
CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the BC members call on July 31, 2019. In the interest of time, attendance will be taken via the Zoom room. With this, I'd like to turn it over to Steve DelBianco to begin. Steve, please go ahead.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Chantelle. I circulated a policy calendar last night, so let me dive into that. Since our last BC call, we have had two public comments that we've filed. On July 26th we did a very brief comment supporting two proposed changes to the ICANN bylaws – one a fundamental bylaw, one a regular bylaw. Both were technical clean-ups regarding the IANA naming function review and the SSAC and RSSAC leadership. Those have already been filed. So let me turn to the currently open public comment periods, there are several of them.

The first is these external experts who come in at the request of the ICANN board, and they do a review every five years of each of the ACs and SOs. This is required by the ICANN bylaws. They've just finished the first draft review and recommendations for the ccNSO.

I had asked in the past two BC calls whether anyone in the BC wanted to comment on the review. The review is generally positive, with only a few proposed improvements from the reviewer. I had circulated ... No one in the BC expressed interest but then Jimson got back to me to say he believes the BC should support the draft review and the proposed improvements, and those proposed improvements are on page 67-70 of the report which I've linked to.

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.

Again, we are not in the ccNSO. We don't have that much dealing with them. I know all of you as members use country-code TLDs, and many of you have businesses that are registered in country-code TLDs so the BC certainly has an interest and could comment on it. Are there any objections to the BC filing a supportive comment on the draft report? Anyone in the BC have any concerns with that? I don't see any hands up or chat, so we will do that. Thank you for Jimson for prompting it.

We scroll to the next one, which is Draft Financial Assumptions and Projections, and this is a two-part report. They want comments on ICANN's financial assumptions for the base-case high and low, and then separate comments on the operating initiatives. While several people volunteered, Jimson has carried the water, as usual, and Tim Smith has just provided a couple of edits to those today, which Jimson has not yet reacted to. I could share with you the document itself, Draft Operating Initiatives and Financial Plan, and you'll see that Jimson comes up with several relatively benign observations. We're generally supportive of the review. We make a few suggestions to make it a little bit sharper.

You've all had two weeks of this in your inbox so I wasn't going to go through each and every line of what Jimson's draft has. But at this point, I need to submit these comments on the 5th of August, and this would probably be a great opportunity for you to ask Jimson any questions you might have about the draft that he has prepared. Jimson, I see that you're on the line, so let me ask you to specifically look at Tim Smith's two edits that came out in an e-mail this morning to the drafters, and if you're comfortable with those edits I'll incorporate them and circulate both of these comments for a last call in the next couple of days.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Yes, thank you, Steve. I'll get back to you shortly on that.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Jimson, thank you, and also thank you for drafting these. Let me turn to the third one. This is on the Root Server System Advisory Committee (or the RSSAC). They have come up with a new framework on how to govern the Root Server System, and it includes some cooperation ahead with ICANN on a new concept paper to create three new groups to help to manage the Root Server System: an RSS Governance Board, an RSS Standing Committee sort of like a customer committee, and a Root Server Operator Review Panel. I think in many respects the Root Server System is emulating what those of us did in the IANA transition with respect to the root itself.

So I believe that is supposed to be following a good trajectory, and I'm grateful that Jimson and Mark Svancarek volunteered to draft comments. Now, Jimson got done with his draft quickly, Mark made a few edits, and the third attachment to today's policy calendar contains the current edits made by Mark to Jimson's draft. This comment is due 9th August. I will send a last call around. But Jimson and/or Mark, anything you want to call your colleagues' attention to on that comment?

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Yes, Steve. Actually, as Sue mentioned, the governance framework took a cue from the IANA transition for ICANN. I think it will withstand stress down the line, because if you look at what ICANN's faced in the UN and

the [ITU], and when countries like Iran and India, they came to ICANN and they saw we have a good standard, they had nothing to say. So when the time comes for those guys to now take reckoning of the Root Server System, they will meet a rock-solid governance framework, and that is what I think you tried to achieve, and that is a good thing.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Jimson, thank you. One the screen in Zoom, I have loaded the draft comment, and I have centered the screen on the concern that you raise with respect to the RSSAC Governance Board and the ICANN Board. I don't ever think that the ICANN board is accountable to the RSSAC Governance Board. They are different boards of different bodies, so are you really suggesting that ICANN's board should be accountable to the RSSAC Board?

JIMSON OLUFUYE:

Well, the thinking is this. ICANN is responsible for managing the L-roots, and since the RSSAC board would be the one in charge of all the Root Server System, that is why I was looking at it with regards to the ICANN Board responsibility on the L-root, they will fully be in compliance with the decision or the quality framework approved by the RSSAC Governance Board, so it's from that perspective. I also concluded that ICANN itself is a balanced governance structure, so I don't think there should be much to worry about there. Just for us to know that.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Jimson, I would recommend that it's not the ICANN Board, but it's the ICANN Org, O-R-G, who runs the L-root. Leave the ICANN Board out, and just say that ICANN Org, just like any other root operator, would be accountable to the RSSAC Governance Board.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Okay, I get it now.

STEVE DELBIANCO: I would raise it as a question. I would say that it ought to be explicit that Org itself is accountable to the Governance Board.

MARK SVANCAREK: I can accept that edit.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Beautiful. Thank you, Mark. Any questions from BC colleagues on the Root Server draft? Okay, seeing none let me turn back to the policy calendar. There are a couple more items that are open. By 12th August, just two weeks away, we need to do comments on the proposed definition of name collisions in the scope of inquiry, and I've included the fact that the BC provided comments on collision, so we're instrumental at raising this concern in the last round.

I want a big thank you to Susan Kawaguchi and Jay Sudowski for volunteering to draft a BC comment. It's due in two weeks, and we like to have BC members have at least seven days to review a draft. Susan and

Jay, then, I'll be glad to help you more if you need it, but I do think the best thing to do is to look at the SSAC's report and the BC's comments which I included from April of 2018. Any comments on that, or others who want to volunteer to help Susan and Jay?

The next one up is there's a GNSO PDP on inter-governmental organizations and international non-governmental organizations on how they can access curative rights protection mechanisms if their names and acronyms are used in new gTLDs. This comment period closes three weeks from now and we need some volunteers from the BC that are familiar with this topic and can help us to comment on those PDP recommendations.

This is an important one. Do we have any volunteers that would take a look at this? We've commented on it before, and we'll be able to stand on the shoulders of that work. I see Marie volunteering. Marie, thank you. You're a councilor. You're already carrying a heavy load for the BC. Can I ask another BC member who's not serving right now to assist Marie in that draft?

JIMSON OLUFUYE:

Okay, Steve, I can join Marie.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Jimson, again, you're an officer carrying a heavy load as well. There ought to be somebody ... Thank you, Jimson, but we ought to try to find someone who's relatively new to this. Alright, we'll ask again next week, but Jimson and Marie, as always, thank you for stepping up. The only

other open item is open until September 9th, and it's a survey that ICANN Org is conducting on the NextGen program. Mark Datysgeld has volunteered to lead the BC response. Are there any other BC members who want to volunteer to help Mark on this who have experience with the NextGen program? It's supposed to be about synergies with the academic community whenever ICANN puts a meeting into a particular city and country.

Next up is I have a historical catalog of what's been happening on modifying WHOIS policies to comply with GDPR. At the bottom of that, I highlighted in yellow just a couple of things that are relatively new. We have a full team of BC members who are participating on the Implementation Review Team, or IRT, that is supposed to be implemented phase one, and I would welcome any of those folks to tell about what's going on in phase one implementation. Then we can talk a little bit about phase two, where we have another call tomorrow. So, Suzanne, David, Ben, Mark, and Margie, anything to say about the Implementation Review Team?

MARGIE MILAM: Sure.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Mark had his hand up first, but then Margie.

MARGIE MILAM: Sure, thanks.

MARK SVANCAREK:

Okay. What I have to say about the IRT is a heavy sigh. This is the first time that I have been involved in an IRT, and I don't know if they're all like this, but it seems like there's a great rush to get it done on behalf of Dennis from Org. Whenever we run into problems, everybody's like, well we can take the shortcut, or maybe that's out of scope, or something like that. They plow ahead without spending a lot of time trying to figure out how to make things work. They try to avoid as much work as possible. Maybe I'm just being cynical, or maybe it's not quite how it seems to me.

For instance, we had a problem last week where it was not clear under what legal basis a technical contact could provide consent to have their own data published. This is a case where the registrant requested their data be published, and they also want the technical contact data to be published, because it wouldn't make sense to have the one and not the other. But the technical contact might not be the same entity or organization or part of the same organization as the registrants.

So, how do you get them to agree to do it? There's one prevailing legal theory in the IRT that you simply can't. This is based on two things. This is based on, one, a particular legal interpretation, and two, an unwillingness to really explore different implementation ideas that would go around that legal interpretation. So, for me, I've been waiting for my lawyers to get back from vacation. They're back now, and we'll see if we even agree with the basic legal interpretation.

Regardless of whether we do, I might propose some implementation ideas. But this just felt to me very much like it's an indication of people

who really don't want to implement a policy looking for excuses not to implement a policy. And I'm sorry if that's harsh, but it was very eye-opening and disturbing to me. Margie, do you have anything to add?

MARGIE MILAM:

Yes, just to give a higher-level view for the BC. What you're hearing is that even the phase one report where there were what we thought agreed-upon interpretations of what recommendations were, those are cutting against us. The problem is that the IRT is dominated by contracted parties, and you don't have a lot of participation from, say, GAC, SSAC, ALAC, the kind of balance that we have on the EPDP. It's actually a very difficult dynamic for the BC, and it requires a lot of work and attention, and even pre-planning to prep for the IRT meetings because I am fearful that even the small things that we think are in the phase one report may get eliminated in the IRT.

And just to give you an example with the tech contact, the tech contact has been interpreted in the IRT as being optional by the registrar. If a registrar doesn't want to offer a tech contact, they don't have to. And that's not how we thought the phase one report was intended to be interpreted, but there's just simply no support for having a more reasonable reading of what that recommendation is.

That's the kind of thing that we're seeing. It's very much one-sided against us, and it requires a lot of participation from BC and others to fight and draw the line as to what the phase one recommendations were meant to apply to.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Margie and Mark, thank you. It's so good that we're well represented in phase two and phase one. Turning to phase two, I mentioned to the rest of our members that tomorrow's two-hour call for EPDP phase two will be discussing the second reading on at least two use cases. I put those into the policy calendar with links in hopes some members would click on those, and what we mean by a use case. Why don't you give us some context about how these use cases are likely to work, and how you're arranging to use them in a way that advances the BC's interests? Mark and Margie?

MARGIE MILAM: Sure.

MARK SVANCAREK: [inaudible] question?

MARGIE MILAM: You want me to go ahead?

MARK SVANCAREK: Yeah, go ahead.

MARGIE MILAM: Okay, sure. What we've been doing with respect to these use cases – and we still haven't fully worked out what will happen at the end of the process – is to try to find a commonality with the separate use cases submitted by the other group. For example, the criminal activity is

something that the GAC was mostly interested in, and we've been very supportive of that. We submitted, on behalf of the BC, a number of use cases ranging from phishing, civil claims, [M and A], and due diligence for domain name purchases, that sort of thing.

What we've been doing is trying to align ourselves, wherever possible, with our colleagues, so that the use cases can be discussed. What we think will happen after this conversation is that this will trickle up to a purpose that encompasses all these different use cases. But it's [inaudible] with others on the team to see how many use cases should be considered as we develop the purposes in this space, too.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Mark, anything to add? And any other BC members have questions?

MARK SVANCAREK: No, I think that's a pretty complete summary. We have an abundance of use cases right now that we have to combine, of course, and there's always the risk that as we combine them some of the detail will be lost. But there's really no other practical way to approach this and I guess things are going as well as they can in this. There does seem to be, at least for now, a genuine interest in understanding how these use cases work, although all of our assertions, as usual, are challenged. But at least it has been mostly collegial and so we're making some progress, then, I guess.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Alright. There are 15 BC members who a year ago signed up for a sub-list in the BC called BC-EPDP@ICANN.Org, and that list was superbly active

and supportive over the first year, and now that we're into phase two I note that Margie, Mark, and Marie have been sending inquiries into that list and there's only a few folks that are following it anymore.

I'm making an appeal here to BC members that are following closely on the WHOIS issue in GDPR, please reinvigorate a little bit and try to get more engaged to support Mark, Margie, and Marie in the work they're handling both [inaudible] on the EPDP. Mark and Margie, I will be unable to join the prep call tonight, but I will be on tomorrow's EPDP call.

Let me turn next to the council. On GNSO, or channel two, Marie and Scott are our councilors, and Marie and Scott, I'd like to run it over to you.

MARIE PATTULLO:

Hi, Steve. You've got Marie because Scott is on a bus. He is listening to us, and if I get anything wrong he will prod me to keep the order, the way that we're talking at the moment already about the EPDP. At our last council meeting, there was a discussion of a letter that the council is going to be sending to both the EPDP team and to the Board. Now, we talked about this briefly on our last BC call as well. I sent you just before the call opened an e-mail stream from the council where we've been talking about this.

The best way to summarize this is that the letter from the council suggests that purpose two – so, that's the access [inaudible] data – isn't really the problem, and we don't really need to be doing anything at the moment to make the EPDP team find wording as to how that will go forward. It won't surprise you to hear that neither Margie nor Mark agree with that, and I don't think any of you do either.

And the second one is about recommendation 12, that's about the idea that the contracted parties are absolutely fine to delete the organization field because that would be very, very hard for them to fill in because lots of the data is wrong. I am clearly paraphrasing here.

Now, if you look at the full mail stream you will see that until yesterday, the BC was in a [inaudible] the people on council who disagreed with this. We've now got two because the IPC also disagreed for other reasons. Please do read through the stream. I know it's wrong, but Margie and Mark really do need us to get [inaudible] council, and to do that we do need you guys to [see them]. Now, Steve, before I go into the other council points, can I open that, in case anyone wants to comment? In particular, Margie or Mark.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Please do. Would you like me to open it in the Zoom room, or do you have that handled?

MARIE PATTULLO: No, no, I didn't mean that. I meant does anyone on the call, in particular, Margie or Mark, want to add anything to what I've said, or have any questions about that? Thanks.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Margie and Mark?

MARGIE MILAM:

Sure. I did see the e-mail Marie, that you sent, and I thought that it summarized the situation great. Essentially, for the BC members, what this is, is two recommendations from the EPDP report that were not adopted by the board, and now the GNSO is in this consultation process where the GNSO Council is expected to send a letter back to the board on what to do.

And so what we've been encouraging the council to do is to essentially ask that purpose two, which in particular is the one that we all hear about because it relates to third-party access, needs to get updated because of the advice that was received after the phase one report was published. Remember that the European Commission had sent a letter saying that the purpose two shouldn't be adopted as-is, that it conflated two different concepts, and that it needs to be rewritten.

What we've been encouraging the council to do is to take this consultation period as an opportunity to send it back to the EPDP to update purpose two, so that it becomes part of the phase one recommendations that were adopted by the board. The risk is if those aren't adopted then there essentially is no purpose two for third-party access until after phase two is concluded, and who knows how long that will be and how long it'll take to implement phase two recommendations if we actually are successful doing that.

There's a big risk there if there isn't some sort of placeholder purpose until then, and so that's what the letter's intended to do. But Marie and Scott have difficulties in that there's really no support on the council at this point. It's a question of standing our ground and explaining why it makes sense to address those issues now.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Margie. Back to you, Marie.

MARIE PATTULLO: Yes, thank you very much, Margie. Another issue that we discussed at council last week – week before, whenever the council was, sorry – also refers to EPDP, this time to do with data accuracy. The council got a letter from ICANN Org asking for it to explain how the EPDP team plans to consider the subjects of data accuracy as it relates to gTLD registration data and related services, such as the WHOIS accuracy reporting system.

Now, we explained in council quite straightforwardly that the EPDP team is already looking at this as part of phase two. It's in its timeline. It's in its work plan. It's after legal analysis, so our answer to Org and council should simply be that the EPDP team is dealing with it.

Now, there was a bit of pushback. Hardly surprising. In the council, the one that concerned me the most was Rafik, who is both the vice chair of the council, but as you may also know, the liaison between the council and the EPDP work. He said that we should be very careful and not add any more [costs to] phase two, and also noted that not all [inaudible] related matters, especially those that are not consensus policy, would be dealt with in phase two, but might indeed need a new PDP all of their own. Unless Margie wants to come back on that, I would just say this is one we need to keep on the radar, so I will keep talking unless Steve interrupts me.

The other couple of points from council, which are very brief; ATRT. There's going to be a survey set of questions coming out of the ATRT team somewhere in mid-August of how it's going to [close in] with September. You've already seen the initial questions that came through on the 24th of June.

If you want to know about how the work on how we're developing 3.0 – in other words, how PDP should work better – as always let me know. We're still having weekly calls.

But the only other one that's pretty big, that's quite active, you'll also remember the consumer trust, the CCRT (Competition Consumer Trust Review.) Now, the board sent five recommendations to the council to look at further. The council is looking at them further, and it has come out with a draft. If anybody wants to see this, let me know and I will send it to you. Briefly, one goes to a PDP about privacy, which kind of has been taking over by events, one goes to the relationship between registry operators, registrars, and DNS security abuse.

There are two that go to RPMs. And the final one, I'll quote, the recommendation was: set objective [inaudible] for applications from the global south." So, not that I'm looking at Mark or anything, not that I'm seeing that Mark's on the call or anything, but if anybody wants to look at this, Mark, do let me know. That's it from me, Steve, Thanks.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thank you, Marie. Any other questions for our councilors? Alright, I'll scroll down to channel three, Barbara Wanner's group of supporting all

of our work at the Commercial Stakeholders Group, where Barbara is our elected liaison to the BC. Barbara?

BARBARA WANNER:

Thank you, Steve. I really don't have any meaningful updates this week, because our CSG ExCom call is tomorrow. But in the interim, I would just say that we've received a lot of support for the BC's proposed postponement ... Not postponement, but doing without, if you will, an intercessional next year, and instead having a meeting at one of the ICANN meetings.

We had originally proposed doing a two-hour meeting at ICANN 66. The ISPCP came back and said, "Well, why don't we give ourselves even more flexibility and say ICANN 66 or ICANN 67?" If BC colleagues feel that it would be more important for us to use ICANN 66 to have a dedicated session with the contracted party house, or the SSAC, or whatever, we could conceivably book that and push the NCSG meeting off to ICANN67.

But I need to hear from people about who they feel they should meet with and give priority to at ICANN 66, in addition to meeting with the board, Goran, and other members of senior management.

And really, that's it. I would just say – and this is thanks to Marie's heads up – just to draw to everyone's attention that for Visa-exempt countries Canada requires you to apply for and receive an electronic travel authorization, or ETA, in order to fly to Canada. US citizens do not have to secure this. However, if you are a permanent resident of the US, that is to say if you're in the United States on a Green Card, you do. I'm happy to just send the link on to the BC private list. It's very easy to understand,

self-explanatory. You can apply online. The questions they ask are very basic. It's not an elaborate process. But just an important heads up if you reside in a Visa-exempt country, and the website lists all of those countries. So just for those folks who are planning to attend ICANN 66. I think that's it for me, Steve, thanks.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Barbara, thank you. I'll scroll up a little bit in the Zoom room, and you'll see that there are currently three high-interest topics for cross-community sessions being proposed for Montreal, and the GAC has taken the lead on this. DNS abuse mitigation, EPDP [inaudible] and human rights. And on abuse mitigation, that Mark Svancarek provided some edits to the way this panel is being set up, so instead of us proposing a different cross-community session, it's better for us to show that we are really keenly interested in shaping and participating in what the GAC has proposed.

Mark, thank you for that text. I've circulated it with some emphasis, and getting good feedback so far. So let's be sure that you or someone from Microsoft is prepared to be in Montreal if I can get you on that panel.

MARK SVANCAREK:

We'll be there.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thank you, Mark. At this point, I'm going to ask Chantelle to display the agenda for today's call, coming right up, and then we'll turn it over to the next section which is ... Claudia is not with us yet, unavailable, so Jimson

I'd like to turn it over to you for the Operations and Finance Report.
Jimson?

JIMSON OLUFUYE:

Okay, thank you Steve, and again welcome everyone. So first, which we can see, is the notice that BC officer election will be coming up and also that of committees. We have the [credentials] committee. We have also the outreach committee. By virtue of our charter, election is to hold every year. The notice has been sent to the list, and thanks to Chantelle for getting that across.

So, we're looking at starting in September, nice precisely for nomination period for two weeks, in line with our charter. And then we have candidate statements nearly after that two-week period. And then we'll take discussions as usual. The candidates call on 2nd October, and then confidential voting will start between 2nd October and 9th October, a one-week period. Results will be announced on Thursday, 10th October, and the new officer will take their seat by January 1st, 2020.

ExCom decided, which will start on time this time around, so that new officers can be actually ... That could be not only transition, as the case may be. And also in line with the ICANN requirement for early processing of election in the constituencies, with regards to travel processes.

So, for the officer's position that's open, of course all the officer's position, the office of the chair, the office of the vice chair policy, coordination, and the office of the vice chair of finance and operations, and the CSG officer. That is the Commercial Stakeholder Group liaison, or

rep. And so we are all encouraged to come forward to be part of the process.

Then shortly after the officer selection, we'll have the committee's election. You can recall that our charter became effective June 2017, and so there's a requirement at least members and [inaudible] officers for a three-year period [inaudible]. The members of these various committees sign for two years in accordance to the charter, and so the option of serving for another year. But basically the position of the chair is an elected position and it has to go for election.

Okay. I've spoken about the officer selection and the committee selection. I will move onto membership dues. I want to thank members for expeditiously responding to invoices sent, many have responded. I think so far we have about 65% payment, so thank you. We were still trying to remediate cases whereby checks were sent. Maybe there were delays one way or the other. It would be great if you could all use a credit card or maybe a financial process can just do direct transfer.

So with that, it would be so easy to overcome those delays we've been seeing that members have. [inaudible] want to say thank you to those [that are having it], and if you [inaudible] any issue, please feel free to send to me, so that I can take a look at those issues.

Next is on Montreal outreach. An outreach is coming up in Montreal, and I believe Barbara is meeting tomorrow at the CSG – they are meeting tomorrow. And as usual, we count on the support of our friends in the Global Stakeholder Group to [inaudible] give us support.

We're also in the process of publishing our newsletter, so if you have any article you think would be beneficial, please feel free to put pen on paper. It doesn't have to be so long. It could be very short and effective, could be of your experience in BC so far, and especially those that were beneficial of CROP, so you could actually ... Some of them, we've seen your report, and some of them will be detail and used. But apart from the beneficiary of CROP, others they will have a message to deliver with the benefits of our audiences, please do so. We seriously [need] articles for our newsletter.

By the next meeting we'll have more details about the outreach plan, especially since Montreal is a French-speaking area in Quebec, so maybe do outreach to the French community and so on and so forth.

And then lastly we have a number of funding mechanisms approving the project by ExCom for FY20. Very soon Claudia will be sending out some information concerning this, so be prepared to take advantage of a number of these.

There is ICANN CROP that is within the region, so this time around the region of ICANN meeting is not America, that is Canada and the US. So members that live in those countries that want to use CROP, please feel free to use CROP to be part of the outreach. As well if you speak French, and you are staying [far off] from Montreal so CROP can bring you in there to also join the outreach program. Or if there are minorities like in the US, minorities, SMEs that you think would benefit, please feel free to recommend them. Immediately the expression of interest document message is sent across [inaudible].

Basic CROP is also there, though it's also restricted to [inaudible] regional activity, but it doesn't necessarily have to be consigned to ICANN meeting, but it's connected with doing outreach for BC and pushing BC messages.

In addition to the [inaudible] we have the leadership development funding, [inaudible] for members that are active, contributing to policy work. I want to continue to advance it.

So, leadership development for members that have [inaudible] contributing, to be able to be attending of ICANN meetings. And if there are no members that could respond to this, then non-members can be recommended, with potential to becoming members of the BC. So, all this, [inaudible] ask for ICANN 66, ICANN 67, and ICANN 68, so, we need to take note of that.

Barbara mentioned the need to get ETA for those permanent residents in the US, or Europe, and thanks Marie for bringing that out. Actually, I also found out that for those of us that need to secure a Visa, it appears the Canadian Visa is the most strenuous because it requires about 45 days for processing, compared to the US, that could take just three days or one week max. But Canada from our side is taking about 45 days, so we need to start the processes on time.

That is why those that want to take advantage of this mechanism, the moment Claudia sent the expression of interest letter out, should be able to respond as soon as possible.

Once again I want to let you know that we've had a very good relationship with Chris Mondini, that he has been helping out throughout with

outreach, and we're hopeful that he will continue to enable us to have robust outreach in Montreal. But yes, that's it for now. Any questions? Thank you.

BARBARA WANNER: Jimson, I don't know why I'm having such a terrible time with this date, as the ExCom knows, but just for the sake of correcting the record, the CSG ExCom call in fact is Friday, that would be August 2nd. Thanks.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Oh, okay, sorry. Maybe it's [inaudible]. I thought ... Today is already Thursday, oh my goodness. Okay, sorry, thank you.

ANDREW MACK: Jimson, this is Andrew, can you hear me?

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Yes please, Andy?

ANDREW MACK: Just a quick question. Recognizing that it's not a long flight for many people from North America, is there any possibility that if we didn't really need our CROP slot for North America, we might be able to take it and use it in Cancun, to add it so that we'd have an extra slot for Cancun? I know that Mexico is sometimes considered part of North America, and sometimes it's considered part of Latin America, depending on where you are.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: From the criteria set, I don't think it's transferable unless maybe Chantelle can help us. Yes, maybe Chantelle can help us with the inquiry, and we can get an exception. Yes, that would be nice. That would mean that we have a list, too.

ANDREW MACK: I'm thinking that given the ease of getting to Montreal, realistically, and giving the attractiveness of Cancun, I think we should still do, and I think we still plan to do, outreach in Montreal. But we may have the ability to do a bigger splash in Cancun, that's all.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Sure, naturally.

ANDREW MACK: I think it's worth looking into.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Yes, it is the 20th-anniversary celebration of BC is coming up in Cancun, so you know. The ExCom moved it from Montreal to Cancun, so there's going to be a real good outreach in Cancun. Chantelle is online, so Chantelle will help us clarify if we can use that CROP for Montreal in Cancun. Good points you made, anyway.

ANDREW MACK: And we should be thinking about what is our signature drink for the BC 20th anniversary. Anyway, thanks for [inaudible].

STEVE DELBIANCO: Jimson, thank you. Are there any other questions for Jimson? I did note in the chat to each of you that the officers of the BC are encouraging members to run for these officer positions, especially now that we're creeping up on the end of our term limits for the new charter. Each of us as officers would be glad to brief you privately on how much effort is involved, what methods we use to make it a manageable amount of work.

And let me also remind BC members that ICANN provides some travel funding for our elected officers. It's a modest per diem, it puts you up in the ICANN venue hotel, and there's a modest amount of airfare that's provided, so it certainly defrays the costs of participating in ICANN, and that's another attraction.

Please think about your level of interest at running for any of these officer posts, and reach out to Claudia, Jimson, Barbara, myself, and our councilors, any time you want to know more about what the position is like. We need more of you to participate. I will at this point ask if there's any other business? Okay. We're going to terminate this call and give you ten minutes of your life back. We'll talk to everyone again on August 14th. Bye, now.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]