want to trouble the rest of our BC members on this until we figure out what IPC actually wants to do. And then I'll do a special email to the BC membership. But we're not taking any action...

Mason Cole: Okay.

Steve DelBianco: ...on it in today's call because we're waiting for IPC.

Mason Cole: Okay. Thank you, Steve.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Mason, appreciate it.

I wanted to scroll quickly down to Channel 3 -- which is the whole work that we do as the CSG.

Now, Barbara Wanner is on vacation -- not available to be on the call today. But there is one item that I certainly wanted to bring up today, and that is the structuring of these high interest topic sessions -- it'll occur at ICANN63.

The BC had submitted two ideas. One, having to do with the general discussion of access to non-public WHOIS data -- which we've led at the - each of the past two ICANN meetings. And we also brought up the idea on the subsequent procedures for the next round of gTLDs and wanting to have a public discussion on where that stands. We suggested that not as wanting to be the only one asking for it. We did suggest that if the actual team working group is doing the subsequent procedures had a lot to say that we said the BC would like to be part of that.

With regard to the WHOIS, and access, and GDPR we got a reply from Donna Austin -- and, I guess, she's acting in that role as co-chair of counsel. But Donna Austin came back with some ideas to come up with a consolidated plan for how we would address GDPR and WHOIS at ICANN63.

Chantelle, were you able to create a pdf out my second attachment in order to load it?

Chantelle Doerksen: Hi, Steve. I didn't see that request come through. I can do that now.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you very much. What Donna is proposing is a different kind of a structure, and it would not be one that the BC would lead -- as we did at each of the last two ICANN meetings. And, I guess, that's fine as long as our topics gets covered and the BC has an opportunity to participate.

The proposal that Chantelle is creating and loading is one that we need to react today probably today or tomorrow. Barbara usually handles all of this for us as our CSG liaison, but as I'm able to do so because she's got some personal time off.

I'll wait for Chantelle to load that in the Adobe. It was the second attachment to the policy calendar. So all of you can load that attachment -- if you wish -- from my email.

I would say to this, she is trying to combine as many as five different session proposals to a single two-hour session. And they want to come up with an innovative way of hosting it. So the idea of a panel is suggested, and they may actually bring it outside or in to handle it. Now this is a two-hour general session, and I think that - I think - I don't even know why it is that Donna Austin has, sort of, taken on the role of proposing of how to reorganize the session. But I can paste into the chat what it is that she had while we're waiting on Chantelle. There it is.

Thank you, Chantelle.

The far right-hand column of what you have on the screen in front of you is what Donna Austin is proposing as a way to rationalize and consolidate it. And you'll note in the bottom, right-hand corner that there isn't even a separate

role for businesses in terms of panel participants. She has law enforcement, intellectual property, cyber security. So I think we would do our best to insert a BC representative among the panelist.

Are there any reactions from BC members on their proposed way of reorganizing that session?

Go ahead, Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: Thanks.

I just want to mention, I too don't understand why Donna is taking this on. But maybe that was agreed to in an allocation of work within the leadership -- sometimes that - my comment is more specifically - right now our best friend -- in my view -- our the SSAC and potentially the broader GAC.

So in reorganizing the session, you know, maybe we should be - I think it is important to have law enforcement there. But I'm looking at this and it seems extremely unbalanced. I don't see the GAC. I don't see the SSAC there, and yet the SSAC has very relevant reports and information that should be included besides a business perspective just to add, maybe...

Marilyn Cade: ...a suggestion. It's not only about us, but it's also about being more inclusive of those other groups.

Steve DelBianco: Yes, it may well be that the cyber security expert is meant to convey the SSAC and that law enforcement is meant to pick up the GAC perspective. I'm being charitable in that assumption, Marilyn, but I believe that's what she's thinking there.

Susan, and then Margie.

Susan Kawaguchi: Just really quick on Donna. Donna was on a group that sort of reimagined the meetings -- ICANN meetings, you know, when we went to this new type of structure. And so - and since she's on counsel has taken on the role of continue to work with ICANN (org) on scheduling GNSO-related sessions. And so as vice chair she sort of - I'm not sure exactly - she just started doing it. I'm not sure it's truly a GNSO counsel function, but she's been doing that for the last two to three years.

Steve DelBianco: And I do consider it helpful that Donna is trying to consolidate five different proposals into a single two-hour session. So I have no objection to her being helpful, but we may need to push back a little bit about the composition of the panel.

Margie, I'll go to you next.

But I did want to make sure that members understood that the bottom row on this table is a standalone session proposal for understanding how RDAP and the role it can play in RDDS. And I think that would be a brilliant idea to do a session on that. It may not be one that requires two hours, but it would be one where Alex Deacon -- and others in the BC -- that understand how RDAP can help to play a role.

That could help as well because on the EPDP RDAP is part of temp spec. And we always believed that was hook for being able to achieve tiered access since RDAP can accommodate tiered access for non-public WHOIS. So the more we keep that alive as a technical means to achieve non-public WHOIS data the better off we are. And rather than burying it in a two-hour general

GDPR session, it could be better for us to advocate for a separate RDAP discussion as well.

I'd like to get feedback on that.

But first let me turn to Margie.

Margie Milam: Sure.

One of the observations I have is that there's a lot that are possibly talking about in the session. Which means that the unified access or even the model we've been working on will get very little discussion time. Seems like, you know, why WHOIS is so important. Okay we - I think we (unintelligible) you know - or the - you know and privacy issues.

So is there a possibility where there could be a separate session on the accreditation and access discussions? Or if not, have that be a larger part of this discussion.

Steve DelBianco: I can certainly propose both of those to Donna, because I'm thinking that after this call I'll need to do some sort of response to Donna's proposal. And, I guess, it would be a multi-factored response where we talk about business participation -- law enforcement, and the GAC. And we talk about the small emphasis that is in there on the accreditation model. We talk about the - probably the lack of need to use a lot of time on the question of why privacy and WHOIS matters. So, I guess, I'll have to note the comments that are being made here and go back to Donna. But I don't believe that this decision is one that we, alone, will influence.

Tim Chen and then Alex.

Tim Chen: Hey, folks. Can you hear me?

Steve DelBianco: We do.

Tim Chen: Okay. Yes, Margie already said it so (unintelligible) I put my comment in the comments.

But I really agree with this independently. I would prefer -- strongly prefer -- that the discussions are on accreditation (unintelligible) published topic conversation. I've seen way too many two-hour meetings with four or five different topics -- that certain topics get lost because of time, I think, because of - at the expense of other topics. And so I would prefer that doesn't happen. So just wanted to make that point (unintelligible) the next person.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Tim.

So it's topic Number 13, the unified model for access and accreditation, moving from concept to timely implementation. I guess, that we would suggest that that be a stand-alone session.

And go to Alex Deacon.

Alex Deacon: Yes, thanks, Steve.

I just wanted to (unintelligible), I think the RDAP session would be helpful. And if we can't get Topic 13 as a separate session -- which I think would be great -- then we could potentially use the RDAP session to express, you know, points that are important to us. I'd be happy to participate in that if it makes sense.

So I'll note that I'm encouraged that Mark from Microsoft is participating in the RDAP working group because my request to join that group have been ignored to date -- not too sure what, if anything, to read into that. I'll ask again, but, you know, even though I requested access and the ability to kind of represent the end user in that working - the RDAP pilot working group I've still not been invited. So I just wanted to give everyone a heads up on that.

But if there is a way I could help with any prep or any panel discussions in Barcelona just let me know.

Steve DelBianco: Alex, are you able to observe and listen in on those discussions even though they haven't formally invited you to be in?

Alex Deacon: No, I haven't - well I haven't asked that - requested that specifically. I'm not even sure who's in control of who gets to join and listen in or not. But I'll reach out the Mark Svancarek from Microsoft (unintelligible) sorry from Verisign who's the chair (unintelligible)...

Steve DelBianco: Verisign, yes. Yes, please do. And it was my understanding that GDD was running that pilot group because it's not a creature of GNSO, is it? I don't think so.

Alex Deacon: No, it's not. That's right.

Steve DelBianco: Okay. And if you recall it was Akram who told us that by the end of July that pilot -- including tiered access with encrypted information -- would be published for reaction. And that's the opportunity, I guess, we were looking for. And given that that's not out yet I think we want to press it on there.



Remember he made those promises to us when we met in Panama and this is a great time to hold him to those.

Thank you, Alex.

Are there any other comments from BC members on proposals for sessions?  
Fantastic.

Thanks.

And, Claudia, I could turn it back to you at this point.

Claudia Selli: Thank you very much, Steve. Chantelle or Ozan, could you please put the agenda on? Just for information of the BC members, yesterday I circulated a email for the meeting request to be done in either 63. I didn't see any objection so Chantelle will get - will send out the request for a meeting.

For - yes, then I would leave the floor to Jimson unless anyone wants to speak. I see Alex mic is open, but maybe he was (unable to speak) to the previous issue.

Jimson Olufuye: Okay thank you very much, Claudia. This is Jimson speaking.

But - so at this point we are close to 80% in compliance. We want to thank members for their payment.

And now to the election, the initial period ended yesterday. As of that time, we have three nominees for the three positions are available. For the small business representative to the NomCom we have Lawrence Olawale-Roberts,

and for large business rep we have Paul Mitchell, and for Large business. And they all in good standing.

So I will just mention again that with respect to the candidate statements for the BC private list should be made by Wednesday, 15, August.

And then we have a candidate call on Thursday the 16th of August. That's around 15:00 UTC, but once it's confirmed it will be communicated to everyone. And then after that we will have the voting. And between August 20th to August 27th, and the outcome will be announced. And we thank the nominees for accepting to serve in this capacity.

And also take this opportunity to mention that the Officers Election be coming up between October and November as per our policy. And at the same time too, in line with our charter, the committees of the BC too will have an election (during that period) talking about the credentials committee and the (outreach) committee. So we you have the election for that period.

Then on other matters, like the chair, Claudia, actually talked about the need for members to apply to benefit the leadership development program. For funding to attend the ICANN63, 64 and 65. We have two tracks of this leadership program.

The first one is - was sponsored by ICANN and that is limited to (inner region) nominees. For example, for ICANN63 whoever will be nominated should be domicile in Europe. So I think the members that have contacts in eastern Europe can actually nominate someone from eastern Europe. (Consider) that to be still developing to benefit from this. So it's a way of reaching out and (building) leadership.

Then for ICANN64 in Japan to be (in-region) that can be nominated to benefit from this.

And ICANN65 Marrakesh Africa would be those in residing in Africa.

So three different slots for 63, 64, 65 for ICANN.

And counsel recall BC has the same similar program as we all agreed to use some of our funds to broaden participation in activities. But not only BC, it's not limited to any region, so (it can) be anywhere across the world someone can be nominated (unintelligible) BC members can benefit from this and (unintelligible) executives. So it's available for ICANN63, also ICANN64, and ICANN65. So (just one) delegate each, (one) beneficiary.

And also for CROP, we have three slots for CROP managed by ICANN. That is for (any) region. CROP for new members is the community regional outreach program. Community Regional Outreach Program. So (unintelligible) region event or programs so that members can use that to conduct outreach within their region. Maybe within Latin America, within USA, North America, or within Africa, Asia, etc. So three slots available in this managed by ICANN, and two available managed through our funding program.

So I just feel I should explain these (again) but the details already on the list. So on this note I want to say thank you for listening.

Back to you, Claudia.

Claudia Selli: Thank you Jimson.

We have just one minute left. I know Marilyn wanted to brief us for the cross community working group on auction proceeds.

I don't know, Marilyn, if you can be really brief in less than one minute because we need to close down the call.

Marilyn Cade: I can be very brief -- in less than one minute. Marilyn Cade speaking.

The CPWG auction proceeds is -- in my view -- we're struggling a little bit - Tony Harris at the last meeting. There are - what I'm going to propose, Claudia, with your permission to send a written notice. But I really need for members to take note of it and offer some comments. The CPWG auction proceeds will be holding a public event at ICANN. I'm not telling you it's going to be a high-level event because that's still to be determined. But it's going to be really important to have attendance at it.

There were originally four ideas -- four options. I've been trying to winnow it down to those that are very practical with the support of some of the others. We do have a little bit of a challenge. There's - one of the co-chairs is invested in a particular outcome. And there's relatively low attendance, and participation, and contribution to the working group. The consultant is not unbiased, and that means that questions have to keep going back and forth.

But we're making progress, we're going to have a report. It's going to come several weeks before the meeting. And I'll just do a written report and ask people - members of the BC, then, to be aware of it and offer their comments. Because many of the BC members have different experiences in how funds are distributed. And also -- although the topics had been relatively defined -- I think the BC should look at how those topics advance the interest of the BC. Capacity building, as an example, security stability, etcetera.

Thank you. Thank you, Claudia.

Claudia Selli: Thank you - thank you, Marilyn. Thank you, everybody. And call is adjourned.

END