

ICANN

**Moderator: Chantelle Doerksen
September 6, 2018
10:00 am CT**

Coordinator: Recordings has now started.

Chantelle Doerksen: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the BC Members Call on Thursday September 6, 2018. In the interest of time 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 keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. With this I will turn it over to the BC chair to begin. Claudia, please go ahead.

Claudia Selli: Thank you very much, Chantelle, and welcome everybody and thank you for participating. Steve, in the interest of time the floor is yours.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks, Claudia. Steve DelBianco here. I sent a policy calendar yesterday and then sent an update a few hours later when Barbara Wanner gave me some additional items. Thank you, Barbara. So we'll get right into it.

Since our last call, we've had one publicly filed comment and it was the what we call early input that was requested by the chair of the expedited PDP for adapting ICANN's Whois policy to the GDPR. So that's called the EPDP, which is expedited PDP. I want to thank Mason Cole, Tim Chen, and Margie Milam for drafting that early input document.

We took it from our earlier comments on the temporary specification that ICANN published and we used this early input as the basis of other comments that the BC has been making in the EPDP process. And again, those are a pair of two-hour calls each week. We've just concluded one this morning over the last two hours. And, Margie and Mark are our two reps on that group, and it is a marathon effort, I can tell you that.

There are two public comments that close before our next call so we want to be sure we give them adequate attention on today's call. Everybody can scroll independently. So let's go down into the currently open public comments. The first is a - ICANN has done a draft plan, strategic plan, for ICANN's presence in Africa. This is a plan that covers the 2016 to 2020 period.

Chantelle, do your best to see if you can fix that ringing. Thank you.

The first comment period closes just a handful of days from now on the 10th of September and we have circulated earlier an attachment that Jimson had drafted for BC comment, and I sent it around on the 3rd of September. It's the first attachment to the policy calendar. It's not an extensive comment, and it builds on things the BC had said in May of 2017.

Jimson, if you wanted to add anything, you could at this point or if anybody has questions. Otherwise we are going to be good to go on the 10th of September. So are there any questions or comments on our comments on the Africa plan? All right, seeing none.

The second one is a very technically specific comment on how to manage internalized domain names, or IDNs, and variants on IDNs in new top level domains. Those comments close the 17th of September. One of our more recent BC members is Mark Svancarek from Microsoft who's joined Margie at

representing us on the EPDP. And Mark very technically skilled and took a deep dive into the IDN variant issue.

So I first circulated that on the 24th of August, thanks to Mark, and then I added a new - circulated a new one with a paragraph that Mark added, and that is the second attachment. So Mark has done a superb job. He's not on this call since he's attending the RDAP call right now but this would be a great chance for BC members who have questions on Mark's draft, it was attachment two to the policy calendar.

Lawrence, I note that you have comments coming on Jimson's draft. If so, please circulate with a reply all and, Lawrence, please do so today. I want to give BC members a chance to see your comments and not wait to the last minute.

Are there any other questions on the IDN variants? Okay great. Thank you.

The next one closes -- this is number three on the list -- and it closes the 24th of September. I know this is a very brief comment because Donuts, who operates nearly 100 I believe gTLDs, has a unilateral policy they call the domain's protected marks list. People call it the DPML. And that's not a consensus policy of ICANN; instead it was a service that Donuts offered as a way to enhance its applications for new gTLDs and as a way that it believes they act responsibly for the purpose of consumer protection based on intellectual property rights.

So they offer this service unilaterally and they are making an adjustment to their contract, an adjustment to the DPML service contract, that I understand really just makes it more consistent with the way it's been actually operating. On the previous two calls in the BC, I laid out for you what the change was

and then we were lucky enough to get volunteers, Marie Pattullo, Vivek and Mason Cole, and Mason used to work Donuts, to draft a brief BC comment on what Donuts wants to do to its contracts.

That is right in front of you at the bottom of Page 1 on the policy calendar. You'll see that we are appreciating it and supporting the idea of making this change to the Donuts DPML policy. So I think that this is our great opportunity to weigh in on that and see if we have any questions. All right, seeing no questions. The comment will be this one paragraph you see at the bottom of Page 1 on the policy calendar.

Oh gosh. Mark Datysgeld just informed us in the chat, Fadi Chehadé is back, perhaps not directly though. If (Avery Partners) is a venture firm then I doubt that Fadi will get his hands on to Donuts, but we'll see.

Okay, number four, we have three other public comments that are open right now that I think are relevant to the BC. One is a particularly big one and it is important to the BC. I want to thank Vivek for taking the first shot at it but by the 26th of September we need to provide some pretty specific comments on nearly 300 questions and recommendations on what is called subsequent procedures.

What is that? It's a PDP whereby a working group is trying to come up with procedures for subsequent rounds of new gTLDs. And you can bet that there are plenty of folks on that working group who are anxious to get the next round of new gTLDs launched. So their urgency creates an opportunity to be sure that we get business-friendly policies in those subsequent procedures.

It is a Google sheet instead of a ordinary draft document, a Word document, that was used because there are 300, as I said, questions and recommendations

and the BC can pick and choose those with which we have enough concern that we want to make a comment. And Vivek and I have put in several comments on that Google sheet.

I am going to ask now if I can get two or three more volunteers in the BC to review that sheet, looking for areas that we need to pay attention to for the BC purposes. Can I get at least two volunteers to do a review? Susan, fantastic. Thank you very much. And, Susan, all one needs to do is to click on the link right there where it says "See this Google sheet" and you can browse through it.

It's available for editing for anyone who has the link, Susan. So, Susan, when you make your edits, after you've done them, just send an email to all of us in BC private so that we all know to go back in there and check the edits that you have made. Thank you, Susan.

Can I find one more volunteer in prepping for the next round? We'll have more opportunities but this is early input and could be influential. All right. Thank you, Susan.

Next one up is a - RDAP is so important to where we're going to go to comply with GDPR and to comply with other privacy laws since it's going to end up being the required way that we used to use Whois Port 43 for automated access to Whois data. That has been replaced as part of the temp spec with RDAP. And RDAP is another technical tool to do a query of a fully, you know, of a domain name in order to learn what the Whois data is.

Initially that would only be the un-redacted portion of Whois, which is not much use, but over time the RDAP protocol should also accommodate tiered access. You recall that Akram, Cyrus discussed this with the BC on the final

meeting in Panama where they said, "Yes, the RDAP profile accommodates tiered access."

And so what I've indicated here is that Item 26 on the RDAP profile is to permit registries and registrars to use RDAP to provide reasonable access to data for the temp spec, and that is reasonable access to people like consumer protection, cyber security, law enforcement, intellectual property interests.

We desperately need a BC volunteer to comment on the current RDAP profile and our main goal is to ensure that the RDAP profile is sufficiently defined so that if and when we come up with an accredited access method that RDAP will be the technology used, the pipeline that's used, to get at the data itself.

Alex Deacon, I am so glad that you're able to help us with that because I know you're our resident expert on RDAP. Can I get another that is used to this? Tim Chen, perfect. So Alex and Tim, you and I have talked about this many times but I believe that the registries, and particularly VeriSign, is really anxious to have RDAP be the way to do it. And remember this that ICANN has volunteered to be the RDAP host.

That is part of the unified access model proposal that ICANN circulated as they're looking for community input on whether ICANN could operate the RDAP server so that we would rely upon ICANN as the legally responsible party who would then use federated access to retrieve the data from the registries or registrars behind it and then provide that answer. We're not suggesting that's the only way to proceed but we'd like to keep alive that as an option.

Alex or Tim, is there anything you wanted to add for your BC colleagues on this? Great. Thank you very much.

Finally the Whois review team, it's a review team called RDS-Whois 2, so it's the second community-driven review required under the bylaws, has published their draft recommendations. Those comments won't close until the 4th of November. They were just published earlier this week. And we were fortunate enough to have Susan Kawaguchi serve as vice chair of the review team.

So Susan put in an incredibly detailed amount of effort to that while she was serving as the BC's councilor as well. So Susan can be a resource to us on analyzing these recommendations and answering them in the template that the team has provided but we need a volunteer from the BC, with Susan's help, who can come up with the BC's proposed answers in that template.

Denise Michel: Steve, this is Denise. I'm sorry, I'm not in Adobe. Facebook is happy to help.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Denise. Appreciate that. Anyone else? Susan, please go ahead.

Susan Kawaguchi: Thanks, Steve. And just remember this is a draft report. We didn't come to terms on a few things and then - or agreement. There was some long fought battles of what was going to go into the report. But. And then, you know, obviously the moving pieces were hard to work around at times, but definitely - the section that I worked on the most was compliance and we definitely have huge issues in compliance, in my opinion. They've gotten better over, you know, the last - since the first review team, Whois review team, but not - they have not moved to the point where they should be.

One thing, as you're reading the report, we were sort of restrained from talking about GDPR and even though there are some comments about how GDPR will affect the RDS. But. So it would be really helpful to have those insights

from the BC on, you know, wait, look, this isn't, you know - whatever, however GDPR is affecting RDS and really do a deep dive on that and request that the review team look into certain areas because, you know, our scope was pretty narrow but I think there's room to, in the final report, address a lot of GDPR issues that we're seeing already.

So if you read the report with that in mind, that would be really helpful. And I am available at any time and can put a list together of things I think we should focus and target for our comments.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Susan. The template that you have suggested makes it easy on each recommendation to indicate level of support and a free form field to put a written comment. So the guidance that would be most appreciative from you is to identify for an internal BC audience to identify which of the recommendations, and you can just put them by number, you don't have to paste all the text, but which of the recommendations do you believe need to be buttressed with strong supporting language because you're afraid they could be overwhelmed by opposition, say, by others.

And by the same token if there are recommendations you believe we should express reservations or modifications to, you can highlight us with a priority list. And if you did that early, it'll make it easier for us to recruit other volunteers to do the work of formulating the points we want to make and filling out the template.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay. Good idea. I'll do that.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you so much, Susan, for all that you do.

All right so that's it for the currently open public comments, but there are two additional public comments we want to make in the next several days and I wanted to bring attention to the BC. The first is right here at the bottom of Page 2 of the policy calendar. This is regarding modification of Whois policies to comply with GDPR.

And the IPC and BC have worked together on many letters and back at the end of July we were in the process of approving a letter and then the IPC said, "Hey, time out. Let us come back and do some edits." So attachment three to the policy calendar is a joint letter from the BC and the IPC that we want to get in very quickly to ICANN Org. I can assure you that the points we're making here are consistent with the early input we provided to the EPDP last week. But, Chantelle, if it's not too much trouble could you load the third attachment from the policy calendar in the Adobe room?

What I'm requesting is to get BC members to reply with any edits or objections by the end of today since we would like to file that comment with ICANN Org. So again this is a open letter and it's only two pages long and we quickly acknowledge the fact that ICANN Org has to create a credible unified access model. And we quote the GAC, we quote Article 29 Working Party in Europe, and we quote the SSAC on the need for that. So this is again it's a call for urgency, and ICANN has been generating iterations on their unified access model.

And then on Page 2 we suggest that while it is important to get European Data Protection Board guidance, we're not always going to get the most clear and explicit guidance. All we'll get is sort of general guidance. And we believe that ICANN should take concrete steps and put those in front of the EPDP for purposes of seeing whether we're on the right track.

So this is a relatively brief letter and I would ask now are there any objections for BC members of joining the IPC on the letter you have in front of you? I'll take comments as well and edit suggestions. You can reply on list by the end of today, if you would be more comfortable doing it by email, but send it to all of BC private. And if I don't hear any further objections, I will join the IPC and we'll file the letter late tonight or tomorrow morning. Thank you.

Chantelle, if you could now load the fourth attachment. The fourth attachment is a new draft, and I haven't put a deadline on when we would put it in, but ICANN Org did publish another iteration on a framework for the unified access model. And they did that on the 20th of August. And in that they laid out six specific questions on this unified access model where they're seeking input from the community.

Now remember they don't do this with a formal public comment period so there isn't a deadline and it's often difficult to know how soon one has to offer input to be able to steer the ship. But we did discuss with Göran and staff that they feel pretty urgent about it and they feel particularly focused on the end of this document, which is this notion that ICANN could be the centralized controller, the centralized operator of an RDAP service. That doesn't mean that ICANN would necessarily have all the data but they're interested to know whether they should accumulate it.

So in this document itself, Tim Chen and I, Alex Deacon, Margie and Mark tried to put together a set of the BC's specific input to the six questions. So this was circulated and I need the BC members to provide some input on how we steer ICANN on the unified access model. I will keep this open for the weekend with an intent to file it on Monday the 10th of September. So let's say that the 9th of September is the deadline for BC comments, but this should be a great chance to do that.

Tim Chen I note that you're on the call. You can I had alternative views on a couple of items. It'd be great to hear your perspective, and I'll scroll to the document so we can give BC members an opportunity to review.

Tim Chen: Yes. Thanks, Steve. Can you hear me?

Steve DelBianco: We do.

Tim Chen: Okay. Great. Yes, thanks for the chance to comment. I think my biggest not concern but question for the BC is it's really important to me that our comment on this document represents the BC's perspective. You know, just kind of side bar, the company that I run we're kind of deeply involved in this issue at a number of levels and a number of different areas inside and outside of ICANN.

And there is so much going on that I often find myself commenting on multiple different letters or articles or whatever it might be any given day or week and, you know, I have fairly strongly held opinions on this issue, which shouldn't surprise anybody here, so I just want to disclaim that, you know, anything that I draft what I'm doing is trying to support the BC as a member of the BC and all of the broad comments and work that we do and specifically ones where I feel like I have some area of knowledge. But it's important to me that it represents the - broadly the BC's interest.

And so for that reason I think the most important thing I can say is I really would like other members to review the comment here and make sure it's consistent or if there's any competing views that they are raised. It's really helpful for us.

You know, as Steve mentioned, he and I had different opinions on one or two of these things, and there's some really specific items in this around obviously access to the data, things like fees that may be charged to users of the data or for the accreditation process, and it'll get more - as we get into this, it will get into more specific point of contention that we know are going to be debated heavily more broadly than I can.

So I think it's important that we have the BC's perspective set here so we can defend it and feel like we're defending the broad perspective of the BC and hopefully not in any case ever, you know, the individual perspective (unintelligible). That's really the high level point I wanted to make. It's a five-page document. I don't want to go too deep into it but, Steve, do you want to bring up certain points that - on this call to discuss, I'm happy to represent, you know, why the draft says what it says right now if you think it's helpful.

Steve DelBianco: Yes, let's take two minutes to do that. And, Tim, the BC perspective is broadly defined in the mission. It's specifically articulated in previous positions that have been filed, but ultimately what we say on any issue that's in front of us is also a function of what the individual BC members as companies feel about it, and that informs the overall perspective. So it's completely appropriate for you to talk in terms of what domain tools is doing with the data, how it serves the interests of business users and registrants, and if that informs our point of view, you don't want to be shy about advancing it.

So one example is on the screen in front of you and it was a question on whether an authenticated user, assuming we get to that, an authenticated user makes a request for access to the non-public Whois data, when they make that request the question is should they be required to put a reason code for each request. And the reason could be I'm investigating fraud, I'm investigating cyber squatting, I'm investigating a cyber security problem.

So presumably it could be the indication of a code but it would require that for each query that a code be attached, and that code would then be stored by the RDAP provider to provide the justification to GDPR that we are for a legitimate purpose, we're doing it for a legitimate purpose.

So Tim and I had a different perspective. I felt like an automated process of putting in a code would not be too burdensome and would give us the better chance of winning the day on getting accredited access. Now Tim's observation is what you have in the document here is that Tim suggests that we would find it over-burdensome to specify a purpose on each individual record, and that's the kind of debate that we want BC members to weigh in on.

Some of it's political, which is what the best position for us to take now? Should we start right up front saying that we would do a reason code or should we start saying no and eventually yield that later on as a bargaining position? And that's hard to know right since ICANN is holding all the cards on the unified access model. They're developing it in the dark. They publish for public comments. You wait around and then they reveal a new one six weeks later.

So Tim or others?

Tim Chen: Let me chime in here, Steve, because you accurately portrayed one of the issues that - and this is example one. My perspective on this is that what I've observed in the interactions among the constituencies, you know, privacy advocates and - really more privacy advocates than affected parties are really going to take every pound of flesh they possibly can, and we've seen this and pushed back on whether even the registrant org, you know, which is still in the

temp spec, should even be in there along with city, state and zip and other things.

And, you know, we know you're right, the - clearly certain parties are going to come back and say obviously you need a legitimate interest reason for every single request because that's how they're going to interpret law because we know that's coming so you're right about that. I don't believe in conceding on any points because if you concede on points up front they're just going to go to the next point they want and use that for their negotiation and you're going to have to compromise on something else. So it's good to have things that, you know, we're really give on and talking about to embolden our negotiating position overall.

The other point which is probably more important is the big issue from - one of the biggest issues from a security perspective, and a brand protection perspective, is the ability to do reverse Whois and individual or multi-variant searches across the database (unintelligible) better.

That's a huge issue that's going to be tackled in multiple different ways at some point in this, I'm sure. But if you follow how this data is used by security practitioners, a lot of the work they do is finding things that are associated with artifacts in GMS. And the only way you do that is to have the data together to search across it. So if you think about a world where you're going to have to say, I have a request. I'm law enforcement or if they're carved out of this discussion, then I'm a security practitioner, or a brand protection, or an attorney and I want to do this kind of a query, I don't see how that query can be enabled if you have to have a legitimate interest for every single domain name. Because you're saying, show me other domains that are associated with this bad actor.

And so just the ability to technically support a broad query like that I think is defeated or made more challenging if somehow there's a requirement that you can only do single requests at a time that have a specific reason held against them. So if we get there, we get there but I don't prefer to start there. That's why I wrote this as it is.

Steve DelBianco: Tim, thank you very much. There was one other point at the end, which is the last question, on whether ICANN should be the RDAP provider and we don't have to make that decision now. We just have to say to ICANN, please continue to explore the idea of ICANN being the centralized RDAP controller, although not a centralized database.

So I think that that is not a negotiating item as much as it is as trying to take ICANN at its word and get them to accelerate that. Are there any other BC comments on this document? We're going to keep it open until the end of the day on the 9th of September and then we'll submit it to ICANN Org. All right. Thanks again, Tim.

I thought we would turn now to Susan and Marie to see if you want to pick up on Channel 2 for GNSO Council.

Susan Kawaguchi: Thanks, Steve and thanks, Marie. The last meeting being so far away, but nothing much contentious except the IGO/NGO problem is still swirling around with the PDP. And so we should have a further discussion about that. There wasn't much discussion on the last council meeting about it. It was more informational but there has been discussion on the list of whether - so the Council has a major decision of whether to accept the report and the recommendations, which go - are absolutely against the GAC advice, and then let the Board deal with it, or reject those, which is sort of - could be a

monumental decision for the Council because that has never happened before to reject.

And we don't really - because of the working group it would be hard to send this all back to the working group and say do more work on this. So that's the biggest thing. I haven't seen the agenda yet for the next call. Something not completely unrelated to the Council that I just wanted to bring to the attention of the BC was that the proxy privacy IRT has started working again. There's a meeting right after this meeting at 9:00 a.m. my time. And there was a meeting last week and I had to miss that one. But they put out a - ICANN Org put out a one question poll asking whether we should sort of put the work on hold again and go back to the GNSO Council.

I responded to the poll saying I'm on the GNSO Council. There's no reason to do that. We should just continue the work. And so I'm not sure where the privacy proxy is leading, but I still fully believe even though GDPR will impact it that we should move forward with the process and have an accreditation process for privacy proxies. Because in my experience, they - privacy, in looking at WHOIS records, at this point at least, privacy proxies are not going away, and in fact, I'm suspicious that some registrars have changed their registrations all to privacy proxy. That's a suspicion. I don't have actual hard facts on that. So that is something I'm researching.

Steve DelBianco: Susan, I understand as much as a third of the new gTLD registrations are covered by privacy proxy and that was before GDPR kicked in, in May. Do we have a sense that it's increased beyond that one-third in the last two months?

Susan Kawaguchi: So I'm going to call it a suspicion. I don't really know but with the amount of WHOIS records I have looked at in the last few months, it's very difficult in

some - with some records to figure out is this a redacted record or was this switched to a proxy. And so in the work I'm doing currently, we specifically will ask the registrar, is this a proxy registration or is this redacted when we sort of force them or try to force them to make the statement. So we know what they're relying on because you sort of have two barriers then. You have to get through the GDPR issues and then go through their proxy reveal.

So which we all know doesn't work. Nobody reveals anything. To me, a proxy is worse than GDPR.

Steve DelBianco: Oh, brother. All right, Marie, anything to add on Council? Any questions for Susan and Marie?

Marie Pattullo: The only thing I have I put in the chat. I can talk more if you want me to, but I don't think I need to. Thanks.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks, Marie. Appreciate it. All right, let's go to the next channel with Barbara Wanner to talk about our liaison to the commercial stakeholders group. I'll bring that onto the screen right now. Barbara, over to you.

Barbara Wanner: Okay. Thank you, Steve. I just wanted to cover two things in my report today. The first one is you may recall on the last call, I talked about some concerns that were raised in the CSG ExCom about the position that ISPCP was taking in the EPDP. And Wolf-Ulrich underscored today that the ISPCP takes very serious CSG coordination on the EPDP and I believe that Vickie Sheckler will be playing an active role facilitating a coordinated discussion.

So be mindful and keep your eyes open for emails from Vickie inviting people to participate in a call to discuss coordination of its CSG views on the EPDP. But Wolf-Ulrich was quite concerned about underscoring how seriously

ISPCP takes that. Whether that will compel Thomas to dial back, I don't know. But at least they're willing to talk.

The second thing I wanted to talk about, and this is really where I welcome input and need input from the BC concerns the upcoming elections for the GNSO Council Chair. I received minor edits from Marika to the GNSO - to the process that we developed within the NCPH concerning the selection of a nominee for that position. I will circulate those to the BC private for sure, but also back to the NCSG. I really don't think that Marika's questions or proposed changes will be controversial. They really actually put more of the coordinating burden on the GNSO Secretariat.

I will also communicate to Farzaneh that the CSG will not be putting forward a candidate for a potential nomination. And then also too, we will be waiting according to these guidelines worked out, we will be waiting for Rafik, who the NCSG is putting forward, for Council Chair as a nomination, to contact us to have a conversation in anticipation of the vote.

So that's kind of where things stand. I fully anticipate that we will end with no consensus, which means that the NCSG, excuse me, the non-contracted party house as a house will not be putting forward a nominee for the Council Chair position. Everybody, the CSG is unified in its support for Keith Drazek. So that's kind of where things stands. I also wanted to give everybody a head's up that Farzaneh will be stepping down as Chair of the NCSG and that Stephanie Perrin will secede her. So I think we will continue to have very partisan views in the NCSG and things won't get any easier in terms of coordination.

And that's kind of my report. If that process in terms of how we proceed for NCSG, excuse me, for GNSO Council Chair, sounds good to everybody, that's

how I'll proceed. I personally have a question for those of you who have the institutional memory. Donna Austin is term limited. So she will be stepping down. Can Rafik continue on as a Vice Chair if he is not elected to Council Chair or will we then have a duty -- a little bit of interference here -- will we then have an opportunity to select a CSG representative to serve as Vice Chair? Does anybody have any insight into that?

Steve DelBianco: I don't. Anyone else know the rules? Chantelle, could you help us figure out the rules on Council Vice Chair with Rafik? And not necessarily on this call but send an email back. It's helping us understand from GNSO Secretariat what the term limit issues are. Thank you, Chantelle. Barbara, anything else?

Barbara Wanner: No. Oh, just finally, if people want, I will recirculate the questions I have proposed for our various meetings at Barcelona. The CSG has yet to nail those down. We will, in our next ExCom call, we will also discuss sort of how takes the lead in asking what questions. So give some thought to that as well. Thank you.

Steve DelBianco: Barbara, thank you for that and I did circulate it. It's attachment 6 of the policy calendar. The current set of questions. Okay, I think that's it for the policy calendar and we're back to you, Claudio.

Claudia Selli: Thank you very much, Steve. I just wanted to inform the BC around the preparation of ICANN 63 for our BC open meeting. So we sent invitation to the contracted party house as well as to the European Commission to come as our guest at the BC open meeting. We are waiting for their answers and we'll see if we need to eventually invite other people. Would you have different or additional requests, please let us know.

Just one suggestion, I wouldn't overcrowd the meeting with a lot of guests because I think it's good to leave room as well for internal discussion. I don't have more than that unless there are comments, question, or anything. And otherwise, I will leave the floor to Jimson. Jimson, are you there?

Jimson Olufuye: Yes, I'm here. Greetings everyone. This is Jimson speaking. First, on the election results, so really appreciate everyone for playing a (unintelligible) role in this. We all know the results for the council election and the NomCom election. So thank you Scott and Paul Mitchell and Lawrence Olawale-Roberts for putting yourself forward to ICANN. Your information for travel has been submitted to ICANN travel Constituency Travel to be part of activities at ICANN 63.

So again, for Scott McCormick as new Councilor will be joining Marie attending the BC, and Paul Mitchell is the NomCom rep for BC for large business seat. And Lawrence Olawale-Roberts the small business seat. So again, thank you.

On invoices, I think we just have about 82 percent of our members paid. So if there's still any challenge with your invoice or if you have to receive something or going to spam, please reach out either to the secretariat or myself. So thanks to all the members who have paid up.

As part of our FY19 plan, the outreach plan for this year, and of course, Europe and at the same time, Africa. The ExCom has approved that we participate, the vice chair, myself to participate at the Asia-Pacific ICT Alliance event October 10 to 12 in Guangzhou, China. And while there, we'll have opportunity to speak to ICT leaders with regard to what we do in the BC as part of our long-term strategy to reach out to other stakeholders.

There is the Outreach plan calls for ICANN 64 in Japan. So I'll also be discussing with (unintelligible), that is the Asia-Pacific ICT Alliance with regard to our members can be there to continue the conversation at ICANN 64 in Kobe, Japan.

With respect to Europe, thanks to Marilyn that has put in some proposal for ICANN 63 and that is on under consideration. On this proposal, there will be collaboration with ICANN, entire Europe, AIM, and ETNO, and all our stakeholders I guess. I think Marilyn is on the call. Marilyn, do you want to quickly speak on this?

Marilyn Cade: Can you hear me?

Jimson Olufuye: Yes, we can hear you.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you. I did submit a detailed proposal. It's gone so far only to the BC outreach committee and to the ExCom, and I would like to move ahead with posting it to the full membership. Europe is a unique opportunity for us because while we do have a significant presence through three very key business associations who are on the BC membership, ETNO, and very longstanding members. As a matter of fact, both ETNO, and ICC, and actually all three, AIM, were involved at the launch of the BC.

And so we've had a very strong presence into a certain aspect of European business. But we don't have the national level business user presence that would be very helpful to us. And looking at our diversity in Europe, my proposal suggested that we also engage with Digital Europe to reach their 39 national ICT and business associations.

I've been in touch with Chris Chaplow and am reaching out to two Spanish associations tentatively. So far, all of my contacts have been generic in the sense of ICANN is coming. I hope you'll be interested in attending. Here's what ICANN does. Here's our BC flyer. Here's our newsletter. Here's why we matter. I've not at this point made any overtures to them to be partners, as I really felt that the proposal needed to be reviewed and approved both by the outreach committee and the executive committee, and the membership.

We're fortunate that we have a great model that Gabby evolved and Chris Mondini has committed to helping us with having a room onsite, which would significantly lower cost but also give us the opportunity. We've also gotten advice from Chris about when the local business community is likely to be willing to attend events, which is really late in the what we would call the late afternoon, early evening, warning us not to plan to do something on a weekend, such as Saturday or Sunday, which is very much reserved for family responsibilities, particularly among the European countries, Spain among them.

So it would be an hour and a half. We would have a program as we did at ICANN 62 and I propose that we try to get Goran for a brief speech and if we could add to engage with someone who would be able to talk about the digital economy, which is very much the pressing issue in most of the European countries as all of the associations are heavily engaged in how to bring jobs and how to strengthen the voice of business in influencing their governments in a variety of ways on certain topics.

I also suggested that we ask our existing association members to help us with outreach to their European colleagues from their companies or their associations to help extend invitations. Thanks.

Jimson Olufuye: Thank you very much, Marilyn. Is there any connection with the 20th anniversary of ICANN? Would there be any connection so that the businesses that will be (unintelligible) can also witness that? Would there be any kind of linkage with the 20th anniversary commemoration of ICANN?

Marilyn Cade: Thank you for that question. I have reached out to Tanzi who is working on the planning of that, to ask if we could also have special invitations for - that we could distribute to that event. She's also engaging with me on what the program is going to include so that we should have a highlight on whether they're bringing some of the early founders to attend, which would, again, be a way for us to highlight the fact that business has been heavily engaged in ICANN.

But right now, that's very preliminary. Just questions about could we do this. I would not...

Marilyn Cade: Sorry, just one quick comment. It would need to be relatively early, such as Monday or Tuesday, unless we try to do it the few hours before the gala. And I am waiting to see if Chantelle or someone can give me information about whether - because originally, Mondini had indicated it would be right before the gala. No, sorry, right before the event with GAC. So I am just waiting to see what the proposed date is for when we would be given the room at the venue.

Jimson Olufuye: Okay, thank you Marilyn. Is there any member questions for Marilyn maybe to approach her afterward. Also, on outreach, there is plan for outreach in Africa, Nairobi specifically, in conjunction with the Africa ICT Alliance Summit. This has been a longstanding engagement between BC and Africa wherein we talk more about what we do (unintelligible) at the opening ceremony October 8 and that will be a booth for the BC, wherein flyers and

cards will be distributed and there will have some awards at the desk - at the booth to provide more clarity on what we do to get (unintelligible) at the event. So that is planned for Nairobi and provide full report. We will get full report on all this in newsletter and I hope we go through them.

Next is on Meet the BC flyer. Thanks to Chantelle, she has been communicating with us on this. We need to do the latest edition of the Meet the BC flyers. So far, there has been low response. We thank those that responded but we still need good marks to go ahead. What we request is your profile and picture as members represented in the BC.

The objective is to further advance diversity across the world. This membership is not only North America. It's all Europe. It's around the world, Asia, Africa, and Latin America. So we need to make the public to be aware of this for us to continually feel in a good perspective.

So that is all from my side. I don't know if there's any questions. Back to you, Claudia.

Claudia Selli: Thank you very much, Jimson. So I don't know if there are other comments or other points. Otherwise, I will adjourn the call and the next call is taking place on 20th of September. I don't see any hands up. So Chantelle, the call is adjourned. Thank you everybody.

END