CHANTELLE DOERKSEN:	Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the BC Membership call and Candidates Discussion call on Wednesday, May 29, 2019. In the interest of time, attendance will be taken via the Zoom room. I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for the transcript and to keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid background nose. With this, I'd like to turn it over to our chair, Claudia, to begin. Claudia, please go ahead.
CLAUDIA SELLI:	Thank you very much, Chantelle, and thank you very much, everybody, for participating to the call. In the interest of time, I suggest that we start with the election candidate discussion for the GNSO councilor and NomCom seat. Chantelle, over to you.
CHANTELLE DOERKSEN:	Thank you very much, Claudia. BC members, I would like to advise you that we have sent the candidate statements moments ago in a consolidated PDF form. For easy reference, please review this if you have any questions regarding the candidates themselves. One moment. My apologies.
	The statement of the BC Members Call for [leadership] discussion with the GNSO and Nominating Committee candidates. I would like to advise BC members that both the nominators and the nominees qualify

---

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.

according to the BC charter rules as paid members of the BC and all nominations are there [for valid].

Nominations for the roles of GNSO councilor and Nominating Committee representatives were received. [inaudible] nominations were submitted on the BC private email lister and were acknowledged by the vice chair of Finance and Operations, myself as the voting officer, and my colleague Ria Otanes as the verifying officer.

The candidates were contacted and accepted the nomination. Today's candidate discussion will allow a question and answer session with the candidates themselves. I will serve as the moderator for this portion of the call and [inaudible] with the candidates. For transparency purposes, please note that the nominees are as follows.

Standing for the BC's GNSO councilor role, we have one candidate – Marie Pattullo. Marie was first nominated by Andrew Mack and first seconded by Tim Smith.

For the Nominating Committee large business seat, we have candidates – Paul Mitchell. Paul was first nominated by [Gabrielle] [inaudible] and first seconded by Lawrence Olawale-Roberts.

For the Nominating Committee small business seat, we have one candidate – Lawrence Olawale-Roberts. Lawrence was first nominated by [inaudible] and first seconded by Mark Datysgeld.

Candidates will be allotted time for questions in alphabetical order by last name, which is Paul Mitchell, Lawrence Olawale-Roberts, and Marie Pattullo.

For today's call, I will open the floor to the candidates themselves – Paul, Lawrence, and Marie – to see if there is anything they would like to add at this time. Then we will open it up to questions from BC members.

BC members participating on the call may submit questions for candidates [inaudible] chat. I will run the question and answer session as the moderator for this portion of the call. Candidates may choose to respond to the questions on the call or in writing to the BC private list.

As a reminder, this portion of the call is limited to 25 minutes. Ballots for the election will be sent on Thursday, the 30th of May 2019 at [inaudible] UTC opening the voting period, which will then close on Thursday June 6th 2019 at 23:59. Only paid members and primary contacts for the BC Member Organization will receive a ballot, unless formally advised to myself as the voting officer before the opening of the vote. Any proxy assignments are needed by today, close of business.

Votes will be counted by the voting and verifying officers on Thursday June 6, 2019 and the results of the election will be announced on Friday, June 7, 2019.

With this, I would like to open the floor to our candidates, and looking at the Zoom room, I do not see Paul on the call.

PAUL MITCHELL: I'm here.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Paul, you're here. Okay. Thank you. I would like to turn the floor over to you for any initial comments you'd like to make. Paul, the floor is yours.

PAUL MITCHELL: Okay. Well, thank you for the nomination. I'm enjoying my time on the current NomCom and appreciate the trust that's been placed in me in order to carry out that assignment should you decide to return me for a second term on the assignment. I will continue to do my [debts] to get a great outcome for the organization as a whole. I'm happy to answer any questions that you have about my thoughts on the process and whatnot. Otherwise, I think we could make this expeditious. And I'll stop talking.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Thank you very much, Paul. Lawrence, are you on the call and can you hear me? I will work with [Ria] to try and reach Lawrence remotely via the phone bridge. Marie, are you on the call and would you like to say any initial statements or words?

MARIE PATTULLO: Yeah. I'm here. Can you hear me?

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Yes, we can.

MARIE PATTULLO: Thank you. Sorry, I've got connection issues. I just put it in chat. I sound like I'm in a submarine, so hopefully you can hear me [inaudible] can hear you.

I have been on the council now for coming up to a year-and-a-half. I have to admit it's been incredibly interesting, and most of the interest has been actually watching the dynamic, understanding a bit more about the personalities behind the policies and also of course trying to put through everything that you guys want us to put through for you. After all, that is our job. I'm very happy to answer any questions that you have. Thanks.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Thank you very much, Marie. Ria is trying to reach Lawrence on his phone right now. Are there any initial questions that BC members have for either Paul or Marie?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Chantelle, I put a question for Paul into the chat.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Thank you, Steve. One moment. I'm still learning how to facilitate this with Zoom. Please, Paul, go ahead.

PAUL MITCHELL: Okay. The question is can I tell you more about the 55,000 domains that Microsoft manages today, purposes, examples, challenges, etc.

Interesting. So, Microsoft is a global cloud provider, among other things. We have domains that we manage just for our own brand, Microsoft.com, etc., and everything that runs off of that. This includes sites that are limited in distribution and sites that are wide open to the world that are localized in many languages around the world. So, there's the marketing sites, the technical sites. For example, MSDN and all of that. Then there's a whole network of things that we operate on behalf of our cloud services, so Azure and our Azure customers. Some of these are, again, relegated to private purposes but many of them are things that you could find if you looked for them.

Obviously, the challenge that we face is the scale is large and growing, and it's ever-changing in terms of what the needs are. Cloud in particular is growing at an exponential pace and the need to do more and more localization or internationalization which is something that we're fully behind, it takes a collection of resources.

Then, there's a question about domains held just to defend them. We do have some defensive portfolio approaches, but in general, we are not going down the extortion game for sites. But we have paid for a few like Microsoftsucks and things like that to keep them clear. But we do have a substantial operation related to threat detection for our customers as well as for ourselves that involves doing a lot of research into domain ownership and the chain of badness that happens when bad actors get going with branded sites or attempts to be fraud and phish and a wide range of things. Our digital crimes unit is focused on that end [inaudible] organization we call Mystic which is [inaudible] and the threat and intelligence center internally. Those guys are connected

to law enforcement agencies all around the world. Most of that, we don't …

We talk publicly about the fact that we have programs for it. We don't talk too much about specifics of bad actors until we've actually done something substantial. You've probably read about some of the larger ones like [inaudible] that Microsoft has been involved in.

Then we have an offering right now, based on the security side, that is about protecting or attempting to protect the integrity of the electoral process and candidates around the world in terms of trying to combat manipulation. That has been around and certainly in the news for the last couple of years.

So, there's a lot. If you guys are all interested, I suppose we would be willing to put together a little webinar on what we do up to a certain point for members of the BC. [inaudible] the domains team actually do that at some point in the future if there's interest.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Paul, another question for you quickly. Considering the need for NomCom to get the skillsets required by ICANN for those that should come up on the board of ICANN, do you have enough application? Do you have enough expression of interest to be able to make some appropriate skillsets-based selection to the ICANN board? Thank you.

PAUL MITCHELL: Yes. The answer is assuredly yes. We have had an abundance of interested parties that are – many of them are very, very qualified in a

number of areas. It is a difficult task to return a small number of people for the available slots that the NomCom is chartered with filling out of the number of highly skilled candidates that we have.

We do have a diversity of geography and in background and skillsets and I'm quite confident that there will be good results of the completion of the process here.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Thank you very much, Paul. Steve, do you have any follow-up questions.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Not for me, thank you.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Thank you. So, we have four questions in the queue and Lawrence has just joined. Before we continue with the questions, I'd like to give Lawrence the opportunity to say a few words. Lawrence, the floor is yours.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Good day, everybody. My apologies for joining late. I had to rush out of another engagement to be able to meet with this. My name is Lawrence. I'm a member of the Business Constituency through my company, MicroBoss. Thank you, all, for allowing me to represent the small businesses over this current year.

My work within the NomCom has been what I will call quite rewarding and revealing. It's been a good opportunity to, first of all, join in the outreach efforts of the NomCom towards seeing that more companies, big, small get interested into the different leadership positions within ICANN. And aside from the opportunity for outreach that this opportunity has given, I have also been able to participate actively towards the process that will lead to having some very credible individuals step into leadership positions going forward. This wouldn't have been possible if the BC did not allow me to do this, so I'm very grateful.

The work of the NomCom has been quite enormous but it's not been daunting. There's been a very cordial relationship and it's made the work progress actively. I've also been able to leverage on the strong BC representation that we have on the NomCom. Today the BC is a very strong force to say, because [inaudible] and that of Paul which is for the large businesses. We also have two BC members. We've also consistently had two BC members in leadership. [Zahid Jamil] and [inaudible] recently joined the leadership also while [Shelly] stepped down.

All in all, I see this opportunity as one that will lead to continuity, continue the good work that we've been doing and hoping that, at the end of it, not only the BC but business interests will definitely be taken [inaudible] across the [inaudible]. Thank you.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Thank you very much, Lawrence. We have roughly ten minutes left for this portion of the call and we have four questions. With that, I will read the questions in the order received, and if we run out of time, the questions will be responded to by the candidates on the BC private list.

The first question is from Mark and the question reads: "Candidates, would you mind sharing your vision on how to better position the BC going forward in order for us to better achieve our goal? What are the priorities?" Paul, Lawrence, Marie, if you could kindly limit your response to one or two minutes. The floor is yours.

PAUL MITCHELL: Sure. I guess, from my perspective, the challenge of the BC is it's not necessarily always clear what its agenda is because of the diversity of membership within the BC and there is perhaps a question around the BC – which issues the BC should focus on. Sometimes, the BC comes across as it's focusing on everything and that may not be as helpful as it could be if there was perhaps a perception of more focus. That [inaudible] would be one clear item to think through.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Thank you, Paul. Lawrence?

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Yes. With regards to that, I had touched earlier on as it currently stands, the BC in relation to the Nominating Committee right now, the BC is [inaudible] in the sense that we have about out of close to 20 membership, we have about [four] from other [business constituency]. I

believe this is strategic and whatever has been done internally to ensure that within the leadership and the members of the Nominating Committee, we have strong representation should definitely be continued. It's not … I don't believe it's accidental that at this point we have two members in leadership. It's strategic. And I think that particular strategy is something that should be worked on to at least ensure that, going forward, we have [inaudible] representation going forward.

Looking at the vision of the BC, the BC has always been very deliberate in its activities. It's not another vision that leads things to [chance]. I would say that the vision of the BC is great and we should concentrate more or continue to concentrate more on the [inaudible]. The thing is that the goals that we have. That's just my [add]. Thank you.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Thank you very much, Lawrence. Marie, please go ahead.

MARIE PATTULLO: Thanks, Chantelle, and thanks to Mark for the question. To better position ourselves, I think we continue to do what we do but do it better by leveraging the amount of diversity that we have. I'm talking about membership coming from different parts of business, different parts of the world.

The differentiation that I would try to put forward, [Ria] will try to put forward, is that BC uses the Internet for its business as opposed to the Internet being its business. It's pretty important to all of us that we

clearly stand up to our colleagues on the contracted party site. Their voice naturally tends to be louder while our voice can be clear and transparent and repeat the same thing that we say everywhere no matter where we are, which I always think is the best way forward.

Mark, on your point about what are the priorities, to me – and this is personal – I would say the first one is what I just said about being not the counter-voice but we [comparatively] to the CPH. I would also say that we need to fix the problems that went wrong in the last round before they open the new round, and that includes of course all of the PDPs around that. And this might surprise you. We need legitimate access to certain data. Apart from that, the priorities are pretty much whatever comes onto the table of business [inaudible] by ICANN. Thank you.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Thank you very much, Marie. The next question is from Marilyn and there are three parts to this question. Question one is: "In the past, the NomCom has seemed to focus on volume rather than quality and seniority of candidates. [Has this been true?]." And then the second part of the question is: "Are you satisfied with the ICANN support from external sources in both recruitment and also in review and screening of potential candidates?" Part three is, "In your opinion, are the non-board seats receiving sufficient attention?" This question is for the NomCom reps. Paul and Lawrence, the floor is yours.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: So, if I may jump in, with regards [inaudible] maybe by the time [inaudible] with the first question again. But to the second and the third question, yes, the NomCom is receiving a lot of support from ICANN with regards to the process for selecting candidates, aside from having to secure the services of recruiting firms to look for candidates globally. This [presents] NomCom. There has also been another firm secured to look for candidates from the regions that really need to have some stronger representation on the board. That's focused on Africa, on Asia-Pacific, and the LAC region. Aside from that, we've had tremendous staff support. Without the staff support, the work would definitely had been very daunting. But staff has helped a lot.

To the third question, the non-board seats also are receiving very, I would say, the kind of attention that has been given to the board. I'll start with ICANN board and for the PTI board. The ALAC, the ccNSO, the GNSO, all the non-contracted and contracted parties [inaudible] candidates for the non-contracted and contracted party houses are receiving as much attention. The [interviews] have been scheduled. The candidates [inaudible]. While we will be having face-to-face interviews or the board, we also are going to be having interviews for the candidates for the number of seats. Like I said, I didn't quite get the first question, but maybe [inaudible].

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Thank you, Lawrence. Paul, please go ahead.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Well, maybe you can say the first question again.

EN

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Sure. Question one: "In the past, the NomCom has seemed to focus on volume rather than the quality and seniority of candidates. In your opinion, has this improved?"

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Every candidate [inaudible] are given equal opportunities. The same process has been used across the board. This is deliberately done so as not to favor maybe those who are more ICANN [inaudible] than the independent candidates, so to say. So, presently, that the process that the NomCom has adopted is one that gives everybody the same equal opportunities. We tend to want to listen more to those who don't have any background around ICANN because knowing fully that we want to get the right kinds of skill sets or looking out for the right kind of skill sets. But even with that, everyone is given equal opportunity. So, it's not about volume. It's about quality and showing that from the pool that we have, we are able to pick out the best candidates.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Thank you, Lawrence. Paul, would you like to add anything?

PAUL MITCHELL: Yeah. I would just say – and I tried to interject a couple of times. But generally I'm in agreement with what Lawrence has just said on all three questions.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Okay. Thank you, Paul. The next question is from Barbara and the question is for Marie. I will also post it into the chat so everyone can see who has just joined. Barbara's question: "Marie, I believe the GNSO has a special working group that is focused on reviving and revamping the PDP process. Has this been put on hold due to the EPDP? Do you think efforts to improve the PDP process will address problems we have seen in some PDPs and will the process become paralyzed or captured by a particular SO and AC?"

MARIE PATTULLO: Thanks, Chantelle, and thanks, Barbara. No, it hasn't been put on hold. Yes, the council does have a small group. It's got a great name. It's called PDP 3.0 and we met yesterday. We normally meet every two weeks. There are 11 different improvements that we're working on. You guys have already seen this. We sent them around some months ago. Very happy to do it again. But there are obvious things such as this is a statement of participation Now, we took that [inaudible] EPDP experience and what we're trying to do with that is ensure that people realize they have to behave themselves. They have to behave decently They have to come to the table realizing they're going to have to not [inaudible] some kind of compromise. And yes, the standards of behavior do apply to you, too. And many of you will know I'm referring to a specific case there which [inaudible] said they didn't.

We've got other things, Barbara. Things like drafting up a chair checklist so they know what's expected of them. Working, obviously, with former chairs or current chairs to draft that up. We're looking at the different kinds of working groups. We don't always need a full PDP with the

world, their dog, their best friend, and their next door neighbor. Sometimes we want to go to a representative group on the different SOs [inaudible], somebody who actually knows what they're talking about.

So, all of this. I'm more than happy to share lots of documents with you about all of this. We've got a full [inaudible] as well. If anybody wants that, including you, of course, Barbara, just let me know and I'll send it through. Thanks.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Thank you, Marie. Our final question is from Waudo to the NomCom candidates. Again, I will post this question into the chat. "Using your one-year experience so far, what advice would you give to get more participation in ICANN leadership positions from businesses in the developing world?" Paul and Lawrence, the floor is yours.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: I don't know if Paul wants to take a stab first.

PAUL MITCHELL: Sure. I will go. I'll try first. I think the challenge is – there are several challenges. Maybe the most important is making it easy to participate from wherever one actually is. And we've had challenges even within the NomCom where some of our members have been unable to participate as effectively in the intersessional due to connectivity and other issues. Largely, [ICANN] can't fix the world's connectivity infrastructure, but there are improvements that can be made in

facilitating participation, making materials available, streamlining [inaudible]

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Paul, your line is breaking up .Can you hear us?

PAUL MITCHELL: So there I was just demonstrating the connectivity challenges because I changed devices and left my house. Sorry about that. So I think that ICANN can do a better job of facilitating and making materials accessible, certainly making it easier to navigate the myriad of ICANN-related sites that are necessary to go through to find documents, and sort of, again, really focusing on improving process and making sure that that documentation of process actually matches the reality, which that's always a work in progress.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: And to ride on what Paul has just said, which is very key, I would want to stress continuous engagement. The positions that NomCom have to fill definitely are limited. Out of the large pool of board directors, there's just a certain number of ICANN board members that can be filled from year to year, and it's the same scenario with the council positions and all that. So the NomCom definitely always has a large pool of very qualified, resourceful candidates, but have to pick in some cases just one for an open position.

So in terms of continuous participation in ICANN, especially with regards to leadership positions. I'll say if anyone puts in an application and isn't

selected, it doesn't mean that that person is less qualified or not qualified at all. It just means that there's a lot – I mean we have so many qualified candidates slugging for the same position, so such candidates shouldn't feel discouraged or feel underrated. All you just need to do is to continue.

For some of us, there could also be a [inaudible] could have an opportunity to step into leadership position from our constituency or from [inaudible] but the key fact is that because of the limited number of candidates that can come in through the NomCom pool, the key is to continue to try. If you don't make it this year, please put in an application next year if you applied and you feel qualified.

Aside from that, also, I would want to stress that there are also other windows, rather other doors through which we can step into leadership positions. We need to be active, we need to stay engaged, we need to earn the trust of the community to be able to move into these positions.

I also [– one thing I like] also about the BC, this is one constituency that also encourages young persons, newcomers to step into leadership positions. I think that culture should continue, and more businesses will definitely find their way up the ladder. Thank you.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Thank you, Lawrence. And Steve had one comment in the chat which I'll read out loud. The NomCom gets to nominate eight board seats. That should mean you're filling openings every year. Paul, Lawrence, do you have any closing remarks that you'd like to add regarding that statement before we wrap up?

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: That's very true. The board is structured in such a way that they're going to have board members dropping off almost every year, so there's always going to be a board they can see. The dynamics about that also speak to the fact that the qualities or the criteria fulfilling such board seats is not static. This year, we might be looking for candidates from a particular region, but next year, that region might be filled up because you can't have more than five candidates in a particular region.

So different issues impact on the choice of candidates, but like I said, the key is to keep doing it because there's always going to be a board position, most likely going to be a board position to be filled by the NomCom each year, is not to get tried of the process but to keep diving into it.

With regards to [inaudible] talked about outreach, yes, the NomCom appreciates the fact that there's a lot of outreach to be done, and he's doing a lot in this regard. This year, the outreach was much better than the last. We're documenting the processes that lead up to [inaudible] every year, so that the new NomCom coming in has something to rely on, and I'm sure that the newer NomCom going forward will have a lot to learn from what was done with regards to outreach this year and make better efforts next year. Paul, you wanted to say something?

PAUL MITCHELL: Yeah. Again, I would completely agree with Lawrence. I think it's really important to recognize that the criteria that is necessary for board positions will change from year to year as the existing players drop out,

and our goal is to make sure we have a balanced board that has the collected toolset across management, finance, legal, policy, technical, and sorting that out at the beginning of the NomCom process with each session is one of the most important things, I think, that the NomCom actually does, is to sort of identify that profile. And I think the better we collectively get at doing that year over year, the better the institution will run as a whole.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Thank you very much. This concludes the discussion portion of this call. Paul, Lawrence, Marie, thank you very much for your time. Next, I will turn the meeting over to Steve to discuss the policy calendar. Steve, the floor is yours.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Chantelle. I recirculated a policy calendar this morning, because it's a little bit different, and therefore I'll put it up in the Zoom view window. So I can move through this pretty quickly. The only comment we filed since our last call was filed on the 14th of May, and it was a comment on the dot-biz registry agreement. Since we're in the walk-up to an ICANN meeting, there are fewer public comments noticed and due, and that's a bit of a relief.

Of the public comments that are open now, there are three that I had highlighted for BC attention. The first is a comment on ICANN's multi-stakeholder model, what are our problems with the multi-stakeholder model. This has been underway for a year or so, and one of Cherine Challaby's initiatives was to try to address and improve the

effectiveness of the multi-stakeholder model at a very high level within ICANN. It's hard to get him to focus on GNSO working groups or GNSO voting strength when he's looking at it at such a very high level. But nonetheless, we should take advantage of that. So I'm very grateful to Mark Datysgeld for doing a draft last week, which we circulated for member comment, and I want to thank Zak Muscovitch, Jimson Olufuye, who both provided some edits. And Mark as our drafter incorporated your edits, not all of them verbatim, but put them into the stream where you had requested them.

So I circulated that this morning, and members have until the close of business on the 3rd of June to add to that. I thought I would also mention that David Fares, who's on the call today, noted that we ought to also address the imbalance of power that occurs within GNSO in the sense that the contracted parties can block anything approaching consensus policy. As David is well aware, that is part of this picket fence arrangement at ICANN, given that anything within the picket fence can be imposed upon the contracted parties on an existing contract. So that was sort of this rationale, the contracted parties would have to be able to block something that would affect them.

I really don't feel like that's justified in today's world, and we ought to bring it up and see whether we can motivate a little discussion on that as well.

I will keep an eye on the participant list to see if anybody has their hand up. Mark Datysgelt, would you, Zak, or Jimson as the three commenters, have anything you want to add to that draft public comment that the members have in their hands?

Alright, seeing none, thank you again to Zak, Mark, and Jimson. The second one is not due until the 15th of July, and it's a relatively short comment. It's only a few pages long. It's a discussion of how to streamline the organizational reviews at ICANN, and this has been a multi-part commentary where staff at ICANN Org is trying to understand a way to improve the way they conduct these organizational reviews every five years.

Remember, that's required by the ICANN bylaws, and it has since the beginning of ICANN. It's nothing new with respect to the transition. These are the organizational reviews, so for instance, every five years, ICANN hires an outside expert to interview people in GNSO to do a review of the GNSO as an organization saying, does it still have a purpose? Is it effective in fulfilling its purpose? What structural or process improvements can be made?

So those are the reviews we're speaking of, and the BC has commented on it before. Barbara and I did that work, and it would really help if we had another volunteer from the BC that would work with us on this comment. Again, it's not due until the 15th of July. We'll have an opportunity to speak about it when we're together in Marrakech. Can I find a volunteer to help Barbara and I? Mark Datysgeld, thank you for agreeing to help. Thank you, Mark. And Waudo, thank you. I didn't put your name down last night. My bad.

Alright, thank you. The only other public comment that's open now isn't due until the 9th of August and has to do with the root server system. I'll wait on that. We'll defer any discussion on it in today's call.

Let me move down into the WHOIS policies and how thy comply with GDPR. In this section, I always recap important events that have happened with respect to the evolution of WHOIS. What is currently on tap is the fact that weekly calls have begun for the EPDP phase two. Now, Mark Svancarek and Margie Milam are our reps on the EPDP. We end up doing a prep call every Wednesday evening in advance to those Thursday morning calls.

The calls have been frustrating. The new chair is still trying to feel his way around. He's being very transparent, and organizing things well, but at this point, we are at logger heads with the registrars and the NCSG who choose to interpret the letters from the data protection board and data protection authorities as claiming there's no way we can do an access model for accredited entities, which had been our assumption as we finished up phase one.

Mark and Margie, let me turn to you now to educate your colleagues on what you see as what's on tap for this week at the EPDP. Margie, why don't you go first? Not hearing you, Margie.

MARK SVANCAREK: Yeah, I don't hear Margie.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Go ahead, Mark.

EN

MARK SVANCAREK:	Let's see. So what do we see right now? Well, we're still in a very early stage of the process, so early that we're arguing about terminology. And in a way, arguing about terminology is a good thing. On the other hand, the fact that the group as a whole is defining out of existence the word "access" is not a good sign. So there's this push to define all transmission of nonpublic data to third parties has disclosure, which is taxonomically correct, but is not helpful to us since we had defined a subset of that transmission to be the unified access model.

So that's one thing that we're seeing right now. Another thing that we're seeing right now is a pushback against legal support in a sense. Certain questions remain unresolved in our opinion, and there is an effort within NCSG to simply shut those conversations down entirely by saying that they are without merit or things that are already resolved, which is clearly not the case since people are still bringing them up.

So then lastly, we'll just be moving a lot more slowly. We were having four hours of regularly scheduled meetings in phase one. We'll be having 90 minutes of scheduled meetings going forward with an opportunity for a second path to address certain types of issues. I don't think that schedule has really worked out, which means that rather than nine months for the first phase, we're probably looking at 12 months for the second phase, even though it's in our opinion really not more complicated.

Good news is that the SSAC is more active already than they were in phase one. I think they're more active already than they were for most of phase one, so that's a reassuring sign. We will see if the GAC is able to step up in a similar fashion. What else, Margie? What do you think?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Mark, thank you very much for that. I sense from your voice you're also getting a bit discouraged. But we have a lot of allies, as you said, and maybe we need to [hook] each other up through the side chats that we do, and remember that ICANN Org, at least Göran, was on the same page that we were.

MARK SVANCAREK: Yeah, that's correct. Göran is on the same page. The TSG put forward a model that I'm not sure I entirely agree with it, because it has everything going through ICANN. There are of course other data flow models that would be equally useful and valid. But that work was good.

Steve Crocker is putting together a policy enforcement engine discussion group right now that he calls the barbecue, the BBQ. There's a sort of a pun on something else. That's very promising on one level. I think that when it's shared with the larger EPDP, it's going to seem scary to them. It'll seem like it has great technical complexity.

STEVE DELBIANCO: It'll be scary to the registrars who would have to implement it, and then Milton Mueller will claim that it's going to allow the kind of unfettered access we had once before.

MARK SVANCAREK: Yes, Milton is very consistent in saying that. Anything that allows highly efficient transmission to third parties is "the same unfettered access

that we had in the past." So we're overlaying all this stuff. I have an authenticated identity. I've been accredited by some agency. Here is my legal basis, bla bla, and yet he's saying that if that's programmatically interpreted and that the transmission is authorized on the basis of all of that, that is still the same old thing that we had before, which is clearly not true. [One more thing that I would say is –]

STEVE DELBIANCO: David Fares asks in the chat if the registries are being helpful. And David, I would claim at this point, no. We did not create the alliance with registries that we wanted to do at the end of phase one, and I think we're paying the price at this point. We're sort of isolated from the contracted parties.

MARK SVANCAREK: Yeah, I would say that at a personal level, individuals within the contracted party are certainly nicer and more accommodating to us in general, but I think that's because they won so many concessions in phase one that they don't have to take such an antagonistic approach towards us. That doesn't mean that they agree with any of the things that we want, of course.

Just my last comment, the communication from the EC, you saw what an immediate response it had on the board. I think that – so within the EPDP, we're really discussing, how does the EPDP work directly with the various regulatory authorities as opposed to sending everything through ICANN. How do we do that in a way that is efficient and not prejudicial, and so that needs to be resolved. We're already seeing Milton Mueller

say that the EC is just a little branch of something and therefore their opinions are not important. I think we heard Rafik say basically the same thing in the council call yesterday.

So look forward to that in coming weeks. NCSG likes to cherry pick things, and now the current example of that is cherry picking advice from regulatory authorities.

STEVE DELBIANCO: That's right. Whatever their intention and whatever their true [meaning,] if regulatory authorities in Europe are throwing monkey wrenches into any plans we had for an accredited access model, and attempts to clarify that that may not be what they exactly meant have really been hamhanded and poorly managed become our biggest problem right now, is the data protection board, data protection authorities. We need to find a friend there. Thank you, Mark, Margie, for all the work you do.

Let me turn now to channel three, which is the discussion of council. Scott and Marie, you'll notice that I've updated [this morning] to include a link to the agenda [and] your chat transcript and Zoom recording from the special call you had yesterday, would invite you to educate folks about what happened there. And there's really not much else to discuss on council, because our next meeting hasn't got an agenda yet for the 26 June in Marrakech. So Marie and Scott.

EN

MARIE PATTULLO:	Scott, jump in and correct me anytime I'm wrong. We have a normal meeting [inaudible] 16th. You've already seen the notes from that. But one of the things we did not have time to discuss is the board's reaction to EPDP phase one. Everything that Mark just talked about of course is the current work in phase two, and let's remember there were recommendations on phase one that were sent out to the board. They have not [inaudible] all of them. There are parts, two of them, they have not adopted, and that's what we were talking about last night, yesterday, depending on where you are in the world.
	Now, we didn't talk at all about substance. It was all about procedure, followed completely on from what Mark was just saying as well, with our friends in the NCSG and our friends in the registry saying the board doesn't have the right to do this, the board shouldn't be [inaudible] recommendations, the board's being mean to us, [inaudible] board, and then most of the reps were saying, "Guys, come on, calm down. Let's just [talk this out] and talk with them."
	So we came around in a big circle about what's going to happen. It's probably that the leadership of council are going to reach out to the EPDP team, so that's Mark, that's Margie, that's Steve, and ask them how they feel about these two recommendations.
	As you see in the policy calendar, Steve's already put up [inaudible] so that conversation is going to keep going. The other part [inaudible] about the IGOs/INGOs, which is a very different subject. As you know, curative rights for INGOs and IGOs [inaudible] all recommendations were sent to the board, recommendation five we discussed at our last actual meeting.

The last bit first, we're going to recharter a special subgroup within the RPM working group. It's not going to be specifically about RPM. Recommendation five is actually about international law, access to justice. So we're going to tailor that, adjust it to be very specific to make sure we get the right people involved who know what they're talking about. Watch that space for that one. I don't have timing on it, but it will move forward.

Meanwhile, surprising exactly nobody, [the GAC] has reacted to the fact that council sent the recommendation one through four to the board knowing full well they were completely [inaudible]. So the GAC asked for us to have a "facilitated dialog." We then got lots of chat last night about they can't make us do this, [inaudible] policy of ours. So last time, it was the board being mean to us, and this time, it's the GAC being mean to us. But basically, we've come down to, yes, of course, we're going to talk to them. That's the way we move things forward so that it's a little bit more sensible.

If it's going to be using the dangerous word, "facilitated," maybe not. but it's basically a turf war as to who owns [what bit of policy,] and if we want to move things forward, we all need to behave like adults.

So that's my take on it, but I'm very grateful that a lot of you [listened in] last night. At this point, I want to put a huge shout out to the guys that did Skype me or Skype Scott, [stuff that] we can come up with in the meeting, which is really useful. Scott, do you want to add anything to that.

SCOTT MCCORMICK: No, that about covers it. Perfect.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Marie, thank you both for being so responsive on that [back] chat for Skype. And you're right, it is a collective group, and when you get advice or suggestions for something to say or something to stick in the chat, always put it through your own lens as to whether you think it's really the right time and the right atmosphere to do it. A lot of times, we'll ask you to say something extreme, and if you don't think it's well advised, don't feel compelled. But thank you. I thought you really handled it well yesterday. Any questions?

MARIE PATTULLO: Steve, the BC is [inaudible] but always polite and calm.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Right. Persistent, if not always polite. Does anyone have any questions? Scott and Marie, thank you very much. I'll scroll down now to the next channel, which is Barbara Wanner and the Commercial Stakeholder Group liaison. Barbara, I have all of your notes up there. I believe you might only be on dial in. When you're finished, Barbara, we'll let Marylin Cade speak to the outreach [discussion]. Barbara?

BARBARA WANNER: Thank you, Steve. As you note from Steve's agenda for channel three, we have the selection of the GNSO council vice chair on our plate. Something we'll have to think about going forward. Rafik's term

concludes in 2019, and we have an agreement with NCSG that this will rotate now to a CSG representative. We will discuss this tomorrow on our CSG ExCom call, but I would be interested in BC thoughts on who a good candidate would be from the CSG side. Marie has proposed [Filip] from the ISPC. I don't know if he's been approached yet, but we'll talk about that tomorrow also.

Two, I wanted to point out that the NCPH agreed on election procedures. You all were involved with that. Steve and I and Claudia were. And we agreed to those procedures last year, and we used those procedures in terms of responding to Rafik's candidacy for GNSO council chair.

All of that to say that I thought it would be very simple for us to simply request that ICANN Org post them on the noncontracted party house Wiki page. Evidently, since they revised our procedures, that has to be put to the community for comment. So I didn't want anybody to be alarmed if they noticed that coming up for comment. This was an agreement that was worked out between us and the NCSG. So I think we should be okay. It'll be interesting to see if it attracts any further community comment, but god willing, the NCSG won't have second thoughts and want to blow the deal up. But that's more in the spirit of an FYI to anticipate that down the pipe.

Just to remind everybody that we will have a teleconference on the 17th of June at 14:00 UTC with Becky, Matthew, and Chris Disspain. And this is in lieu of our CSG closed meeting with our GNSO council representatives. So I encourage everybody else to participate in that, and aside from the EPDP phase two, and issues there, the uniform

access model and so forth, please let me know if you think any other topics should be covered during that closed teleconference.

We'll also have a CSG open meeting on 26th June in Marrakech from 8:30 to 10:15 with Göran, Cyrus, and we have extended an invitation to Janis Karklins. I don't know if he has accepted. But again, we hope to engage all of them in a conversation concerning the need for access and not to drag our heels in terms of moving forward on phase two.

And I believe that's it from my end, and I'll turn things over then to Marylin to update us on outreach events at ICANN 65. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Barbara. Marylin?

MARYLIN CADE: Before I move to outreach, can I just ask a clarifying question? Why are we inviting Chris Disspain as the vice chair versus inviting the chair? I'm not objecting, I'm just seeking clarification.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Chris is the board's liaison to the EPDP, Marylin, and is the one who participates on all those calls. So he's the one who's got his hand on that along with Becky Burr.

MARYLIN CADE:	Okay. I just wanted to understand this since we have other topics. And again, I'm not objecting. This would mean that Chris is responding only to our questions about the EPDP, right?
STEVE DELBIANCO:	Marylin, if you look at the topics that the BC has discussed with the CSG, for the June 17th telecon, it is about EPDP phase two, the unified access model, the Technical Study Group. So that is its primary focus, and that is why we invited Chris, to join Becky and Matthew.
MARYLIN CADE:	And again, I'm not objecting. I just wonder, since usually we have more than one topic with the elected members of the board, is there a view that we will have time for at least one or two other topics for just those two board members to comment on?
STEVE DELBIANCO:	As indicated in the policy calendar, please let Barbara know immediately if we have other topics, because this is not just the BC. Barbara has a call with the CSG ExCom tomorrow and wants to float other topics that all three members of the CSG are in agreement with. So if you have other topics, anyone on this call, e-mail the BC private, but make sure Barbara Wanner sees them before the end of today. Thank you.
MARYLIN CADE:	Thank you so much.

BARBARA WANNER: Okay, and I could just add that I've been asking for this for the past several weeks, so this is not the first time I've solicited member comments on this, just as an FYI. Thank you.

MARYLIN CADE: I know. My apologies for just now waking up on this. So, shall I talk? Just to check, I don't want to repeat what I'm saying. I'll do it just one time on the CSG outreach.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Please.

MARYLIN CADE: Is that okay to do it now?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yes.

MARYLIN CADE: Okay. So originally, we had hoped to have an event in Casablanca on the way to Marrakech, and our member, [Mahmud] had been working with us and with Chris Mondini and Baher Estmat to try to identify a small event in Casablanca. However, it was proposed for Friday afternoon, and it just didn't work out. The associations were not – the three that

we contacted were not available, although originally, we did have some interest.

So what we're doing with the support of the ICANN team, Chris Mondini and Joe and Baher, and Pierre Dandjinou, we have two VPs from ICANN engaged because we have both the African region, and also the MENA states, that is North Africa and the Arab states, which Baher is responsible for.

So we are doing a lunch on Tuesday that ICANN is supporting, which means they're providing the room and they are also providing the financial support for boxed lunches. We've had a BC outreach call, and then also a CSG call in follow-up with the ICANN team. So the primary outreach event will be this lunch. The team that met from the BC outreach asked after a discussion with the IPC representatives, designated representatives and the ISP CP, ask ICANN to increase the number of seats from 40 to 50, and they're working on that, and checking to see if the room can allow that.

So it will not be a fully open event. We will probably have something like 20 to 25 participants across the ICANN Org and the three constituencies, and the n20 to 30 attendees from the community. ICANN staff has gone through the registered attendees. They have identified 45 possible invitees.

The BC outreach team and also the IPC designated contact have already gone through the fellowship list and also the registered list, and there associations to identify special invitees. [Mahmud Lapit] who is with [TAGI] is reaching out to two key associations to try to get some senior

attendees that will travel to the event. The BC has three CROP attendees, all of whom will be in Marrakech, two of whom are particularly focused on support for outreach in Marrakech.

We will then also have the opportunity for a meet and greet on Wednesday morning. It's 30 minutes that ICANN, again, is helping us with. So those individuals that are interested in meeting and learning more about the three constituencies will have a special invitation to come to a breakfast event on Wednesday morning before CSG open event.

Besides that, the two CROP-funded attendees are going to be spending time in the booth, and also, we will have the opportunity to have Jimson and Claudia, our chair, speak at the fellowship welcoming event. It's only four days, so we're crunched on time.

The final comment I want to make is Baher Esmat has identified an innovation lab that is in Marrakech and has proposed – he is inviting leadership from that organization to come to ICANN to the lunch event, and he has also proposed a tour, and I am hoping that some of us will want to take advantage of that, realizing that we have very limited time on this four-day event, and it will be difficult for many people to take the time out to attend. But we will be posting the information about the innovation lab, and we're trying to come up with two or three options that don't compete with other major events. So some of the BC will be able to visit the innovation lab.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Marylin. Back to you, Claudia, to wrap the call up.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

CLAUDIA SELLI: [inaudible] Steve and everyone. Can you hear me?

STEVE DELBIANCO: We do. Go ahead, Claudia.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Okay. Great. I just wanted to inform the members that basically, the BC meetings, open and closed meeting have been agreed for Marrakech, so we have this meeting happening. And we'll just need to invite people for our meetings. So if members have any suggestions, please do send them to Chantelle as soon as possible. And [inaudible] other inputs for the members, and if there are no other points to be brought up in the call, then I would drop off the call. Thank you, everybody.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Claudia, we have Jimson's [inaudible].

CLAUDIA SELLI: [inaudible].

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Thank you.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Jimson, please, the floor is yours.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Yes. Thank you very much. Well, we are already out of time, and discussed a number of these issues. Just to thank members for their responsiveness to the membership dues, and if you have questions, please feel free, as [inaudible] reaching out to reach me or the invoicing secretariat.

So I will just stop here in the interest of time. Thank you.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Thank you very much, Jimson. If there are no comments or questions from members, I would close the call, and then we'll speak on Wednesday, 12th of June. Thank you very much, everybody, for participating.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]