

---

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.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the BC members call on December 12th, 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 keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. With this, I'd like to turn it over to the BC chair to begin. Claudia, please go ahead.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Thank you very much, Chantelle, and thank you very much, everybody, for participating to today's call. In the interest of time, I will give the floor to Steve for the policy calendar. Thank you, Steve. The floor is yours.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Claudia. Chantelle, thank you for loading the policy calendar. I emailed this yesterday evening, so BC members should all have it in your inbox. Turning to the first channel one on public comment process, since our last BC members call, we filed two comments. Yesterday, we

---

*Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.*

---

filed a comment on the initial report of that cross-community working group that's been looking at what to do and how to allocate new gTLD auction proceeds.

A big thanks to [inaudible], David [inaudible] and Marilyn Cade, and Jimson for providing a lot of edits. It's an excellent guide, I think, for the participation of Marilyn and other BC members on that ongoing work of the CCWG for auction proceeds. Marilyn, you're on the call. I want to note for you that when we get later into channel two of the policy calendar, you'll note that I have an excerpt of the BC position regarding the use of auction proceeds to replenish the reserves of ICANN. So that can inform Scott and Marie if it comes up at the council meeting on the 20th of December. Thanks again.

Also, on December the 3rd, we filed a BC comment on the draft report of this external consultant's review of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee, or SSAC. These are required every five years per the ICANN bylaws. The consultant's report made a series of recommendations. None were too dramatic, and I want to thank Tim Chin for leading the BC drafting on most cases agreed with what the consultants had recommended for the SSAC.

But Tim lead, and with the help from Chantelle, we were able to suggest that because the SSAC is a closed group – literally invitation only for its membership – that we're suggesting that they adopt some sort of a term limitation to get fresh blood into the ranks of the SSAC membership, not just the SSAC leadership. Tim, thank you very much for leading us on that. Good work.

Alright, turning now to the currently open public comments – this will take a little bit of time, but please bear with me. The first one up is due the 14th of December, just two days from now. This is a comment on the proposed new consensus policy for what to do with the names of the Red Cross and their affiliated groups at the second level in domain names and gTLDs. These comments, as I said, close in just two days. I'm going to thank Marie and Mark Datysgeld who drafted a two-paragraph comment, which I've embedded right here in the policy calendar so it's all very easy for you to read. I'll give you a moment to read that, because I'd like to get confirmation on this call for us to submit that in two days. I will also say to Marie and Mark, if you have anything to add, you can do so now.

You'll note that what Marie and Mark drafted here tries to suggest that what the Red Cross, protections are necessary to protect charities and those of us on this planet who donate to charities so that we don't become defrauded and the money isn't denied of worthwhile causes. So we're basing it on intellectual property law, and I think that was a great law to make, Marie.

Alright, are there any comments? Marie, Mark, or anyone else? Alright, hearing none, unless I get something back from BC members by COB on the 14th, I will file that comment for the BC. In fact, get to me by COB on the 14th so I have time to file it in the morning.

The second one up is supplemental initial report from the subsequent procedures PDP. This is about procedures for the subsequent rounds of new gTLD expansion. Sort of a strange name, but subsequent procedures is the name that stuck, and people call it SubPro.

---

---

The comments close a week from Friday, on the 21st of December, and the supplemental report itself is put together in a way that is fairly easy to respond to since they're a series of structured questions. It is the second attachment to the policy calendar e-mail. And I want to thank Susan Kawaguchi, Andrew Mack, [Vivek] for helping to draft that comment. And since it is due before our next BC call, this is an opportunity to probe some of the suggestions we have in the draft comment and ask any questions of those who drafted. It's the second attachment to the policy calendar.

I want to point out that in this comment, the BC is reiterating concerns we have about speculative applications for new gTLDs, and something we have called gaming, a notion of putting in many bids with an attempt to earn revenue through a private auction of contention, and then use that revenue to bid on the TLDs they really wanted. Nothing illegal about it, but it doesn't even remotely keep with the spirit – intentions of a competitive application process and is a significant disadvantage for applicants from smaller markets around the world.

So what the BC has done in this report is picked up on a suggestion from the working group, a suggestion that ICANN in the next round adopt what are called Vickrey auctions. It's an English auction style. When applications are submitted, the applicant for that TLD would include a sealed bid for what they'd pay for that TLD if there was contention. In other words, they have to make their decision, at the time they're submitting the application, of how high they would go if there was contention for that auction.

---

There's also suggestions in there that if it's a community evaluation, community priority applicant, they wouldn't have to go to auction, they would have to get it automatically. Right? If they passed the community evaluation. And there's also discussion of multipliers so that a disadvantage applicant from a lesser developed country would get a multiple of their bid to compete with perhaps some more wealthy applicants that they would contend with.

So this would mean no more private auctions. There would be no distribution of funds to losing bidders. It would mean that the only auction would be based on sealed bids, and all the money would go to ICANN, presumably disposed according to the rules that the CCWG on Auction Proceeds would use.

Are there any comments from the drafters or BC members? You're a quiet crowd this morning. Alright, I'll also ask, we need a BC member to volunteer to represent us on the Subsequent Procedures PDP working group. Remember, they're nearing the end of their work. I would anticipate several more months. But as you know, we're already looking at initial and supplemental reports from them.

So at this point, when it comes time for that PDP working group to count heads, someone from the BC needs to be in the room to raise their hand to represent the BC position. We did have a couple of BC members from Amazon who had departed, so we don't have anybody who's very active on that. Margie Milam is listed among the participants, but Margie is also our rep on the EPDP. Can I get a volunteer – just one – to serve on that working group? This is the PDP Subsequent Procedures. Is anybody out there? Seriously, honestly.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah, Steve, I guess people are silent.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Okay. Well, I thought maybe Adobe wasn't working, BC no one's raised their hand to volunteer for this one. Now, Statton, I'm glad to know you're on Work Track 5, and I'm going to be bringing that up on item six in channel two. Thank you, Statton. But we do need someone to follow the other work tracks.

All right, while you're thinking about that, let me turn to number three, which is an initial report for the expedited PDP – we call it the EPDP – for the temporary specification on what to do with WHOIS on the face of GDPR. Those comments also close a week from Friday. We've got a large group of BC members led by Mason Cole [who are] helping to volunteer to draft the BC comment. We've had two calls already. We had one yesterday, and we have another one coming up Friday.

But we do need some active participation from BC members in following this EPDP to help to draft the BC answers. There are 90 questions in this document. We have well over half of them answered, those that are relevant, but we need some help by this Friday to get more answers in. We've done this through a live action Google doc. I have a link to it under number three. That Google doc enables all of you with the link to add text and suggest comments, maybe even raise questions about what the BC is suggesting.

---

So those of you who have thoughts on this EPDP, please enter into that Google doc, enter your comments, perhaps put your name associated with your comments so that we can all look at them on our Friday call, and better still, join the Friday call to help us finish the drafting. This is considered ten-day notice to all of you on what the answers are in our draft since it's attached to your [here]. Okay?

Next one up is policy status report for the inter-registrar transfer policy, so abbreviation is the IRTP. This is the way in which a registrant can ask for the transfer of their domain name registration records from one registrar to another. And when that happens, they have an inter-registrar transfer policy.

This is not a comment for the BC to file, but rather, they're asking for any registrant who just had experience doing transfers of their names among registrars to complete this survey. They have a second-page survey, it's relatively easy, so this is an ideal opportunity for BC members who have any experience, positive or negative, transferring domain names, to click on the link in my policy calendar on item four to fill in the survey.

Alright? Just two other ones which aren't due until January. I need a volunteer to help draft a comment on the new dispute resolution service provider. The Canada International Internet Dispute Resolution Center wants to become one of the dispute resolution providers for ICANN. Comments close the 4th of January. We have a few Canadian residents on the phone. [inaudible] anything at all about this Internet dispute resolution center in Canada, be great for you to volunteer to

---

help us assess whether they're capable of doing the job and should be approved. Zak, please go ahead.

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: Yes. I'm Canadian, and I brought complaints and defended complaints at that Canadian [outfit,] so I'm happy to volunteer in conjunction with anyone else to draft a comment on that. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: That's fantastic. Thank you, Zak. Zak, I have a link to the application form Canada International. Look it over, and we can circulate an e-mail. I'll help you to circulate it through the BC. Again, it's not due until January 4th, but with some of the end of your holidays coming up, we're going to want to get it in people's queue early. Thank you.

And then number six is a comment due near the end of January, the 22nd. It's on Work Track 5 of that Subsequent Procedures Working Group, and they're dealing with geographical names. And the whole tricky topic of what to do with names of things like rivers and regions that aren't truly geographic entities. Statton, I've got you down as one person who's representing the BC in there, and I do hope you'll help us to come up with comments on the supplemental initial report.

Are there other BC members that can help? And Statton, if you want to add any color to what's in that supplemental report, please do so. Mark Datysgeld, thank you, Mark. Important to have somebody from the region that gave rise to this controversy, our South American friends.



---

Alright, let me segue to the next item, which is modifying the WHOIS for compliance to GDPR. As I told you earlier, that is the EPDP. And Margie Milam, Mark Svancarek have done an amazing amount of work, multiple two-hour calls every week, plus preparation calls beforehand, and a lot of e-mails to read, analyze and respond to along the way.

For instance, we have our next two-hour call tomorrow morning, and at this point, we're waiting on public comments to come in. And earlier, I mentioned in the policy calendar that we're drafting the BC response to those public comments, and there'll be quite a bit of work on this team in analyzing it. Margie, and Mark, is there anything you'd like to add for the BC member colleagues about what the EPDP status is right now?

MARGIE MILAM: Sure, Steve. Can you hear me?

STEVE DELBIANCO: We do.

MARGIE MILAM: Yeah, I really appreciate all the help we've been having in putting together the responses. I would like to encourage the BC members to also file independent comments, because with are, as it stands, outnumbered in this group, and a lot of the issues that are important to us are ones that we're in the minority on. So it's really important to be able to get as much input from different companies in addition to the BC comments. So that's just something I wanted to flag.

---

And as the group continues to work, we'll be working on preparing our next face-to-face in January, [next] January, and so the idea is [inaudible] we'll take a look at those comments and update the recommendations. One of the issues I wanted to flag for this group is in particular an issue that came up on the last call, and that relates to when we start talking about access.

There is a little bit of a disagreement on the team regarding what the charter says and when it's appropriate to start talking about access. It's our position on the BC that the gating questions have been answered through the initial report, and now it's time to go ahead and do that. But that's something that, according to the charter, requires the GNSO council to also weigh in. So I think this is something that our GNSO councilors on the BC should be aware of and we should strategize on how to get that issue up to the GNSO council so that we can actually start working on the issues related to access. [inaudible]

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thank you, Margie. Margie, that's very helpful. Chantelle, if you're able to load the attachment three from the policy calendar. It's a PDP. If you please load that into Adobe – boy you're fast. Margie has tried to draw an important distinction, that when it comes to WHOIS data, assuming it's even collected, there's three elements of disclosure. It's published in the public WHOIS to the extent that the fields are not redacted, but there are also opportunities to request the disclosure from a registrar, registry where a party gives the reason and the purpose why they need access and the registrar/registry is supposed to have a reasonable

---

process to grant disclosure of that information using the GDPR 61F balancing conditions.

We haven't been able to get much in the way of standards associated with that, and that would be in the lower left-hand corner of the diagram. So the upper left is the publication of data that's not redacted. We're in a battle to make sure that organization continues to be displayed for the temp spec.

The lower left is this notion of asking for disclosure, but knowing that the discretion about whether to disclose is in the hands of the registrar/registry. Margie brought up the next thing we did once we answered the gating questions, and that's on the right-hand side of the document. We call it access for short, but it's this notion that parties that have been accredited whose codes of conduct have been approved by data protection authority could make a request of ICANN, and ICANN then can force the registrar to return an answer using the RDAP technology, and that answer would be routed to the requester. It would be logged as well.

So we discussed this extensively in Barcelona, and the BC, IPC, even the contracted parties endorse it, since ICANN becomes the responsible legal party for compliance with GDPR, and if ICANN can find a way to do that, it can compel the registrars to return answers. And a lot of the folks on this call doing cybersecurity and consumer protection and IP protection will be able to try – will at least be able to attempt to be certified by the data protection board as a legitimate user.

---

So Margie, I just wanted to add a little context. I know you're in transit, but is there anything else you want to add with respect to the EPDP? [Mark SV,] you as well.

MARK SVANCAREK: No, Margie's covered almost all of it. Just [inaudible] providing your individual feedback, do take note of the [inaudible] that we feel are important, keeping the organization field unredacted. There are a lot of contrary arguments saying that, well, that could be personal data or it could [relate back] personal data. These are weak arguments. If you have access to legal resources that can provide good rationale why these are weak arguments, that kind of stuff would be very helpful. So [areas] of consent related to various fields, things like that, anything that you could weigh in on would put a unique legal perspective. It would be very helpful as well as just business rationales.

STEVE DELBIANCO: And also cybersecurity rationale, something you're an expert on.

MARK SVANCAREK: Yeah, cybersecurity rationale. We probably have cybersecurity covered, but yeah, keep piling onto that one.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Alright. Any questions for Margie and Mark? Thank you. I now want to turn it over to Marie Pattullo and Scott McCormick. They are councilors at the GNSO, and in channel two of the policy calendar – which is being

---

loaded right now – you'll see that I have recapped the 26th of November motion, I recapped the last council meeting where just a couple of items came up – let me scroll down to that on the policy calendar here. Hold on a moment.

Alright, so [inaudible] the top of the screen in Adobe, and we can turn to Scott and Marie to describe what was done and what we expect to happen at the 20th of December meeting. Scott, Marie?

MARIE PATTULLO:

Hi, Steve. I'll kick off and [hope we'll] fill in the blanks. There wasn't that much that came out of the last council meeting. The agenda got a little bit hijacked with a side conversation about whether or not we should approve a GAC communique simply because the registries think that the GAC keep repeating the same advice and they'd like them to realize that we've actually listened to it, which is to do with the two-character domains. But nothing really happened of great import.

The next meeting is next Thursday. At the moment, on the consent agenda, [inaudible] the draft consent agenda is this, should we or should we not put in a comment on the GAC communique? Which is really not contentious, but we'll see. Secondly, we're expecting next Monday the standing committee to approve a candidate on behalf of the GNSO who would serve as mentor for the ICANN fellowship program during 2019. So we expect to be able to vote on that as well.

Then there's a whole bunch of discussions. One will be about the ongoing problem of what to do about the IGO/INGO access security rights protection mechanism support. As you remember, there was a

---

report that came out of the PDP which was disputed by a number of different parties, both the process and the content, and in essence, the council is still trying to figure out what the best way forward is, including the outstanding issue that the report conflicts directly with GAC advice, which of course not a reason to reject the report, but we do have to be practical going forward.

We also expect to be having a discussion on these funds. You'll note that Steve has given you details on that already. It didn't happen at he last council meeting, because we got stuck in this circular conversation.

We're also going to be having a discussion on what to do about policy development processes, how to make it work better. As you know, we're calling that 3.0. I sent to everyone earlier a draft implementation plan. That's come out of council leadership. We're going to be discussing it both next week and when the council has as face-to-face in January.

I'd be really grateful if anyone who's ever been on a PDP working group, ever led a PDP working group, ever thought it was great, ever got frustrated, we really want your concrete input here, because this is about making the policy process work, and you guys are the ones that have been involved for years. So I'd be really grateful if you can, anything at all, any ideas, give them to Scott and I so we know what you want us to do, what you want us to say.

Also, you're shortly going to see that the new call for volunteers on a drafting team to develop guidelines and protocols for GNSO's [inaudible] obligations as a "decisional participant in the Empowered

---

Community –“ [Committee, I'm sorry.] That's already been issued. If you think you would be interested, you have until [6th of] January. And Chantelle, if Steve's okay with this, maybe we can circulate that to the full BC.

And finally, there is possibly – I don't know, maybe going to be a call for volunteers for the WHOIS procedure implementation advisory group. Now, that's to do with how WHOIS conflicts with privacy law. Of course, at the moment, it's on hold because of the EPDP. Theoretically, when the when the EPDP came out with its initial report, the GNSO's supposed to be asking for volunteers for this new advisory group. Not quite sure that that is the best time to [quote] staff as it may be a little premature. It may be on the agenda for next week's council, but it's not yet. So that's enough for me. Over to Scott.

SCOTT MCCORMICK: I have nothing further to add.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Scott and Marie. Marie, you mentioned the idea that they want to reconstitute, council wants to reconstitute the drafting team on how the GNSO makes decisions and policies within the new Empowered Community. As one of the leaders of that Empowered Community design, I was the one who chaired the last drafting team, and it would be logical for me to participate since I can carry over on the knowledge of how it was wrapped and what we did the first time.

---

However, for that work to begin in January, I would need one of the many BC members that are helping on the EPDP to step up and take my place as alternate for those calls. And we can make that decision sometime in January. So those of you that have been helpful, Mason, Statton, [inaudible] Susan, the rest of you, think about whether you could do that.

Any questions for council? Marie and Scott, you'll not that I've placed in an excerpt from the BC's approved position on auction proceeds being used for replenishment of the ICANN reserve. It's just underneath that item where I've listed it in the policy calendar under the 20th December.

Okay, we'll move on now to channel three, which is the CSG. Now, Barbara is dialed in from someplace in Brussels, or perhaps even on a train. Barbara, I don't see you in Adobe. Are you still on the line?

BARBARA WANNER: I hope so. Can you hear me?

STEVE DELBIANCO: We do, perfectly.

BARBARA WANNER: Okay.



---

STEVE DELBIANCO: So Barbara, [if you] don't have Adobe in front of you, what I had done was indicated you are planning topics for CSG. We have attached to the policy calendar your complete list of proposed meetings, topics and questions, and they indicated to everyone they should get back to you by the 14th of December with suggestions. I also pasted in your three-paragraph takeaways from your meeting with Göran in Washington. Take it from [here.]

BARBARA WANNER: That's great. And that kind of constitutes my report, so I look forward to input from people concerning our planning for ICANN 64. And the point hat Göran made about the technical aspects of credentialing, I think, dovetail with what you discussed earlier, with what you and Margie discussed earlier concerning access.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Barbara, I have a question for you. In addition to your report, what was the general theme that Göran is taking? Is he still confident that he can persuade his prior fellow regulators to find a way through the WHOIS mess? Has he talked at all about getting a European government to find that WHOIS is a public interest service? Anything like that?

BARBARA WANNER: Yeah, no, he didn't get into any of that at all. he did say, as I noted, that ICANN will issue for public comment a proposal about how ICANN deals with governments on certain policy questions. So I don't know whether it could be addressed within the context of that. But he made no

---

mention of that in our meeting. It was very informal in nature. Quite frankly, it was disrupted by the motorcades related to the Bush funeral, so it was a very informal discussion.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Any questions for Barbara from BC members? Thanks again, Barbara. Claudia, I'll turn it back over to you for the rest of the agenda.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Thank you very much, Steve. Very briefly, [inaudible] preparation of the Kobe meeting, we are planning an outreach with the BC outreach committee in Kobe, and in order also to attract businesses there, it would be very helpful if people could just send to Chantelle, who's planning to attend, with also your title and company so that we can constitute the list of people that will be there, and that might be used to attract farther participants.

Of course, we will keep you looped in and informed about all of that. The most important part for preparation is also trying to set up those meetings for the BC as well, so we would need also input from speakers that we might want to have for the BC open and closed meeting. And that's it from my side, and I will pass the floor to Jimson.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Thank you very much, Claudia, and good [day] to all members. Let me begin by welcoming a new member [inaudible] Mark Wilson. Welcome. And also to welcome back a member representative, Claudia Martinuzzi, of Louis Vuitton. [inaudible] you've been away for quite a while, and we

---

are happy you're back. Precisely, you were away on maternity leave, and we're happy that everything is well with you. Welcome back.

[inaudible] on the agenda, we have decided to integrate [inaudible] call for the chairs election in two committees. That is the credential committee and the outreach committee. There are candidates [inaudible] provided. In accordance with our charter, this is [the middle edition] of election in the committees, so we are listening to them to get their agenda.

So the nominated chair of the [credential] committee is Andrew Mack, and for the outreach committee, it's Marilyn Cade. As I said, candidates [inaudible] provided, and we'll just use this opportunity to ask them some questions so that members at large can also get a feel of what they do. They're doing tremendous work in those committees.

I would like to maybe [have] others send in their question. I would like to ask the candidates [inaudible] maybe beginning from the credential and then the outreach committee what they hope, how are the hopes to realize better the expectation of our charter regard to the function of the committees. So, how do you expect to take this committee to the next level, in line with the expectation of the charter? First for members recruitment, for member accreditation, and for members recruitment of outreach committee. Andrew?

ANDREW MACK:

Sure. Jimson, can you hear me?

---

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Yes, please.

ANDREW MACK: Okay, great. Well, as everybody, I think, knows, I am the sitting chair of the credential committee. I was asked by excom a little while ago to take on that role and have been happy to do it, although truthfully, it's very much of a group effort. Our goal is to do two things. Number one is to make sure that everybody who presents an application is appropriately vetted, and hopefully to do it in a way that leans in the direction of bringing them in if at all possible, but bringing them in with enough knowledge about who they are so that we know that they are a good fit.

And the second thing is to do it as relatively quickly and as much in a consensus way as possible. I think that we've been pretty successful, all in all, with that. It's a good group of people that works on credentials. Most of the time, the kind of work that we do is aimed at trying to get more data from people to understand a little bit more about who they are, and to make sure that they don't fall outside of the BC's guidelines.

Occasionally, we are in a situation where we find an applicant that might qualify for different constituencies. Generally speaking, we're happy to have them, but it's oftentimes worthwhile to understand their motivation for wanting to join the BC. But like I said, our goal is to emphasize [in] as much as possible.

Over the course of the last few years, we've had a couple of interesting kind of general themes. I think the one that came up this year was about including lawyers and law firms in our membership, and I think

---

we came to a nice consensus around that, that our goal was to make the BC open, that there was really nothing in the charter that precluded a lawyer from participating, and as long as they didn't fall outside of the charter in some other way.

I'm happy to answer any questions, and I'm happy to take any support from other members of the credentials committee that happen to be on the call, because we very much do function as a group and as a collaborative body. Thanks.

JIMSON OLUFUYE:

Okay. Thank you very much, Andrew. Please do stand by for questions. But I apologize, I'm not on the Adobe [inaudible] so Chantelle, once you see hands, let me know. Marilyn will be speaking next responding to how charter can be [inaudible] charter expectations [inaudible] going forward. Thank you. Marilyn. I guess Marilyn might be unmuting. Okay, maybe while we wait for Marilyn to come online, if there's no hand up – maybe I'll go ask Mark as the sitting chair. You know, we updated our charter, and the update was approved last year, and we adjusted the admission threshold, the [profit] threshold for business who's making profit through registry, registrar operation. So [inaudible] impacted membership criteria and admission. Has that impacted it at all?

MARK DATSYGELD:

It's a great question, Jimson. I don't think it's been a big issue. One of the things that is occasionally challenging is especially in the global south, what we find is people have, as you know in Nigeria it's often the case, people wear multiple hats, right? And people who are consulting

---

in the space sometimes work, and the amount of revenue that we get from a particular source is not fixed in time. Right?

So I think that that is one of the things that we may, over the course of time, wish to look into a little bit more closely if it becomes an issue more often. We had one candidate for BC membership, I believe it was last year, that was from – I think it was from South America – but I'll have to go back and look at my notes – where that was a question, as to whether they fell slightly above the threshold and whether that was at any one point in time or over the course of a few years. And this is an issue, frankly, we'd love to get some more of the BC broadly's guidance on it.

It's my sense that these are guidelines and we want to maintain a little bit of flexibility. Obviously, if it's someone who routinely falls outside the guidelines, that's a no-brainer, we would say no. But it's something that we might want to consider as we're looking at people, especially from underserved parts of the world.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Okay. Thank you very much. So it would be good to be monitoring, as I said, so that members can be briefed going forward. [inaudible]

MARK DATSYGELD: Yeah. I think that's right. It's never been a big issue. That's all.

---

JIMSON OLUFUYE:                   Okay. Thank you. [inaudible] I don't know if Marilyn is ready now. Marilyn? Or if there is any question for Andrew.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN:           Hi, Jimson. The operator is dialing now, and now we should have her in momentarily.

MARILYN CADE:                   I think I'm on.

JIMSON OLUFUYE:                   Okay, great. Yeah, Marilyn, please go ahead.

MARILYN CADE:                   Thank you. My apologies, I thought I was connected by audio. First of all, I just wanted to thank the excom and all the BC members for including this opportunity to talk with you about outreach and the role that the outreach committee plays, and also some ideas about how we may be able to further enhance our outreach and awareness activities by not only continuing what we are doing but also perhaps enhancing in a few ways the input that we provide to ICANN and to others from the community. And I want to give a couple of examples where I hope that the outreach committee supported by the boarder BC membership will contribute.

We do have an outlook strategy document first authored in 2016. It's been updated every year since. We will be needing to update it for

---

2020. It covers in detail the engagement and outreach activities, including asking BC members to volunteer to help with onboarding and mentoring of new members when they are indeed brand new to the BC, help to introduce them around, and to help to get them up to speed on policy positions and activities.

We've been very successful in adding in the members from Latin America and Africa, although we want to add more, but we do need to develop a strategy that can bring in members from Europe, particularly eastern Europe, Asia, and also, I think we need to revisit some of the membership associations that have global reach that are not members at this point but were initially.

So just to mention a few that have global reach, of course in Europe, there's Digital Europe which also has 29 national associations and has some very different members, companies from those who are presently engaged in ICANN.

In Asia – Claudia mentioned the fact that discussion is underway in the outreach committee, but with the regional VP staff and also Chris Mondini, on how to engage effectively with Asian associations and Asian companies. And that indeed is an area where we do need a better strategy, and we need the input not only of the existing [inaudible] outreach committee, but help from those companies who may have presence, particularly active business presence, in some of the countries such as Japan, South Korea, and also, I would just reference that we will be going in 2020 to Malaysia, and it's not too early to look ahead and start thinking about how we update our strategy document to take into account a longer-term view than just one year at a time.



---

I do want to return to more frequent working calls. It's been very challenging this year due to how busy everyone is, but we will try to return to that, and of course, take minutes and then be able to have ongoing reports back to the full membership on ideas about how the full membership can help in outreach and growing the BC.

I just want to make one final point, and that is one other area that we don't have perhaps enough focus on is the area of security and stability. And I'm glad that Scott is on the call because of his extensive background. We also have other members with strong presence in that area that is such a high priority that it may be a way for us to also broaden some of our outreach activities. Thank you.

JIMSON OLUFUYE:

Great. Thank you very much, Marilyn, [a chair] nominated for the outreach committee. I don't know if there's any questions for Marilyn. Maybe while you think about that, Marilyn, I want to ask a question. In the past, we've always designed the leadership development program to bring in potential new members, especially from developing countries. And with that, countries like maybe Japan have been [inaudible] not been able to attend our events based on that because Japan is a developed country.

So maybe challenge for outreach [inaudible] working on, do you think it may be necessary to kind of upgrade the criteria to include maybe some specific developed countries where we do not have membership or where we have low membership? Eastern Europe is also another one in this regard. So, would you consider maybe a review of leadership

---

development program so that some select developed countries can be beneficially included?

MARILYN CADE:

Thank you for the question. I did reference our leadership program in my comments because I think it's important for us to reenergize it and both resume our own financial investment in it but also try to pursue returning some of ICANN's financial investment to it. We can spend our own funds on – if we identify someone who is a well-defined, interested candidate, and in particular, they're able to help us reach other businesses within that country, I do think it would be worthwhile, our looking into that.

It might be that we wouldn't even have to provide complete sponsorship to a business entity, or we might be able to set a certain level of sponsorship that we provide which would then encourage the association or the business to provide some matching which indicates their commitment and interest in the BC.

I would say though that I think we need to continue what we've been doing in the past, and that is a mentoring call, an introduction call, materials briefings ahead of time, and then on-site mentoring where those executives are able to meet with our officers, they're able to shadow a BC member that has expertise in an area they may be interested in so they really feel well-introduced to ICANN when they go back home.

---

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Okay. Thank you very much, Marilyn. Any question or comment to the candidates, please? Committee, chair, candidate? Well, in the absence of any, I would like to [note] that after this call, [beginning from tomorrow,] the election would take place [but] within the committees. The election would take place within the committees.

And for our information, according to our charter, there is position for members of the committees to [have this time] max two times and one extra. So that means in a short while, maybe another year or two, there'll be a callout for new members that [may] want to join.

So on this note, thank you. If there are still no other hands up, then I'll just hand over back to Claudia. Thank you.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Thank you very much, Jimson. I cannot see if there is eventual hands up on the chart, so please let me know in case. But if you have any other points to raise, please do so now. I believe there's none, so with that, I would close the call, and we'll speak in two weeks. Thank you, everybody, for being on the call, and have a nice rest of the day.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thanks, Claudia.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Thanks, everyone. Operator, you may now stop the recording. Please remember to disconnect all remaining lines, and enjoy the rest of your day.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**