OZAN SAHIN:	Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the BC Membership Call on Thursday, April the 3rd 2019. In the interest of time, attendance will be taken via the Adobe Connect room and phone bridge. I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. With that, I will turn it over to the chair, Claudia Selli, to begin. Claudia, please go ahead.
CLAUDIA SELLI:	Thank you very much, Ozan, and thank you very much, everybody, for being on the call. In the interest of time, I will leave the floor to Steve for the policy calendars. Steve, the floor is yours.
STEVE DELBIANCO:	Thank you, Claudia. The policy calendar will be displayed in a moment, I hope. I sent it out yesterday afternoon. If anyone has failed to receive it, let me know and I'll send it again. There have been no new comments by the BC since we met in Kobe, so let me turn directly to the current ICANN public comment. I have four of them to discuss, three of which I will need a volunteer from the BC. Good news is that all three of them are open public comments that don't have a volunteer are very similar and they regard new gTLD registry contracts. I'll turn to that in a moment.

But, first, between now and April 17th, we want to try to get a BC comment done to the board as it considers super majority approved policy on the EPDP phase one final report. And that final report includes a launch of phase two. So, we call it the phase one final report but what the board is approving is more than just the phase one report itself.

Mason Cole, along with Statton Hammock, David Fares, and Susan Kawaguchi volunteered while in Kobe to draft that comment and we had an extensive discussion in Kobe on how we were going to frame that conversation and that it was mainly going to be seen as a quick explanation of our vote and a focus on what matters most to us which is teeing up the right priority and workflow for phase two in unified access. That was what we agreed on and I'll note that that is exactly what Mason and his drafting team delivered in the attachment.

I'll note that afterwards, Tim Chen circulated a contra view on things but, Tim, that isn't where the BC ended up in Kobe. You may be able to persuade your colleagues to adopt the edits that you're suggesting and I wouldn't mind at all having a brief conversation on that while we have Mason on the line along with the other authors and Tim.

But, Mason, let me give you a moment, if you would, to talk to us about that draft which we circulated. I also see David Fares's hand is up, so David, maybe we'll go to you first. Go ahead, David.

DAVID FARES: No, no. Why don't I go after Mason, if that's okay?

STEVE DELBIANCO:	Mason, please. Mason? I'm not hearing Mason, David, go ahead.
DAVID FARES:	Okay. So, I just had a bilateral exchange with Mason after we got Tim's comments and I think Tim's comments are well taken, actually. I think when we go back to the conversations that we were having in Kobe with the contracted parties, I think everyone decided that it was time to move on, that we didn't need to dwell on the past and that we tried to reestablish some good will among us, so that we could move forward in the constructive dialogue with the contracted parties when we're dealing with phase two.
	So, maybe while I know that's what we discussed in Kobe, I think the conversations in Kobe progressed from the time that we had the BC meeting. So, maybe Tim's suggestion of not focusing on why we voted the way we did is probably the sound one since I do think we were able to move the dialogue forward with the contracted parties at Kobe.
STEVE DELBIANCO:	Mason? I don't see Mason or hear Mason. Tim Chen, anything you want to add to this?
TIM CHEN:	Yeah. Hey, folks. Can you hear me?
STEVE DELBIANCO:	We do.

TIM CHEN: Okay. Sorry, I'm in a [inaudible]. Just quickly. It was a straightforward comment. I don't feel really strongly about it. I'm not trying to derail the BC's consensus here at all. Just my comment I think has [inaudible] of the process, moving past planning / in any way feeling like we need to explain our vote. So, that's just consistent.

Then, the second part was just more form. It feels like [inaudible] lead with a really long explanation of all the things we want in phase two, when I believe the ask is "please comment on the phase one report" and we just tucked that in at the end.

I just don't want to be labeled as "here the BC goes again", kind of drive an agenda, and oh by the way, we'll put some comments on phase one at the end since that wasn't what we were supposed to be talking about.

So, it felt a little bit like maybe that's not getting us off on the right foot by the second phase here. I prefer to just put our very accurate responses to phase one on what we disagree with and then I'm happy to include all of our [inaudible] on phase two afterwards. Again, don't feel strongly but that's why I took the time to make the comment. I'll go back on mute.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Tim. What we discussed in Kobe and what I still believe the case is, is that when we make a comment, it is expressly to drive our agenda. That's why we do a comment. And if it isn't exactly what the

requestor has asked for, we'll give them what they asked for, but quickly transition to the rhetoric we want to make the arguments for where we want to drive things. There seemed to be a consensus in the BC that this board is going to approve the phase one. We can talk about the things that need to be fixed, like geographical and national versus legal. We can comment about those, both in terms of explaining our vote and to say that these are priorities.

But the ultimate priority, what we are driving toward, is to get the board to draft emotion. When it approves the council report – and it will – we want the motion to include instructions to council, instructions to council on how to prioritize and drive the work towards the unified access model. We want it to contain instructions to Goran to drive ICANN and ICANN Legal to step up their effort on working with data protection authorities and data protection board to get legal clarity that we need for ICANN to take sufficient responsibility. These are the ways we will drive towards the agenda that we need and that is why [inaudible] waiting for phase two and a lot less waiting on the elements of the phase one report.

What else do we have? Any other BC members? Margie, your hand is up. Please go ahead.

MARGIE MILAM: Sure. Hi. One of the things I'd suggest in the comment would be to also [to have support] what came out of the ALAC and GAC statement we just received. I think it's really powerful. And to the extent that we give piggyback on what the advisory committees are saying, I think it

strengthens the [inaudible] to the board. So, perhaps the group could take a look at that and see how we weave that into the comments.

STEVE DELBIANCO: So, the drafters, you'll note that I circulated that comment highlighting the helpful sections that was circulated yesterday at 7:15 PM. Any other comments on this first? Okay. Let me thank Mason and the other drafters for getting this out ahead of schedule. We now have a full two weeks for the BC to refine and revise that comment and get it into the board.

But I would say this. The sooner we get it in, the better we have a chance to influence the composition of that board drafting. That was another element we discussed in Kobe, which was to response to Cherine's request to the BC during the CSG board in Kobe when he said if you have something in mind for what should be in this motion, he'd like to see it. Well, that's a challenge we agreed we would take. I believe, Margie, you're in charge of that small drafting role. We want to get that done far sooner than the end of the comment period since we want to affect that motion in its early stages. Just a reminder, Margie, for the most part. Mason, if you have—

MARGIE MILAM: Yeah, okay.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yeah. Go ahead.

MARGIE MILAM: Sorry. I'll send you an e-mail. I'll send the BC an e-mail on that specifically today.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Margie. Mason, now that you're there, do you want to do anything on the audio?

MASON COLE: No. I've been taking notes on what everybody said. The drafting team will take another swing at the comment based on input from the BC.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Beautiful. The audience is the board. The purpose is to influence the instructions that they give to council and to management. Then we design a comment that suits that audience and for that purpose. We're really not writing for the masses. We're not writing for the GAC. We're writing for the board. Thank you.

                       Alright. Let me turn to comments two, three, and four in the open public comment. I think you each have independent control and you can scroll. Two, three, and four have to do with new gTLDs … I shouldn't say new. They have to do with gTLD registries who are approaching the end of their contract period, and under the [presumptor] renewal permissions are negotiating bilaterally with ICANN to come up with a new contract that presumably adheres to the base gTLD registry

agreement. Oh yeah, that is another product of bilateral negotiations between the registries and ICANN.

So, in all of these cases, ICANN Org is supposed to represent the interests of the Internet community, business and consumer, and the rest of the Internet community. We count on ICANN being able to negotiate on our behalf when they go into these arrangements. And despite clamoring about this for years – Denise Michel has been a help to me on this – we end up seeing that ICANN's GDD simply goes into these negotiations with its own agenda and emerges to ask for public comment after they've already negotiated, as if that is going to modify what they've already negotiated. So, it's a very frustrating process and we want to elevate our ire about the way they do it as well as make key points for what we'd like to see changed.

So, we have three registries that are available now to comment on and there are three more coming up within the next month and a half. Right now, we have dot-info, dot-org, and dot-asia and we have commented most recently last year on [coop] and [museum]. Those were sponsored gTLDs. If you recall, we had quite a bit to say about [dot-museum] and their attempt to sort of shed their sponsored community. That would be applicable to the dot-asia registry agreement. For dot-org and dot-info, they are open gTLDs and our most recent comment on that was what we filed on dot-net and that was in March of 2017.

So, what we need now is to take a look at these provisions that are in here and because they brought them in from the base gTLD registry agreement, they brought in the URS (uniform rapid suspension) and some other dispute resolution processes that were cooked up in the

EN

new gTLD program – well, at our behest among others. But they never were the subject of a bottom-up GNSO policy. Because of that, the GNSO has had concerns about ICANN imposing policies through contract renewal that were not part of the GNSO. So, that's a process point that the BC has made in the past. It's a process point that gets us some points but costs us in other ways when we actually want the board to jam something on the contract parties. So, I just make that as an equivocal point.

What I'd like to ask, though, is can we get any volunteers who will help to draft these comments? It's possible that we could do these as a batch, that org, asia, and info could be done as a batch because they are more similar than they are different. Again, asia because it's a sponsored group has a slightly different focus. But both org and info are very similar and they were both subject to a price cap on the annual increases for domain names. That is to say org and info in their old contracts were limited to 10% increase in the domain name price each year.

In the negotiation of the new arrangements for org and info, ICANN has lifted those price caps and there won't be any cap on how much they can change prices in dot-info and dot-org. They claim that it's because the maturation of the domain name market and the goal of treating the registry operator equitably with operators of both new gTLDs and other legacy gTLDs who use the base registry agreement and there are no price caps on a base registry agreement.

I noted in the comments that when we filed on dot-net, we suggested that the BC does not believe that ICANN should have the role of price

regulator in a competitive market and that we were comfortable with extending what were the dot-net price controls of 10% a year into the next term.

So, can I get some volunteers to help with one or all three of these? I see Mark Datysgeld saying, "I will do four." I can't believe Mark would be volunteering. Mark, are you … Did I catch that out of sequence? Were you helping with dot-asia, Mark? Thank you. Mark D., thank you. I need some more, though. We need some more volunteers. These are due the 29th of April, so we have a lot of time. They're not exceedingly complex comments. We're only commenting on a handful of things, like pricing, sponsorship arrangement, and the adoption of RPMs and DRPs.

I would say that for new members of the BC, relatively new members, this is also an attractive comment to weigh in on. It doesn't require lots of in-depth knowledge of the GNSO process. It's really leading a relatively straightforward agreement where there's a bunch of redline changes to the previous agreement. And info, org, and asia are well-known TLDs that support a lot of business functions as well. Marilyn, your hand is up. Please, go ahead. Marilyn, can't hear you.

MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Steve. I have a question. Can you hear me?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Marilyn, please go ahead.

MARILYN CADE: Thanks. I have a question. I'm not volunteering. I'm just asking a question. How do our comments help us one way or the other on trying to encourage these registries to be more responsive to our concerns about open and accurate WHOIS? Is there a message here that we can send?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Marilyn. We'll take that on as one of the comments we can make. I do note that all three of these adopted the registries public interest commitments and the registry code of conduct. So, if we dive into those to find some hooks, we might be able to make something of that. Any other volunteers? Because Mark and I are not going to be able to get it done alone.

Alright, that's a sobering response. I'll have to figure out how we're going to move ahead on that, because right on the heels of these, we will have dot-biz, dot-info … Sorry, biz, [arrow] coming up around the corner.

The next thing I had on the policy calendar was a long list of sort of a chronology of the modification of WHOIS policies to comply with GDPR. I keep it in here because we do get new BC members or those who suddenly wake up and pay attention and it sort of walks you through how we got where we are, starting roughly a year ago. And because of that, I'll keep it in the policy calendar. We don't need to go into the details of it now.

But I did want to give this opportunity to Mark and Margie, who are our loyal and hardworking reps on the EPDP, to give everyone a brief update

on where we are. You'll note that our attachment four to the policy calendar was the e-mail where both the BC and the IPC jointly worked up a proposal for separate work streams, one on the unified access model and another on what other remaining phase one items. We put that forth and it's generated some debate amongst the EPDP folks whose favorite excuse right now is that we can't maintain the breakneck work pace of phase one, so they're looking to put things in a slower, more serial fashion than fast and parallel. Well, we may be able to take advantage of that by getting them to work fast and furious on UAM.

Mark and Margie, let me turn to you, though, to educate your colleagues on where we are in phase two.

MARK DATYSGELD: Margie, do you want to go ahead? I'm having some audio hell.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Margie?

MARGIE MILAM: Sorry, I'm driving right now.

MARK DATYSGELD: Okay, [inaudible].

EN

STEVE DELBIANCO: Alright. Neither of you have a great connection. I did summarize and I want our colleagues to look at attachment four where we are laying out the two tracks to work streams. In parallel, we said that the legal work stream needed to be permanent and ongoing but we are getting pushback and it would be my impression from everything else we said that if we have to put these work streams in series that we would probably prioritize the UAM. Any other comments on that?

MARK DATYSGELD: Yeah. That may make sense, but really, there's a lot of risk in the legal work stream.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Some of that risk is supposed to be mitigated by reaching out to the contract parties and having them understand that we have consistent interests to do on ICANN to take on [inaudible] responsibilities that the contract parties can reveal through a UAM to accredited entities without taking legal risk. So, I do hope we can—

MARK DATYSGELD: Yeah. That's the [inaudible] work already.

STEVE DELBIANCO: And that is supposed to … We are supposed to advance that cause in a call we're having tomorrow, Mark, with some of the contract parties. Agree?

MARK DATYSGELD: Agree.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Alright. If there's no questions there, I'd like to turn things over to Scott and Marie on channel two which is what's going on at council. Scott and Marie?

MARIE PATTULLO: Hey, Steve. This is Marie. Can you hear me okay?

STEVE DELBIANCO: We do, perfectly.

MARIE PATTULLO: Great. Thank you. I'll start off if I can with the EPDP [inaudible]. We don't have a chairman for phase two, as you all know because I told you all. The leadership of the GNSO Council has extended the call until Monday next, so until the 8th of April.

A personal call. If anybody knows anyone prepared to take this on, please get in touch with council. We understand that one person has so far come forward. I don't have official confirmation on who that one person is but bearing in mind one person posted on Facebook that he had applied. I'm assuming that is the one person. So, in all seriousness, we need to push this.

And phasing in from that is another issue to scheduling in our upcoming meeting in Marrakech which of course will be a very short meeting. I presume that Claudia will speak to this later. There is a, we think, quite sensible suggestion that we, bearing in mind the little time we will have in Marrakech, it does give more time to focus on the EPDP if we give less time to certain cross-community or high-interest topics. But that's for discussion and I know that Claudia will be able to talk about that further.

On the [inaudible] sales, our next meeting is the 18th of April. I can't give you the agenda because I haven't got it. As soon as I do, of course it will be sent around. Some things that are ongoing at the moment, the small group of councilors are working to improve the PDP system, the so-called PDP 3.0. We are now having a call every two weeks. We had our first call Monday. Nothing of substance there to report at the moment. It's based on the implementation program that you've all seen already. So, I will keep you posted and reach out to you if I need help. We appear short of that.

Another thing is that the fellowship selection committee which is under the chairmanship of Heather, who used to be GNSO chair, has developed a strawman for fellowship criteria going forward. The message she has [inaudible] to both [inaudible] and to Mark. He's already got back to me with comments on that within 24 hours of me pleading for comments. I will draft up something that's readable and send it out to all of you, hoping that if anybody else has fellowship experience and also can help us on that one.

On the council meeting that we had in Marrakech, again, you all know what happened. Most of you were there. But a couple of headlines is that we still don't have clarity on what's going to happen to the infamous curative rights, [inaudible] NGOs and IGOs. As you know, the BC position is we really dislike recommendation five. There's also a practical concern that sending it to the existing RPM PDP – that's the rights protection mechanisms PDP – is a bad move. Firstly, because it's the same people. Secondly, because that PDP is in a heck of a mess right now. And thirdly, because it's a very complex legal issue [inaudible] the experience of most people involved in ICANN. I'll keep you posted on that one.

We are trying to get privacy-proxy relaunched. We got serious pushback. One suggestion that came out of the registries, which is sensible, is that we look at those [bits] of the agreed privacy-proxy implementation that can be taken forward now and try and move with those because not all of it is affected by EPDP, although certain registrars are claiming that it is.

There was a certain amount of bad feeling. I won't say it was much bad feeling because that's not the truth, but there was a certain amount of bad feeling about us and the IPC having [inaudible] against the EPDP phase one report and that the portrayal of consensus agreement on the report was perhaps not completely valid, bearing in mind the BC and IPC did vote against. The BC, as always, took a very non-combative approach to this, because to be blunt, us getting into [inaudible] with our colleagues isn't going to help anybody. The IPC can do what the IPC wants to do. But we did seem to at least walk away from that table friends which I think is incredibly important.

And I will stop talking, Steve, and ask you if there's anything else you want me to talk to specifically.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Marie. I think that when we get to next channel and back to Claudia we'll definitely pick up on the idea of how to structure the meeting in Morocco. I think [inaudible] added to the agenda to discuss the fellowship things towards the end of this. But thank you for bringing both of those topics up. Do our colleagues have any questions, or Scott, do you have anything you want to add from council?

SCOTT MCCORMICK: No. Marie covered it. All good.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Scott and Marie. We'll turn it over to Barbara Wanner. Barbara, I know you had a fire drill. Are you back on the line?

BARBARA WANNER: Yeah. We're back. I really don't have much to report. We'll have a CSG ExCom call in the next week or so to talk about priorities for how we want to use our time in Marrakech. I read with great interest Keith Drazek's proposal to limit the number of high-interest topic sessions or cross-community sessions to enable more time to work on the EPDP and phase two, and I personally think that's a good idea, but of course I defer to the consensus of the group. We might want to take that

approach, too, with respect to our meetings and how we want to focus them and focus the invitations that we sent out.

So, I'll just leave it there and leave you with a message that more info is on the way. Thanks.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Barbara, thank you. At the bottom of the policy calendar, I put a question to our membership that I'll raise now. Would the members on this call at least support the idea of limiting to just three high-interest topic cross-community sessions in Marrakech, which would allow more time for the EPDP and other policy issues? Is there any BC member that would like to differ or object to the BC saying that three is a good limit? Marilyn Cade?

MARILYN CADE: Thanks, Steve. Actually, I wanted to ask if two might be a better number. I'm just … Under AOB perhaps I can give a short update about the cross-community working group auction proceeds but I think both EPDP and the cross-community working group need work time and having multiple high-level topics take significant time away from [inaudible] and staff availability. Just wondering if two might be a better number, as long as that didn't exclude the work time needed for EPDP, of course. But also the work time needed for other events that we all need to engage in.

EN

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Marilyn. Any other BC members commenting on this? Okay. So, the ExCom will take this input and react to Keith Drazek's suggestion which was two or three. We'll suggest certainly no more than three and perhaps as few as only two. I hope that will help.

But there's another subtext here, that the NCSG was very upset because when the BC moderates one of these high-interest topic cross-community sessions, we structure and moderate in a way that advances our agenda. Guilty as charged. I hope we do it effectively. That made the NCSG claim that we not only need fewer high-interest topics but we need – what did they call for? Objective third-party moderators and organizers. So, you should know that that's coming as well. And it's not likely we'll have as much influence over how these sessions go in Morocco as we did in previous sessions.

Without any reaction to that, we're going to turn it back over to Claudia. We're finished with policy calendar. Claudia, are you on the line?

I don't hear Claudia, so what we might do is move to Jimson on operations and finance. This is agenda item six. There's quite a bit in there. Jimson, are you on the line?

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Yes. I'm on the line. Good [inaudible], everyone. First, let me give feedback on ICANN's response to our comments with respect to FY20 budget comments. On the comment, we talked about the [inaudible] of intersessional for 2020 and that should take place by biannually. That is once every two years. ICANN Org said this already in the budget and it's approved for FY20.

Also, the Constituency Travel. Constituency Travel was [inaudible] three officers and [inaudible]. So, this also [inaudible] and is in place. As we recall, we approved that [inaudible]. We support it. [inaudible] also in our own [inaudible] budget for FY20. And that proposed budget for this year will be coming up for review shortly. We are still tidying this up.

And CROP support will [inaudible] FY19. CROP is Cross Regional Outreach Program, a program to conduct outreach within the region of ICANN meetings. So, [inaudible] at FY19 level. We got three in FY19, so we should expect three for support in FY20.

I also asked about the open data program. We wanted to be sure that it's still in the budget line and we got feedback that [$240K] has been marked for open data program for FY20. I recall that the open data team actually came to brief us and they had a general briefing as well. So, [there is some cost].

[inaudible] to increase in FY20, what they call [merit] increases. And when expenses are expected to be flat. So, they are considering [flat] and [inaudible] increase [inaudible] remain flat. They're [inaudible] that the FY20 budget proposes to reduce the average increase in ICANN Org staff compensation from 4%. So, that we're just seeing a reduction of 4%, which is the historical average increase to 3% due to the funding levels. But even these costs are stabilized as well and we need to stabilize the cost. So, this way [inaudible] for inflation and moderate compensation increases.

We also took them up on head count increase, [inaudible] head count increase. [inaudible] when we pose the question and we're still

[inaudible] the response. The response is that ICANN Org expects to increase [inaudible] expenses by $4.3 million in FY20 due to head count [inaudible] of [ten] positions along with merit increases of [3%]. So, they say that the head count [inaudible] is very modest in comparison to prior trends and the [merit] increase of [3%] is also [inaudible] than historical average.

On the additional budget request, we expect it to remain flat to FY19 level in FY20. But we do not expect to get feedback on the budget request until the board finalizes the budget for FY20.

So, that is on the feedback on budget comments by ICANN Org. Then I move to the process of [BC], GNSO, [inaudible] committee elections. I'm not on the Adobe, [inaudible] on my system. So, perhaps if there is any questions, Steve, you could just let me know.

Well, we are starting [inaudible] election process much earlier to give clear [inaudible] before the councilors on NomCom to take their seats. So, the election for BC GNSO councilors are coming up and NomCom are coming up on Monday, May 6, 2019 to Wednesday, the 29th of May until 7th June when the announcement will be made. [inaudible] will be [inaudible] shortly by [Chantal]. One councilor seat is open, and you can recall that a very active councilor is [inaudible] seats currently. [inaudible]. That is for 2019 and 2021 session now. This coming election is for 2019 to 2021 and it's only one seat that is being [inaudible] for.

For the Nominating Committee, we have the role open for the At-Large and the [large business and small business seat]. So, eligibility, you just need to be a member of BC in good standing, [inaudible] standing to be

able to [inaudible]. And if you want to nominate anyone, just contact the person you want to nominate and ask him or her if he or she is willing to stand for position, too, and submit a nomination to BC [inaudible] by e-mail, [inaudible] name, company affiliation, and BC membership. The e-mail [inaudible] position that you are nominating the person for. So, as I said, details will be sent to [inaudible] secretariat very shortly, [inaudible] after this call.

Lastly, with regard to ICANN 64 outreach, we had very, very successful outreaches in Tokyo and Kobe. We have been briefed about the outcome. [inaudible] that the chair of the outreach committee is online. Perhaps you can give us more summary about it and maybe you could talk about plans for ICANN 65. Marilyn, are you on the call?

MARILYN CADE: Yes. Thank you, Jimson. Well, very quickly, I would just like to thank everyone who participated in making Tokyo and Kobe a success and give you a bit of feedback. I want to thank those of you who made the extra effort to attend the [JACA] event which was offsite during Kobe as well as also [Andrew Mack] and Steve and Claudia who traveled to Tokyo.

The good news is I am now in discussions with [inaudible] and others from the [Kadonran] and JIPA from our Tokyo meeting about follow-up. This is a longstanding, very unique approach that Japanese business takes and they are interested in advancing how we can collaborate on the initiatives they take following each international meeting where they translate all of the PowerPoints, they do a major update. And we

are also talking about identifying potential membership for the BC from both of those organizations.

JIPA is a little different in that some of the companies from JIPA – that is the Japanese IP Association – are potential members and a couple of them have indicated interest in further dialogue. So, we should think of this as a very interesting approach, very customized to how business does business in their country. Many of those businesses have a global reach and it would be absolutely fantastic if we are actually successful in [regaining] [inaudible] and a few global companies, rejoining the BC.

Let me move to looking ahead. We have two indications of interest to use CROP for the region for ICANN 65. One in Africa. I think [inaudible] is on the call. And also from [Momec] [inaudible] to do a coordination actually in Marrakech. Then we have one other CROP still here from any proposals. Those proposals go to the executive committee to review.

We have also an indication of a high-level executive nomination from Lebanon. It's a Lebanon tel-com and content provider that is very interested in joining the BC as a potential member from the region. She will be providing additional information that can be forwarded to the executive committee for a high-level executive nomination.

We need to start thinking early for Montreal, ICANN 66, since it's possible that we could do something much more impressive in Montreal to bring in some businesses that we haven't heard from for some time and some associations that have global reach and possibly partner again with the ICANN team. I just want to reinforce how strategic it has been to partner with Chris Mondini who has been such a strong ally of ours

and it's actually his budget [inaudible] much of the cost in Tokyo and also much of the cost when we've done previous events in Panama and also in Puerto Rico.

We'll be scheduling regular BC outreach calls that I'm asking [Chantal] to set up. And for anyone who's interested, please do consider participating in those calls and volunteering to engage with the outreach committee in planning further outreach and follow-up. Thanks, Jimson.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Okay. Thank you very much, Marilyn. As usual, the summary report will be available in our next newsletter that will be published this ICANN 65. I would also like to request members to please follow BC Twitter handle. Please follow BC on Twitter handle. I know some members are doing that already. We are tweeting a number of information during the outreach. So, we want to encourage every member to follow [inaudible] capacity or [inaudible] capacity.

Again, finally, I don't know if Claudia is on the call now, on the line. I believe she might want to also talk about an expression of interest of the [inaudible] shortly with regard to the formal use of the [inaudible] for outreach in Japan. We have some funding [inaudible] and the ExCom [inaudible] perhaps you can use to support [inaudible] members to participate in Marrakech, ICANN 65 in Marrakech.

On this note, I don't know if there is any questions. Okay. So, Steve, maybe I'll hand over to you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Jimson. I appreciate it. Is there any other business on behalf of BC members? Mason Cole, please.

MASON COLE: Thanks, Steve. I just wanted to raise a quick issue on the proposed comment that Alex Deacon circulated to some BC members about the TSG. I don't know. I had some audio problems. I'm not sure if that was covered earlier in the call, so forgive me if I'm bringing it up again.

STEVE DELBIANCO: We did not.

MASON COLE: So, I just wondered if that was something the BC wanted to take on. I'd be willing to help coordinate that if that's something we're interested in taking on.

STEVE DELBIANCO: At the end of this section on GDPR and WHOIS, I included a link to the draft report that the TSG put out and their website. It's my impression that the TSG merely confirmed what Alex Deacon and the technical people like Mark on the BC have said all along, is that RDAP technically can do the job. Summarize for us the kind of commentary that you think would be productive for the BC to make.

MASON COLE: Well, I'd have to go back and review Alex's comment, but at the top, more broadly, I just took note that if was something the BC wanted to try to address or just leave it as it stands right now.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Alright. I'll take it on to do another look. If not, official public comment period, as you know, there was a group that finished the report and did a lot of interactions in Kobe and they confirmed everything the BC had been saying all along. So, other than "good work, thanks very much" I'm not sure there's much more we can say. But why don't you and I look at that? And if we think there's more, we'll circulate a note to the whole BC right away.

MASON COLE: Alright. Sounds good.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Mason, and I appreciate the work you did on the drafting. Marilyn Cade?

MARILYN CADE: I want to update very quickly. Can you hear me now?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Go ahead. We do.

MARILYN CADE: Thanks. I just wanted to update on the cross-community working group on auction proceeds. As many of you know, just a reminder, I didn't join the group until meeting 17. I quickly observed that we were very under-represented and eventually Tony Harris was no longer able to continue due to time commitments for the [CSG] representatives. I was nominated and supported by the BC and took that role.

It has been very interesting. We were fortunately supported by Tola and [Waudo] as participants and also by [Brian Sarcalli] and from the IPC and Tony Harris continues in a participant role from the ISPCP but not very actively.

The point here is that the group is getting very, very close to making a final set of recommendations. It's been somewhat challenging to make sure that we are able to have integrity represented in the recommendations since some of the representatives from the contracted parties have an interesting – and from the At-Large have an interesting perspective on how the funds can be spent and how conflicts of interest should be addressed, etc.

I think we're finally getting down to a bottom line of recommendations and that would be taken up in a face-to-face in Marrakech. It will be an open meeting. I'm not suggesting it will be a high-level event but it will be an open meeting. Then there will be a recommendation to the board. So far, with BC input and input from the IPC, the focus has been on making sure that it's an external process without influence by ICANN or influence by the contracted parties and there is a set of examples of the kinds of things that can be funded which are all about being

EN

consistent with ICANN's mission but not competing with it or replacing the ICANN budget. But it could be in parallel to the ICANN budget.

So, I'm just going to give two examples. For example, CROP only funds now three travel, three special events. There is an argument about whether additional funding could be available that is similar to CROP, not called CROP but based on support requests from the constituencies. That's a back and forth. It could deal with further interest from us. Happy to talk to anyone who's interested in more detail.

The second issue is can funding be provided to external groups that are doing work in universal acceptance or advancing awareness of IDNs if ICANN is only providing a small amount of funding and what is the conflict here where ICANN might decide not to fund something that is consistent with the mission, assuming the funding could come from the auction funds?

So, for anyone who is interested, I'd be happy to have a longer conversation, offline conversation, and very, very much welcome input and guidance.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Marilyn. Very helpful. Are there any questions for Marilyn or other items of all other business? Alright. Thanks, everyone, and we'll conclude this call a little early.

RECORDING: You have been removed from the call. Goodbye.

EN

STEVE DELBIANCO: That was a prompt … Wow. Okay. I guess we're done. Thanks, everyone.

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

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]