CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the BC Members Call on Wednesday, May 15, 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 name before speaking for the transcript and to keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to block out background noise. With this, I'd like to turn it over to Claudia to begin. Claudia, please go ahead.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Thank you very much, Chantelle, and thank you very much, everybody, for attending the call. Today we will start with the CSG liaison for Barbara, you will start and then we will go into the policy calendar. Thank you. Barbara, the floor is yours.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Barbara, I've got the policy calendar up for you under channel three. When you tell me, I'll scroll down to include the sessions for Marrakech.

BARBARA WANNER: Hi. Can everyone hear me?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yes, Barbara.

EN

BARBARA WANNER:	Okay, great. I'm sorry. We got a new phone system here which further complicates things. Okay, I'm ready to go, Steve, if you want to scroll down.
STEVE DELBIANCO:	It should be there right now, Barbara.
BARBARA WANNER:	Yeah. Okay, great. Thank you. Thank you, everybody, for your flexibility, allowing me to go first. I will be very brief. There really isn't too much more to update you on other than to report that it looks like, through Chantelle's efforts, we are securing a meeting room for the CSG open meeting on the 26th of June. We pushed it up a little earlier to give us a bit more time, so we begin at 8:30 and continue on to 10:15. We have requested that Göran, Cyrus, and Janis Karklins join us so we can talk further with them about EPDP phase two. That's about it right now.
	The unfortunate news about that time slot is that it appears to conflict with the CCWG Auction Proceeds meeting. I think Marilyn is the only CSG member participating in that working group. Please correct me if I'm wrong. We can always bring Marilyn up to date with what we talked about in the CSG open meeting. I would just say that if we press to have it rescheduled, we run the risk of the CSG open meeting conflicting with a high-level topic session or cross-community session that is of acute interest to us, very high-priority interest for us, such as the EPDP phase two session.

So, that's where things stand. Scheduling is just very, very tight for this meeting and I know everybody is doing the very best they can to make it work.

So, we will have another CSG ExCom call shortly and I'll continue to update everybody on details. That's my report, everybody. Thanks.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Barbara, I just scrolled up to the current list of high-interest topics and cross-community topics that are currently being debated. Is this something that CSG ExCom or members want to comment on?

BARBARA WANNER: I thought Claudia was going to cover that in her presentation and I don't want to preempt that. I think that all of the constituencies are being asked to prioritize their preference for which sessions they want to have and so forth.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Okay.

BARBARA WANNER: Yeah. I believe we have to send that in maybe even today or tomorrow. It's a very, very short turnaround.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Claudia, why don't we cover that right now? I'll turn it over to you. We have on the screen the current list of the sessions. It sounds as if we might have to boil it down to just four.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Indeed. In fact, various discussions across the different communities seems to boil down the different sessions to three or four in order to allow more time for the EPDP discussions. If members have strong feelings about certain high-interest topics, it would be good to discuss that now so that we can report back.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Claudia, I'll note that there's been some pushback from the registries on the idea of doing anything on EPDP at the next meeting because the idea is the EPDP is right in the middle of meeting and never really got going on phase two. So, it's not likely to be on there.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Indeed.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Watching the participants raising their hands, do we see anybody who wants to comment on this?

EN

CLAUDIA SELLI: Marie was suggesting the merging of EPDP [two and one.] I don't know if anyone else has comments? Steve, would you have a suggestion [inaudible]?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Marie, you are on the line. Please try to expand on what you were saying, Marie, in the chat.

MARIE PATTULLO: Sure, Steve. Can you hear me?

STEVE DELBIANCO: We do.

MARIE PATTULLO: Thank you. From what you were saying and from what's noted on this paper, if we have pushback about phase two being discussed at all, we would look reasonable and I'm standing by saying absolutely. We just roll that into the discussion of GDPR and EPDP phase one. Realistically we are going to mention phase two. That's got to happen. It's going to happen. But we could merge those two sessions into one, I think.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Claudia, I think Marie's really right, and that the way to do that is to make sure we have a person who's on the phase one panel and give them the opportunity to bring up phase two. But I don't think we'll get the rest of the SO/AC leaders to agree to merge them if we do it

explicitly. It would be better to just give up on phase two and move some things like combating domain abuse and move that over into the phase one session and then take advantage of the opportunity to get a panelist on there. That's a good idea, Marie.

CLAUDIA SELLI: That's a great suggestion.

BARBARA WANNER: Does anybody know – and has the effectiveness of specific review recommendations and their implementation, what does that focus on? It's not very clear. Does anybody know?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Specific reviews or things like the ATRT, the SSR review. Those are called the specific reviews. They're called for in the bylaws. And in some cases, their recommendations are not implemented. The most recent example was what they call the CCTRT, the Consumer Trust Competition and Consumer Choice Review, whose recommendations were, well, to a large extent, sort of parked by the board. That was a big topic at the last ICANN meeting. That's what driving that. It's really a timely topic and I think it's going to get approved.

BARBARA WANNER: Okay.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Claudia, do you have enough input to go there? And then we can move on.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Sure.

STEVE DELBIANCO: So, Claudia, with your permission, let's go to the top and do the policy calendar now, okay?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: No problem.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Please, go ahead, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Alright. Thanks, everyone. Since our last call, we've filed two comments. On the 7th of May, we filed a comment on the proposed renewal agreement for dot-asia. That's a sponsored registry agreement that has no price control. I owe a big thanks to Vivek Goyal for helping to draft all of the appropriate community interest sections there, including featuring our concerns about IDN (or Internationalized Domain Names) that serve markets like Asia and what dot-asia serves.

So think of it as a very strong BC comment, and in it we reiterated what we approved on info and org that we would like ICANN to pursue URS as

well as other RPMs (Rights Protection Mechanisms) and registrant protection commitments any chance it gets when it renews these agreements. And that was reflected there. Thank you, Vivek.

And then just yesterday we filed the comment on the dot-biz registry agreement renewal. It is almost identical to the [inaudible] we filed on dot-info and dot-org. So we continue to lock down a BC position to get those registry-registrant rights protections, and to keep ICANN out of the business of price regulation. So, thanks to all for helping me get those in. I'm looking for hands. Not seeing any, so let me move into the what's open.

We have two public comments that are open right now. The first is on how evolve ICANN's multi-stakeholder model. This comes out of strategic objective number two that came out of Cherine Chalaby's initiative for strategic objectives for the entity. And he believes that there are problems with the current multi-stakeholder model. It takes too long, right? It's not really as inclusive as it ought to be. There's a great difficulty of defining and reaching consensus. There seems to be a lack of trust, and my favorite, there's a lot of volunteer burnout. The BC commented on that and agreed. We went further to say that ICANN is developing a reputation for being combative, and slow, and less transparent, and we cite the EPDP as the latest, glaring example.

I want to thank Mason Cole, Marilyn Cade, Jimson, Mark D., and Zack for volunteering to draft. That comment closes on the 4th of June, so we have over two and a half weeks to get that done, with a seven-day review period for members. So, are there other members who would like to volunteer, or would the current drafters like to say anything at

this point? Boy, you really need a big screen to manage a Zoom session, don't you? Alright, I'm not seeing any, so I'll look forward to an update in two weeks, as well as a draft that you can all comment on.

The next item is, by the 15th of July, so quite a ways out, there's a process proposal from ICANN org to streamline the organizational reviews. Earlier, Barbara was asking about the specific reviews, like the CCTRT, the WHOIS SSR. The organizational reviews are different. They've been baked into ICANN's bylaws since day one. Every five years, ICANN hires an outside consulting firm to do an analysis of one of the organizations, an SO, an AC.

When those reviews are done, they come back with recommendations to the board on things to do to improve the effectiveness—and please mute when you're not speaking—that improve the effectiveness of one of those orgs. This is a very brief document. It's only five pages long. And the BC has commented on it before.

Barbara and I have done this work for the BC before. But this is a great opportunity for somebody to comment, to join us, and help on this. It's only a five-page doc. Our comment will be no more than a single page. Let's have a volunteer who hasn't participated recently, or hasn't participated at all, to help Barbara and I with this. I'm watching the chat and the participant list. We only need one. Waudo, are you volunteering to help?

WAUDO SIGANGA: Yes, unmuting. Yes, yes I'm volunteering to help on that one. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Waudo. Can always count on you.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Okay, the next section of the policy calendar is the background part on modifying WHOIS to comply with GDPR. In the bottom, in yellow, is the only thing I have on here that is new, and it is the notion of EPDP Phase 2. So, this is a great chance for Mark and Margie to talk about the current debate over how we organize that work, and this really troubling discussion about whether the data protection board would ever approve a unified access model. We have a call tomorrow morning. So, Mark and Margie, why don't you tee up where we are right now on the EPDP. Margie? Not hearing you.

MARGIE MILAM: Sure, I'll go ahead and jump in. Hi, everyone.

MARK SVANCAREK: Okay, yeah. Can you hear me too? I was having a little trouble. Go ahead, Margie.

STEVE DELBIANCO: We can hear you both. Thank you.

MARGIE MILAM:	Yeah, Mark why don't you go first?

MARK SVANCAREK: Okay. Well, we're still at a very early stage of the thing—still debating about whether we should have parallel tracks on any of the work. We saw some documentation come through the other day that changed some of the terminology around the words "disclosure" and "access," which was, at first, very annoying and somewhat alarming, and really seemed like it was result of side conversations between NCSG, and Yannis, and Marika. That's why it bothered me so much.

But we've decided to take the high road for the short term, and just simply say, "Look, we don't care what this is called. There's a thing we want to do—some sort of a mechanism for receiving non-public data that can be automated, and programmatically developed, so that humans don't have to be necessarily involved, and you can call it whatever you like."

So, yeah, so Steve's got his drawing up right now. On the left is the thing that we defined in Phase 1, which we called "disclosure." That was an accepted term at the time. And then, on the right, we have our standardized access model, where we used the term "access." But as you can see, you don't really have to use the word "access" here. That was a just a carryover from the original temp spec.

So we can settle upon any terminology that we want as we go forward. I do think that settling on some terminology's going to be very important.

The terminology that was proposed by org this last week, actually just confuses things from my perspective, because they use the term "access" to mean the ability of a data subject to—

STEVE DELBIANCO: Oh, brother!

MARK SVANCAREK: – see and modify their own data, which is not a bad term in GDPR land, but completely different from anything that anybody has ever used in EPDP. And then, they've defined the word "disclosure" as this process we show on the left of this diagram, but actually in GDPR land, disclosure means telling a data subject that there's been a breach. So, as you can see, our terminology situation is in bad shape, which doesn't help anybody. So…

STEVE DELBIANCO: Mark?

MARK SVANCAREK: Yeah.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Mark, if I could ask on that, I am suspecting from the dialogue that the registrars in NCSG are trying to kill the right-hand side of the diagram. It's not just changing the terminology. They seem to be saying that we're only gonna have to live forever with what's on the left, because

they say there's no legal basis to ever do the right, and remove risks to the contract parties.

MARK SVANCAREK: No, that's right. So, I'm going on and on about the terminology, but clearly the point of changing the terminology is to confuse the process that could, perhaps, develop the righthand side of the diagram. So yeah, I think there are elements within the contracted parties that are opposed to it for whatever reason. Either they think it won't be needed, or it will be too expensive, or that it will either not reduce their exposure, or will make it worse. I mean, I think that's sort of a Volker position, is that everything makes it worse. And then, of course, the NCSG, for their 10 reasons that they have, collectively.

So, that's where that situation is. We are starting to meet tomorrow. The meeting tomorrow, I think, is going to focus—and Margie can clarify this—is going to focus on the latest legal opinions from Bird & Bird. Bird & Bird is the legal organization that has been hired to serve both ICANN, related to the EPDP, and the EPDP stakeholder group itself, which a strange sort of contradictory double role. But they have produced a lot of interesting and useful legal opinions, and so there's a number of them that we should be discussing tomorrow.

I think the most interesting of them, really, is the one on territorial scope, which was a gambit put forward, saying that if we can demonstrate that ICANN is an international organization, for whom GDPR applies, then it doesn't matter where a registrar sits, or which customers they address—that all registration data would be protected

under GDPR. So, as you recall, we've always had a legal and natural person distinction that we've fought for, and a geographic distinction that we've fought for. This is an attempt to shut down that latter one. So, there are five or six topics that we'll be discussing tomorrow on the legal front. I think that's the one to really pay attention to, because that's the game changer. What else, Margie?

MARGIE MILAM: Thanks, Mark. Maybe I can give a higher-level description of what's been going on, for those that aren't in the details. As you guys will know –

MARK SVANCAREK: Sorry, I live down in the details. This is my part.

MARGIE MILAM: Yeah, and that's great. I totally understand all those issues we're gonna talk about. But just from the BC perspective, since Kobe—remember, we had a public comment period. We had comments filed, but the interesting thing that happened since Kobe are these communications with the European Commission. The first one was a public comment, and then the second one was received a few weeks ago, clarifying their position.

And the interesting thing is that it actually puts doubt into whether purpose two, which is the purpose that we would all be relying on for cybersecurity and intellectual property purposes—whether that's properly worded in the Phase 1 final report. And the reason that's

relevant is that the board still, to my knowledge, hasn't approved the final report—the policy from Phase 1. I believe they probably have to do it this week, because of the expiration of the temp spec. So, we're really at the closing few days before the board acts.

But the real question is, what will the board do with purpose two, because purpose two, as the European Commission clarified, isn't worded properly. It conflates the ICANN purpose with the purpose that relates to third-party access. So, that's the interesting thing that I think everyone should focus on. And that's what, as we go into Phase 2, it raises a lot of questions. And the reason why I raise with following up on Mark's comments is that the legal analysis, theoretically, should be updated, to take into the clarifications we received from the European Commission, because the European Commission raised a lot of things that the BC has been saying all along.

There are many purposes that apply beyond the legitimate purpose under GDPR. For example, the European Commission recognized that that the issuance of the WHOIS system is in the public interest. There's a public interest exception under GDPR, which we were never able to explore in Phase 1. They also mentioned the performance of contracts. So, there's other things that we've been saying along.

This is what led to a very narrow and conservative view of what that policy should be, because we didn't have a lot of clarity on the legal issues. Well, now that we have clarity from the European Commission, it opens the conversation as to, should we revisit some of the things that happened in Phase 1? So, those are some of the dynamics that we'll probably talk about, tomorrow in particular, and over the next few

weeks. I think the BC should be looking at what happens with the board vote, because the board vote is coming any day now, and it'll be very interesting to see what they do.

MARK SVANCAREK: Yeah, I would say that those Commission communications were generally favorable to us. I mean, there was a little bit there, particularly in the first one. In the first one, there was something for everybody, I think. But the second one that was provoked by Göran request for clarification, I think that was really strongly in favor of some of our arguments. I don't know. Do you agree, Margie?

MARGIE MILAM: Oh, absolutely!

MARK SVANCAREK: I thought so, too.

MARGIE MILAM: Right, and a couple other themes from that letter is that it really emphasizes the need to move quickly—very quickly—and to create a unified access model. It uses the word access, because the European Commission believe that that's very important for the internet ecosystem. And so it'll be interesting to see how the group actually tries to factor in some of those themes, but I was very pleased with the second letter.

STEVE DELBIANCO: We have a question from Alex Deacon. Go ahead, Alex.

ALEX DEACON: Yeah, thanks Steve. Yeah, it's Alex. I just wanted to comment on the earlier point that Mark made, that there are some NCSG and even contracted parties who want to avoid getting to the right side of your diagram, Steve. While I agree with that, I think there are several large and influential contracted parties who understand the need for scalability and automation. So, there are a subset of contracted parties who actually support some sort of unified access model to be defined, obviously.

So, I don't think we should be too, too worried that the smaller contracted parties, or NCSG folks who are against a unified access model, have much traction there. I think we do have similar positions to some of the larger contracted parties, which I think is helpful in moving the discussion along to a model that can be automated—can leverage, perhaps, the TSG framework that was defined, and the like. Thanks.

MARK SVANCAREK: Yeah. Alex has got it right, and I'm sorry that wasn't clear from when I said the NCSG and elements of the contracted parties, because there are other elements of the contracted parties who see the need to move ahead, and actually solve this problem at scale, as opposed to dragging their feet, or creating a lot of misdirection, and doubt, and delay.

EN

STEVE DELBIANCO: Mark and Margie, thanks again for carrying all of our water on this EPDP. And it begins again in earnest tomorrow morning. We're gonna move on now to channel two, which is Council. So, Scott and Marie are our councilors. I've scrolled up in your screens to the beginning of that session. We'd already covered what happened on their last call, the 18th of April, so why don't we go directly the Council meeting that is happening tomorrow, where I've got several highlights in here, and let Scott and Marie talk us through it. Go ahead.

SCOTT MCCORMICK: Thanks, Steve. Yeah, so we'll start off with number four. Obviously, there's some discussion around the IGO-INGO curative rights issues. Marie sent out an e-mail on the 8th, so open for comments on that until tomorrow. So, if there are any, we can discuss it here, or we can take them via e-mail.

Let's see, the IRTP, we'll be discussing that, the status report, and where that is going. Item six is discussion around the GDPR. Obviously, Mark and Margie, we were just discussing that, so obviously that plays into Phase 2. Let's see here. Item seven, the IRP Standing Panel—still some discussion around that. There is questions, and there's the link in the e-mail, for those that are on phones. We would love to submit some responses to that, so any volunteers that would like to come forward and help draft some of those would be great.

Item eight is the Customer Standing Committee for the non-registered GNSO liaison. That's gonna be discussed tomorrow at Council. And then, number nine is the evolution of the multi-stakeholder governance model. So, those are the big topics for tomorrow. I don't believe there's

STEVE DELBIANCO: any votes tomorrow, so it's all discussion. Let's see here. Moving on down the road, here—

STEVE DELBIANCO: Jay's got a question. Jay, go ahead.

JAY CHAPMAN: Hi, can you hear me?

MARK SVANCAREK: Yep.

JAY CHAPMAN: Okay, hi. This is Jay Chapman of Digimedia. If I could just refer back to item four, I just noticed that, in the e-mails, that the proposal is for a subgroup to be created within the RPM Working Group, and that members of that subgroup—the proposal is that those would be appointed. I was actually a member of the IGO-INGO Working Group, and was on there for the entire four years.

Just wondering if there's a possibility that those of us who were previous members of the—or, I guess we still are, because that group hasn't been officially closed—could be added as members of this subgroup, and not have to go through the whole appointment process, given that we've already had four years of experience and exposure to the matters and the issues involved. Thanks.

SCOTT MCCORMICK: Yeah, I wasn't familiar with what happened previously. I don't know. Marie, do you have any input on that?

MARIE PATTULLO: Sure, Scott, and thanks for the question, Jay. Firstly, you're right. It's gonna be a subgroup. Thank you. Really, anybody who got through that entire IGO-INGO mess, well done. Well done for still being there four years later. The idea, of course, is to try and firm it up, and move it forward. So, they're working, as you've in the papers we've sent round, more or less in the EPDP model, so it wouldn't be as massive, as huge. It won't be open to everybody. You don't have to be a member of the RPM Working Group. That much is clear. It's still not clear how many people will be coming forward from every constituency, every stakeholder group.

As to whether we can—choose your words—get around the appointment, that's something that the BC would have to decide, on who they want to put forward. But, as you've seen in the draft that we're gonna be discussing tomorrow, which, as Scott pointed out, isn't for a vote. It's just for discussion. There's no bar, if you like, on you must be a member of the RPM group, or you cannot be a member of this. That's not the question. Thanks, thanks.

JAY CHAPMAN: Okay, well thanks, Marie. So, then, I would just like to put forward my name a volunteer, to be appointed on behalf of the BC for that subgroup. Thanks.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Jay. Marie, you'll take care of that, and Scott. Any other questions for Scott and Marie? Okay, fantastic. We'll move on, now, to other element of GNSO Council. We've already covered the Commercial Stakeholders Group. So, I think that's it for the policy calendar. And Claudia, back to you.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Thank you, Steve. As far as I am concerned, we already discussed the different interest topics. The other thing that we will need some input on is the final block schedule that we would either need to consent to, or eventually, to say that we would disagree, and we don't support the block schedule. I will forward it the members, and you can let me know if you have any concerns, that I can go back to Tanzanica and let her know what the BC thinks. That's it from my end.

Also, one last point, we're working to see whether we can secure the BC Closed Meeting in Marrakech. We will update you on that as soon as possible, and as soon as we have confirmation. I will leave the floor to Jimson, unless there are questions or comments. I don't see any, so Jimson, why don't you go forward.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Okay. Thank you very much, Claudia. Well, let me begin with the election update. The GNSO Council and NomCom elections process is still ongoing. And yes, we are at the nomination period, between 6th of May and the 28th of May. So, the floor is still open for nomination, and for the secondment of nominations, and what have you.

The period for the candidate statement is still 28th of May, and by the 29th of May, on Wednesday, we look forward to having the candidate call—that will be recorded, of course—followed by the confidential electronic voting on candidates on 30th. That's the following day, lasting for a week period. And by June 7th, the results will be announced. Well, conducting the election is still our secretariat, Chantelle, and I want to thank Chantelle for following up effectively in this regard.

Next is our new member. We have a new member, and that is Contemporary Consulting, Limited. That happens to be my firm, so I'll be leading that organization in the BC. [inaudible] had been the lead for the Africa ICT Alliance, which a number of other ICT leaders in Africa established in 2012. And going forward, to lead AfICTA in the BC, will be co-founder [of] AfICTA. That's Waudo. Waudo will be leading AfICTA going forward. This follows a decision by AfICTA leadership in this regard. So, Waudo, welcome to your new role as a lead for AfICTA in the BC.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Thank you. Thank you, Jimson. I look forward to working with the BECAUSE and bringing AfICTA viewpoints to most of the discussions. I don't know if they are going to mention it, but I'll also be assisted by Yusuph Kileo, who is also a member of AfICTA. So, we shall be, the two of us, working on BC. Thank you.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Okay, thank you very much, Waudo. Next is on the ICANN 65 outreach, and CROP. Yes, we are utilizing the three CROPS. They are the three ICANN CROP provisions for BC.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Jimson?

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Hello?

CLAUDIA SELLI: Sorry, I think—yeah, I'm seeing in the chat that Chantelle says that Jay has a hand up. I don't know if it's an old hand, or if Jay wants to say something.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Okay.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Just checking.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Jay, is that an old hand? Okay.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Yes, it's an old hand, so you can keep on. Sorry.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Okay, thank you. Next is on the ICANN 65 for outreach update and CROP. Yes, we are utilizing the three CROP slots for the BC, which is good. One will be used to attend the African Internet Summit in June, and [Lawrence], and the other two be utilized by a member, [Mahmud], and Roger.

So, the outreach chair—that is Marilyn—is still consulting and working with the Global Business Engagement lead. That is Chris Mondini, who has always collaborated with us through putting up effective outreach in Marrakech. I don't know if Marilyn is online. Marilyn, are you online? Can provide you provide some updates, if you are?

MARILYN CADE: I am here.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Okay, great. Please go ahead.

MARILYN CADE: Thank you. Well, first of all, I just want to thank [Lawrence], and Roger, and [Mahmud] for stepping up to taking our CROP seats, because it's really important that we use all three of the CROP slots before the end of June.

And just to elaborate, just for a moment here, [Lawrence] will be attending, for the second time, the annual meeting of the RIR in Africa.

It is called the African Internet Summit. And while it is attended primarily by the technical community, it also has access to many of the small businesses who do participate, and has very strong support from ICANN itself, of course, as the African RIR is a very significant player in the internet ecosystem there. So, [Lawrence] will be participating there, with both a booth and a speaking role, and distributing our materials. And some may remember that there's a very excellent report that he did from the last time that he participated.

[Mahmud] and Roger will be participating on site, in the various opportunities for engagement, at ICANN65. And in addition, [Mahmud], and Chris, and Baher Esmat, who is the sub-regional VP for MENA countries, which is the North African and MENA states, are still trying to organize a small event on Friday afternoon in Casablanca. That is very much progress under development.

It's not easy, since we would have to attend on the Friday afternoon, and of course there's nothing going on from ICANN on Saturday, so that would mean a bit of stretch, in terms of going to Casablanca, and then either staying over, or coming in early to Marrakesh. However, there's a very good presence of US companies that have presence in Casablanca, and we are very much trying to work on that with [Mahmud's] help, and with Chris's help.

On site, during ICANN65, Chris is collaborating—and I don't know if Barbara's still on the call, but would welcome any of her comments. Chris is still collaborating with the three constituencies of the CSG toward a lunch, which we hope would be on Tuesday, that would attract individuals from the fellows who are qualified as business, but also all

who are registered and identified ahead of time as being with business, that we would then invite individually, with Chris's help, to attend.

The topic that would be addressed would be focused on what's of most interest in that region, which include IDNs, of course, the data access issue, particularly the issue for effective access for law enforcement and for trademark protection, which are high priorities in that part of the region, as well as, then, just a mini invitation to attend the rest of the meetings of the three CSG entities. And if anybody's particularly interested—I have heard from Microsoft, but if anyone else is particularly interested in collaborating on this, please just send an email, and we'll add you in to the planning.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Okay, thank you, Marilyn. Do not know if there is any questions for Marilyn. Well, in prep for the outreach, a newsletter is ready, and it will be released at the appropriate time for outreach purposes. Okay, seeing no question, I will move to the next item. The is the draft of BC FY20 budget. Well, I sent a draft—a summary. I communicated with you all, some few hours back, with regard to the draft BC FY20 budget, and that was with an excerpt of the summary.

The full detail is being provided, which is around 33 pages. The idea is for it to be our annual report, so to speak, wherein we can capture most details about the operational scope of the BC. And I want to use the opportunity to appreciate the Finance Committee for the collaboration, and for my colleagues in ExCom, for the support—for making sure we

could come up with this proposal. Of course, not leaving out every one of you, including Chantelle.

Well, the detail is in the summary. If you could make effort to go through the summary, that will enable you to capture a lot of the discussion points. But at the same time, we are looking for details, like the members we had. The full membership list is there, and those that have resigned. We have some members that resigned. So far, about nine members resigned, while we gained eight members. We are still in FY19 till June 30th. That means that we could still receive new member. Or yes, the Credential Committee, they'll process some membership, and we hope that you will respond before then.

So, in summary, a budget of about $77,900 has been proposed for FY20, which is about 62% higher than FY19 expenditure, of [about] $48,000. Well, we're looking at commemorating BC Year 20 this year, during the ICANN66 in Montréal. And that will enable us to reach out to other sectors in North America, that has not been actively engaged in the BC. And we also factored in the Latin American study—how to improve engagement—and some of the recommendation, like a multilingual website for the BC will be effected in FY20.

With regard to our legal standing, we continue to build a legal structure. [Sorry] that right now, we have received a communication from the IRS, and that communication is also attached to the documents so that members can see progress. And in all, we are looking at a draw down of our budgets, from what we had, about $150,000 in FY18, to say, around $100,00 by FY21. The whole idea is that, as a not-for-profit organization,

we need to have the standard reserve, such that our reserve should be able to match 24 months of expenditure.

So, our annual expenditure around $41,000—or our annual income, rather, is about $41,000. So, if we're looking at the standard reserve, we should be looking at $82,000. So, but we're still in—we need a range of $94,000. So, I want to encourage you to at least go through this executive summary. With that, you can see what ExCom has been projecting, and what we've been trying to arrive at as an organization. But our organization, the BC, is a recognized legal entity by IRS, and we are engaging our legal counsel, and our accountant is a CPA, so that he can effectively do the proper filing.

Finally, if anyone has an issue with regard to invoicing, please feel free to communicate. Yes, we've been receiving some communication, and it's being addressed accordingly. So, on this note, I don't know if there is any question or topic for clarification. And also, as information, the ExCom will be approving this by ICANN65. That is Marrakech. That is also in the email, as well. They have communicated.

But before then, it's still subject to update, because it's possible that we can have new member come in, so with that, the figures will have the change. Or maybe there is an important expenditure that ExCom approves, that will have to be factored in. Thank you. So, Claudia, back to you.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Thank you, Jimson. I don't know if any member has something to raise under AOB. If there are no questions or comments, then I would resume

EN

the call, and we will speak in two weeks' time. Thank you very much, everybody, for participating.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]