CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the BC members call on Wednesday, July 17, 2019. In the interest of time, attendance will be taken via the Zoom room. With this, I'd like to turn it over to our chair Claudia to begin. Claudia, please go ahead.

STEVE DELBIANCO: We can't hear Claudia, so this is Steve DelBianco.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Hello, everybody. Can you hear me?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yeah, we do. Claudia, we did hear you and then you stopped. Are you still there.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Hi, everybody, and welcome to the BC call. Sorry, I don't have a view on the Zoom room, but I know everybody is there. So in the interest of time, I will give the floor to Steve for the policy calendar.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Claudia. I hope that it's displayed in the Zoom room. If it isn't, all of you should check your e-mail about an hour ago when I sent the policy calendar with a small update. So it says Updated Policy Calendar for 17 July.

I have one comment filed since we since we last met in Marrakech, and that was on 15 July we filed a comment on ICANN's proposal to change the process on streamlining these organizational reviews. I want to thank Barbara Wanner and Mark Datysgeld who gave me some [inaudible] that comment. None of the rest of you weighed in on that. And it is an important set of comments since we're setting the table for the next review of the GNSO in a year and a half. That is an opportunity for us that we want to do something special on. So thanks, Barbara and Mark.

Let me look at the currently open public comments. We have seven open public comments plus an open survey. The fundamental bylaws proposal, number one, and number two is revisions to ICANN bylaws. On a call we held a month ago, BC members, you agreed that we would endorse these proposed changes and those close next week. So are there any BC members having any concerns about that? If I don't hear any, I'm going to go ahead and indicate that the BC supports those two. So I'm looking for hands up. I'm not seeing any, so I will submit that.

Statton, you said you can hear me. Put in the chat if people are having difficulty hearing, and I'll try to remedy that.

All right, scrolling up on the policy calendar, this is last call to see whether any BC members believe that we should comment on this independent review of the Country Codes Names Supporting Organization (ccNSO). The independent reviewer has come back and validated that the ccNSO has a continuing purpose and doesn't need any significant changes. But there are a lot of recommendations made to fine tune the way things run internally in the ccNSO. Again, that's not

our constituency and if we don't have a basis to make a comment, maybe we just stay out of it. Are there any BC members that want to volunteer to draft a BC comment on that review?

All right, seeing none, let me move to the next one. Jimson Olufuye had volunteered to handle the draft financial assumptions and the operating initiatives that ICANN has put out. These comments close on 5 August. We have time. While Arinola, Marilyn, and Tim had volunteered to help, Jimson's initial drafts are circulated here. It's Attachment 2 and Attachment 4. Attachment 2 is on the financial projections and assumptions, and Jimson suggests that we're pleased with those. But he has a more nuanced initial draft comment on the operating initiatives, and that is Attachment 4. Jimson, would you, Arinola, Marilyn, or Tim want to say anything more about these drafts so that your colleagues can react? Okay, hearing nothing, I'll move on the Number 5. Thanks, Jimson, again for drafting.

Number 5 has to do with the root server system and evolving the way that ICANN governs the root server systems. Now the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) has a framework on how to govern the root server system. They published that as RSSAC037. It has recommendations to the board. Then ICANN came back with a concept paper proposing they establish three new groups inside of the RSSAC governance model.

This is a lot of bureaucracy. This is the ICANN way, right? Why propose a solution when you can propose three groups to fight over what the solution should be? So Göran is enthusiastic about this. He gets that the

root server operation is a critical technical function that ICANN has to fulfill under the IANA transition.

So Mark [inaudible] and Jimson volunteered to draft the BC comment. Jimson circulated Attachment 3 with an initial draft, and I'm waiting on Mark to find some time to look at that next. This is not due until 9 August. We have plenty of time. In general, Jimson is complimentary of the development of these new groups. But I would personally say that if there's any way we can reduce the bureaucratic expansion and still accomplish the efficiencies that we're looking for, that would be an appropriate thing for the BC to come back with. Root server maintenance is critical to a lot of the BC members at this point, not only because of the websites they have themselves but because of the TLDs that a handful of BC members are operating.

So I'll take a queue. Are there any comments on our Comment Number 5? Okay, thank you. Again, thank you, Jimson.

Number 6 is not due until 12 August. I need volunteers at this point. This is about name collisions for the next round of top-level domains. You recall the BC was pretty active about the potential risks of name collisions in the 2012 round. That would have been that if somebody launched a new TLD like .printer, that would conflict with a lot of the intranets in corporate server systems where you've already named a critical resource, maybe even a secure resource and that name conflicts with a new TLD. This is what happened to .mail and why it wasn't launched, .server, for example.

Now the BC did put in comments in April 2018. Stephanie Duchesneau did those for us. Now it's time for us to comment on the latest scope of inquiry for name collision. A great one for BC members that have some expertise in this area. So do we have any volunteers I can look to now?

I've noted, Marie, that you're not hearing. Do you have your [microphone] on? Because I believe that others can hear.

Do I have any volunteers to help on collisions? Can anybody hear me?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Hi, Steve. Yes, I can hear you, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Okay, thank you.

JAY SUDOWSKI: If I can get some help, I'm happy to volunteer, but I can't do it all on my own.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Understood, Jay. Thank you for volunteering to be part of that. We can start by taking a look at their report and the comment that we filed, which is only two pages long, and see how we would want to build on what we said before. So I feel like it's pretty manageable.

JAY SUDOWSKI: Okay.

STEVE DELBIANCO: I'll work with you on [it as well]. Jay, thank you very much.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: I'll work with Jay on that too because when I was at Facebook we faced that issue.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Susan, thank you. Appreciate it.

Okay, Number 7, the curative rights [back] for the intergovernmental organizations and nongovernmental organizations. But this is not until 20 August, so we'll take that up later on. I'm happy to have a volunteer now who wants to be particularly on top of that one.

I also wanted to mention that ICANN is doing a survey. It's not part of the public comment period. But they're doing a survey on the NextGen program. ICANN runs that program so that students and academics that are in the region where our meetings are held can learn about and attend the ICANN meetings. The survey is not due until 9 September to assess it. Mark Datysgeld who is an academic himself volunteered to lead the BC response draft because the response is supposed to be from the organizations, the SOs and ACs and constituencies. Do we have any other volunteers that want to assist Mark on that draft? All right, not seeing any, thanks again to Mark.

The next up was our notion of modifying our WHOIS policies to comply with GDPR. I'll just scroll down to the yellow highlighted. The first thing I

did is to thank David Snead who volunteered when we made the call in Morocco. He volunteered to assist Susan Kawaguchi on representing the BC's interests on the Implementation Review Team on Registration Data Policy. Thank you very much for doing that. Susan, David, is there anything you would want to report on what's happened since Morocco on that?

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Actually, Ben Wallis and Mark and Margie [inaudible] also, which is really good because we're struggling to [maintain to] limit the registrars and the registries to the language in the report. But also we're having issues with how clear the language is in the report. So it's easy to push it the wrong way. So the IRT is doing an initial review of everything and individual recommendations. Then as we see it as one full policy, then we'll get another opportunity to push back. But the language was unclear to me but clearer to Margie on the technical contact. So we're going to definitely have to really push on keeping what we think is in the report. It's just sometimes that's hard to identify what's truly there.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Susan. Anything to add, Ben? Mark?

BEN WALLIS: Hi. I don't know if Mark's on the call. We are going to meet every two weeks, so Mark and I joined for the first time last Wednesday. I think they've got as far – out of the 29 recommendations, they're up to about Recommendation 5 or 6. In that area between 5 and 9 I think is going to

EN

be the basis for the discussion at the next meeting next week. So last week, as Susan referred to there, there was some back and forth about exactly how optional it was for registries to allow for a technical field and whether it was optional for the registries to provide it or whether they had to provide it [whether it was] optional for the registrants to fill in the field or not.

So that's an example of where maybe the Phase 1 report wasn't clear enough and it's still providing a bit of confusion amongst the IRT. [Where] the registrars and the contracted parties all seem pretty clear which interpretation they have.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Ben and Susan, thank you because we're about to turn to the council discussion. In the council tomorrow, council is going to be discussing Phase 1 of EPDP and the recommendations, particularly Recommendation 1 and Recommendation 12. I imagine that is part of what you're covering in this IRT, right? Recommendation 1 and Recommendation 12?

BEN WALLIS: My understanding was that the instructions to the IRT are that they should not look at Recommendations 1 or 12 at this time unless they have further instructions from the board and they are to pass over these.

STEVE DELBIANCO:	I see. Okay, and then council is going to debate it tomorrow, and Marie and Scott can cover that for us in a moment or two. Do any of you have questions for Susan, Ben, David, Mark, or Margie? Fantastic.
	So let me turn to Marie and Scott on Channel 2, which is council. What I did here was summarize the fact that last meeting in council was 26 June. There were no motions at that meeting. Council is trying to drive some participation for the implementation oversight team. And thanks to Jay Sudowski who provided his expression of interest for that. Marcus had also expressed interest. And, Marcus, I had invited you to put your expression in as well, but I don't think that you did. Good news is that council is going to endorse all of the folks who put in expressions of interest. So, Jay, you will be forwarded to ICANN org to join that team with the endorsement of GNSO. We'll have to wait and see how many they select.
	So, Marie, happy to turn things over to you to cover the next council meeting and the items I have on the screen for you.
MARIE PATULLO:	Thanks, Steve. Am I coming through okay?
STEVE DELBIANCO:	Perfect.
MARIE PATULLO:	Great, thank you. There is a meeting tomorrow, my evening, some of your afternoons or even mornings. It's going to be quite a big agenda.

As always, if you want to listen in, there is an audio stream. And as always, I'll be very, very grateful if some of you can be there are a number of issues that will be coming up.

I'm only going to look at the most important ones. The first is, as Steve just referenced, the letter that the leadership of council has drafted to send to the board about the two recommendations that were not completely adopted in Phase 1 of the EPDP.

Now that draft letter with reference to [inaudible] Recommendation 1, so the other [inaudible] we'd like to have in there, such as consumer protection. Although the wording of that isn't great, we think it does leave us enough room so that EPDP Phase 2 can actually discuss it.

But there is a query [inaudible] [Paragraph] 2 of the draft letter because it basically says we know that there were issues [and you're not understanding] why we deleted the organization field [data]. Because we explained this to you – we being the contracted parties, so the registries and the registrars – because we explained it to you in such great detail in Marrakech and you completely understood, I'm quoting now from the letter, "the council welcomed the rationale that was provided by members of the [EPDP team] [to why deletion] was originally recommended," etc. "As a result, the council is planning to resubmit the recommendation in its original form."

Now the question is open [inaudible] EPDP colleagues. Do we try to get that paragraph changed? Because if we do, how is that going to affect your allies on the EPDP team? I [can't answer] that one. Neither can

Scott. Neither can Steve I don't even think. So this is something that I do need [inaudible].

Do you want me to pause there, Steve, or keep going?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Marie, I have that on the screen right now, so let me see if any BC member has any further guidance about whether you should attempt to amend that second paragraph. And if you don't get the amendment, do we vote no? BC members who are following EPDP, this is a great opportunity. This talks about Phase 1 implementation, Recommendation 12. The current letter kind of ignores what it is the BC had come up with. Marie, what would you propose as the plan that you pursue in council tomorrow then for the second paragraph?

MARIE PATULLO: Well, it's a difficult one, Steve, because this is one that I really do need direction. To me, it's politics. It depends on how far you wish to push on this because we know what the CPH has said. We've all heard it. We know also that our chances of getting an amendment to this letter are small because we'd need all of the others to agree with us or the majority or the other to agree with us.

We can, of course, I can get it into the council record. [Scott] can get it into the council record tomorrow that we do have concerns, that we're not as convinced by this as this letter appears to make it.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Marie, I would say that you've got the guidance from the BC, and the BC does not agree with where this letter is going on Recommendation 12. So I think that if you just looked at what the BC said, we would say don't agree with Recommendation 12.

On the other hand, the politics are something you will decide in the moment when you and Scott are given an opportunity to say something and to vote. We want to give you the authority to go either way, but you certainly have the authority based on what we've written to say that the BC does not support the letter based on what is in there for Recommendation 12.

MARIE PATULLO: Okay.

STEVE DELBIANCO: And leave it to you to [make the decision] based on the politics because that's something you and Scott will assess in the moment.

MARIE PATULLO: Thank you. It is a discussion. It's not a vote, per se.

STEVE DELBIANCO: True.

MARIE PATULLO:	It's a review [of the] letter. So thanks [for that]. [I thoroughly] appreciate it. [We can] see how it goes.
	Moving on to Item 5 where we're talking about org's request for clarification on data accuracy, now what's happened here is also pretty interesting because Keith [inaudible] has received a letter. [I'm] looking it over. Yes, it was signed by Göran. [inaudible] final report.
	"The topic of accuracy as related to GDPR compliance is expected to be considered further as well as the WHOIS accuracy reporting system. However, it is not clear who would consider this topic and when. Therefore, org seeks the council's clarification on whether the Phase 2 team will be considering the subject of data accuracy including projects that utilize gTLD registration data, such as WHOIS [ARS]."
	Now there is not an immediate deadline on this because Göran's letter talks about looks forward to the council's input and engaging further on this at ICANN [65] at Montreal. [But] I do know that accuracy is something that really matters a lot to all of our people. And I know that Susan's on the call as well. And I'm wondering if anybody has any specific leads or direction on our discussion for this tomorrow?
DENISE MICHEL:	Apologies. I'm only on the phone, not in Zoom, but I'm happy to be in the queue.
STEVE DELBIANCO:	Go ahead, Denise.

EN

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you. Yes, [we] Facebook would be happy to send you some additional information and links to previous BC comments on this. I think it's an – Facebook believes it's a very important issue for the council to support, but certainly the BC members of the council. We'd be happy to provide additional information beyond what I send you later today if you and Scott need it.

MARIE PATULLO: Thank you very much. That would be great. To make it easy, Denise, I will send you what we've received or put it onto bc-private as well just in case anybody else wants to read it. I'm very, very grateful for that. Thank you.

DENISE MICHEL: Great.

MARIE PATULLO: Anyone else? Or should I move on?

DENISE MICHEL: While I'm on the phone – and apologies I'm not in Zoom, and actually [the] security problems with Zoom required me to remove it from my machine so that's unfortunate. But the previous text, Section 12, you were referring to, is that in our BC e-mail list? I wasn't able to see it when you were discussing it earlier.

MARIE PATULLO: [I'm sorry. Do you mean] the draft letter?

DENISE MICHEL: Yes.

MARIE PATULLO: I put it on the BC EPDP list.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Denise, I believe your in that list, right?

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. I'm sorry. Margie's not in today, but I'll [inaudible].

STEVE DELBIANCO: I'm going to forward it to you right now. I'll forward it to you right now.

DENISE MICHEL: Oh, okay. Great, thank you. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Anyone else in the queue? Back to you, Marie.

MARIE PATULLO:	Thank you. Now the next thing of use, there's going to be a couple of discussions. The evolution of the multistakeholder model. If you want to know anything that's happening in the council, small group that's dealing with the 3.0 project, so the way to improve the PDPs, let me know. I won't take up the call now in case anybody actually wants to do that because there are a few other things.
	We got an e-mail from Keith. For me, this was this morning. For some of you, it would have been yesterday evening. The board has approved the FY 21-25 strategic plan. What they have now done under the new way ICANN works after the transition is [they're] up to the Empowered Community to agree to [inaudible] so-called rejection [access] process.
	Now there's a deadline for that which is 24 July, which is very, very soon. Here I bow to Claudia and to Steve and to all of you who know far more than I do as to whether or not you think that should be forwarded to all of the BC. And if anybody has a comment, we need to react very quickly. I'll pause there, Steve.
STEVE DELBIANCO:	Yeah, please do send to the entire BC. I don't think there's any downside to relaying things that you get from council to the whole bc-private to encourage discussion. Although we know that over time when our members get lots of e-mails from the ExCom they tend to tune us out, so let's be discretionary.
MARIE PATULLO:	That was my issue. Okay, thank you. I'll do that right now.

Next up, the consensus policy implementation framework. Now this is something that lives in ICANN's global domains division. Every [inaudible] when they change things, they review them, they update them, they send out what their [intending] to do for comments. So yet another public comment.

This one is ages away. It's 9 September. If anybody is interested in the [inaudible] for the consensus policy implementation framework, the [inaudible] here concern the potential standardized processes for post-implementation consensus policy reviews and amending the [inaudible] document itself. It's a living document and, of course, some language [inaudible]. [inaudible] but I'm going to say if anybody is interested, let me know and I will happily send it to you. I'm trying not to fill up your inbox.

And then the final one is one that came up at our meeting in Japan. It's one that came up in the BC many years ago which is string similarity. Those of you who did not have the joy of joining us a few years back, when ICANN opened up the new extension for the last round they looked at things as to whether those extensions would be confusing to the average person sitting in front of their computer screen. They decided that certain things were not similar, so not string similarity, including plurals. So the word hotel and the word hotels [and there was also] if I remember car and cars, but people correct me on that.

Anyway, this is an issue that we had thought would be dealt with in the new round because it's a little bit obvious and a little bit clear. However, the chairs of the working group that is looking at the new round, the so-called SubPro working group (that's Jeff Neuman and Cheryl Langdon-

Orr), have written to Keith (the chair of council) telling him that although we though about maybe discussing this in a cross-community working group, we think that's a really bad idea. It shouldn't happen. String similarity should live in their working group, so the SubPro PDP. Anyone wants to be involved, it should be there. They're not going to have a CCWG, and anyway CCWGs are not there to [do] policy.

Now this is a personal bugbear of mine. I do realize that. But, Steve, what do you think? Or, members, please. What do you think we should do with that, if anything? Pausing for comment.

STEVE DELBIANCO: BC members, on string similarity, what do we have? I don't think this is our last bite at this one. The BC was very emphatic on the need to have an objective and consistent way of preventing two strings that look the same because of a Cyrillic letter O and a Latin letter O or that are differed by one letter that would be very confusing to users of that domain. That's why car and cars plurals were such a big concern for us. Any further guidance for Marie and Scott on this?

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: I can't figure out how to put my hand up. The problem with a CCWG – and we did face this with I can't remember which working group we had to deal with on council – but is if recommendations come out of that CCWG, then it really has to go to council and then maybe create a PDP because there's no authority for a CCWG to recommend actual policy. So I agree with Jeff that this belongs in the SubPro. But I'm surprised they haven't focused on it yet.

EN

MARIE PATULLO: Thanks, Susan. Who do we have on SubPro from the BC? Anyone?

STEVE DELBIANCO: No, we do not have a permanent and consistent attendee.

MARIE PATULLO: Okay, thank you, Susan. I really appreciate that. I will think again about the [inaudible] that's coming to council, and I will share with you my suggested bullet point thoughts. Because really something should be done. We're supposed to be here to look after end users. It's part of the BC's mission for everyone having an easy use of the Internet. Yes, I know I'm paraphrasing. So, yeah, this just bugs me. It bugs me.

Okay, a couple of other bits. As you know, ICANN got blindsided [and] was completely bewildered when the GDPR happened. As you also know there is a move afoot to stop it being blindsided by anything else happening anywhere in the world. At the moment it has what it calls a regulatory tracker which [to be fair] is a semi-small list of things happening in places and not much use to anybody.

So council is writing to org suggesting ways that it could be better. A massive shout of thanks goes to Ben, [to both Marks] [inaudible] put together some [more words]. It's still being discussed in council and it will not surprise you to hear that while the draft letter says it would be really nice of the GAC to let us know if they have draft [legislation] that could [inaudible] in the future. Different words, but that's what it says. The NCSG are not happy that we've mentioned the GAC at all. [So] I

don't think anyone is surprised about that but, again, I'll keep you posted.

And finally, I've already put in the chat that if anybody is interested in name collision, the Name Collision Analysis Project (NCAP) – sorry if I'm getting [inaudible] correctly – they have a request [for a provider] out [inaudible] study as part of this project. They're not getting any responses, so they've extended the deadline and put out the call again. If anybody wants to know more about that, if they think they can help on that, let me know and I'll forward you all of the information.

Steve, I think I've covered everything. Let me know if I haven't.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Marie. In the chat, I've put a link. Mark Datysgeld and I have referenced our earlier comments on string similarity, string confusion. I think the most recent one was December 2013. Andy Abrams had done a superb job on that, so please give that a look. It's in the chat.

MARIE PATULLO: Great. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Marie. All right, let's move on to Barbara Wanner to cover the third element here which is the CSG liaison. Barbara, I have it on the screen. I'll turn it over to you.

BARBARA WANNER:	Okay, great. Thank you, Steve. Things have been very quiet since we were in Marrakech. But just on the horizon we, of course, have the GNSO Council elections, selection of new officers. Keith Drazek from Verisign has indicated that he will stand for reelection as GNSO Council chair. We anticipate that someone in the contracted party house will nominate him. The CSG constituencies have agreed to support him, so that should not be controversial.

Rafik Dammak has also indicated he will stand for reelection as the non-contracted party house vice chair. The CSG constituencies also have agreed to support Rafik for another term provided that the vice chair position goes back to the CSG for the 2021-2023 period. We had a lot of discussion about that on the ground in Marrakech. That was influenced by our desire to have control of that seat while certain individuals pursue their ambitions within the NCSG.

In terms of planning for ICANN 66 meetings in Montreal, that will shift over to the ISPCP, so we're off the hook in terms of having the pressure on us for that. But nevertheless, if you feel that there are groups that it would be useful for us to meet with there, let me know and I will include that request in our discussions with our counterparts in the CSG.

And then finally, we're putting this question out to the broader BC membership whether you think it would be useful to engage in an intersessional meeting with the NCSG in early 2020. We got an e-mail from Mary Wong concerning logistical issues. Long and short, there really is no good time when this meeting would not conflict with something else that is going on or otherwise cause people headaches in terms of travel plans and resources. So I guess, what do you say, Steve?

Just let us know your views on whether you think it would be useful for the non-contracted party house to meet in an intersessional setting or forego this.

If I may offer my personal view, I personally did not find the intersessional that we had in Los Angeles to be very useful in terms of moving issues forward and moving forward any sort of collaborative spirit with the NCSG, particularly with respect to the expedited policy development process. What I would like to propose is that we might couch this as being sensitive to budget constraints. I would first approach our CSG counterparts and say the BC doesn't feel this would be a useful expenditure of time or resources. Why don't we instead offer to meet the NCSG even for two hours at the Montreal meeting as a budget-conscious alternative to an intersessional. Just throwing that out as an idea, and I welcome everyone's feedback.

Thank you. That's my report.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Barbara, thank you. I'll go first. I've been to all four of the intersessionals, and I fully support the proposal that you have. It is sensitive to the fact that if NCSG is really excited and can't wait to do an intersessional, that's going to probably cause us to take a step back and think about why. But I will agree with you completely that they have very limited usefulness for either substance or relationships and would prefer your plan which is a two-hour meeting in Montreal rather than a separate meeting of two days where everyone flies into a single location on the planet. Any other BC members have a view to this intersessional?

EN

DENISE MICHEL: I support your recommendation as well, Barbara. Thank you.

BARBARA WANNER: Thanks, Denise.

CLAUDIA SELLI: I also – sorry.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Just to provide a little background information, you know it's been a yearly event, but we did propose it should be a biannual event, that is one in two years. The process that we insisted on then that it should be once is three years is beginning next year.

Well, I think an opportunity for meeting always [closes gaps] in any governance structure. So if there's an opportunity to meet, good. So if the majority feel that let us have it in Montreal for two hours, well, it's fine and good. But I don't think we should throw it away, the biannual structure, because we were the ones that pushed it to biannual. We recommended it should be biannual unless we want to [inaudible] during ICANN meeting again so it can be changed. But just for us to know what has transpired before now. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Any other BC members?

CLAUDIA SELLI: Steve, I don't know if you can hear me.

STEVE DELBIANCO: We do.

CLAUDIA SELLI: I'm very, very busy, but just to say that I would support Barbara's proposal. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you.

BARBARA WANNER: Mark Datysgeld asks, "Would it make sense for one year to be physical or face-to-face and one year virtual? Something like that?" Well, that's an idea. What would people like me to do? I think first of all I have to float some of these ideas with the IPC and the ISPCP and get a feel for what they think. How do people feel about that as an immediate next step?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Barbara, Mark hasn't attended them and might not understand what we mean by physical. When you proposed a two-hour meeting in Montreal, that is a physical meeting.

BARBARA WANNER: Oh, okay.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Mark, I think what you're missing is the intersessional has been a quite expensive two-day event where we all flew to Iceland or we all flew to Los Angeles. I don't believe, and Barbara and Claudia agree with me, that it is productive enough to warrant that level of effort. It's even a little awkward because we don't get along and agree with the NCSG. So the relationships didn't really improve that significantly, and so we don't believe we should do this intersessional meeting where we all fly to one place specifically for a two-day meeting. And I believe the majority of the ExCom agree with Barbara on this. So at this point, Barbara, I would say that's what you go forward with, and one compromise is this idea that if they would like to meet, we'll meet for two hours in Montreal.

BARBARA WANNER: Okay.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Okay, that's it for policy. I'll [inaudible] back to you, Claudia, for the rest of the meeting and the agenda. You can take over the shared screen, Chantelle.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Sure. Thank you very much. I'm sorry. I cannot see the screen, but for the ICANN 66, Barbara gave an update. The only thing I wanted to report on is that certainly in terms of organizing the high-interest topic

and cross-community session we are starting to work on that. They asked for [proposals] as soon as possible. So think about that, and certainly we should be putting forward something.

At the same time also ICANN is proposing to reform a little bit how it is being [perceived] starting earlier [in terms of] organization in the week after an ICANN meeting. And then also maybe changing slightly the name of the cross-community session. That can be a bit confusing. There is a document that I will try to send it over to the members so that you can have a look at that and see and tell me what you think about that proposal. But in general, for ICANN 66 if you have anything that you want to put forward, please reach out and we will try to push that through.

That's it from my end. Jimson, it's over to you. Thank you.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Thank you, Claudia. If I may, let me just say something briefly on the governance of root server system. Steve did mention, yes, we recommend that we should look for a more efficient toward governance because of bureaucracy. Well, the structure I saw there looks balanced because it's quite standard for a standard organization like ICANN.

I believe it's something, a structure that will stand the test of time down the line that will build more transparency and more credibility from external observers, especially when it comes under scrutiny. I'm saying this because of all the criticism we have seen from being in [inaudible] working groups when they are quick to criticize. So I think the

template's kind of a safeguard to take care of such future criticism. But the same if there is a more efficient approach, that would be great.

Okay, now to my plate. Number one, as mentioned in Marrakech, BC officers election [I notice] will be coming up shortly. The program is still [such that we will] be able to tidy that up between the September and October timeframe so that in line with [our] tradition new officers can take their seats January 1, 2020. So if you're interested in any of the offices, you can begin to prepare and look forward to that. [inaudible] be interested in participating in this.

To participate to be able to vote, of course, we have to be sure that we are in good standing concerning our dues. So membership dues, I would like to thank members that paid their dues expeditiously. Though some paid earlier, but the invoices secretariat could not reconcile some payments because the payee name was different from the name of a member on record. Because of that, it was quite difficult to reconcile [immediately].

So I would recommend that when members paid and a third party does that on your behalf, please notify the invoices secretariat so they can quickly reconcile it so that you don't get the automated notices. Notices have gone out again for those that have yet to pay. But if you receive it and you paid, please get in touch with the invoices secretariat so that you can sort out the glitches.

Okay, this is just from me. I don't have much [inaudible] say thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Claudia.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Thank you very much. I don't have anything else, but I don't know if members have any other points that they would like to raise now. Please do so. If there is nothing else, then I would close the call and we adjourn to the next meeting. Thank you very much, everybody, for participating.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]