CHANTELLE DOERKSEN:	Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Welcome to the BC Members call on Wednesday, February 6th, 2019. 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 names before speaking for the transcript and to keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid background noise. With this, I'll 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 discussions and review of the policy calendar. Thank you, Steve.
STEVE DELBIANCO:	Thanks, Claudia. Chantelle is loading the policy calendar. I sent an updated one last night because I had something to add to it. So if any of you don't have that e-mail, it's something I'm happy to send you separately. And this is the updated one. Thank you very much, Chantelle.
	We have not filed any new comments since our last call. There was one due earlier this week, which would have been the BC's comment on the Registrar Stakeholder Group's proposed changes to their charter. I want to thank [Statton,] Chris Wilson, Marilyn Cade, for taking a look at

whether we would comment on that registrar's charter, but the drafters concluded that we did not have an adequate BC interest to comment on their charter regarding the voting rights of registrars who also had registry interests. So the drafting team said, on balance, let's not do a comment, and I went with the advice on the drafting team. So we did not follow on that.

Let me turn to the currently open public comments. We have just a few of them that are relatively brief that I'd like to review on today's call since they're due in the next several days. The first one is our comment ICANN's draft fiscal year 20 operating plan and budget and their five-year operating plan. Those comments close in just a few days, on the 8th of February. And I want to thank Jimson who did a draft. So Chantelle, could you please load the third attachment, [inaudible] PDF, and I'd like to ask any BC member who's looking at the draft e-mail from me to just simply click on the third attachment if you want to see it on your own device.

This is Jimson's draft on the FY20 op plan and five-year plan. Jimson, I don't see you listed there, so I'm not sure if you're on the line. If you are, I'll ask you a question or two. Jimson, are you there?

CLAUDIA SELLI: Steve, Jimson is on the bridge normally.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Yes, Steve, I'm online on the call.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Got it. Jimson, I'm displaying to your colleagues on the BC the one-page draft for the FY20 op plan and five-year plan. And I note that you had a request that the intersessional be restored. I think what we had proposed is the intersessional could occur every other year, to be skipped to release funding for other key community initiatives.

And when you say to restore it, I realize we're just restoring it for one year, we're not necessarily saying every year it needs to be there, because I believe the BC sentiment is every other year is sufficient for the [NCPH] intersessional.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Steve, you're right, every other year, alternate year [inaudible] That's what we said.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you. So on page one, we do need to amend what you have in the draft, because a reader would see that and believe that we want it to be restored for every year from now on, and that would affect a five-year outlook. So why don't we clarify that we mean every other year? Okay, thank you.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Okay. Yeah. That makes sense.

STEVE DELBIANCO:	Great. And you've got a comment in here or CROP or asking for BC outreach funds to be sustained, for CROP to be restored to what it was in fiscal year 18. I certainly think that'll enjoy the support of the BC members. I'll ask now if anybody else on the call has any other comments on the draft you have in front of you, the third attachment to the policy calendar.

Okay, great. Thank you. Jimson, stay on the line and stay active, because we're going to be coming to a couple more drafts from you in a few moments. The second item on the policy calendar is another comment that's closing on the 11th of February, and this is an updated set of operating standards for specific reviews. Remember, specific reviews are things like the SSR, the ATRT, the WHOIS review, and the new gTLD extension review.

We have two BC members that are participating in the current review on SSR, Scott McCormick and [inaudible]. They had volunteered two weeks ago to draft a BC comment, but I don't have a draft yet. I know that [inaudible] said he would work on one, but we need to get that circulated very quickly. I will follow up again with Scott and [inaudible], because we're only about five days from that closing of that period.

Let me jump now to another one that Jimson and Tim Chen drafted. And Tim is unable to be on the line today. This is the third item down and it's attachment number four. Chantelle, would you please load the PDF of attachment number four?

This is a BC comment on ICANN's strategic plan for fiscal years 21 to 25. Let me clarify with everyone that Cherine Challaby is very keen to focus

everyone's attention on the strategic plan for ICANN. When he made a tour after becoming chair, he ended up speaking about the strategic plan almost every time as one of his top priorities. And now I also point you to the fact that when we meet in Kobe, the very first high-interest topic session is about the strategic plan and what Cherine and the board have in mind. So he clearly is making that his legacy and his signature achievement at ICANN. So it behooves us to pay an awful lot of attention to what is in that strategic plan.

Chantelle, thank you for loading that document. Again, this is a relatively brief one, and thank you, Jimson, for drafting it. I would invite Jimson to add any color as to what he's got in here and invite BC members to give feedback on what's here. Jimson?

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Yes. Thank you, Steve. [On broad] review of the document presented, it was clear that a lot of work has been done on it, a lot of work indeed has been done, and the document actually captures the aspiration even though I was of the view that perhaps [inaudible] more aspiration more than the document anticipated, but [inaudible] aspiration. Because looking at the vision, I thought earlier that the vision needed to really move the ICANN [inaudible] champion, because really, from that perspective, ICANN has done a lot. We started pushing the single network, DNS-based network that has grown the economy of the world [inaudible] many years, but with other people's view coming in that it's better to do [the model as it is in a champion.] So I think that is still okay, and that is what we settled down on.

But we wanted clarity on a particular [inaudible] global public interest, because it needs to be defined so that people don't have a different view of what is global public interest. Even though we know what is the majority of the world population, but that still needs to be clarified to avoid some different complications down the line.

And then finally, the issue of the objectives, [Glenn] has mentioned many times that there is no specific prioritization for the objective. But at the same time, I think we need to prioritize, need to focus this objective one [inaudible] priority, epically ensuring that ICANN keeps faith with the IANA function, DNS system, and making sure that [inaudible] global public good.

So, in short, the strategic plan is good. I think [inaudible] work, and they by and large [inaudible] many of the conclusions reached earlier in this document. Thank you, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Jimson. You and Tim Chen, I think, have done a solid job on this. I do believe we should amend our comments so that whenever we reference one of the five strategic objectives that we repeat the objective and then put our comment right underneath it. That'll make it easy for BC members to understand what we're speaking about. And thank you, Chantelle, for putting that link.

So in particular, I have noted personally – and Margie Milan and Mark Svancarek can attest to this, that the PDP process feels broken, and that may entirely be because of the balance of power, or I should say the imbalance of power, when GNSO does voting.

Whenever the NCSG and the contracted parties align, it's almost impossible to change anything in a way that suits the interest of business users and registrants. So, Cherine is sensitive to that, and has said so many times. And I believe that's part of why we see one of the five strategic objectives is to improve the multi-stakeholder model. I believe that is code for potentially changing the way consensus is reached in GNSO, the most important place where we operate on policy.

So I do think I t's wise in Jimson's draft to support that issue. But I might even suggest we go a little bit stronger in that vein, is that ICANN has to take a broad look at the way gTLD policy is done and it includes the effects on parties who aren't devoting members [to] GNSO, like the SSAC, the ALAC and the GAC. They have something to say that often align with our business interest, but they don't have any votes in the GNSO.

Any other comments or suggestions for the drafters? Jimson and Tim, thanks again. Chantelle, if you could please put back the policy calendar. I'm jumping now to number four, which is an amendment to the IANA naming functions contract.

Again, this contract came to ICANN once we accomplished the transition from the US commerce department, and they're simply asking whether we want to make any changes to that contract itself. Those comments close in two weeks, and we do need a volunteer from the BC to draft those comments. Do I have any volunteers that consider themselves customers of the IANA naming functions, for instance Amazon and Google, to the extent that you do use – Microsoft as well – you are a

customer of the IANA functions when it comes to delegations of your TLDs, and even for number blocks. Not a very difficult comment to file, but it does require a little bit of perspective. I'll continue to look for those volunteers.

Number five is the consultation on a two-year planning process, and this doesn't close until the 20th of February, so we'll have some time. But in this particular comment, ICANN is proposing instead of doing the budgeting every year, they're suggesting going to a two-year cycle to do a budget.

Now, Jimson drafted one comment on this. It's attachment number six to the policy calendar. And in there, Jimson, who does most of the work for the BC when it comes to these annual fire drills over the budget, Jimson is recommending that ICANN stick with a one-year budgeting cycle. That is the only comment I sort of wanted to cover today on the call to get a feel for the rest of the BC members, whether you think a two-year or a one-year when it comes to ICANN's budgeting. So I'll take a queue on that. Let's please hear from BC members.

Jimson does most of the work and believes that there is time and space to do it. Jimson, I have to say to you, I shudder to think what the BC would do if you were not our vice chair for finance administration. Would we find another Jimson someday who's willing to do the work every year? Because if not, we'll wish we had voted for two years.

Alright, hearing nothing, I'm assuming BC members are comfortable sticking with the one year. Alright, thank you. Number six on here is Customer Standing Committee, and I'll ask Chantelle, if you don't mind,

please load attachment number five. A big thank you to John Berard who attacked this one right away. It's not even due until 25th of February, but John's come up with an excellent draft comment. I'd like to get your reaction. And I do think that he's right to emphasize that the Customer Standing Committee will only work if the liaisons that are appointed to be on the committee show up for the meetings. And this particular review, this initial report says that attendance is a real problem. So John is calling that out here.

The BC does not have a member on the Customer Standing Committee, so it's not as if we're going to take it on a boomerang on this one, but I do believe that John is right that we want to emphasize the need for people to attend. John, is there anything you want to add about your draft?

JOHN BERARD: No. It says what I wanted it to say. The liaisons are from either SOs or ACs that are not registry members of the GNSO or members of the ccNSO, so it is a technical committee, which may be a reason why nontechnical members are hit and miss with their performance, but it's as pretty essential one because it carries over – it transforms some of the IANA responsibilities to ICANN, and so we should be mindful of it. And because the liaisons are not consistently in attendance, it makes me wonder if perhaps there's a lack of awareness at least, and maybe a misunderstanding of what the CSC does. And I'd rather have more information than less, because that cultivates suspicion. So that's my motive in writing this.

STEVE DELBIANCO: The one member of that liaison committee just from the GNSO noncontract party is James Gannon of Ireland who I'm going to guess that James is among those who's had a spotty attendance record. And it may well be –

JOHN BERARD: None of the liaisons are bathed in glory, that's true.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Okay. Good point. But the BC will want, perhaps, to put one of our members up for that noncontract party GNSO liaison next time around. We did support James when he put his name forward. Are there any comments from BC members for the draft that John's prepared? Right. Thank you. Chantelle, would you put the policy calendar back up? And thank you, John, for the drafting.

I have a whole section on the policy calendar on modification of WHOIS policies, comply with GDPR. There's only two items in that list I wanted to focus your attention on. I'll scroll down to that. It's right down at the bottom. The first was on last Tuesday. Scott McCormick, Jimson and I did a call with Göran. Claudia was unable to join. And we focused pretty tightly on the EPDP and the unified access model, and I have enclosed as attachment seven some staff notes that David Olive took on the call.

Scott and I probed Göran over what progress is he making with data protection authorities, data protection board in the European Commission on finding a way to shift legal responsibility so that ICANN

could require contracted parties to respond to queries from accredited entities under the unified access model.

Göran said that most of his progress has been in two areas. First, he's working with Europol to try to get accredited. The second thing he said is looking at recital 45 of the GDPR, is trying to get the European Commission to come up with draft language for the parliament to consider that would declare that parts of the DNS are public interest service, and he believes that would reduce the risk of a contracted parties incurring a fine if it responded to a WHOIS request from an accredited entity.

So I'm trying to make a long story short because Göran didn't want to give us too many specifics, he didn't share any names, but he seems to believe there's some hope with the text that's already been agreed to that might have to be voted on in the month of March before the European parliament elections.

Claudia, if you don't mind, I'd like to turn to you for any color you can add since you're our resident expert on what happens in Brussels.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Sure. Thank you, Steve. In fact, what is happening is that they're trying to find a solution, as you say, to have a link to the public interest for the GDPR to allow transfer of data.

One solution that they had thought about is to insert language into the [inaudible] regulation that is being currently negotiated and should be

voted by, as you said, before March in any case, in the March plenary session.

So, what they have been putting as language in the recital is that basically, the [DNSA] is public good, not public interest. So now, what is needed is that the text of this [piece of] regulation being reviewed by lawyer linguists so it's composed of people [in] the commission, council and parliament to improve the text.

And one [ask] that ICANN [is trying] to achieve is basically to make the link between public good and public interest so that maybe linking it to the GDPR, there would be some ground for transferring data. Now, I had some conversation with [inaudible] in the commission, and they're looking at that.

Of course, the commission's willing to help, but they were trying to understand how to make that work. Also, a lawyer linguist will need to improve the text and [it's not to] say that this link will be automatically made. And then also, it remains to be seen how this work with the GDPR and how DPA could possibly interpret it, because it's another regulation to which they are referencing.

So, I'm happy to keep you informed around how things go and whether the commission manages to find a solution. I know that they have asked [also Göran] for some additional information and some language that has not been provided yet, so I'm trying to understand where these conversations go back and forward, but they are looking at that. So if I have more info, I will let you know, but in any case, everything is happening between now and March if it does.

But my question – and of course, it's part of my conversations also how DPA can possibly interpret that. That is also something to be seen, because I don't know whether they will consider that as a valued ground.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yeah, Göran had a different spin on it, believing that if the European Parliament voted on the language, that it would be explicit enough to declare that DNS, and thereby WHOIS were public interest services. So I think Göran is overselling [us] at least.

CLAUDIA SELLI: I don't know. I don't know if he has had maybe conversation with DPAs that are confirming that, but I think that there are different things to be explored. I wouldn't put too much hope. I think it can be a solution, but I wouldn't put all the hope on that.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Okay. Do you have text we can review, Claudia?

CLAUDIA SELLI: Yes, Steve, I have shared with you the language, so you can forward that to the whole membership, and I can forward you as well the [whole] text of the regulation.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Please do. I'd appreciate that.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Sure.

STEVE DELBIANCO: We have a hand up from Margie. Go ahead.

MARGIE MILAM: Hi. Thank you for this update. Claudia, I know it's hard to read the tea leaves, but how likely do you think this might pass by March given the political situation in Europe and the election and everything? I'm just curious from your perspective what you think the likelihood is that something like this could actually be adopted.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Thank you, Margie. It's a very good point. The thing is that, first of all, now it's more at a kind of technical level because it's with the lawyer linguists, and so it's less into the, let's say, political arena. But of course, I think the commission also need to understand better what the plan is, and so the time indeed is very tight. I am a bit reluctant that this can happen, but of course, if ICANN put all their effort behind it and try to make sure that all the elements are there, maybe this could possibly. But of course, I think it's very difficult.

Then for the voting part, it's less problematic because in any case, I don't think MEPs will really focus so much attention on that recital, also because, by the way, recitals are not binding, so it's not law, it's an indication. It's not something that would bind anyone to do that. So it's

also another thing to consider. But I think it will pass once the text is improved, it will pass under the radar in the voting part.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Claudia, I pasted the text for the [recital] into the Adobe chat.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Yeah, I saw that. Thank you, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO: And I see your point is that saying public good is not the same as public interest, DNS doesn't always imply WHOIS. So we've got to do better, I think, for this to be as helpful as Göran thinks it should be.

On that call with Göran, he mentioned your name a dozen times as someone he greatly respects for the influence and access you have in Brussels, and I would say that that has opened the door for you to do a direct outreach, a private outreach to Göran and talk to him about the language.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Yeah. Okay.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Try to educate him about the ways in which this language needs to be improved if it is really to be as positive as he thinks. Now, remember that it's a homerun if it ended up saying that WHOIS by itself is as public

interest service and GDPR doesn't apply. But nobody believes that's where it'll go. Instead, it would diminish the risk of being fined when doing a good faith response to WHOIS disclosure requests, and that's likely where this would go.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Yeah. I also think that there are –

STEVE DELBIANCO: Margie, your hand is up.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Yeah.

MARGIE MILAM: Yes. Just one more question. What is this a recital to? I didn't understand what kind of [inaudible]

CLAUDIA SELLI: I will forward the text to Steve that can circulate to everybody. It's the ENISA regulation, so it's basically this regulation, ENISA is the European Network Information Agency in Europe, and basically, they are defining the task that ENISA would do. So the recital is in fact linked to an article 45 of this regulation that defines the task, and the article says that ENISA should be assisting member states, agencies and bodies in developing and promoting cybersecurity policies. So the recital clarifies that among these cybersecurity policies, the DNS would be a public

good, if I'm not mistaken. So this is the link that they're doing, but yeah, I don't know, it's a bit stretched.

STEVE DELBIANCO: So Claudia, I do think it's appropriate for you to reach out to Göran considering he is very interested to hear your thoughts on that.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Sure.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Alex?

ALEX DEACON: I think this is promising, and I look forward to seeing that text. Thank you, Claudia, for sending that along. I think there are additional resources in Belgium that we could leverage to assist in the process, and I'm just wondering how or if that would be possible. I'd like to at least update folks in Brussels who are interested in this topic first with the text, but also perhaps even get them involved, if it makes sense, in order to help influence the final text version. So let me know how or if that's possible, and I'll work on it on my end. Thanks.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Claudia, everybody would like to know that. So after you speak with Göran, send a note to BC private, including what you hear from Göran

as well as what you think you can do to answer Alex's question, which is really us asking how can we be helpful.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Yeah. Absolutely.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Fantastic.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Yeah, happy to do that.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Claudia. Appreciate that. Margie and Mark, as our tireless and peerless representatives on the EPDP, you are in the middle of trying to do consensus calls on phase one final reports. What would you want to share with BC colleagues on the current status of state of play?

MARGIE MILAM: I guess I'll go. Things are moving really quickly. We are negotiating key issues and working on language at the same time with the expectation that we'll start doing consensus calls next week, I believe. A lot of the issues that we care about on the BC are being pushed to phase two of the work, and so things like the unified access model, things like exploring the natural/legal person distinction, there's a lot of areas like that that are things that the BC cares about that we'll be looking at in phase two.

Phase one is mostly the definition around what the purposes are, the process flows, the legitimate bases for processing data, that sort of thing.

And so [it'll get interesting discussion] when we get to phase two as to how we proceed with those issues, and so there's just so many issues I don't know where to dig in. Perhaps Mark can dig in, and Alex, and share some of their observations.

MARK SVANCAREK: There is a large list of open issues that are of interest to our constituency. I'm not sure that it's necessarily useful to go through all of them in this call. What is interesting though is that a lot of things are being pushed to phase two, and [inaudible] two implications, I think.

One, if Göran is successful in getting the DNS protected at the European level, then it's good for these things to be postponed, because they won't have been closed off in phase one, and we'll be able to take advantage of that fact.

The other thing is that there will almost certainly be a push from certain parties and individuals to [wreck] phase two to [ensure] that we get nothing that we want for a variety of reasons. So, any consensus that is formed during this phase one process has to be explicitly contingent on phase two going forward in a timely fashion and phase two being resolved in a timely fashion, and that if we don't have consensus on phase two, that that withdraws our consensus on phase one. I think that's an important consideration for us.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Mark and Margie, you did a great job drafting a justification of consensus, the assumption under which we would give consensus to the phase one report. I would ask, how did the conversations go with SSAC, ALAC and GAC about joining that consensus?

MARGIE MILAM: Sure. I can address that. Essentially, we put together a consensus statement that looks like [that Kurt] indicated, each group will be able to submit some statement as part of the final report, essentially saying that you recognized that our colleagues have been working really hard on developing these recommendations but that there's a lot of work that needs to get done in phase two, and that our consensus positions are essentially dependent upon being able to work through those issues satisfactorily.

So we tried to share this with the GAC and the SSAC and ALAC. SSAC agreed with the sentiment, and so did GAC. SSAC has a very strict process by which they go through to issue written statements, and so they didn't feel that they could do that in the timeline needed to issue the final report, but they were definitely supportive of the sentiment. The GAC also supported the sentiment that decided against joining that statement, and ALAC has agreed to join that statement.

So, we essentially will have the BC, IPC and ALAC essentially saying the same thing, that the consensus essentially is contingent on further work in phase two and that there really isn't a complete policy until phase two is completed, just so that we ensure that we have a lot of attention,

focus and hard work in the group to sort out the issues related to the access model and [fleshing] out the details related to how intellectual property and cybersecurity interests could access WHOIS through the access model.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Margie and Mark, Again – go ahead.

MARK SVANCAREK: Just one last comment. I agree with everything that Margie said, but I would like to caution that SSAC has been, let's just say, an unreliable ally in this EPDP, and that's mostly because of some of the people who have been assigned to actually participate from the SSAC in the EPDP. Whether it's a matter of personality or conflicts of interest, their support has been unpredictable at best.

So even though it would appear that they'll support us on this, I will believe it when I see it.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Mark and Margie, thanks for your tireless efforts on that. and as you deliberate on BC positions with regard to consensus, rely on your judgment, standing on the shoulders of the work the BC did on the draft [EPDP] report where the BC approved the positions we articulated in that comment. I can resend it if you need it, but that's your guide post for making decisions you need to make in the moment as consensus calls are occurring over the next few days. And thank you, again, for all the great work you've done. Any other questions for Mark and Margie?

Great, we'll turn to channel two, which is GNSO council. Marie Pattullo and Scott McCormick, do you have anything to add about the two council meetings on the calendar? There's one for Feb 14, which I cannot find an agenda, and another one coming up on Feb 21. Marie?

MARIE PATTULLO: Hi, Steve. I'm sorry, I see Scott's not on the phone, so you're stuck with me yet again. I sent through to excom this afternoon or this morning [inaudible] the agenda for the 14th, which was originally planned to be a discussion of the final report from the EPDP team. Of course now [what it is] is quoting an update on the final report from the EPDP team chair, Kurt Pritz, and discussion of next steps.

We're also going to be talking on the about the [inaudible] about the never-ending IGO/INGO saga. Where we got to there is that we have the leadership wanting us to get the first four recommendations [inaudible] the board even though we know the GAC doesn't agree. And the recommendation five [leadership team should] go to the RPM working group.

Again, if you know from the summary of the last meeting we had in Los Angeles, I don't think that's the best idea. I spoke with Susan about this, I've talked with [Michael] about this. I know that Phil Corwin doesn't think it's a great idea. The reason is simply that it's very complex, the RPM working group is already way behind schedule, so [inaudible] scheduled already by the same people, because the same core group in the RPM working group is not necessarily the best way forward.

Anyway, that's the meeting on the 14th. Backtracking slightly to the meeting we had in Los Angeles, the only other thing that I haven't mentioned so far is that, I don't know Margie and Mark feel about this, but there seems to be an agreement within the council that the face-to-face [inaudible] group was successful, so no actual backup plan needs to be defined. You'll remember that Cherine asked council to come up with a so-called backup plan.

However, there is concern about the implementation delay in that if there is a final report, if it is agreed, there will of course need to be time for the contracted parties to implement. They were very clear, and council, they believe that the definition of how it should happen belongs not to council but belongs [to the EPDP team.]

Okay, that's all for me. Back to you, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Marie. Are there any questions for Marie on GNSO council? And Marie, if you do get an agenda for Feb 14 or 21, feel free to circulate it to BC private so we have a better idea. None of that was available at the time I put together the policy calendar.

MARIE PATTULLO: I'll hit "forward" straight away.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Great. Barbara, turning to you for channel three on CSG and Kobe. Go ahead, Barbara.

BARBARA WANNER: Okay. Thank you, Steve. I just have three items I'd like to raise with the committee today. And I know I sound like a broken record, but I feel compelled to reiterate them. I really need your input on questions that we pose to the board during our CSG session with them. The deadline for that is fast looming. I would appreciate your input by the 8th of February as I indicated in a reminder e-mail that I sent around earlier this week, because we will be having a CSG excom meeting on the 12th where we will consolidate all those questions to ensure coherence and so forth and send on to the ICANN staff in time for the deadline that they've given us.

In particular, I know you're frightfully busy, but I would appreciate if Margie and Mark could take a look at the points that I've [posed] for our combined session among all three CSG constituencies that will focus on EPDP and UAM, particularly in light of how quickly things are developing.

Second point, meeting – I received a request for the BC to meet with new board members. Regrettably, that window had closed for the requesting meetings with board members, but we received correspondence that all board members will have a lot more flexibility at ICANN 65 for such meetings. So I think we can certainly pursue that in Marrakech.

Finally, and this goes back to a point that Steve phrased earlier, the importance that Cherine is placing on development and implementation of the strategic plan and getting feedback from the community on it.

They've asked the community come to Kobe prepared to offer four suggestions of addressing various questions that they posed.

I have proposed one concerning how the community can improve [our] addressing issues raised in both the strategic plan, the consultation paper on the two-year budgeting process, and the FY21 to 25 operating plan. We need two more suggestions for that.

And then also, concerning outreach, I received a couple of suggestions for that point on outreach and included those in a recent e-mail. I received text from Marilyn, and I will recirculate that for everybody to review.

So that concludes my report. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Okay, Barbara. Thank you. I did include a link to the block schedule and the questions you posed in the Adobe. I've just proposed one question, which is to say to the board your draft strat plan, [culture improving our] policy development process, the question is, is the board willing to look at changes to process and structure for how policy is made for gTLDs?

I also, Barbara, would say that if you look at the draft comment attached to the policy calendar on the FY20 and five-year, you'll see that the drafts that we've discussed earlier on the call do include at least the current BC thinking on those two topics. And it would be easy to crib from those drafts some things to mention about the strat plan.

BARBARA WANNER:	[Yeah, fine.] I'll copy and paste them in. I kind of appreciate from the people that drafted that would sort of step up, but I will copy and paste what is in that submission. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO:	Yeah. To the extent that you think it's appropriate. You'd only take what you think is sort of high-level and has the right context for a direct board conversation. Because the way Jimson and Tim had drafted it, it sort of assumes the reader knows a lot and it's really not a cut and paste exercise. It's going to take some judgment and expertise on your part. So, sorry for the extra work, but it's not as simple as a cut and paste, I'm sorry.
	Okay, that's all I've got. Back to you, Claudia.

CLAUDIA SELLI:	Thank you very much, Steve, and Barbara also for the reporting. For ICANN 64, something that I wanted to share and that Chantelle just actually said before the call is that the meeting with the new board members will not be possible for ICANN 64, so we're going to [submit it] for ICANN 65. But we'd still need to reach out to possible speakers for our BC open meeting. We haven't received any type of contribution in this respect, so if we don't receive anything, excom will decide who to reach out and we will go with that. So please, if you have any ideas or any desire, send it immediately to Chantelle, and also if you can copy myself, within the next few days. Otherwise, we'll go ahead with our [inaudible].

And that's the main thing that I wanted to share. For the rest, I will leave the floor to Jimson.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Okay. Thank you, Claudia. I'm happy to welcome a new member to BC, from Panama, representing [inaudible] group. He's [Alvaro Aguila.] This is one of the outcomes of the Panama meeting BC outreach. So, Alvaro, you are most welcome, and Chantelle has already reached out to you. Feel free [if] you have any questions, feel free to [inaudible] for clarification. Thank you.

We do have a list of some members who are yet to fulfill their membership [inaudible] so with the excom and Finance Committee, we [inaudible] reaching out to [inaudible] members about [inaudible] number. But we are making progress with at least one. But by the end of February, if we do not get feedback from the others, they will have to be withdrawn from membership for now.

With regard to ICANN 64 outreaches, both in Tokyo and Kobe, you could recall that excom approved some funding to enable about seven members to apply. [inaudible] be able to participate in the outreaches. So, members confirm, once you have your visa or [inaudible] you don't need visa to attend, please let us know so that the funds can be made available for your [inaudible].

And with respect to update on the outreaching itself, the chair of the outreach committee is with us. Marilyn, do you have some updates for us, please?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Jimson, we lost you. Are you still there?

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Yeah, I'm asking Marylin. If Marylin's there, Marylin can [go ahead to] give us update [inaudible] can you hear me?

MARILYN CADE: Yes. Thank you, Jimson.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Yes, Marylin, please go ahead.

MARYLIN CADE: I'm very sorry about this echo. And I'm not sure if it's me or someone else. So, the hosting organization in Tokyo has indicated – and Claudia may also be able to add to this, they've indicated that Tokyo is an invitational event into two existing organization' high-level meeting.

One is [inaudible] and the other is [inaudible] which is a Japanese research and technical association. And they have been pretty clear with us that we are [inaudible] a limited senior level of speakers are invited as guests. So it's really not a jointly organized session as we had hoped, but it does provide engagement for the BC [inaudible] speakers to meet with C-level executives to encourage them to send their staff to Kobe.

In Kobe, we have much more flexibility, and [I followed] up with Claudia that we have a segment during the [ISPCP] session on Wednesday, which is offsite, has an expected attendance of roughly 100 people, some of whom will be candidates for the [BC.] Most are small ISPs from Japan, some are the telecoms operators as well, and our topic is security, stability and resiliency with two to three speakers from the BC, plus one from the Japanese ISPs [speaking, and the session would be introduced] by Claudia, and then the panel would take place and then there is an open, shared reception. There will be some board members. Other board members will be at – and Claudia can elaborate on this, but there's a high-level dinner for the executives of the constituencies and [SGs,] so the board will be split, I'm told. [And if Claudia, you have further information, with some coming to this reception] and then joining the dinner in progress.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Okay. Thank you very much, Marilyn. Is there any question or any clarification required on the outreaches? [Maybe while we await] any form of clarification, I'd just like to note that [we also made] some arrangements for the newsletter. The newsletter will be printed in English and Japanese, and we want to thank some of out members [that will be helping] to [reach] some of these newsletters to Tokyo and to Kobe. Thank you very much, the concerned members.

And finally, [inaudible] I don't see any hands, I'd just like to make a clarification concerning the [inaudible] funding approved and the structure. There are seven people that applied, and on item number two, we have Andrew, Mark, they've got an issue with their per diem.

Actually, [inaudible] supposed to be for Claudia. Well, Claudia has not received BC [inaudible] or ICANN funding, except with the [inaudible] travel, so that's why the per diem is [earmarked] for Andrew, Mark, and [inaudible] the allocation for [inaudible].

So [I'd like to] to make this clarification [inaudible] request for clarification by a member. So, [inaudible] from Claudia, Claudia does not receive per diem, no cash [for this,] but [basically,] travel funding. [inaudible] $7000 basically for outreach [inaudible] distributed based on request. [inaudible] make that clarification.

So, on this note, I'd like to return this to Claudia. Claudia, over to you. Thank you.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Thank you, Jimson. We'll certainly send this all clarification by mail so that you can see that, and yeah, I think Jimson explained it quite clearly. I don't know if there are questions or any other items from the participants on the call. It seems like there's none from what I can see, so our next meeting is on the 20th of February, our next call, and in any case, we will keep in touch by mail. Thank you very much, everybody, for participating to the call. Chantelle, we can stop the recording and adjourn the meeting. Thank you very much, everybody.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]