ICANN

Moderator: Chantelle Doerksen
November 28, 2018
10:00 am CT

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

Coordinator: The recordings have now been started.

Chantelle Doerksen: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the BC Members call on Wednesday, November 28, 2018. In the interest of time attendance will be taken via the Adobe Connect room and the phone bridge.

I'd like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for the transcript, and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid background noise.

With this I will turn it over to the BC Chair, Claudia Selli, to begin. Claudia please go ahead.

Claudia Selli: Sure. Thank you very much Chantelle and thank you very much everybody for being on the call today. I just wanted to start the call by thanking everybody for the great support you have been giving to the past team that has been reselected in the different roles that we were having, and I also wanted to thank the officers for the great – the work that they have been doing and they're – continue to do every day for the BC so thank you everybody.

And in the interest of time I will leave the floor to Steve for the policy discussion.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks Claudia. Chantelle's putting up the updated policy calendar. I sent it around to all of you this morning with a few updates. First thing I'll do is recap two comments that we filed since we had our last call 14 days ago.

One is on November the 26th earlier this week. We filed a comment on the final report and recommendations out of one of the bylaws mandated community reviews where we reviewed whether the new gTLD expansion increased consumer trust, consumer choice and competition in new gTLDs.

I want to thank Stephanie Duchesneau and Mark Datysgeld for that drafting. It was a – an excellent short, crisp set of comments to the CCT and Stephanie and Mark did a great job on that. Thank you.

The second was on November the 18th we saw the comments on the WHOIS Review Team's draft recommendations. Susan Kawaguchi had been the Vice Chair for that review team but we were good enough to have Denise and Jimson step up and draft a BC comment.

I want to thank Marilyn, Marie, Tim for the edits that you provided. So both of those are in and they're excellent BC comments. Let me move on now to the currently open public comments.

So in particular there's a few of them that'll deserve our attention. The first is an initial report from these - Cross-Community Working Group, not just a PDP but a Cross-Community Working Group to try to determine mechanisms and criteria for how to get – how to dispose of/how to properly use a few hundred million dollars of auction proceeds from the new gTLD first round.

The comment period would've closed today but it has been extended by two weeks to the 11th of December, and that gives us room to have a brief discussion here today but it gives us two weeks via email for us to exchange drafts back and forth.

So right off the bat let me thank Tola. You did the original draft. David Snead came in with a – lots of crisp edits and then Jimson made a few tiny edits and then Marilyn came in with a more substantive set of edits, and we'd gone back and forth on that over the weekend.

Now the first attachment to the policy calendar was what we'll call the 19th of November draft, and then Attachment 2 is one that Marilyn brought in with some edits that Marilyn wants to argue for and we're going to give time to – for discussion of that.

But as - I did note yesterday in an email that this - particular preliminary recommendations by the CCWG, which start on Page 17 of their report – their preliminary recommendations are really what they're soliciting comments on, and none of those preliminary recommendations mention this notion of whether ICANN's Board should be able to claim reserve auction funds for the purpose of replenishing reserves.

The BC has a position on that and we supported it in principle and I've articulated all the positions we have from April of this year. Reason I'm bringing this up now is that our own councilors in the council meeting that's coming up are going to be discussing whether GNSO Council wants to take what they call remedial action over the fact that the Board passed a resolution in Barcelona to claim $36 million of auction funds to replenish the ICANN reserves for money that was spent on the IANA transition.

And it's my view as your Policy Councilor that the BC doesn't have a problem with the principle of replenishing that $36 million, and that that could be the discussion that our Councilors Scott and Marie would have when the Council gets to that item on your next call.

That is not however something that I believe needs to be in the ICANN -in the BC's comment on auction proceeds because auction proceeds - at least the preliminary recommendations don't speak to the idea of reserves at all.

It's only brought up as an example and the recommendation is it would happen completely outside of the auction proceeds group. So with - setting the table for you that way gives us the opportunity to say to David Snead, Marilyn, Tola or Jimson why don't we take five minutes, discuss where you think we're headed on our auction proceeds recommendation. Anybody?

All right. Hearing nothing on that we'll move on to the second one. I look forward to a email dialog in the next two weeks but let's not wait until 15 days from now to start circulating substantive edits.

I would say that David/Marilyn/Tola/Jimson/the drafting team, try to come together in the next few days with a consolidated draft. Please be attentive to the limited scope of this reserve fund point and then we'll circulate that comment to BC members who I'm sure will give some input on that.

All right, Number 2 is a draft report of an outside review and this is every five years the ICANN bylaws require ICANN to hire an outside consultant to evaluate the effectiveness, continued purpose and other aspects and structure and processes that are used in each of the ACs and SOs other than the GAC.

Well the most recent cycle has found as its target the SSAC, the Security, Stability Advisory Committee. Now the outside consultants have published their report with draft recommendations and the comments close in just several days on the 3rd of December.

And I had Tim Chen and Roger Baah volunteer to draft and Tim Chen circulated a first draft just yesterday and I attached it to the comment. And Chantelle can I ask you to bring up the PDF of the first draft, which was Attachment 4 to the policy calendar?

As Chantelle is loading that Tim Chen is on the line and Tim why don't you walk us through? It's only a page and a half long. Walk us through what you've got in the comment so the BC members can react.

Tim Chen: Sure thing. Steve are you able to hear me?

Steve DelBianco: I am Tim and I have the comment up on (unintelligible).

Tim Chen: Okay great. I'm just I'm going to navigate over to that on my laptop. So just briefly generally it's fairly straightforward. I wanted to make sure that she has a chance to expand on, you know, what I see as all the – my opinions on this review.

The good news is I think it's fairly comprehensive study in terms of the attempt to do broad research by the group – the analysis group that was commissioned to do the work.

I tend to agree with most of the recommendations. I think they're pretty constructive. So I'll just point out a couple of areas where I tried to add emphasis or – and one or two where I disagreed.

And then certainly in the next regrowth period we have as Steve says I invite other people to redline this version. But I just wanted to repeat the purpose of the review so it was clear to everyone and it's a chance to remind everyone that the remit of the SSAC is very closely aligned to ICANN's own mission statement, which I think is important in the day and age of some of the issues that we're talking about as a constituency.

Secondly, it focuses on three outcomes and so I tried to align our feedback with those three outcomes. Certainly the first ones – it is just confirming that the SSAC is relevant.

It's obvious the second one is some comments on some of the improvements that are in this report and the third one, which I think is the area where I focus the most, is trying to encourage more transparency and communication.

My own opinion of SSAC -- and somewhat limited experience – I remember this coming in as a newbie to ICANN -- was I've seen kind of a closed insular group.

It was really hard to understand what they were doing to kind of get in there. I tried to actually attend one of the meetings I was interested in. (Andy Nog) got showed the door in one of my first ICANNs.

And so to me it's such an important constituency that, you know, I'd like to see them be more – to have more effort to do outreach with other SO and AC groups, which is one of the things that's oddly supported if you're – if you read the 84-page document in this report.

So just going through quickly to some of the tactical things below the line, I talked – the – about the research that there was. It did seem to be – it was somewhat limited – some of the response volume from certain other groups.

So SSAC itself had reasonable input. It looked like the BC had some representation but other groups were less well represented, so I just think that indicates that they should do more outreach to some of the other groups.

It's kind of self-evident that they're not really connected as well as they need to be with some other groups so I pointed that out. We – I pointed out that we agree with a lot of the recommendations that they make in here.

A couple of things that I wanted to state in addition – C. For timeliness I use SSAC 101, which is obviously near and dear to my heart on improving WHOIS and ICANN's role in that.

You know, I pointed out that that's something that's been out there since June and it's unclear -- or even outside of the EPDP process, which has its own timeline -- if – what if any action ICANN's going to take.

And maybe I missed it but, you know, that's the kind of thing where it's a pretty detailed report, a lot of really good information there and then what happens next.

So maybe that's me but I don't really know what happens next. I think part of what SSAC should do is continue to emphasize that their opinion matters and that they expect progress and communication on the recommendations from the ICANN Board or more broadly within the ICANN community.

The only other thing that I might point out as I kind of scroll through this reminding myself what I wrote here…

Steve DelBianco: Yes Tim. Tim let's go right to the last one on Rec 27 and I've placed…

Tim Chen: The last one.

Steve DelBianco: …into the chat – yes if you don't mind. And since we only have six days until this comment closes there won't be another phone call, and this would be a great time to go straight to that one and I appreciate your frank recommendation on this.

Recommendation 27 was the consultants weighing in to say and I put this in the chat that the leadership of the SSAC should be limited to two three-year terms, and that the SSAC should impose no term limits on regular non-leader members.

And you're proposing that the BC would disagree with that and suggesting we don't see how the benefits of permanent membership outweigh the moral hazards of having tenure as it were, tenure being the notion of never being able to cycle out.

Why don't you explain your thoughts behind that and let's engage a little conversation on that particular disagreement? Tim you first.

Tim Chen: Sure. That's the only part that I really disagreed strongly on. Yes it's just fundamentally my personal belief. I don't believe in, you know, people just get to sit there forever just because what, they're – they know the other people on the group, which just seems to be kind of how that group was put together,

and they have, you know, one of 100,000 people that have qualifications in security.

I think you need to always refresh the membership to get new energy, get new diversity and you get – you know the urgency that you have a few years to make a difference.

So, you know, my strong opinion is tenure is just generally bad and I don't see why it makes any sense here like it doesn't in a lot of places. Again my own personal opinion.

Steve DelBianco: Great. Thank you Tim. I'll note that the BC has term limits for officers but we don't have term limits for members. I would also add that I'm unaware of any other AC and SO that limits the tenure of actual members other than leadership.

Roger, Marilyn, anyone else like to weigh in? Just – I see Marilyn in the queue first. Go ahead Marilyn. Can't hear you Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: I'm hoping now. Thanks. Marilyn Cade speaking. Thanks for all the work you've done on this. I will just make a comment about the unique role that the SSAC leadership (unintelligible).

I'm not by any means suggesting perpetual leadership as I think we saw with Crocker, but I do think that stability in leadership at the SSAC is particularly important since that – the SSAC does have a liaison position on the ICANN Board.

Personally I would prefer to see all of the Advisory Committee being treated like true liaisons rather than kind of informal members of the board. We

didn't address that in our comments but I support the idea that particularly in the SSAC/also in the reserver organization Advisory Committee, stability of the leadership does perhaps extend beyond two years into at least four years in order for issues…

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: Marilyn you might be missing the point of Tim's – remember the recommendation was term limits should be there for leadership, two three-year terms Marilyn, but it was the general membership of SSAC that Tim was speaking to.

What would your opinion be about whether the BC would recommend that SSAC members also be term limited?

Marilyn Cade: Thanks Steve. We don't limit our members. I don't think it'd be consistent for us to limit SSAC members but we might want to reserve that until we hear others from the SSAC community.

Refreshing the community - and maybe that's Tim's point. Refreshing the community might be important as skills change over years, but I wouldn't suggest we ourselves try to limit the membership of a group when we don't limit our own membership.

Steve DelBianco: Right but keep in mind that the SSAC has a fixed number of people just like for instance the Nominating Committee and the board itself. So there are institutions at ICANN where there are significant term limits on membership in groups where membership has a fixed quantity and I think that's Tim's point. So Mark and then Susan.

Mark Datysgeld: Yes I wonder if the better recommendation would be for them to, you know, either loosen their membership criteria or expand the number of people within the SSAC.

I suppose that could be unwieldy although they already have quite a few people as far, I mean, I was an invited guest once and they had a lot of people in that room.

So whether the people should have a tenure or a time limit or not I think there's a benefit of tenure. Even though technology does change a lot of the backbone technology really hasn't.

I don't know whether a ten-year period of time would lose experience or not, but you might want to make it easier to become a member or expand the membership somewhat.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you Mark. So Tim is – as drafters you and Roger should take on board that perhaps this point be expanded to indicate that when it comes to membership, to create a more dynamic cycle that either expand the number of members or consider term limits for membership to get fresh blood. Susan?

Susan Kawaguchi: And I'm just agreeing -- this is Susan Kawaguchi for the record -- that, you know, there should be – it should be easier to get on SSAC and not, I mean, I think keeping some people on with that institutional knowledge is really good, but you hear a lot of stories of very qualified people not being able to get on SSAC.

It's a very limited – almost a boys' club is what I've heard so, you know, never tried myself obviously but I think that we should encourage them to,

you know, at least have a new, you know, maybe a percentage of new people each round.

I don't know if that's every year or every two years but adding that fresh blood is critical I think.

Steve DelBianco: Excellent points for us to expand on this one. And so I'm hearing that we would explain the rationale and suggest that they'd either expand their membership quantity, which is very difficult because it's all buried in the bylaws, or that membership have term limits and give examples of other fixed membership where there's a fixed quantity of people.

I think of the NomCom and the board for example where there are a fixed number of people and ask whether those organizations have term limits for membership and I think they do. Over to you Tim Chen.

Tim Chen: Thank you. Just one final point I'd make here. The – I read the slide deck actually first from the Webinar and then went back to the document and they're not terribly consistent.

But one of the things that's in the slide deck that I didn't see in the document is a quote when they were talking about subsidy and increasing recruiting efforts, which is something we – I strongly support in my comment.

There was a quote that was, "Let's not do diversity for diversity's sake. This is a technical group." And, you know, I just really strongly disagree with that point of view and I pulled my comment out because I wanted to be more…

((Crosstalk))

Tim Chen: …to the document. That's what I'm supposed to be reviewing and I don't know if the deck…

((Crosstalk))

Tim Chen: If you go in the deck…

((Crosstalk))

Tim Chen: And, you know, my strong opinion is, one, diversity creates strength…

((Crosstalk))

Tim Chen: …and experience and it's really important in any candidate, I mean, and just a candidate doesn't exclude you from somehow being treated separately. And so that comment is really indicative of the insular nature of this group in my opinion. That's another…

((Crosstalk))

Tim Chen: …to say, "You need to blow it up on the inside out," and hopefully Rod as new Chair will…

((Crosstalk))

Tim Chen: And so I think we should have a really strong comment here whatever we decide to say.

Steve DelBianco: Yes Tim this is Steve. I would ask you to – let's restrict ourselves to the recommendations in the report for the public comment purposes rather than the deck or side comments that are made.

Let – let's focus on what are the recommendations and I think we are better off focusing on the notion of cycling out membership or expanding it more so than diving into a strict diversity requirement.

I wanted to see whether anybody else has comments on this. And hearing none – yes there is Marilyn and you'll see that that's in there. That's one of the ones that Tim agreed with. Okay Tim, Roger, thanks for your…

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: …work on that. Much appreciated it. I'm sorry. Marilyn did you want to get in on this?

Marilyn Cade: I do.

Steve DelBianco: Okay well…

Marilyn Cade: I just want to quickly say – sorry, if you don't mind Steve I want to say how important I think we – you noted Tim -- thank you for this -- that the SSAC should focus on increasing interactions, blah blah blah.

I think that's very important but I would just ask us to perhaps think about how we also could increase that. I'm – we used to have events and sessions but I think perhaps we need to do more to engage onsite.

Our calendars are also very challenging but perhaps we could be part of the solution here.

Steve DelBianco: Yes Marilyn Recommendations 10, 14, 17 and 18 make those points and Tim is draft – Tim's draft suggests that we strongly support and agree with those. If you have specific recommendations and suggestions please send them around in an email and Tim and Roger as drafters – we can add to that okay?

All right, thank you very much. Let's go back to the policy calendar please Chantelle and move on to Number 3. This is a report that's not – a comment that's not due till the 12th of December but again that – that's really only 16 days away.

And this is the supplemental initial report from the Subsequent Procedures Group. This is the subsequent rounds of new gTLDs so they call it Subsequent Procedures.

It's a very large and complex PDP Working Group and we have had BC members that have worked on this that are shown as currently active: Alison Simpson, Isabel Rutherford, Margie Milam and I think Margie's on the phone today but I don't see Isabel or Alison on the call.

What we need is more of a dedicated BC presence in that PDP, because as they move down the road towards final recommendations they will look around the room in a consensus call for that PDP and they need to count the BC's position.

So this is as much as anything an open call for BC members who have a keen interest in this to participate at this point as the BC's representative to the PDP and we're going to need that.

I'll send a email call around since I don't want to pick somebody else if Alison or Isabel are interested in stepping up to it, so I'll send that via an email after this call.

But when it comes to this comment I wanted to thank Susan, Andrew and (Vivac) because you volunteered to draft a BC comment on this. It's – closes the 12th of December and with a week's advance time we should shoot for circulating to the BC members by the 5th of December.

Any other volunteers that want to help? Chris Wilson is noting that Alison Simpson is no longer with Amazon and thank you. Jimson's going to want to note that to take Alison off of the BC list. Anyone else…?

((Crosstalk))

Lawrence Olawale-Roberts: Steve this is Lawrence. I would like to join and put these comments together.

Steve DelBianco: Lawrence thank you. Okay. I will move on to the next one, Number 4, which is the proposed consensus policy for the names of the different Red Cross organizations and how they're used in the second-level domain names.

To right it – sorry, to the left of the dot of a - gTLD second-level domain names there's a concern that the Red Cross backed by the Government Advisory Committee thinks that they need special rights protection mechanisms other than those which are available to other rights holders under the rights protection mechanisms.

This has become contentious because it has put the GAC in a class with the GNSO. Can I get a volunteer from the BC and it would be best I think if it was somebody with a legal background who can help on that?

Mark Datysgeld. Fantastic. Thank you Mark. And Marie. That's great. Mark and Marie give that a look. It's due the 14th of December so it would be great to circulate something to the BC by the 7th of December.

Let me move on to the next one. It's the initial report on the expedited PDP, which we call the EPDP for the temp spec. This is the idea of a PDP that would develop policy that replaces the temporary enforcement policies that ICANN Org came up with to conform with the GDPR.

Mark, (Svantrak) and Margie are working so hard on how to represent the BC's interests. We're coordinating with the IPC whenever possible and we need to develop specific responses to what are posed as preliminary recommendations and then questions.

There's a lot of them in there but it's well structured so that we have a Word doc/that we'll be able to propose the BC's response to the questions and the preliminary recs.

We'll all – and the BC be able to approve it and then I can go ahead and submit that via a form that ICANN wants to use. That comment period closes the 21st of December and I want to thank Mason Cole who's already volunteered to start the BC drafting of our responses.

So Mason rather than start to do it online to the Google Doc -- it's a little bit challenging for people to do edits and markup and changes -- I'd ask you to

use the Word doc which I have a link to, and from that Word doc we can circulate that for edits in the rest of the BC membership.

Mason - anyone else willing to help Mason on that comment - on the EPDP comment? Susan Kawaguchi please go ahead. Your hand is up.

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes I – I'll volunteer to help draft that.

Steve DelBianco: Susan, fantastic. Thank you. Again we often get the same names to volunteer for a lot of things but with people like Susan and Mason leading the way, this wouldn't even be a bad place for another BC member to get involved on, say, a new comment. So anyone else who has experience using Whois and perhaps direct experience with the effect of GDPR on Whois, can step up to this. (Vevak) is helping Susan and Mason. Thank you, (Vevak).

Faisal Shah: I can help as well. This is Faisal.

Steve DelBianco: And Faisal. Great. Thank you, Faisal. As Marie notes, when these questions were published, our - one of our challenges is to get a BC comment in and yet numbers will matter. So what also would be helpful to have multiple BC members who submit comments on their own that may support in part or in whole what the BC is submitting. But I don't believe that will be sufficient to move the numbers when it comes to consensus calls within the PDP.

What it will take to make a difference will be to get our allies in the GAC, SSAC and the ALAC to begin to take a firmer position on the recommendations that we think are priority matters, things like the organization field, things like legal versus natural persons, or the geographical coverage of the temp spec. These are areas where if the ALAC would firm their position up, they'll have a much better chance of getting something -

policy that's closer to what the BC looks for when it comes to a consensus call later in this PDP.

All right there are two other open public comments but they don't close until the end of December and one of them in January so I will wait on those until our next call to try to solicit volunteers. I think I can skip now to channel two on the policy calendar. Channel two is where we address GNSO Council. What I have done in here is list for you the last council meeting, what resolutions were adopted.

There was an interim council resolution on the 26th of November that was done by email where council voted to nominate GNSO candidates for the Accountability and Transparency Review Team. And we do have a BC member, (Tolas Abezan), (Tola), you're nominated in there and there's a special line in there where Council is going to suggest that the BC and the registrar candidates be prioritized in order to distribute representation.

The way this works is that if the other ACs and SOs don't nominate three, then that creates open slots and the GNSO will do its best to get the other AC/SO chairs to approve our extra names to get on to the ATRT3. And thank you, (Tola), for volunteering.

Let me turn it over to Susan, if you want to take over on this, as well as Scott. Go ahead and tell us what else is coming up on Council's agenda, which is tomorrow.

Susan Kawaguchi: That would be Marie.

Steve DelBianco: I meant Marie. I'm so sorry. Marie? Marie, over to you. Marie, I think that your chat indicated earlier that you might have a tough connection. Is that correct? I'll wait for Marie for a moment. Mark Svancarek, go ahead.

Mark Svancarek: This is a point on the previous topic, so I don't know if I can still speak on that. So regarding the public comment, yes it's not clear to me. I'm just looking for some clarity, and this is just my inexperience talking. How valuable is it to bring outside people, you know, people outside the ICANN community, people not (unintelligible) for instance, to provide public comments? For instance, I have cyber investigators, I have digital crime people, I have all their allies within the company and outside the company.

Steve DelBianco: Mark, get them all. The more the better and it sometimes can be more valuable when they're not part of the established ICANN community. And they don't have to comment on all the recommendations and questions. If we prioritize…

Mark Svancarek: Yes, I wasn't going to have them comment on all the recommendations and certainly not charter questions or anything like that.

Steve DelBianco: Excellent, Mark. By all means, please do.

Mark Svancarek: All right. Thanks.

Margie Milam: Yes this is Margie if I could get in the queue as well.

Steve DelBianco: Go ahead, Margie. Yes this one's really important to have as broad of a participation as possible, because as you take a look at the EPDP report, and there's a webinar tomorrow from I think it's 6 am Pacific time, there's very little that went our way. In fact nothing has really gone our way in that EPDP.

And so the issues that are really important to us we need to highlight in the public comment forum so that we can get some at least support for further discussion on that in the EPDP group. So this is one of those scenarios where I think individual companies submitting is going to be very, very, very important.

Steve DelBianco: Margie, you're so right, and thank you again to you and Mark for enduring the many, many hours of calls and document review that you're going through on this PDP. Margie mentioned the webinar that's occurring tomorrow and I hear from staff that very few people have registered for that. Margie, Mark and I will be on. I'm sure (Statin) will be and some others in the BC. But you should register and get on that webinar. It's an opportunity to hear a presentation of what's in the report as well as guidance on how to respond.

Marie dialed back in so, Marie, take us through the council agenda for the 29th of November meeting. I have it up on the screen for everyone else.

Marie Pattullo: Thanks, Steve, and apologies everybody. I'm remote. I'm in Poland and I'm having connection issues. There's really very little to say because the meeting, as Steve said, is tomorrow. You see that the votes we have are purely consensus so nothing there that's of any concern. Keith is going to be the nominated person for us to the empowered community, which of course makes complete sense.

We have comments on the GAC communiqué. Nothing there. The contentious parts will be something that, and you did rightly mention, Susan, earlier that Susan knows far more about than I do, which is the ongoing discussions to what to do with the IGO-INGO mess, for want of a better word. We will of course also be talking about the EPDP.

If anything comes up that I think you need to know urgently, I will email Steve to get out to all of you but I'm really not expecting much to be really worthy of comment tomorrow.

Steve DelBianco: Marie, thank you. You'll see in the policy calendar that when you get to item six on your agenda that is where someone in Council has said they want to discuss remedial actions to the board's Barcelona resolution to take 36 million from auction funds and put it to the ICANN reserve. To help guide you on that, I pasted the excerpt of the BC's position, which is generally in support of that one-time replenishment. And so you'll have the specifics that you can cite if that discussion becomes contentious tomorrow afternoon.

Are there any questions on Council? All right. Fantastic. Barbara Wanner, over to you for channel three on CSG.

Barbara Wanner: Thank you, Steve, and hello to everyone. Well, we're beginning planning for ICANN 64 and I will send an email to the BC private shortly that just proposes some issues or topics that we might explore during these CSG meetings, and I welcome your input. I also welcome suggestions of people that you want to meet or you want to use these CSG meetings as an opportunity to engage with them. For example, perhaps we bring in the SSAC to engage with them a little bit more, just a suggestion.

Let's see, in terms of our - it looks like in terms of our meeting with GNSO board members, it will not be on the first day, as has been the practice, and quite honestly I think that could be beneficial because in the past it's typically been very early in the morning and people who arrive a little late are denied that opportunity to meet with them. So it looks now like it'll be a lunch meeting on Tuesday on constituency day.

In terms of meeting with specific groups, in addition to SSAC as I proposed, I understand that people genuinely - generally were pleased with our meeting with the Contracted Party House. If you think that should continue, we can outreach to them and try and get something lined up separately. And then also we have this question about whether we want to meet with the NCSG at ICANN 64.

I think in theory it would be a good idea because Farzaneh has stepped down. She is no longer the chair. The new chair is Stephanie Perrin. But in view of the very tense discussions in the EPDP over both philosophy and substance, I can understand completely if the BC would prefer to delay that meeting, say, to Marrakesh or a later time. But I need BC feedback on that. If you feel it would be worthwhile to meet with the NCSG, we'll pursue that. If not, we'll just hold off.

Finally, I'm very disappointed to let you know that I will not be with you on the ground at ICANN 64 due to a major conflict that there is a very important meeting that USCIB members have been actively involved in for the past two years at the OECD. It's a ministerial meeting to roll out the Going Digital project and my senior management and my committee chair believe that the priority should be to bring that work to completion. So I won't be with you in Kobe.

But I am soliciting volunteers, anybody who would like to step up and keep notes of our various CSG meetings and then provide a short report of that during the BC open meeting at ICANN 64. You could be deputized to serve in that capacity. So that's it, Steve. I guess I will follow up then on the BC private email concerning the items that I mentioned. Thank you.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks so much, Barbara. Appreciate that. Marilyn Cade, we had put an item in the agenda as soon as we finished the policy calendar was to get an update from you on the Auction Proceeds Cross-Community Working Group. Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: Thanks, Steve, and thanks to the chair for putting this on the agenda. I had sent a very short PowerPoint. I don't know if it's available. I'm not going to walk through it but I did want to refer to it. So can I just make sure everyone will have access to it, at least in the record?

Steve DelBianco: Yes, go ahead, Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: Sorry, Steve. Yes. Thank you, Chantelle. So what I wanted to do is update everybody about the Cross-Community Working Group on Auction Proceeds, and (Tola) is on the call with us but I think he's on the phone so we may need to come back to him for his comments by phone.

I serve now as CSG representative on the Cross-Community Working Group on Auction Proceeds. To date, there - all of the comments come from parties that are lobbying for what they want the funds to be expended for and ignoring the purpose of the public comments. And I think we at the BC, and I ask you to take particular attention to this, as I serve now as the CSG representative, the purpose of the public comment process was to seek comments on the mechanisms to distribute the funds and a set of principles consistent with the ICANN mission, not to lobby on particular allocation of funds.

So far, as I mentioned, efforts about comments have been pick me, pick me, pick me, we want a advocacy program to create awareness about new gTLDs. The overall purpose of the public comment process is to ask about

mechanisms and principles, and so I'm asking us to be particularly focused on that to look at our present comments since we have now a few more days and to consider what our views are on both of those topics.

The interesting thing is that all we have to do is look Annex C and Annex D and focus the BC comments on that. And then once we update our comments with broader support and interest on the BC members as the CSG representative, I would ask agreement that I share those with the other two constituencies.

Everybody has an interest in this since whatever we pick could even jeopardize ICANN's status. One option, option one, would require all of the projects that are awarded, that is option one is an internal ICANN mechanism, every project awarded would appear on the ICANN IRS filing. And for those of us who are familiar as corporates from the US and also from other countries, that's really not a good thing.

Option two is a approach to limit the direct relationship to ICANN but still have a strong affinity to ICANN. Option three is a fully non-for-profit organization. Option four has been removed since it was basically a venture capital approach posed by only one of the co-chairs and hasn't received support.

So I'm going to ask all of us to consider please, (Tola)'s done a great job on the initial comment, I'm going to ask all of us to look at the last review and particularly for those of you who come from corporates and may even have experience in your company in the development of foundational funds, take a look at this and give us your comments. We could really benefit from it. Thank you.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks, Marilyn. If there's any questions for Marilyn, now would be a great time. Otherwise I'll pass it back to Claudia for the rest of the agenda.

Claudia Selli: I don't see hands up so maybe we can continue with the rest of the agenda. So for ICANN 64 I just wanted to note that the CSG meeting with the GNSO appointed board members maybe for Wednesday for lunch instead of Tuesday. And the other thing that we should be starting as well as BC to organize the outreach meeting in Japan, as we also wanted to have, let's say, good event in order to gather and attract more members from that region.

We had an initial conversation with (Gia Long) that was - that gathered some of the thoughts and certainly was do we want to fund research or the event to see whether we could organize it directly in Kobe with the (unintelligible) for example to have a separate event. So what I will do I'll try to touch base with (Gia) and see what, you know, where - what we need to do as next step and if we maybe can gather another call including the outreach committee that when we had the meeting was not available to work during the ICANN in Barcelona.

And I don't know if there are any comments, please jump in. And also I wanted to remind that any additional meeting requests for Kobe needs to be submitted to Chantelle by the 20th of December. So if you have any requests, please do send it to Chantelle and possibly copying me so that I'm also aware of what's being requested.

And the last item that I wanted to raise is that we issued these - we passed on let's say the statement from the GNSO Council was looking for members who could possibly be mentored in the fellowship program. So I received up to date today two expressions of interest, one from (Andrew) and one from (Tola).

Just as a general comment, I would also recommend to be sure that you can travel to Japan and that you have your visa in case you get selected by the GNSO. So we will be submitting the names and then the GNSO will decide on the candidate because also other constituencies will be putting forward other names. So we will keep you posted on that. If anyone is interested…

Steve DelBianco: Claudia?

Claudia Selli: Yes. Sure, Steve.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Claudia. It's Steve. I put the link to the call for volunteers to be mentors and, Claudia, I don't think that the ExCom or the BC will be forwarding any names. The GNSO, the way I read it, is that people fill out their expression of interest -- there's a link right on that page -- and indicate their qualifications. And then the Standing Selection Committee of GNSO Council, of which Susan Kawaguchi is the chair, will select a single person from amongst all of GNSO to represent the GNSO. And the other ACs and SOs will each have one mentor as well.

So I'm happy to be corrected from those of you with more experience but it's my belief that this does not pass through ExCom, it doesn't pass through the BC, it passes directly to GNSO.

Claudia Selli: Thank you, Steve.

Susan Kawaguchi: Steve, this is Susan. Just a little bit of a clarification there. You're correct. They should - the candidates should apply in the normal method on, you know, directly to on that link to ICANN but it's critical for our review to

understand that -- for the SSC review -- to understand that the candidates do have the endorsement of their constituency or stakeholder group.

So maybe a simple email to, you know, stating that we would - the BC endorses both of these candidates or as many candidates as, you know, apply, because that doesn't seem to happen completely in the process and, you know, candidates have definitely not been reviewed, not BC candidates but other GNSO stakeholder group candidates, that have not received that endorsement sort of come in a little bit lower in, you know, the evaluation process.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Susan, for that clarification. I'll note for everyone who's interested in mentor, which does get travel funding, that December 7 is the deadline to submit your expression of interest. And to follow up on Susan's point, once you've composed the expression of interest, please also share it with ExCom and we'll be sure that our chair sends the email that Susan is asking for indicating that BC members are supported by the constituency. Thank you, Susan.

Claudia Selli: And we thank Susan. I don't have anything else to report unless people have questions. Otherwise I will leave the floor to Jimson.

Jimson Olufuye: Okay. Thank you very much, Claudia. This is Jimson Olufuye. Following the conclusion of BC oversight selection, the process for the election of the two chairs for the credentials and the outreach committee has commenced, and I would like to use the opportunity again to thanks Andrew Mack, who has been the chair of the committee for the years back until (unintelligible). Andrew has really done well. (Unintelligible) expansion of BC which (unintelligible) around the world. So thanks again (unintelligible) thanks, Andrew. And I only hope, Andrew, that (unintelligible) will continue to serve in the credential committee where you are still the chair.

And then also I'll use the opportunity to clarify with regard to the committee election. (Unintelligible) to the charter, committee members in our various committees, like the credential committee, the outreach committee and also on the finance committee, they are a two-year tenure. Members on the committee are a two-year tenure and not more than one extra year to serve in committees.

So elections for committee members, existing and new, will take place during an election next year. That's 2019 when the two years that are charter's, new charter's, been (unintelligible). With regard to overseeing members' payment, we are still at the threshold of 85%. We are beginning the process of pulling up members to see how much (unintelligible) to see what we can do to repay a number of them.

And on the election process, as I mentioned, is on for the committee, including the outreach committee, so we are hoping once this is wrapped up (unintelligible) outreach in Kobe so that we can have good outreach in that region - the Japan region. So on this note I want to say thank you and hand the baton to Claudia. Claudia, back to you.

Claudia Selli: Thank you very much, Jimson. I don't know if members have questions for Jimson or any other business to raise. No. If that is not the case, the call is adjourned and we will speak again on the 12th of December. Thank you everybody for participating and have a nice day and evening.

END