UNIDENTIFIED MALE:	Recordings have started.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN:	Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the BC Members call on Wednesday, January 9, 2019. 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 the transcript and to keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid 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 Happy New Year to everybody. So, in the interest of time, I will give the floor to Steve for the policy discussion.

STEVE DELBIANCO:	Thanks, Claudia. Hey, Happy New Year, everyone. I hope you all had a wonderful holiday. It was a bit of a break and there weren't a lot of public comments due during that period of time.
	With the policy calendar in hand – I sent it around yesterday – let me turn to Channel One. I want to acknowledge three comments we filed since our last call. We filed two comments on the 21st of December, both on time. One was on the supplemental initial report from that

subsequent procedures PDP. Subsequent procedures means one of the procedures GNSO will use for subsequent rounds of gTLD expansion and that will be a big topic later in the call as I discuss the work track 5. I really want to thank Andrew Mack, Susan Kawaguchi, Vivek who worked with me on drafting the BC comment.

And let me note to all of you we still need a BC member to represent us on this Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group. We call it Sub-Pro. Let me stop there and ask. Is there anyone on the call on the BC who would be interested in helping to represent the BC in the remaining months of that PDP?

At this point, they are evaluating public comments and moving from initial reports to final reports. And for that reason, there will be several instances where there will be a consensus call on the working group for voting. It's essential that the BC have somebody that can reflect the BC views and vote accordingly. I can assure you personally I'll be there to support this person so that you'll know how it is the BC positions shape up to a vote you have to take. I'm trying to entice a volunteer here. It's not in-person. It'll all be on phone, but if you're at the Kobe meeting.

Vivek, thank you so much for stepping up on that. Thank you, Vivek. And I can talk to you more about where we go on that. So Vivek, I'll want you to pay particular attention to the Subsequent Procedures Work track 5. Thank you, Vivek.

Okay, the second thing we did on December the 21st was a very extensive comment on the initial report of the EPDP. That's the Expedited PDP for how to manage the temp spec into policy on the

gTLD registration data. Mason Cole stepped up to lead that draft and it was truly a team effort, truly a team effort. We had Susan Kawaguchi, Sajda, Statton Hammock, Alex, Tim Chen, Margie, and Mark, Vivek – thank you – and [Faisal]. And I led the effort to get us over the finish line. We filed some very substantive BC comments and I can tell you that Margie, Mark, and I have already used those comments in discussions of the EPDP.

I don't expect our comments to move the needle too much. We are unlikely to convince our opponents in the NCSG and the contract parties, but we do hope to provide some ammunition to bring over people in the ALAC and the GAC. SSAC has been a lost cause for some reason. They seem not to be really with us on trying to want to use WHOIS information to stop security threats. It's very frustrating.

And let me add on January the 4th, just last Friday, we saw a comment on an application by a new dispute resolution service provider. It's a Canada-based group and they wanted to be a UDRP provider, perhaps even for URS. Big thanks to Zak Muscovitch. I see you on the call, Zak. You did a fantastic job on that drafting. I made only a minor edit and we put that in on Friday. Thanks again, Zak. I appreciate it.

Let me turn to the open public comment periods. We have six of them right now. Only one is necessary before our next call so I'd like to focus and recruit some help on this. I have a big thank you to Statton Hammock who's led the drafting so far, but the first item on here is the BC's response to the supplemental mission report on Work track 5 of subsequent procedures.

What is work track 5? It is the geographical names at the top level, not the second level, Andy Abrams. It's the top level. So we have an opportunity here to help to shape the PDP recommendations on what to do at the top level. And as you know, GAC used their ability to object to block dot-patagonia and dot-amazon, dot-spa and a couple of others that were not really geographical-based objections. No, instead they were just using the GAC's general ability to give advice that met with the presumption that the Board should comply.

Now in the past four years, a lot of you have worked with me to get new bylaws [substantiated] at ICANN that require the GAC to have full consensus and to allow the community to challenge through a community IRP if the Board accepts GAC advice that we think violates the bylaws.

I'm hearing an echo. See if you can help me with that echo.

Okay, so we have an opportunity then, to shape that comment. Now, Statton, Andrew Mack and I worked on a draft. It's in Attachment #3 to today's policy calendar. We don't need to bring it up right now, but I definitely need some help because we have, well frankly, 26 different sets of questions that are posed for the BC, and we, in some cases, won't provide an answer at all. In other cases, a yes or a no. But so far, what we've drafted for your consideration were some general principles about what the BC's concerns are. But we do need some help to deep-dive.

Vivek, in particular, given that you're going to step up and help the BC on the Subsequent Procedures PDP, Vivek, can I ask you to assist Statton, Andrew, and I on that? Thank you.

Anyone else in the BC that could assist in the next – it's a very short-term assignment – to help dive into that Annex B and propose answers?

Come on. We need one more volunteer. This is about geographical names at the top level, so any of you who have clients that are considering putting in bids on terms that even remotely sound like a geographically significant term, you're going to want to pay attention to this. I said clients, but I also mean members for those of you with trade associations.

All right, Vivek, thank you for your help on that.

Now the next five public comments aren't due until February. But nonetheless, this is the time to start recruiting volunteers. So, you know what I'm going to do next. We have a chance to comment on the Registrar Stakeholder Group charter. The charter itself has only a few things in it that would be relevant to the BC, which is the representation issue. A number of you also run registrar operations and have members in the Registrar Working Group. I'm thinking, in particular, of Google but I'm not sure if others of you do or I'm betting that MarkMonitor is part of the Registrar Stakeholder Group too.

This is a great opportunity to help weigh in. It's a very limited comment. We will probably only comment to the extent that business interests could be represented by those who are voting in the Registrar Stakeholder Group. Statton, you already do so much that I'm reticent to

simply ask you to step on this but Statton, can you check with MarkMonitor's other folks that are involved in the registrars and see if they would have advice for us as to what we should do in the BC comment on number two?

Anyone else [inaudible] volunteer? Thank you, Statton.

STATTON HAMMOCK: Yeah, I'd be happy to do that.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Marilyn, go ahead. Thank you, Statton. Marilyn? Marilyn, can't hear you. Marilyn, your hand is up. We cannot hear you.

MARILYN CADE: I hope you can now.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Okay, great. Thank you.

MARILYN CADE: Can you hear me now?

STEVE DELBIANCO: We do.

MARILYN CADE:	I just had a question because I didn't – thank you. I had a question. I'm not volunteering. I'm just asking a question.
STEVE DELBIANCO:	Too late, I already wrote you down.
MARILYN CADE:	Sorry?
STEVE DELBIANCO:	Go ahead. Please.
MARILYN CADE:	Thanks. ICANN Org has a question about voting rights for some registrars. Can somebody explain what their questions are? A registrar that has paid their dues I'd always assumed had voting rights in the Registrar Stakeholder Group while many of the registrars have relationships with IPs and web hosters, etc. But those aren't accredited registrars. They're auxiliary and they report, they're supported by the accredited [inaudible].
STEVE DELBIANCO:	Marilyn, I can answer your question if you wish. So, my link to the comment lays it out. It's the ICANN who has commented on this because, as you know, the Registrar Stakeholder Group is allowed to define the rules particularly with respect to who can vote, and in some cases, weighted voting. What ICANN is concerned with is that there is

discretion provided to the registrars in making a determination as to who can and cannot vote and they have a non-exhaustive list of entities who's primary business activity derives from a registry or registry operator, and therefore, the registrars themselves are trying to, just like with the e-mail, they're trying to say that if your primary business is a registrar, then great, you can vote. But if your primary business is not as a registrar, they may actually throttle back on your voting privileges. It's similar to what we've done with respect to member eligibility.

Marilyn, can I entice you to volunteer? I know you're good about things like this.

MARILYN CADE: Okay.

STEVE DELBIANCO: All right, thank you, Marilyn. So, I have Marilyn, Chris, and to a limited extent, Statton. Thank you.

Number three on this list is the operating plan and budget and a five-year operating plan. So, there's a lot wrapped up in this and the comments are due – let's see – the 8th of February. Looking for BC members who could volunteer to work on that.

Naturally, I'm watching the chat to see if Jimson will step up as he always does to handle things on operating plan.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Yes [inaudible] and the Finance Committee as well.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Jimson, and members of the Finance Committee. As always, you guys come through. Thank you.

Number four on here is operating standards for the specific reviews. We have commented in the past, largely due to work that Barbara Wanner and I have done, and Barbara and I can start on that but is there any other BC member who can help Barbara and I on that operating standards for the specific review?

So, these are the things like the ATRT, the Accountability and Transparency Review, the review of WHOIS, the review of the last round of new gTLDs, and the Security, Stability and Resiliency. This might be one where Scott McCormick, now that you're on the SSR2 Review Team, you're right in the thick of it right now, Scott, so you're familiar with what's going on and how that review is run. Tola, you're on the ATRT. So Tola and Scott, I'd like to ask you guys to help us with number four. Okay?

Scott, I know you're on the phone. Are you good with that? Thank you very much, Scott.

All right, number five is STRAT Plan for Fiscal Years '21 through '25. This is sort of a top priority for Göran to try to put ICANN on a strategic plan, but in fact, it's Cherine who's been the most articulate at describing the way in which she wants to do the strategic long-term planning. This one does require some BC attention. It's not due until the 11th of February

but I'd love to enlist a volunteer or two to tackle this. This is not a very huge list. I'm looking for BC members to raise their hands or put something in the chat. I'm on number five under channel two. Tim Chen, fantastic. Thank you. Okay, the last one on here—

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Steve?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yes, Jimson.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Yes, I'm interested in the strategic plan. Yeah.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Jimson, thank you very much. Thank you and the Finance Committee. That's great. Thank you, Jimson.

And the final one on here is the consultation on the two-year planning process. Jimson, Finance Committee, this is the perfect one for you. It's a very limited comment where ICANN is asking us, "Hey, what do you guys think about moving to a two-year budgeting and planning instead of a one-year?"

And I have to assume we think that's a good idea and all we really need to do is just signal our assent to continue to talk about that. Can I enlist Jimson and the Finance Committee to help me with number six?

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Yes. So, this can go into the pocket as well.

STEVE DELBIANCO: You guys are the best. There's a lot on there. Thank you.

Okay. Moving quickly. When we look at the greatest, I think, project is on our laps right now and it's consuming the time of so many of us in the BC. It's this expedited PDP on trying to move the temporary specification on how ICANN's WHOIS has to be adapted to comply with GDPR, General Data Protection Regulation, in Europe.

I've included an update in here and the only thing I think is dramatically new is that ICANN finally set up this Technical Study Group, this Technical Working Group. It's got a dozen or so folks on it, nobody from the BC, but their job is to examine closely how RDAP protocol could work in moving towards a unified access model. And I've included a chart. I think it's Attachment 1 and it's the best picture of that. If I could get you to load that, Chantelle. It's Attachment 1 PDF, which is the Org chart.

You'll see that what we have here is a display of all the different moving parts on the PDP and outside of the PDP in moving ICANN's compliance with GDPR. I'll wait for that to come up.

Margie, since you're on the line, in particular, it would be helpful to have your inputs on this. On the left-hand side is what the PDP is focusing most on, is what data gets published, what must be published by registrars and registries. Down in the left-hand corner is when a

complainant asks for disclosure of WHOIS information that's redacted, what are the obligations? What are the best practices for registrars and registries when they receive that request in terms of whether they would grant it, how quickly the respond and whether they have to be specific in the way in which they respond? In other words, if they're not going to give you the disclosure, they should explain why. So, a number of those parameters are going to be discussed in the PDP.

Now in the far right-hand side of that diagram is this long-range solution, which is to have entities who are previously accredited to be able to have unlimited access to the data that's held at the registrars and potentially the registries, and that unified access model is what this Technical Study Group is looking into, and I realize they would use RDAP as the protocol. But RDAP is simply an enabler. It's not really the hardest part of the right-hand side of the diagram.

The hardest part is figuring out how entities get accredited. For instance, consumer protection, IP protection, child welfare. How would those groups get accredited and by whom such that the data protection authorities would recognize that accreditation? If that happened, then ICANN could compel the registrars to respond to queries by accredited entities provided that it met the conditions of GDPR and that ICANN would log those requests and it would monitor for abuse and be able to audit them.

So, I use the diagram to sort of lay all that out and help everyone to explain the different moving parts on GDPR. Margie, would love to hear your input on this but my sense is we're having a hell of a tough time in the EPDP to increase what gets published in the upper left-hand corner.

We're nowhere yet on getting the contract parties to agree to a standardized form and response on the lower left-hand corner. And every time we bring up anything on the right, they go crazy on us so anything you want to add, Margie? Go ahead.

MARGIE MILAM: Yeah. Hi, everyone. Just so I can explain a little further, what Steve has here is not … It doesn't necessarily reflect back to what's in the initial report and so I think this was drafted before the initial report meaning that things like, for example, administrative contact, if you look at that on the left, that's actually out of the report at this point as being even a possibility.

So as Steve mentioned, things are not going very well in the EPDP right now. We're going through public comment. We're having very little support for the things that are important to the BC and the IPC and anything related to cyber security. Surprisingly, we're not getting a lot of support from the SSAC at this point either, largely in part because of their process and how they have to reach agreement on what they can say in the group which sometimes makes it difficult for them to share responses quickly in the PDP format. So, I just want to kind of raise that. But the chart doesn't really track to the initial report.

We also, since the initial report has been published, one of the comments that we published related to asking the group to start talking about access, there was, as part of the charter, an agreement that access discussions, and this is the reasonable access part that Steve was talking about, not the unified access model side of things, that that

would be approached once the initial questions were answered and we still haven't really received any confirmation that we're going to start working on that now.

So, I'm just expecting some of the difficulties we're experiencing right now in the EPDP, we're getting very little traction for review of comments that were raised by us and some of our colleagues because there's a sentiment that we're trying to move very fast to go to final report and that's causing people to not want to spend a lot of time analyzing some of the detail comments that were submitted. So, I think I'll pause with that comment.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Margie, thank you. And as you can see from the diagram, I represented what is in the temp spec so far and admin contacts part of that. I realize that the PDP's initial report is not headed that way and if you wish, I can draw a slash or a line through the admin contact in the lower left-hand corner and I'll do that. And I do want to encourage people to use the diagram, give me feedback the way that Margie did because its goal is to assist at explaining all the different moving parts and trying to understand where it is we can actually get some satisfaction. We aren't likely, as Margie just said, to get much satisfaction out of the work that's happening on the left-hand side.

Margie, thanks again for all the work you do. And I sent a report around about yesterday's call on Team B and we look forward to hearing what you guys have to say about Team A.

Okay, let me move on now to Council. Actually, I had one other item that I wanted to mention is that Adetola, or Tola as we call her, Adetola Sogbesan was appointed by ACNSO Chairs to be a member of the ATRT-3 and Tola, I don't see you on the call today, but congratulations on that.

Let me turn to Council. It's channel two. That means that Chantelle, I'm going to ask you to put the policy calendar back on. And Tola, if you're on the phone bridge and can hear me, I want you to volunteer to work with Scott McCormick and help me on item four under channel one, item four on operating standards for specific reviews.

ADETOLA SOGBESAN: Okay.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Tola.

ADETOLA SOGBESAN: All right, thank you. [inaudible].

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you. And we're back to the policy calendar. And Chantelle, if you scroll down to anybody – I think you all have scroll control – go into channel two on Council and we'll turn things over to Scott McCormick and Marie Pattullo, our GNSO Councilors. Go ahead. Marie or Scott?

MARIE PATTULLO:	Thanks, Steve. I see that Scott's going to have difficulty in speaking, so you're stuck with me again but Scott, do jump in if I miss something important.

We had our last meeting just before Christmas, on the 20th of December. Some of the high points, yes, wonderful. Thank you to Adetola. Also thank you to Andy Mack who has been approved as the GNSO candidate to be on the ICANN Fellowship program mentor in that role, and obviously, Andy will be great in that role. We also have Susan reconfirmed as the Chair of the GNSO Standing Collection Committee. That's the body that, in essence, filters through the CVs for the reviews that come out of GNSO work, so great that we have Susan there as well.

We had a talk about the infamous and ongoing what to do about the IGO/INGO access to curative rates. At the moment, we have more discussions on that scheduled at our next meeting which is going to be the week after next in Los Angeles. We have a three-day session there. Keith who, as you know, is the chair of the GNSO is about to send a letter – GNSO Council, I'm sorry – is about to send a letter to the GAC which is really outreach to them saying thank you for offering to work with us, and yes, let's work together. It's that, only with more words.

The EPDP, you can probably guess what happened there. We talked about what is happening and people were worried about timelines. A third letter that's going to come from the Council leadership to the Board, this time to Cherine, is in response to a letter that Cherine sent to us which asked do we think that [inaudible] team is going to meets its deadlines, and if not, the letter says, yes, we hope that they will meet their deadlines and we don't really want to develop a full-blown back-

up plan in case it gives anybody the impression that this is okay if we just let it go and miss all the dates. There will be something else in place. However, we could maybe suggest an interim policy if that's needed.

If you want more details on that, I think the best person to respond on that is Steve because he is more involved than I am.

The reserve fund we talked about very briefly. As you know, some—

STEVE DELBIANCO: Margie has her hand up. Margie has her hand up, Marie. Margie, is this a question you'd like to put to Marie?

MARGIE MILAM: Actually, it's an old hand but I would like further explanation on what she just mentioned.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Please, go ahead.

MARIE PATTULLO: Steve, do you want to take that? Because it's basically the e-mail you just sent to me.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Council is considering, Margie, and you were copied on this, right? The Council is considering a letter regarding what to do as a response to the

Board when the Board says, "What's the fallback plan if the EPDP doesn't deliver?" So Margie, you were copied on that and I indicated that the letter looks good in the way the Council is drafting its response to the Board and in it, I pointed out one particular paragraph that talks about the Council's desire to potentially do an interim policy where they would approve a consensus policy that would have a sunset date, so there would be continued pressure on the PDP, the EPDP to get its work done, and this picks up on the sentiment of the contract parties and others in Council, perhaps not us, but others in Council that don't want the Board to do another temp spec.

I have it on direct authority that Becky Burr and others on the Board themselves do not want to extend or do another temp spec. That's a shame because we have greater influence with the Board than we do with Council.

But what I proposed confidentially to us – it didn't go outside of the BC and the IPC – is that we could consider getting behind the idea that Council do an interim policy but only if that policy adds some implementation detail.

What kind am I talking about? I mean the implementation detail that says that when you make a request for a disclosure under the reasonable access, that there be a standardized way of requesting it and that the registrars and registries have a process, a standardized process and a requirement for them to return an answer. Now their answer may be, "No, I'm not going to give it to you. Go get a subpoena." But I would like to have a specific response within a limited time. So Margie, I hope that answers your question. It's time for us in the BC to think about

what is the backup plan if the EPDP fails to deliver a consensus policy. I hope that answers your question.

Margie or Marie, go ahead.

MARIE PATTULLO: Okay. Thanks, Steve. Margie, if you didn't manage to see the draft that I'm referring to, I can send it to you again. I'll do that anyway just in case.

STEVE DELBIANCO: When you do that, Marie, include the notes that I circulated to you, please.

MARIE PATTULLO: Yeah, will do. No problem.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you. Thank you.

MARIE PATTULLO: Moving on to the reserve fund, as you know our colleagues in particular in the registrars and registries were concerned about the Board having grabbed $36 million U.S. dollars after taking [$6] million out of the auction fund to replenish the reserve fund. There was a suggestion that the Board should not be "allowed to get away with that", that at a

minimum, there should be a letter written to them asking that they would commit to reimburse that money.

Some people supported that. Some people didn't. The outcome was that there's supposed to be a mail coming to the GNSO Council list asking all of us to ask all of you if you would support such a letter. As of yet, I haven't seen the letter. If I do, obviously, I will report it to our VP of Policy. He will send it out to all of you.

The only other thing – there were a couple of bits and pieces, nothing important – is that two weeks from now, I'm already going to record apologies from Scott and I for this call because we're going to be in the face-to-face Council meeting for three days in Los Angeles from the Wednesday through the Friday. If anybody wants the agenda or any of the documents, of course [inaudible]. If it happens that we need your help, you can be sure that we will shout out to you. That's it, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Scott, anything to add on the Council perspective? Okay, I will turn it now over to channel three on the policy calendar which is Barbara Wanner as our CSG Liaison. Go ahead, Barbara.

BARBARA WANNER: Thank you, Steve. It really [inaudible]. Okay, I hear a little bit of an echo here.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Everyone, please put your phone on mute while Barbara's speaking.

EN

BARBARA WANNER: Okay. All right, that's much better. I have no major update to provide other than to say that our speaker requests are in so that we can no longer make suggestions of who we want to invite to our meetings at ICANN64. However, we will be having a CSG XCOM call. It's been pushed, actually, to the week of the 21st of January where we will discuss the agenda for those meetings as well as proposed designated constituency speakers to pose the questions as we've done in the past so that Steve has very kindly included that as an attachment. If you have any additional suggestions of what issues you want to raise with these various speakers, please let me know as soon as possible.

Second item only is that we will be having a luncheon meeting with Becky Burr and Matthew Shears and other Board members that is a brown bag. We did not secure, the CSG does not have its own budget to handle catering costs. So, it has been suggested to me that we put in a request to ICANN for using its FY20 community request form for funding to cover catering costs for ICANN 65 and ICANN 66. Jimson very kindly forwarded that form to me and it requires extensive justification for how that request comports with ICANN goals and objectives, so forth and so on.

I would like to focus our request for funding to cover a GAC/CSG luncheon meeting just because I think that would have the most impact for us. If you have any other suggestions as to how we should target that budget request, please let me know as soon as possible. Does anybody have any objections to targeting our budget request to secure funding for a GAC luncheon?

MARILYN CADE: Steve?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yes, Marilyn.

MARILYN CADE: I want to offer strong support to Barbara's proposal for lunch with the GAC. Some of you know that years and years and years ago, the BC launched breakfast on a regular basis, and originally, we even collected $20 from all of the BC members attending the ISP and the ISPCP, and we acted as the treasurer to make sure those breakfasts with the Board and then the GAC took place.

And Barbara, I think this is an excellent idea and if I can help in the write-up, just contact me offline. I'd be happy to do it back and I think returning to a regularized engagement with the GAC that's informal builds and strengthens our ability for them to trust us when we bring forward our position, so excellent idea in my view.

BARBARA WANNER: Thank you very much, Marilyn. I will. Then I'll loop you in. I haven't drafted it yet, but as I begin to draft it, I'll forward it to you online via e-mail. Anybody else?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Barbara, Monday is pretty much the deadline you've given us to give you feedback on the eight potential topics for the Kobe high interest sessions, and there's eight of them. They're right on the policy calendar. This is a great chance for BC members to give Barbara some input on the areas of your highest interest since only two of those eight are going to make the cut.

BARBARA WANNER: Okay. Actually, Steve, I believe that came from Claudia. I was not involved in Kobe slamming.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Got it.

BARBARA WANNER: Okay.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Any BC members with input on those eight topics? Speak now or reply by e-mail before Monday the 14th. Anything further from you, Barbara?

BARBARA WANNER: No. That does it. I'll work with Marilyn then on that funding proposal. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO:	Thanks, all. Chantelle, please put the agenda back up and I'll turn it back over to you, Claudia.
CLAUDIA SELLI:	Thank you very much, Steve, and indeed, input is required on it prioritization topics for Kobe, but also on whether we want to be involved in leading a session, so we should indicate that as well.
	And also for Kobe, we might want to start thinking about an invitation to be sent for the BC open meting, so if you have any suggestions, please send it to us and Chantelle so that we can start sending out the invite for the meeting as well.
	Otherwise, yeah, I think Jimson, you should be talking about also the outreach event we want to organize in Kobe if I'm not mistaken. And so I will turn the floor to you, Jimson, for the update, general update. Thank you.
JIMSON OLUFUYE:	Okay. Thank you very much, Claudia. Let me first really support also the initiatives of [inaudible] in regard to the meeting of the GAC. For some of us, I think that the ITU Plenipot [inaudible]. There are so many issues still there that we need to engage our own GAC people in ICANN meetings consistently as the battle is still on.
	So, let me move now to the operations and the final report. The committee elections were completed [inaudible] 2018 and I'm happy to announce that Andrew Mack was elected as the Chair of the Credentials Committee by the members of the Credentials Committee, and also for

EN

the Outreach Committee, the members elected [inaudible] as the Chair and they're taking their seats the 1st of January to [inaudible]. So, congratulations to Andrew Mack and Marilyn Cade.

Then next is on the outreach that Claudia mentioned with respect to ICANN 64. It has been a tradition to always [inaudible] businesses at ICANN meetings. So, this is a planned outreach. It is our plan for March 8th in Tokyo and also March 15th in Kobe. Please, I don't know if [inaudible]. This is the first time we're having two outreaches at an ICANN meeting. The event in Tokyo will be to bring in more companies that are based in Tokyo and not able to travel, so we are communicating with ICANN staff between [Veni] and the others towards [inaudible] happen and the Chair of the Outreach Committee will be speaking and Denise will also [inaudible] will be fully engaged to ensuring that is a huge success.

So that's [inaudible] in cooperation with [inaudible] in Tokyo, but a discussion is still ongoing and that [inaudible] March 15th would be Kobe and will be to collaborate with the ISPCP. The ISPCP is having an outreach that day, and so with the participation of ICANN's business [inaudible] staff, we'll be collaborating with them.

So information will be coming out shortly with regard to timing. When the [inaudible], the exact timing for the March 8th event – it's a Friday, March 8th – and more information will be provided in regard to the logistics and also travel to Kobe.

Marilyn, do you want to make some comments in regard to the outreach plan?

MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Jimson. I'll just speak very quickly about this. We're very fortunate that [inaudible] Kato who was actually involved in helping to found the BC when he headed the Fujitsu office, he has been instrumental in gaining support in Tokyo, including from the CTO of Fujitsu as an association there that focuses. It's called [JATES]. It primarily focuses on research and innovation – to host an event there in Tokyo and the timing is not quite determined but it looks like it would be somewhere between two to four hours.

We won't have logistics costs. [JATES] and Fujitsu will be hosting that session. We have to have some senior presence, and fortunately, that would be Claudia and another officer, Steve, I think. But the idea would also be to have an exchange of views about priorities and Kato is very heavily involved in determining topics.

ICANN has committed to have John Crain there. The CTO himself can't come, but John has been at ICANN for an extended period of time. He's actually worked in Japan from a technical aspect and security and stability is the key issue of interest.

There is also, I just learned at the last hour, there's also the possibility that Tripti who is the Board member from the University of Maryland and does related research is also a possible speaker in Tokyo.

In Kobe, we will be given a specific slot. There are between 100 and 125 expected attendees, many of whom are eligible according to our criteria to join the BC as well as the ISPCP, but many are eligible to join the BC as well and we are offered a slot where we will have the control over

the content and the ability to organize that and then followed by a joint reception, so it's actually a really favorable environment for us even though it means a little additional travel in order to go to Tokyo first and then travel to Kobe. Thanks, Jimson.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Okay. Thank you, Marilyn. Please do drink some water.

So that is it. Mainly, now when do you think the details in terms of timing can come true so that members can make their plans? Members and the ones who stop over in Tokyo for a day and [inaudible] to Kobe. Do you have an idea of when or is that [inaudible] that we can do [inaudible]?

MARILYN CADE: Yes. I [inaudible] with Chris yesterday and we proposed a call with chairs of the Outreach Committee, Claudia and the Chair of the ISPCP to work on finalization, but just an FYI for everyone. If you are flying in, when you make your travel plans, if you choose multiple destinations, you can fly into Tokyo and then attend the session, then take the train to Kobe and then fly out of Kobe. But you have to be careful about your selection, otherwise, you have to go back to Tokyo to fly out and I'm happy to talk to anyone offline about that.

The second, I think we're going to know literally in the next 48 hours because what Chris and I were talking about yesterday is having a call with Claudia and the Chair of the ISP and the two Chairs of the Outreach Committee and Kato and [inaudible] and Chris Mondini o try to finalize

EN

everything literally in the next 48 hours. It's really important for engagement with the Japanese who do not do things at the last minute.

I will just make one other request. If you are a company that has a presence in doing business in Japan, if you would agree that Microsoft, Google, Facebook, AT&T, Verizon, many of the larger universal, many of the larger members – and Barbara, your members and also ISPCP – if you have business presence in Tokyo, then we can send a customized invitation for them to be a guest at the [JATES] event. I worked that out already with Katosan and it's actually very favorable to us to be able to even just give those invitations.

I'll just make one final point. Panasonic has its headquarters very nearby to Kobe and Kato is engaging with Panasonic to see if they would perhaps send a technical speaker to talk about artificial intelligence at the special shared session with the [ISC].

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Okay. Thank you very much, Marilyn. So the sooner we can get more details, I think the better. Thank you.

Next, usually we do distribute newsletters during those outreaches so the call is out. If you have any articles you want to publish with respect to your experience in BC, [inaudible] encourage new members, clearly businesses in Japan to become members of the BC, that would be highly welcome. It doesn't have to be so big or so long an article, can be [quite] big or small, maybe even half a page or two paragraphs of a testimony in terms of how [your experience] has been and how BC has

enriched, added value to your member or particularly your company rather.

So, the deadline for the newsletter or for the article to be submitted so that the newsletter could be ready on time is January 18th, so you have maybe two paragraphs or one paragraph [inaudible] or small [articles], we have a deadline of January 18th [inaudible]. Please do try and put something down. Thank you.

Then the last point is on the draft ICANN FY20 budget and BC additional budget request. Yes, Steve has already raised this and the last committee will be [inaudible]. But I will just say briefly that it's quite impressive that ICANN [inaudible] of all the comments in past years and [inaudible] this time around is quite well improved on, so very good. But more details in terms of [inaudible] will come up at the next meeting.

At this point, we have three additional budget requests made. Number one is on the [inaudible] development. This was approved last year and is to encourage [inaudible] leaders in the BC to be at ICANN meetings. And well, it's actually constrained to the regional meetings. It's constrained to the regional ICANN meetings, but we are asking that it shouldn't be constrained, because for ICANN 63, we couldn't use the leadership development funding because at that point, there was no one we knew that was interested in using that and we could as well use it to support any of our members [inaudible] or parts of America or in Africa that want to be there and we made some [inaudible] in regards to [inaudible] for leadership. So, we are [inaudible] the requested time to ICANN Org and not constrained because ICANN [inaudible].

And also, I've put together a request to continued publication of [object] material like this newsletter [inaudible] BC publication.

So, those two were approved this year, so we will [still be] approved this year or were approved last year. Yeah, this year, so they will be recognized for next year in FY[21].

Then the last request we are making is for BC to also be conducting workshops for IGF 2019. We need to really play [inaudible] role in terms of interacting with all stakeholders, [inaudible] GAC and other global business in regards to the important we are doing. We [inaudible] terms of [modesty] that thanks to Steve and other members [inaudible] the meeting when it comes to participating that really have committed policy positions in ICANN. So we need to [inaudible].

The additional budget request is focusing on this. It was not approved last year. We are hoping for the upcoming year, it will be approved. [inaudible] and maybe with respect to WSIS for the permission period still ahead, so a member of the Finance Committee [inaudible] some additional participants. And also what Barbara is working on will be added as well.

Okay, so I don't know if there are any questions. I just know this [inaudible]. I will turn it back to Claudia. Thank you.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Thank you very much, Jimson, and to close up, I just wanted to also welcome Albert Shin who's the new representative for Looking Glass and he's replacing Kristen Dorn, so welcome to our meetings.

I don't have other issues to add for now. I don't know if anyone else has comments or questions or anything that you want to add before we close the call.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Yes. You did send a mail on CROP You want to [inaudible] in that?

CLAUDIA SELLI: Yeah, indeed. Sorry, I forgot the CROP mail. In fact, we are. I just sent out and I think I gave a deadline, if not mistaken, the end of this week so that we could send names by the 18th of January and I think we have two spots available. It's in the region so you have to be in the same region of the meeting, and yeah, I think I explained also the criteria in the mail so please do apply that if there is an interest.

Any questions on this? And Jimson, please jump in if I forget some of the details of the program.

Okay. If there are no other issues and questions, I would adjourn the meeting and the next meeting is Wednesday the 23rd of January, so I will speak to you then. Thank you very much, everybody, for attending.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]