
CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the BC Members Call on Wednesday, June 12, 2019. In the interest of time, attendance will taken via the Zoom Room. 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 avoid background noise. With this, I'd like to turn the call over to our chair, Claudia Selli, to begin. Claudia, please go ahead.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Thanks very much, Chantelle, and thanks everybody for attending today's call. In the interest of time, I will give the floor to Steve for the policy discussion. Steve, the floor is yours.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Claudia. Chantelle, I'm trying to share, and if you'll allow me – thank you. The policy calendar was distributed yesterday afternoon. You should all have a copy, and hopefully it's in your screens right now, as well. We haven't filed anything new since the previous BC calls, since there haven't been any concluding of comment periods. So, let me move to the currently open comments. As you can see, there are six that are currently open, and a seventh one that's coming, which I have assessed as being really, particularly relevant to the BC.

The first one is with respect to a comment due tomorrow, the evolving of ICANN's multi-stakeholder model. If you recall, this is something that ICANN's chair, Cherine Chalaby, had launched as part of his strategic

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.

objectives. It's strategic objective number two. We have commented on it in the past. And I want to thank Mark Datysgeld, who did a very substantive draft, that we first circulated two weeks ago. And since then, there have been a lot of edits from many BC members—Zak, Jimson, Andy Abrams, Marilyn Cade, John Berard, and I added a small one.

So, it's attachment one to the policy calendar, and I'll go ahead and bring up the document in Zoom, so that we could potentially have a discussion here, since this is our last chance. This is the time to discuss this document. It's on the screen, and it was an attachment there. I'll look for hands in the queue, if anyone who wants to make any final changes, because otherwise, this will be filed tomorrow. Mark, anything you'd like to add?

MARK DATYSGELD:

No, Steve. I would just like to say that I think we had a very productive discussion. I think this reflects very much what a lot of different stakeholders think. And moving forward, we could refer to this document as further discussions unfold. So, I think we have a nice basis to work on in the future. That would be all.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Any other comments? Thank you, Mark. I'll return to the policy calendar, because I wanted to remind everyone that when we gather in Morocco, one of the high-interest cross-community sessions is on this topic of ... There it is, Evolution of the Multi-stakeholder Model. It's on the screen. It's number three.

I think that's going to be led by Brian Cute. Many of you saw him first present when we were in Kobe. He's been tasked by Cherine to help to manage this process, and I believe one of the ground rules of the process is they don't want to look at structural changes.

So, having said that, there are several elements of the BC's draft comment which do get into structural recommendations—well, I should say structural complaints and recommendations, because the BC is not happy with the GNSO structure, with contract/non-contract party power imbalance, and we're not happy with what happened to the stakeholder group called CSG, and what it's done to the constituencies.

So, all that's in there, but don't be surprised if it doesn't get any air time when we're together in Marrakesh, since that's not supposed to be discussed. I believe it was wise for us to do it anyway. Thanks again, Mark, and everyone who contributed. We'll be filing that tomorrow.

The second one is a posting on the Non-Contract Party House election procedures. Barbara Wanner led us in this effort of negotiating in February of this year, where we negotiated the IPC, the BC, the ISPs, along with the NCUC and the NCSG, on how we would do procedures on the board seat. All that this is, is an opportunity to do public comment on what we had already agreed to. Does anyone in the BC feel a need to comment on it in some way? If not, we'll probably just put a one line endorsing it into the public comment period, before it closes the 24th of June.

I'll take any comments on that. Barbara believes that an endorsement would be sufficient. Thank you, Barbara. Good point. We don't want to upset a very delicate balance. Okay, thank you.

Let me move to number three. There's a process proposal out how to streamline organizational reviews. Barbara and I worked on this in the last comment filed. I want to thank Mark Datysgeld and Waudo for volunteering to help. This one is due on the 15th of July. So, it's over a month away. Don't feel the need to get into it right now. Is there anyone else who wants to volunteer?

Okay. The IANA Naming Functions review is going to result in a very small change to the ICANN bylaws. These won't be due until the 26th of July. But I have read this over, and I see it as really a correction to language, to enable to ccNSO to have more flexibility, so that they can't find anyone who manages that ccTLD but is not a member of ccNSO. If there's no objection, I will probably just indicate the BC supports this. Any objection? Thank you.

Number five are revisions that want to be made. These are, again, very clerical edits that the SSAC and the RSSAC just did as part of their five-year organizational reviews. This is another one where I believe the BC should simply agree with the recommended bylaws changes. They're very clerical in nature. Any objections? Fantastic.

Alright, number six, and then I'm going to turn to Chris Wilson to handle number seven. I'm looking to make sure you're in the queue there, Chris. Okay. Alright number six is the Evolving the Governance of the Root Server System. We don't pay a lot of attention to the root server

operators, and their affiliated group at the Root Server Security Advisory Committee, but the root servers are an important part of how ICANN delivers on its mission to deliver unique identifiers.

And Göran, the CEO, is quite excited about this proposal that's the subject of the comment, number six. On a call that he held with Claudia, Jimson, and I yesterday—it's a quarterly call that occurs with the CEO—he asked the BC, "Please take a good look at that." He believes that we'll find innovative methods of engagement in there with these root server operators, and he's quite proud of what they've come up with.

I haven't read it yet, myself, but are there BC members who are very familiar with or interested in the root server interaction of ICANN, who could help us to evaluate that proposal and comment on it? Who's got some root server experience—some of the more technical members of the BC. Mark, please go ahead.

MARK SVANCAREK: I have nothing to say. I just volunteer to take a look at it.

STEVE DELBIANCO: That's always the way it is. The guy with the full plate on the EPDP, volunteering to take on even more. Thank you, Mark. Appreciate that very much. Anyone else?

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Yeah, Steve. I will join Mark.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Jimson.

MARK SVANCAREK: Thanks, Jimson.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Alright, moving on to number seven, this is a topic that's not publicly posted yet for public comment. But Chris Wilson's going to provide some color. What I said to all of you on number seven is that on the 15th of May, the board approved resolution instructing ICANN org to proceed with the .amazon application, and to proceed with the implementation, which includes publication and public comment on one element of Amazon's application, which is their public interest commitments, which I understand have been revised as the result of the years of process they've gone through negotiating with South American governments.

Chris Wilson, I wanted to give you a few minutes to talk the BC through where we are now, to what will be happening next. Chris?

CHRIS WILSON: Sure, thanks Steve. Can everyone hear me okay?

STEVE DELBIANCO: We do.

CHRIS WILSON:

Okay, terrific. Thanks, Steve, and thanks for teeing this up. Obviously, an issue that we, the BC, have been kind of keeping an eye on for ... well, really since the inception of the new gTLD program, if you will. And so, it's been, of course, seven years since then. And you know, as Steve mentioned last month, ICANN's board approved a resolution to go ahead and move forward with Amazon's applications—again, a decision that's been seven years in the making.

In conjunction with that decision, and then moving forward with the applications, the board also approved, if you will, our public interest commitment that we had been discussing for some time with the governments, regarding the use of the .amazon TLD. I think I've talked about that PIC a little bit in the past, but I'll just briefly summarize it.

Basically, it is threefold. One, it would provide the opportunity for the eight ACTO governments, in conjunction with us, to work together to create a blacklist, if you will, of sensitive terms that would never be used at the second level. And these terms would have to meet certain criteria that are outlined in the actual PIC itself. But we would create a list, I think, upwards of 1,500 potential second-level words that would be blocked and reserved for no use, whether by us or anyone.

Secondly, we would allow the use, by ACTO and its eight member states, each a second-level domain to use with .amazon for their non-commercial use, to allow visibility for their part of the world and region, etc. Typically, that would probably be a country code. So, it could be br.amazon for example. But it really would be determined by the

countries with our consultation in that regard. They would be able to host content on that site, etc.

To implement all this, we've suggested a steering committee that would be made up by ACTO and its member states, as well as representatives from Amazon, to effectuate all of this.

The public interest commitment will be ... I can tell people we have formally submitted it to ICANN. I know ICANN is in the process of reviewing it, making sure all the i's are dotted and t's are crossed, etc. And it will be put out for public comment. We don't know exactly when. It is not out for comment right now, though. My understanding is there had been parties that had been filing comments with ICANN since the board's decision in May—I think partially, largely because this has gotten some publicity and news attention, both here in the US and elsewhere.

But the public comment period itself has not officially begun. We don't know exactly when it will begin. Best guess is that sometime, probably soon after this upcoming ICANN meeting. So, sometime in July, we expect that there'll be an opportunity for public comment.

First of all, it's precedent-setting. No other brand has had to do what we've done, and try to find that middle ground, to allow some sort of limited, shared use of this TLD. So, we think it's a win for the multi-stakeholder model of internet governance, notwithstanding the fact that we understand, obviously, as Steve has posted in the chat, that there is still opposition from certain countries within that region to this

decision by ICANN. And they have not fully supported our PIC as presented, and proposed, and approved by ICANN.

So, there's still more to come on this, but we do think this is a strong step forward for internet governance, for ICAAN, for the community in general, and hope that the BC will be able to provide some constructive comments when the time is right, in the next month or so, to speak to that. And of course, I'm happy to provide further color when the time is right on that, and answer any questions now or later about our PIC, or about this issue generally. But we're cautiously optimistic here. We're happy that ICANN has moved forward with the applications, and we hope that this can all come to conclusion sometime this year. That's all. Thank you, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thank you, Chris. While I'm waiting for hands to go up, Chris, I would ask, as a follow-up, could you send to BC private the very latest PIC spec that will be discussed, if you can? And alert us to any potential changes, or changes that have been made as a result of the past two years of negotiation, so that when BC members, where they know Amazon is a member ... when BC members get questions about it, we'll be more knowledgeable about what specifically is going to be in the PIC spec.

CHRIS WILSON:

Yep.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

The BC, as you recall ...

CHRIS WILSON: First, let me check ...

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yep.

CHRIS WILSON: No, I was just going to suggest ... I don't know if I can share the actual PIC yet, since ICANN hasn't published it, but let me check internally. What I can say is that it has ... I guess our proposal, if you will, as evolved, certainly, over the course of the last two years, since the IRP decision in July 2017 that kicked this issue back to the board. But it hasn't changed drastically. There were some things that we had offered in the past. For example, we had offered to support the applications from ACTO and its member states for the use of [.amazonas] or .amazonia, if there was to be a second round of new gTLDs.

That is not part of our PIC. We've also made some financial commitments to support the visibility, and enhancement of the visibility, of the region. Those are not part of the PIC, either. These are things that have been discussed, I guess, over the course of time, that have ... In the end, were not part of the PIC that we put forward.

Really, the core of it is what I discussed just a minute ago, was this notion of a ... And that's similar to what we've talked about in the past—a creation of a blacklist, allowance for some limited use by ACTO and its member states for the use of the TLD as well, etc. So, it's not completely out of left field. It's fairly consistent with what's been

discussed over the last couple years. But some things that had been discussed in the past are not part of this PIC now. But I will check to see if I can share the formal PIC as submitted with you all.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

That would be helpful. You were president of the BC when, in the gTLD program ... we were very concerned that PIC specs become enforceable parts of the ICANN registry contract. The BC led the effort on that, getting PICs created. So, I think it is an appropriate mechanism by which the applicant—Amazon in this case—addresses what we'd call community and public interest concerns. So, it seems to be an appropriate mechanism.

I think it's unusual that the board is having a single applicant publish their PIC spec for public comment, but the anticipation is that it's going to be scrutinized widely, and that they will include accommodations that were done as a result of that. So, it's going to be a widely-anticipated public comment period, and undoubtedly, there'll be pressure from some quarters to change the PIC spec. And we're going to want to work closely with you when that comes out. Are there any questions from other BC members? Alright, don't see any. Chris, thanks for the update. Appreciate that. If we return to the policy ...

CHRIS WILSON:

Thank you, Steve. Take care, buddy.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

You're welcome, of course. Return to the policy calendar, under the modification of WHOIS policies to comply with GDPR. We will turn to Margie and Mark in a moment, to update you on the current status there. But I highlighted in yellow news from yesterday afternoon. On that same quarterly call that Claudia, Jimson, and I had with Göran, we had opportunity to ask Göran questions. So, I probed Göran on the current state of play, and what is ICANN org doing to move ahead on the unified access model, based on the technical study group for RDAP.

Göran was surprised, or acted surprised, that I was discouraged by European Commission letters and the lack of progress on the EPDP, where I believe registrars and the NCSG are blocking the process we should go through to fix the purpose statement. We call it purpose two, but it's the purpose statement for the collection and sharing with third parties of WHOIS data.

So, Göran acted, "Hey, I don't know what you're worried about." The second letter from the EC, he believes is the roadmap, and encourages us to proceed. He claimed that ICANN has a group. He calls it the Strawberry Project, and I think [Elana] leads it. She's the ICANN employee who represents ICANN at the EC. He believes that they're making progress, and will soon have a paper that will include input from the European Commission.

And finally, he encouraged us to immediately begin engaging with the GAC rep, Georgios [Tselentis], who's the European Commission member who's the GAC rep on the EPDP, because he asked Georgios, "How's it going?" And Georgios said, "They never ask me any questions." I know that's really not the way the EPDP's supposed to work, but if that's the

way Georgios sees himself, then Mark, Margie, and the rest of you who help on the EPDP, we ought to be putting pointed questions to Georgios.

And according to Göran, we should be expecting that he can provide answers—perhaps not immediately, but that he can speak for the European Commission. I mean, he’s been there 17 years. If he’s going to represent the European Commission’s views, let’s get them on the record. And there’s been a little chat in the Skype channel on that. So, Mark and Margie, what more can you tell us about the EPDP?

MARGIE MILAM: Can you hear me?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Perfectly.

MARGIE MILAM: Yeah, that’s really news to me that he feels like we should be asking him questions. I think that’ll actually be insightful for us, and Mark and I and the rest of the folks can shift our strategy to ask him questions. From the BC perspective, the input we’ve been providing basically pulls from all of the European Commission letters and the European Data Protection Board letters.

So, that’s been our strategy is to say, “Look, guys, the European Commission says this is okay.” Instead of making arguments about, “Oh, it can’t be done.” Well, the European Commission says it can be done.

So, that's been our strategy, and I think we can expand on it as we go into Marrakesh.

Fundamentally, there hasn't been a lot of substantive discussion yet. As you can imagine, since April, we've been doing a lot of, essentially planning. How are we going to do our work? What's the documents we're going to look at? What additional questions we have for Bird & Bird, who's the counsel that's advising the EPDP.

One of the questions we keep posing back to the legal counsel is, "Please update your advice based upon the recent correspondence from the European Commission," because a lot of it seems to clarify some of the issues that we've been raising all along, like, for example public interest. We said there's been ... from day one, as you may recall, a year before the temp specs came into play, we were saying, "Hey, there's this public interest exception under GDPR." And the European Commission letters recognize that. And so, we've been asking the legal counsel to go back and update their advice based up on that.

And I think, Steve, that's great advice to ask Georgios questions, and we'll factor that into our strategy going forward.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

And Margie, when you ask Georgios, I guess we should preface the question by saying, "Georgios," not as your member of the GAC, but as the EC's representative, "can you comment on what the EC believes?" That way, we're not putting him into a tough spot to say that he's speaking for the GAC, okay?

MARGIE MILAM: Yep, that's great advice. Thanks.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Mark, anything to add?

MARK SVANCAREK: Pretty much what Margie said. We are spending a lot of time planning how to plan. I think this is probably useful for the new chair, and helping to inform him how he should work with us and with org. But for us, it just feels very much like slow going. So, tomorrow, we are going to look at the templates for discussing the city field, and I forget the other one—oh, data retention period. The city field's actually interesting, because the feedback from Bird & Bird is interesting.

The retention, I'm not sure how much we care about that. I think the more pressing issue on data retention is outside of the EPDP—not how long a registrar holds the data, but how is proportional for a third party to hold the data, having received it.

I didn't know anything about the Strawberry Project. I do agree that we should be talking to Georgios as you suggest. Alex Deacon pointed out the other day, though, that there is a risk of going off into the weeds. We have a list of things in the charter that need to be resolved, and so far, we done any of that, because we've been discussing, "Here's the plan for how we will plan." We haven't gotten into anything substantive lately.

And it would be important not to be too distracted, mainly by Milton or Volker, who could easily pull us down ratholes and take us off course. There are many times where I'm thinking, "How should we respond to this?" And then, we talk about it, and it's just like, "Meh, who cares, really? This isn't really ..." It's in the record of the chat, but kind of, "So what?"

So, we haven't gotten to the point where we really need to, in my opinion, push back so hard. It would be useful to get EC guidance into the record, I think, but countering Milton and Volker, maybe not so much. For example, Volker was putting forward an opinion that directly contradicted something that Bird & Bird said. Okay, do I need to counter that right now? No, let's wait until we get into the substantive work of the EPDP.

What else? Oh, I would like to say that I thought that the EC papers were very encouraging. And so, I guess I hadn't shared ... I think I wasn't even aware, really, of your concern about them. I had felt that they were pretty encouraging. And as Margie says, we use them to justify a lot of the things that we're putting forward. I think that's it for now.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thanks, Mark. I tried to get Göran. I baited him a little bit by suggesting that Volker and the NCSG had cited the EC letters in order to block progress on UAM. And Göran kept saying, "Look, it's only two groups. It's not even the whole Contract Party House." And Göran was encouraging us to not worry about a minority of the group. But we all know how this would go at Council, that eventually we'll need one or

the other—either NCSG or the registrars—to be with us, or we won't get this thing through Council.

MARK SVANCAREK: Well, true, the EC letter does say that purpose two needs to be reworked, and it says it in a way that is not particularly helpful. And that is the sort of thing that we could be drilling in on, on Georgios at some point.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Right!

MARK SVANCAREK: But as you saw on the Skype last night, we haven't really settled on what's the simple way to ask the question and get a simple answer, but we'll keep working on it.

STEVE DELBIANCO: I know, and like you said, asking him, "Could you suggest language?" only gives him a chance to say yes or no. We prefer to know what kind of phrases and language would the EC believe is an appropriate purpose two.

MARK SVANCAREK: Yeah, I think we need to guide him down a path with a series of smaller questions. We need to design ...

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Okay, and I'll leave that to you. I'll leave that to you to decide. And I fully support your view, that when Milton Mueller or Volker try to derail everyone with a very provocative statement, there is no need to quote unquote correct it in the record, because there is not significance to the record unless we get to written documents. And then and only then do we have to really be on the record as registering an objection or an edit. You're right, don't take the bait. We don't need to let them ruin the calls.

And then, finally, I would say to all members of the BC, Mark and Margie work at this task tirelessly. There's hours of prep calls, and the calls that occur now Tuesdays and Thursdays. And we have a formal alternate role that I'm filling because we couldn't find anyone else to fill it. I'm not filling it adequately. I'm not being as supportive of Mark and Margie as the alternate should be. And the day will come when Mark or Margie have a schedule conflict, and the alternate steps in, fully representing the BC.

And so, I am asking again, to BC members that are following the EPDP or would like to, to please consider volunteering to take my place as the alternate on the EPDP. If there's any takers or questions about that, I'll happily entertain them now.

Okay, scrolling up to the channel two, which is Council ... Since our last BC call—that was two weeks ago—that hasn't been a Council meeting. There was that special meeting on the 28th, where they discussed, in Council, what to do in response the board's approval of all but two of

the EPDP recommendations. And there was merely a discussion and no resolutions. I've put a link to it.

The BC made comments on recommendation one, purpose two, and recommendation twelve. But there was no vote on that, and the next Council meeting is the 26th of June, while we're in Marrakesh. We don't even have an agenda or motions yet. And as it would be, Scott McCormick and Marie, neither of them are available to be on today's call. It's not such a significant omission, since there isn't anything new since the last BC call. I will not move to Barbara, channel three, which is supporting the Commercial Stakeholders Group role for the BC. Barbara, over to you.

BARBARA WANNER:

Thanks, Steve. If could direct everybody's attention to the calendar that Steve has prepared, I think what I have laid out there is self-explanatory. It's the anticipated agenda for our CSG open meeting. Just a reminder to everybody that we will precede the open meeting with a newcomers' event. It's just a breakfast gathering, and will enable us informally engage with newcomers from the region, answer their questions.

It had been proposed to just sort of set stations up around the room to enable us to chat casually, and enable the newcomers to move around the room and speak with different people, rather than having something formal and seated. So, I encourage as many people to come as can. I think the most important thing is just ensure that everybody is comfortable. Then, the next 8:30 to 9:00 period, quite honestly, will

serve as prep for our sessions with Göran and Cyrus, and then with Janis Karklins. I think that's self-explanatory, too.

We had some preliminary discussion at the last BC call, concerning the selection of the GNSO Council Vice-Chair. Thanks to Chantelle, we've done some additional research on that, and it turns out that Rafik is not term-limited. Rather, and as Marie actually pointed out to us, too, according to the bylaws, the Council Chair and Vice-Chair only serve one-year terms, and must be reelected, or must indicate their willingness to stand for reelection.

Both Rafik and Keith Drazek, technically, are on the GNSO Council through 2020. So, I think what we should do at ICANN 65 is try and get some clarity from both Rafik and Keith, what their plans are. And then, if Rafik decides not to run, then the BC, IPC, and the ISPCP should use the period in between ICANN 65 and Annual General Meeting to decide who we want to propose to serve as the NCPH Vice-Chair, and similarly, who we would back for the Council Chair position.

I've also proposed to the [Excom] that we talk about this a little more in the BC Closed Meeting, which I believe will be over the lunch hour on the 25th. Marilyn has asked me to report on other outreach activities for ICANN 65. I've mentioned the newcomers' breakfast. We'll also have a CSG outreach lunch on the 25th, from 12:15 to 1:30. Seating will be at rounds, similar to how we've done our engagement with the GAC, I'm thinking, in Abu Dhabi and other engagement luncheons that we've held over the years.

There are three topics that have been identified, that we are encouraged to touch upon, but it's just my personal view that I think we should use this time to make everybody feel comfortable, and encourage them to ask as many questions as they feel they need to ask, to determine if they want to join the BC, or any of the other CSG constituencies.

So, if you have ... Just for the record, I want to confirm that I was not involved in the planning of this event. I was simply asked to report on it. So, if you have any specific questions about this luncheon event, please direct them to Marilyn. So, I think that does it for my report, Steve. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thanks, Barbara. I appreciate all the work you've done to prepare for this. Marilyn Cade, anything you wanted to add on outreach, briefly?

MARILYN CADE:

Thank you, Steve. I'll just quickly say, there's been a small planning group. It includes representatives from all three of the constituencies and really, really great support from the ICANN staff, including Chris Mondini and Joe Capitano. Just as an FYI for everybody, Chris will not be attending. Joe will have the lead, along with Baher Esmet, who is the Vice President for the MENAs countries, and Pierre Dandjinou, the overall Vice President from Africa, a colleague of ours from the IPC.

And I have done an analysis of the fellows. We're hoping to get more input from Andrew, who is the GNSO official mentor to the fellows.

With Chris's endorsement, we have permission for those fellows who are identified by the three constituencies to be excused from their mandatory event on Tuesday, so they can be with us. And a few of us are going through the registration list to try to identify other possible candidates. An invitation has gone out from ICANN today to 45 names that ICANN org was able to identify from the participant list.

I am just going to flag an issue that is, I think, of great concern, but it may be a little obtuse to everyone. And that is that ICANN is changing the process by which you confirm your registration for ICANN meetings. And they are looking at curtailing publication of the public list of registrants, even when you tick the box that you're okay with having your name registered. That's kind of a bizarre step for all of us, and to me, and I hope we can take it up later in a discussion. But it creates a real barrier for engagement.

And then, finally, to go back to one final event that's being worked on is an offsite that Baher has helped to organize. Even though time is very limited, we are asking for a few people to find the time to go to an innovation hub. A couple of timeslots are being looked at, Monday sort of midmorning, and perhaps Thursday morning. Even though only a few can go, it's a unique opportunity to engage with the local community. Thanks.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Marilyn, thanks again. Any questions? Claudia, back to you for the main agenda.

CLAUDIA SELLI:

Thank you very much. Well, just a couple of things that I wanted to report back. First of all, a reminder on the GNSO Appointed Board Members for the call meeting on Monday—this upcoming Monday. So, please take part to the call. And then, secondly, we reached out to Theresa Swinehart to be our guest for the BC Open Meeting in Marrakesh. She's interested in coming. We're just waiting for the formal confirmation. And then, I will leave the floor to Jimson.

JIMSON OLUFUYE:

Okay, thank you very much, Claudia. Let me first appreciate Mark and Margie for the work you're doing. And Steve, thanks for the time you also provided for us in the alternate role. Thank you. Let me first talk about finance. With regard to finance, [inaudible] budget, I've not seen any questions on the proposed FY 20 budget yet. Maybe that is because the Finance Committee did a great job. But they also let us know that [Excom] will be meeting on Monday, June 24th, to consider and approve the FY 20 budget proposal, with amendments before the date.

Secondly, in regard to operations, and I'm happy to let you know that the result is out. I believe you have seen it. Secretariat has already transmitted it to the list. And we are happy that Marie Pattullo remains our GNSO Councilor, with 68 votes. And for the Large Business seat, Paul Mitchell, 71 votes. And for Small Business seat, [inaudible], Lawrence Olawale-Roberts, 74 votes. So, I want to take this opportunity to thank them all on behalf, for putting themselves forward. We trust that continue to provide excellent representation, as they have always done. Thank you.

And thirdly, on Wednesday, 26th of June, during the BC Open Meeting—that will be happening from 5:00 pm—will be doing some recognition of some our former officers. So, we want to encourage everyone to be there. That will be recognition for their service in the past. That is for some BC officers that are yet to be recognized.

And yesterday, as Steve and Claudia mentioned, we had a meeting with Göran. And some of things he also mentioned, that the BC should take very seriously the issue of independent review of panels or process—should take it very seriously, because from his point of view, it is the constitutional code of ICANN. More or less, he's pleading that we should all take it serious, the issue of independent review, and should be involved in it, and providing necessary and strong participation.

He also talked about the budget, or the finance, of ICANN, and that he is on schedule to send some reserve into ICANN Reserve Funds. He's scheduled to send funds to ICANN Reserve Funds, because there is ... yes, everything is going as planned. But at the same time, they considered the concern of SO/AC, respect to some things they may want to do. Maybe that will come [inaudible], too, and is absolutely necessary. For example, maybe the EPDP stuff—something that could come along that line.

Therefore, he's setting aside a sum of \$1 million for SO and ACs, to use to fund prioritized projects. That is projects they agree upon, that should be funded specially. It will be outside the normal ICANN budget. So, there is \$1 million to set aside, in case there is anything that SO/AC, that want to do that's not in the budget, and that has to be done. So, he mentioned that to us, maybe for our [review].

And, well, it's my personal opinion that it might not be a bad idea. Getting the consensus from SO and AC could be challenging, but of course, I believe if it's something in the best interest of the community, surely it should be [remitted], or it will be relevant. So, that is on that.

Okay, with regard to outreach, Marilyn has also talked about it, and also Barbara, yes. So, that is what is planned. Funded travelers—that is BC-funded travelers [inaudible] on schedule. And I want to thank Marilyn, as guiding our new beneficiaries of CROPs, in regard to what needs to be done, so that the outreach engagement can go even beyond the Tuesday lunch meeting, and the one morning engagement. So, thank you Marilyn. So, that is it from me for now, unless there is any question.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Jimson, I put this in the chat. The budget is something that most BC members don't pay much attention to, and yet there are some significant changes in the proposed budget, compared to last year. Because of that, I want to remind BC members to take a look at the budget that the Finance Community circulated, because your [Excom] will meet, discuss, and vote on whether to approve or revise that budget when we gather in Marrakesh. That'll be before the BC's Open Meeting.

So, you roughly have a week to look at that budget. And you can circulate questions back to the [Excom], or to Jimson in particular, or to the full BC. But this is the time to have your consideration, because it's your money that we're deciding how to spend.

Jimson, it might behoove everyone if you were to resend, so it's at the top of their inboxes—if you were to resend the latest proposed budget, along with that very useful supplement email that explained what it does to our reserves, because it's a deficit spending in the proposed budget, and that means that it consumes part of the reserve funds that the BC currently has. We've done that for the past few years. It's in an effort to get our reserve to a lower level. So, it's not a sustainable spending level, so it does call for everyone to be on board as to where we're going. Anything more that you wanted to add to that, Jimson?

JIMSON OLUFUYE:

Thank you very much, Steve, for that clarification. Well, the whole objective is to ensure that our funds are not taken off by tax. As you know, now, we are a non-government organization, and whatever income we make, we should be able to spend it on activities, and then also maintain a reserve, which is fiscally about one year of our operational costs or two years, 24 months. So, we said it's 24 months. So, we're trying to scale down so that it can be at that range.

Currently, we have done the filing with the IRS. The accountants and the legal counsel will be working together. So, if approved, then we can file it from 2017, so they are working on the papers. So, just to ensure that we will be able to use those funds to boost BC membership, and participation of membership, [they're going to] ask we go for that to scale down, so that we ... whatever we aim can be in the range of what we spend every year. So, thanks again, Steve, for that information. I will recirculate it again, shortly, for members to review. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Claudia, anything further?

CLAUDIA SELLI: Yes, sorry. I don't have anything else to add, unless members have questions or issues that they want to talk about now. I don't see hands up, so I would adjourn the meeting to Marrakesh. Thank you very much, everybody, for ... Yeah?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Oh, attended yesterday, when ICANN's Security Safety Group put on a session about Marrakesh. I could summarize their conclusions for everyone if there was interest. Does anyone care?

CLAUDIA SELLI: Absolutely, yeah.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Alright, so the presentation was only about a half and hour long. They said that Morocco is officially rated as low-risk at this time. There are no terrorist organizations that are organized of operating in or adjacent to the country. Second, they said be alert for petty crime in Marrakesh, in the city area—not necessarily where the hotels and the venue are. But be aware of petty crime, such as pickpockets grabbing your phone, or a purse or a bag snatching.

This is a Muslim country, so please be sensitive about what one is wearing, particularly for women. And they did say there are no laws dictating Muslim dress, but try to avoid dressing in a way that might be offensive.

The tap water is not safe to drink. You should always use bottled water. And the fresh vegetables should be cooked or cleaned before eating, especially in the summer months. That's all they had to say, and they were not the least bit concerned, and took a lot of questions. But I'm looking forward to Marrakesh.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Thank you, Steve. Any questions for Steve? No? Then, I think we can adjourn the meeting and we'll see each other in Marrakesh, and talk on the phone, for the ones who are not participating.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Alright, bye all.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Thank you very much, everybody.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]