

---

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the BC Members Call on Wednesday, May 1, 2019. In the interest of time, attendance will be taken via the Zoom room. For those on the phone bridge, I would like to ask that you please state your name before speaking for the transcript and to keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. For those that have connected via the computer, please note in the very lower left-hand part of your screen related to Zoom, there is a telephone icon with the word “mute” underneath it. If you wish to speak, please make sure that is unmuted. With this, I would like to turn it over to our chair, Claudia Selli, to begin. Claudia, please go ahead.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Thank you very much, Chantelle. And thank you very much, everybody, for joining the call today. In the interest of time, I will give the floor to Steve in order to start with the policy calendar. Thank you, Steve, the floor is yours.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Claudia. I’m trying to share the policy calendar. Is it showing?

CLAUDIA SELLI: Yes.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, everyone. I think that I could get through the policy calendar relatively quickly and that’s important because Scott and Marie will have a lot to share on council. Barbara has an extensive set of items on

---

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

---

the next ICANN meeting. Then of course Jimson I think has a lot of admin issues.

So, I would say that since our last BC call, we have filed two comments. Back on the 23<sup>rd</sup> of April, we sent in a page of suggestions to the board regarding the motion that they're going to construct on how to react to the EPDP phase one report and recommendations. At our last BC discussion, we had some differences and Claudia and a few others had some edits. I'm so glad we were able to get that resolved. I want to thank Margie Milam for the drafting of that.

Now, Claudia sent that in to Chris Disspain. He was the board member who asked us for it in the Kobe CSG board discussion. I note that Chris has acknowledged him and I posted it to the BC Discuss website. But I want to note for you that for some reason it's not showing on the ICANN correspondence page. I'm not at all worried about that and it's certainly transparent because our letter is on the Business Constituency's public website. But it might be better to avoid being accused of working behind the scenes. Chantelle, I might ask you to check with staff to see why it is that didn't make it to the correspondence page on icann.org. We're not asking that it go there, just wondering why it didn't. Chantelle, can you follow-up on that?

CHANTELLE DOERSKEN:

Hi, Steve. Yes, I can.

---

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thank you. Then on April 29<sup>th</sup>, earlier this week, we found a comment – really, it was two comments – on the renewal of registry agreements for dot-info and dot-org. I want to thank Andy Mack and Mark Datysgeld who helped with the drafting, but a special thank you to Zak Muscovitch and Jay Chapman who participated on the drafting discussions. Zak provided extensive edits, many of which but not all of which we adopted, and for that reason Zak did not want to be listed among the drafters. And as you know from the lively dialogue, Zak, Jay, and some other domain investors shared their views on the BC list. But it was pretty clear to me as your policy coordinator that we had one segment of the BC membership, the domain investors, had a view and it was different than the view that was expressed by other BC members. So, we went with the comment that was filed on Monday.

The importance of this factors in to [inaudible] the open public comments that are in front of us because we've got one coming up in seven days on the proposed renewal of the dot-asia sponsored registry agreement. Now, there are no price caps in the old days or the new days on dot-asia. It's one of the TLDs that has no price controls, one of those many that don't. But it does adopt the provisions that protect registrants [inaudible]. It does provide uniform rapid suspension and other dispute resolution procedures and it, for dot-asia, adopts the registries public interest commitments and the registry code of conduct.

We have done comments on sponsored gTLDs such as dot-coop. We were very critical on dot-museum. We typically have targeted this notion that if somebody obtains a sponsored TLD and then tries to escape from the whole community designation that we felt that should deserve a high degree of community scrutiny.

---

So far, we have volunteers on this from Mark Datysgeld and Jay, Zak, Andrew Mack, and Vivek, you volunteered two weeks ago. We're going to need to turn this around pretty quickly. I'm not particularly concerned because I think we will stand on the shoulders of the org and info comment and take out all the stuff on price increases because there's no price discussion in the dot-asia agreement. But Vivek as the new to the group, I wonder if you might take the first stab at looking at the dot-asia provisions for their community to see whether that's something that deserves further scrutiny. And Vivek, I see you on the line. Would you be able to help out with that in the next 24 hours or so?

VIVEK GOYAL:

Thank you, Vivek. So, the charge is to look at dot-asia's proposal and see if they are proposing any significant modifications to how they define their target community and the eligibility. It is an open TLD with no price caps. I appreciate that. And we'll probably try to get something into BC member hands in the next two days.

Let me turn to the second open public comment and it's for the dot-biz registry agreement. I'll scroll it up to the top of our shared window. The base registry agreement is being adopted along with the URS, the dispute resolution procedures, the registry's public interest commitments and code of conduct. So, this is very similar to what we discussed on dot-org, including the expiration of their price caps.

So, it's my view ... This is not due for two weeks but it's my view that this would be a rinse and repeat on our dot-org comments, pretty much verbatim, and that would be what I would circulate but I would be

---

happy to discuss with the drafters who are listed here or any other volunteers who want to jump in as to whether they want to refine that position further in the next 14 days. I'm looking at the queue to see if there are any hands up and I'm not seeing any. I assume that we have our volunteer core pulled together and I'll be circulating a draft for that one a little later, probably in five or six days. We'll focus on dot-asia first.

There's only one other open public comment. It's number three on my list. This is the situation where ICANN in a sort of top-down way does its strategic plan, for five-year increments, 2021-2025. Now, part two – strategic objective number two – has to do with ICANN's governance. This is where it's more of an introspective look at ICANN. Not an external look as to ICANN is regarded in the world, but internally on how our processes are working. I don't know if Tim Chen is on the line but when Tim sent us his little farewell message over the last two days, Tim pointed out a number of problems that really ICANN is trying to solve with this objective number two, to make things work smoother and faster inside of the ICANN process.

So, what ICANN has done is the board is publishing a draft list of issues – and I have it linked in the comment. And they'd like to get feedback from the community by the 4<sup>th</sup> of June, so we have a lot of time, on specifically how we want to address that. I'll return to what we posted in February of this year. Jimson, Tim Chen, and I worked on the BC's comment. It's a brief one where we said that, "Improving the effectiveness of the multi-stakeholder model is a priority." We said ICANN is rightfully developing a reputation for being slow, combative, and less transparent and we cited as an example decisions in process in

---

the EPDP are just the latest examples in this regard. We wrote that in February of this year, before the EPDP became even more combative and contentious.

So, I think we should have something to say about this and I will ask now for volunteers who will help on that. We have a lot of time. This would be a great one for volunteers who are frustrated with how difficult it is for ICANN to get things done and for you to participate. This is a chance for us to vent frustrations along with suggestions to make it better. I'll pause there and look for volunteers. Marilyn, go ahead.

MARILYN CADE:

Thanks, Steve. I volunteer to work with others. I think there are several examples of where ICANN is actually moving away from the multi-stakeholder model to a kind of centralized top-down staff-driven model. I'm hoping we could address a few examples in that. Hoping others will join but happy to collaborate.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Marilyn, if you have a chance, next time you're at the keyboard, send an e-mail around BC private with some of the initial thoughts to get this conversation started. Thank you for volunteering. Any others?

JIMSON OLUFUYE:

Yes, Steve. Jimson speaking.

---

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Jimson. Mark Datysgeld, your hand is up.

MARK DATYSGELD: Sorry to interrupt. Very briefly. There's something that I've been talking a lot with different parts of ICANN – ICANNLearn, the fellowship, NextGen programs and so on, which is better documentation of policies. This is something that I want to anticipate that I'll try to convince you guys to support me on, that the documentation part is very poorly done. So this is something that I'll try to get across. Just letting you know in advance.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Mark, at least from my perspective, I could barely hear you on that. Any other BC members have trouble hearing Mark? Maybe it was just me. Thank you, Mark. I'll put you down as an additional volunteer. Any other hands?

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: Steve, this is Zak Muscovitch. I'll lend a hand as well. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Zek. Glad to have you. This is on number three. Okay. So, let me turn to the next topic which is this notion of modifying WHOIS policies to comply with the GDPR and other privacy laws. In the center of the policy calendar, I always list a chronology, a summarized chronology of what's going on since last May. And at the bottom of it, I really only have one update and that is that the EPDP phase two work,

---

which really should have begun in Kobe but really didn't, is starting tomorrow as the first call of our biweekly long calls will begin.

Right now, Mark Svancarek and Margie Milam deserve your gratitude as our representatives on the EPDP. I'm currently serving as the alternate to back them up but that is a role that I would happily relinquish to any BC member who felt they could step up to be on all the calls as an alternate and be on the prep calls and then step in if Mark or Margie have schedule conflicts, that means they can't make a call or can't make a meeting. So, write to me offline if you wish or volunteer now if somebody is interested in replacing me as the alternate on the EPDP. I wanted to turn to Mark and Margie. So, Mark Svancarek and Margie Milam, would either of you like to give a brief update, or a preview, I guess, on how we're going to proceed this week with the EPDP phase two? Margie, I see you there.

MARGIE MILAM: Hi. Can you guys hear me?

STEVE DELBIANCO: We do. Perfectly. Thank you.

MARGIE MILAM: Oh, yay. I figured it out. Yeah. We're starting on Thursday and we're starting with basically all the stakeholders are – all the members I guess are representing their stakeholders saying they intend to get out of this next phase of the EPDP. So, we're jumping right in. We have Janis Karklins as our chair which I think is very good news for us and we have



---

a lot of very supportive statements from the GAC and from NTIA that I think will help shape how we move in phase two. So, I think we're looking for moving quickly and resolving our issues with regards to the purposes that are important for the BC members, the ones related to cybersecurity, intellectual property, and consumer protection.

So, we're jumping right in and it will be interesting to see how we all work together with the new chair.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Margie, thank you. If BC members have any questions, just raise your hand. Margie, I share your enthusiasm for Janis Karklins. Government perspective but also a former chair of the WIPO group. I think that means he has an appreciation for law enforcement and protection. Marilyn, I see your hand up. Old hand?

MARILYN CADE:

No, it's a current hand. I put this in chat. Do we want to possibly invite Janis to probably the CSG meeting for 15 or 20 minutes? A lot of us know him very well. Barbara does, I do, you do. Jimson does. I'm just not going to be able to name everybody who knows him. But a number of the BC members and the CSG don't know him. If we could get 20 minutes of his time, that would be ... Believe me, he won't show anybody any favoritism but it would be good to give him the [inaudible] of the various organizations.

BARBARA WANNER:

Can I jump in very quickly?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Of course.

BARBAR WANNER: I'll get into this in my CSG report but it may be difficult to even have a CSG open meeting. I'll explain why. But your interest in inviting Janis is noted and I'll further elaborate on this when my time comes. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you. Janis is a very careful diplomat. Because of that, he would probably not be keen to meet with one group and not all groups. Certainly not at his very first public meeting as the chair. So he might decline for completely different reasons, because of wanting to appear as a really objective chair. So we'll have to watch for that? Any other questions for Margie?

For the BC members who want to follow the actions of the EPDP, about a year ago we set up a special e-mail list called BC-EPDP. There are seven or eight BC members that are on it now and we use that to communicate in real-time what's going on in the EPDP. We do prep calls the night before each of the group calls. So rather than bother the entire BC we tend to restrict that list. So any BC member who wishes to be on the BC-EPDP could write to Chantelle or I and we'll add you to that list. That's an e-mail list. You'll I think be more in the loop on exactly the day-to-day what's happening in the EPDP.

I'm turning now to GNSO Council. I will scroll up to that section of the policy calendar where we summarize what our councilors did on the last

---

call on the 18<sup>th</sup> of April, including a resolution that we discussed extensively in the BC and then tee up the issues that Marie and Scott want to cover. So, Scott and Marie, over to you.

MARIE PATTULLO: Hi, all. This is Marie. Can you hear me okay?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yes. Thank you. Go ahead.

MARIE PATTULLO: Great. Thank you very much, Steve. Starting with what we were just discussing, when we adopted – voted, I’m sorry – to approve the appointment to Janis as the new chair, I think it’s worth members remembering that there was a lot of noise coming from the NCSG purely because back in 2016-2017, Janis was the chair of the General Assemblies at WIPO.

Now, the fact that he did that is one thing among many, many, many, many things on his CV but the NCSG were making a lot of noise about him being potentially bias which is wrong and not true. But I think it is worth bearing in mind, Steve, going forward. I don’t think there is any serious way they could accuse him of that but it was notable the amount of noise they made.

Apart from that, we adopted our response to the GAC Communique. We got some wording changed from that that we weren’t happy with. We even got that through the registrars with no problems, so we’re

---

pleased about that. The new fellowship criteria, again thank you to all that put your suggestions in for that.

Yes, we did adopt and we [forward] the report on IGO NGO access to curative rights protection mechanisms. What's going to happen on that one next is a very big question mark. To my knowledge, the first time that the council has adopted a report and sent it to the board knowing it's completely against GAC advice. The GAC wrote to the council the day before the vote expressing concern. I haven't heard anything since, so I don't know.

What I do know from our discussion in the council was that the idea, as you all know, was to put the first four recommendations up to the board. This is the recommendations put forward by the working group. The fifth one, which goes to can an IGO INGO then have access to courts. It's a bit more complicated than that, but after they've won [inaudible].

There are so many open complicated international legal questions there that it was felt the best thing to do was to get a group of people together who have got expertise in that to work it out, and they are going to be part of the RPM Working Group. Probably going to be a specific small group chartered within that working group. Whether it will be in their current work, whether it will have to wait for phase two, all of these are asking questions that we don't know the answer to but that's where we fell on that one. Only the Intellectual Property Constituency voted against that.

---

The only other thing I think that's worth telling you but I guess you all know already is that council always has a liaison to every PDP Working Group. We didn't have one to the IRT, the implementation people, for EPDP phase one. We do now have one and that's Rafik and that does make sense because he was the liaison to the entire phase one as it went through. Scott, if you want to add anything.

SCOTT MCCORMICK:

No, all good.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

BC members, any questions for your councilors right now? We won't have an agenda for their new meeting until over the weekend on May the 4<sup>th</sup>. Again, that would be for the council meeting scheduled for May 16<sup>th</sup>.

Alright. Let's move off to channel three. Barbara Wanner helping us out with what's going on in the Commercial Stakeholder Group.

MARIE PATTULLO:

Sorry. May I add one thing?

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Please, go ahead, Marie.

---

MARIE PATTULLO: I'm really sorry. The proxy and privacy. As you know, we and our IP friends were pushing for it to be implemented as soon as. As you know, we got pushback in Kobe. What's now happened is a letter has been sent from Keith who is the council chair to ICANN Org saying that we do have differences, we're not quite convinced what to do next, leaving it up to Org and the IRT to decide on if and when we should start, but notably also pointing out something we do support which is the idea that we can pass out those parts of the proxy and privacy report that can actually be implemented now because they won't be affected by the EPDP. So we have to wait and see what will happen on that one. Very sorry for forgetting and I'll stop talking. Thanks.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Marie, I had added that as an attachment and highlighted it in yellow in the policy calendar. Do you feel like you've covered the open questions enough with respect to volunteers on the IRP independent panel?

MARIE PATTULLO: We haven't got any.

STEVE DELBIANCO: I'm looking for hands. You may have another chance here. Okay. Alright. Barbara Wanner, over to you, and I've scrolled up to channel three on the policy calendar.

---

BARBARA WANNER:

Okay. Thanks a lot, Steve. I already previewed a little bit of the particular issues and concerns and challenges we're facing for this meeting. Basically, it boils down to the fact that both meeting space and meeting slots are very few and far between at ICANN 65 to the point where the CSG ExCom agreed to do without a closed meeting in Marrakech and instead hold our closed meeting so to speak via teleconference beforehand. I imagine Chantelle will send out a notice of that in the next few weeks. Chantelle will request a meeting room for the CSG open meeting and if there is room available. The GNSO is only allocated two and I invite Chantelle to jump in and clarify if I get something wrong.

But if we are able to secure a meeting room for the CSG open meeting, it was decided that we would try and – because we have to put in the meeting request – invite Goran and Cyrus to engage with them on EPDP two. We can certainly also reach out to Janis. But if we can't get a room then there will be no open meeting also.

Chantelle is also requesting a meeting room for the BC open meeting. Again, if the meeting room is available, does the BC want to use that slot or do they want to focus on the work of the EPDP [2] and all of the other working groups that will be going on? I've looked at the block schedule. I'm happy to send it around and it would be virtually impossible to schedule any sort of BC meeting and have it not conflict with the EPDP, the SubPro, the CCW auction proceeds, or cross-community sessions. So it's a very tight agenda and of course only four days this time for the policy meeting.

---

I believe the ICANN secretariat is encouraging everyone to make the most of the networking cocktails which will take place at the conclusion of each day of these meetings to network with members of the board, members of ICANN Org, members of other stakeholder groups and so forth.

I'm happy to turn the rest of it over to Claudia. Basically, Chris Mondini briefed the CSG ExCom concerning his plans for doing outreach at Marrakech. Claudia, do you want to take it away?

CLAUDIA SELLI:

Sure. Thank you, Barbara. As far as Chris Mondini [inaudible] was concerned, basically he's organizing or helping organizing [inaudible] with the main business, organization in Marrakech. But also the second point that we will need to follow-up with him is also how we measure success out of different outreach events, which I think is really important to give him tools to help us either recruit more members, or in any case achieve the goals that we want to achieve with the outreach meeting. So, conversation will continue with him – I know, Marilyn, you are in touch with Chris already – in order to organize the activities in Marrakech.

The other point that I wanted to raise apart from the CSG meeting that there's no [inaudible] for the agenda. The other constraint that we have is also for one BC meeting, meaning that we only have the possibility of having or reserving one slot, so it's either the BC Closed or BC Open meeting. One of the two will have to be probably done via teleconference the same way as the CSG. So, I guess it would be



---

probably more interesting to have the BC Open in Marrakech rather than the [inaudible] meeting, but it's up to members as well to jump in.

The other point that I also wanted to bring to your attention is the prioritization of topics for the cross-community session as well as for the [inaudible] session that are being held in Marrakech. So, for now, the prioritization goes with WHOIS privacy, EPDP phase two, combating domain abuse with GDPR, and finally privacy and proxy implementation.

We will be circulating the topics to members to eventually jump in and then you will let me know. The deadline is today, though.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Barbara, anything more?

CLAUDIA SELLI: Any question or anyone that wants input on that?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Alright. Chantelle, why don't you put the full meeting agenda back up and I'll turn it back over to you, Claudia.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Sure. Can you hear me? Hello?

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Hi, Claudia. Yes. I can hear you. One moment while I post the agenda.

CLAUDIA SELLI:                    Yeah.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN:        On my end, you should be able to see the agenda.

CLAUDIA SELLI:                    I'm sorry, it's not displaying yet. Okay, now it's displaying. I don't know if there are other issues to add but I will leave the floor then to Jimson for the operation and finance report.

JIMSON OLUFUYE:                Okay. Greetings, everyone. With regards to operational finance, number one, in regards to the forthcoming election, yes it begins May 6<sup>th</sup>. So, from Monday you can actually go ahead and make your nomination for next councilor. Of course, there's just one seat and currently Marie is occupying that seat, but of course [inaudible] BC tradition, it's open to all.

And [inaudible] the Nominating Committee elections. So, please check your mail and go through the processes again but it begins from the 6<sup>th</sup> of May, this coming Monday. The announcement of the outcome will come June 7<sup>th</sup>.

On the outreach for ICANN 65, yes we just had from the chair and Barbara in regards to the ongoing collaboration with Chris Mondini. So, it's evolving. But as a [protocol] in Japan, we had meeting with business

---

in Tokyo and also other outreach [inaudible]. So, I believe [inaudible] walking that line, [inaudible] want to comment with any additional updates from what Claudia has provided.

MARILYN CADE:

Very briefly. First of all, I just want to say [inaudible] recognition of the work that the CSG and Claudia have already been undertaking with Chris. Just in the last 24 hours, for Marrakech there have been just a couple of new developments and that is making sure that the associations in Casablanca have invitations early. There's one that ICANN has identified. Our member from TAGI, Mahmoud, has reached out to some businesses that TAGI has contacts with and associations, so it's possible that we would have an additional one or two brief meetings in Casablanca. That has to be still verified because whether or not the business groups are actually open to hosting a small delegation of business members.

I did go online and I checked on travel issues for people who might be willing to stop in Casablanca. So, offline already one BC member has contacted me with interest, so if you're interested, I'll just post, Claudia and Barbara if that's okay with you, I'll just post asking people to let me know. Again, it comes down to whether the associations are open to meeting in the afternoon on Friday in Casablanca. We know at least one will be but we have to figure out if more will be.

Chris said also, and I'm hoping, Barbara and Claudia, he mentioned this, he's also looking at replicating the luncheon event that is similar to what he did for the CSG constituencies on-site in Marrakech and that's still

---

under development. That cost would [born] by ICANN. So, the good news is the BC's contribution financially would be to have our presence and provide any additional support for – we have at least one CROP applicant, maybe one more. So we would have members attending. Have our publications, etc. But the actual financial cost of sponsorship for the lunch would be [born] by Chris and Baher's budget, if we're able to do a lunch. Again, that's a CSG participatory lunch with invited attendees from the community on-site in Marrakech.

JIMSON OLUFUYTE:

Okay. Great. Thank you very much, Marilyn, for that update. Yes. That reminds me about our newsletter. You mentioned it in passing. Yes, the production of our next newsletter is on to have a short article that I think is relevant. Please send it to Chantelle and we'll be able to push it into next newsletter for the outreach. Thank you, Marilyn, on that.

Next is on CROP. You recall that the chair sent out expression of interest invitation to members to use CROP. That is Community Regional Outreach Program, CROP [facility], that is provided by ICANN. It used to be six before but it's been reduced by 50%, so we just have three CROP slots now. That is an average one per meeting, one per ICANN meeting.

So we got overall about ten requests to use CROP and also to use the remainder of our outreach funding for FY19 which also includes leadership development funding. So, as I said, ten applications came in and they were all [inaudible] by [ExCom]. So the three CROP slots were allocated but it's very likely that one of the CROP recipients will not be using it anymore, so we [inaudible] would like to put it out maybe

---

before it is sent again on the list that anyone interested in using the CROP to attend outreach in ICANN to please put in the application, please, to ExCom. Information will go out shortly. But we only have a window of today and tomorrow whoever is interested to put in their expression of interest so that all the necessary formalities can be concludes latest by Friday. So, that's on the CROP and the use of our outreach funding.

Well, before the end of today, you'll get information about [invoice] for FY20. You'll get notification about FY20 [invoices]. So, if you have not received it, please expect it. We're giving at least 60 days in advance so you can go through internal processes towards promptly settling that [invoice]. Okay, thank you for that.

Then, there is the budget for FY20 has been prepared and the finance committee is meeting tomorrow to do reviews and [inaudible]. So, there is something we are looking at. I don't know if a member has comments on it but the finance committee is thinking seriously about it and that is regards to marking the 20<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the BC. As you recall, BC was set up immediately after ICANN was established. This was [inaudible] in 1999, so BC will be 20 in FY20. We are targeting Montreal where we'll have an outreach event. Perhaps we can have also the opportunity to [inaudible] and invite other friends and constituencies and memorabilia. Maybe we could have a [inaudible] where the officers of BC, past officers, who can be noted and etc. So, just for you to have that in mind, even as the finance committee finalizes the budget for FY20.

---

Before the next call, surely you'll get a draft in your e-mail and then we can begin to look at it before Marrakech because it will be approved in Marrakech but expect it before the next BC meeting.

On this note, I don't know if there is any question. That will be it for me at this point. Thank you. Back to you, Claudia.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Thank you, Jimson. Is there any question or any item that members would like to raise? Hearing none, I think we can—

STEVE DELBIANCO: Just one thing. I noticed that Chris Wilson has joined the call and I thought I would give Chris an opportunity if he wishes—

CLAUDIA SELLI: Absolutely. Absolutely.

STEVE DELBIANCO: To update us on any late-breaking public news on the dot-amazon application.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Sure. Chris, the floor is yours.

CHRIS WILSON: Sure. Can people hear me?

STEVE DELBIANCO: We do.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Yes.

CHRIS WILSON: Great. Thanks, Steve. I'll just quickly say no new public news other than the board will be meeting beginning at the end of this week, over this weekend, per usual for its previously scheduled board meeting. Our understanding is that dot-amazon will be discussed at the board meeting but there have been no indications or promises that there will be an actual decision made at that meeting.

For those that are interested, there's a litany of correspondence on the ICANN correspondence page from the last couple of weeks, including filings and letters that we have sent to ICANN on this issue and we've taken the position that there is no realistic possibility for a neutral solution between the company and the eight countries and that we have submitted our proposed public interest commitment as a way – in the spirit of compromise, as a way to hopefully [inaudible] the concerns expressed by governments about this issue and would like the board to approve our applications with that public interest commitment attached.

So, all that information is public. It's on the ICANN correspondence page. We made the point again that the decision on this needs to be made soon, very soon. For those that may know, this has been pending

---

---

since 2012, since we first applied for dot-amazon, so it's long, long overdue and it's been almost two years since an IRP decision back in July 2017 that basically told the board that it needed to revisit its decision to deny applications and come up with an independent judgment as to why [our] application should not be approved.

So, a lot of time has passed. It's time for a decision and we're helpful that can be done soon. I will certainly keep people posted on developments. I think worst case, if the board decides this weekend that they don't want to make a decision and they decide to punt a decision to the deep future, shall we say, I think that's a problem and I think that will be a problem for not just us, obviously, but for the BC and others who care about accountability of ICANN and making tough decisions. So, more to come on that potentially as things develop. Happy to answer questions now or offline as well, of course.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Thank you, Chris. Are there any questions? I cannot see the chat.

SAJDA OUACHTOUKI: I don't have a question about what Chris is talking about for dot-amazon, but I just want to mention something related to the European Commission.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Sure.



---

SAJDA OUACHTOUKI:

The [inaudible] they put out regarding WHOIS. So, we've heard – I know there was a lot of concern about what it would mean for IP and everything else that we are interested in. We heard that the European Commission is actually going to put out a [re-statement] or some sort of clarification because they didn't actually intend to cause that type of confusion. Instead, what they were trying to say is that we should [inaudible] ICANN's purposes with third-party purposes but they still do think that IP consumer protection, etc., are things that should part of phase two of EPDP. So, in the next two weeks we should be seeing a statement from them to clarify their position.

CLAUDIA SELLI:

Thank you. Any other items that members want to share? If not, I think we can adjourn the call and we'll speak in two weeks' time. Thank you, everybody.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**