

---

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the BC members call on Wednesday, October 9, 2019. In the interest of time, attendance will be taken via the Zoom room. I'd like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking and to keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. With this, I'd like to turn it over to our chair Claudia to begin. Claudia, please go ahead.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Thank you very much, Chantelle, and thank you very much, everybody, for participating in today's call. In the interest of time, I will give the floor to Steve for the policy calendar.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Claudia. I'll bring up the policy calendar on the screen right now. You should have received it yesterday afternoon. Then I'll have one addition to it from Mason Cole.

Since our last call, we responded to that survey earlier in September. So there haven't been any new filings from the BC since our previous call in the last week of September. I did want to point out though that when we responded to the ATRT3 survey – and ATRT is the Accountability and Transparency Review Team. It's the third iteration. Tola represents the Commercial Stakeholders Group there, and we drafted extensive replies from the BC. And then on our last call, Jimson offered [a further point] and then told them we'll feed that into the ATRT at that point.

---

*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.*

I did indicate for you that there are group responses and individual responses that have been summarized by staff. I won't bring them up now to get into the details, but suffice to say that few of the groups or individuals indicated they are satisfied across the board with ICANN's accountability and transparency. Now they all have their own reasons, and we emerged as the only ones who thought that one of the solutions was to give two more board seats to the GNSO and take them away from the NomCom. I want to scroll down. Jimson, did you want to add anything with respect to the additional point you fed into Tola?

JIMSON OLUFUYE:

Well, Steve, thank you so much, you and Tola, for that excellent draft. Really, I just [feel] that point is very important [inaudible] regard to the need to reduce friction within [house]. Just to re-echo the point you made earlier that if we [are considered] for a board seat, then that could go a long way to reduce the friction and to encourage buy-in and drive [to] consensus in the community. Thank you, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Right, Jimson. Jimson makes a subtle but important point. If both the CSG and the NCSG had their own board member on GNSO balanced by two from the contracted parties, Jimson's point is we wouldn't be taking turns with the NCSG every two years to appoint a member. We wouldn't have to compromise to pick a board member that served neither party's interests. Instead, we'd each have a powerful advocate on the board advocating for our interests without having to compromise with each other. So that helps reduce some of the friction.

---

---

Probably increases our effectiveness. So we're going to have to lobby hard to get that done. I don't see Tola on the call today, so we're going to have to pass that along to him directly.

JIMSON OLUFUYE:

Steve, if I may [still comment], just dovetailing on your point that we need to lobby, I think we need to underscore that seriously, especially as we approach Montreal. There's nothing wrong if you call other people aside and then present our rationale. I think [it goes a long way,] and we need to do the lobby to get it across – and I think we can get it. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

And not only from the outside but from the inside. We've got to educate Tola about the tactics to use as a member of the team as well.

All right, we have a couple of open public comment periods and then one from Mason Cole which is a draft statement we want to consider here.

We have a current document, it was the first attachment to the policy calendar, are the draft BC comments on ICANN Org's effort to improve the effectiveness of the multistakeholder model. Those comments close 14 October. You've had a draft for two weeks, and then on October 2 I circulated an updated draft.

And today, I have a third draft. It's the first attachment, it's [V6], and this reflects a lot of interactive work going back and forth between Mark Datysgeld, John Berard, Andy Abrams has been engaged, Barbara

Wanner has been offering some points. So we're really honing the document. It still has an edge to it where the BC is not all that happy with the way the multistakeholder model is working out for businesses registrants and users. And we're trying to be constructive and precise when we express our concerns and recommendations to improve it. We may be a voice in the wilderness here, but we're going to make sure that our voice is clear.

At this point, Mark, Zak, Jimson, Andy, John, Barbara, anything you want to bring up about the comment? If you wish, I can display it as well. BC members, be sure you get your feedback to us before 14 October. It's the first attachment on today's policy calendar. Thanks again to the drafters.

The second one is the ICANN bylaws require a review of the last expansion of TLDs. They require a review as to the degree to which that expansion increased competition, consumer trust, and consumer choice. They call it the CCT, and it's a review team. Of all their recommendations, six of them were accepted by the board. The rest were deferred for further information. But of those which were accepted, the board has asked staff to drum up an implementation plan with costs and next steps. That document is what we're commenting on here, the implementation plan.

Those comments close 21 October. We last commented on the CCT-RT just last November thanks to Stephanie and Mark. We talked about DNS abuse and safeguards. I call that to your attention because of the six recommendations that the board wants to implement now, one of them is in regard to DNS abuse. So, Mason, pay attention to this because I

---

know you drafted something on DNS abuse. So I'm going to want to try fold all of this together.

Margie Milam, Mason, and Mark, I want to thank you for volunteering to draft. It's still a couple weeks away, so no great hurry. But do you have any questions, or are there additional BC members who would volunteer to help with that comment? Anyone else want to help? It's not a particularly long one because we only have six recommendations that are up for implementation.

For BC members that haven't worked on comments before, you'd be well-served to jump in. Margie and Mason are real pros at this and are going to be able to handle the lion's share of the difficult work. So joining as a drafter would be an easy lift for you. Looking at the BC list, we have a lot of folks on this call, 23. This would be a perfect opportunity for someone who cares, say in particular, about DNS abuse to jump in and help. Okay, I try.

Next one up is public consultation to define what global public interests means to ICANN. This was something that [was] driven by the board because it wants to try to put some meat on the bones of that phrase because it appears all over the place in the ICANN bylaws this notion of global public interest.

The board's idea on this is not to define it at all but to say that the framework that we use [in] developing policy is a framework that automatically gets you solutions that are in the global public interest. To use a technical term, I think that's complete bullshit.

---

---

We believe we should try to frame global public interest in a way that does limit ICANN's scope but at the same time gives us the hooks that we need from the business community to be sure that the services that ICANN manages and offers are available all around the world 24/7/365 in every script, in every language, including universal acceptance of the TLDs.

And we think there ought to be integrity. Integrity with respect to who gets to register a name. Are they really the rightful owner? Integrity that when resolutions occur, that I'm truly getting the website I was looking for.

So to that end, you've seen this already three times. I won't go through it all again, but we're going to propose a definition as opposed to just a framework. Maybe we'll say the framework plus a real definition – a basic, foundational definition.

If we do that, I'll use the text that's here. This text has appeared in earlier BC comments. But the question for you is, what else should I say in this comment and who else can help me draft on this?

DENISE MICHEL:

Steve, I'm in transit, but I'll help you.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Please. Oh, great. Thank you, Denise. And, Tim Smith, I see that you've volunteered to help a little bit about DNS abuse. Thank you. You'll work with Margie, Mason, and [Mark Wilson] on that. And Ben Wallis as well. Thank you, Ben.

Mark Datysgeld is asking about the public interest theme. Mark, it appeared many places in the ICANN old bylaws and now it's in even more places, the global public interest. It was also part of the Affirmation of Commitments. So given that that phrase is in there, there's concern that if you don't define it, it can mean anything or nothing, depending on who is using it. And I support the idea of sticking a definition on it. So it's already a theme. The question is, are we going to bother to define it or just say that ICANN's framework and processes automatically generate [it].

Hey, Claudia, thank you very much for also offering to help. That's fantastic. Those of you who were chiming in on DNS abuse will be wanting to pay keen attention to Mason Cole's draft, which I'm going to cover next.

Okay, [plus] Denise and Mark. Thank you very much. I appreciate everybody volunteering. Any other points you'd like to see us make in the global public interest consultation? That closes 18 October. What's interesting is it's not a public comment. It's sort of buried someplace – public consultation. So it's not on the ICANN public comment list, but it's a public consultation nonetheless. It's not going to get a lot of attention.

We attempted to use our approach at Council who was drafting a reply. And Scott McCormick and Marie are councilors, put our approach in, but Council itself didn't want to pick up our definition and is heading in a different direction.

Okay, there's a chunk of stuff on modifying WHOIS for GDPR. For that, I'll turn to Margie and Mark. But before I turn to that, I'd like to bring up a document that Mason Cole circulated, I think it was just yesterday. On your screens is a document that you received via e-mail from Mason. It's only a page and a half long.

As you know, I've described to you that DNS abuse is going to be a high-interest topic session in Montreal. DNS abuse is one of the six elements that's being pursued under the CCT-RT. What Mason has tried to do is to reach back into previous things the BC has said about abuse, previous conclusions that the ICANN community has reached on PDPs that looked at DNS abuse. About ten years ago, the BC was a true leader. Had a long-term, long-running working group trying to come up with DNS abuse and suggesting ways that it's within ICANN's remit to assist at remedying it.

What Mason has offered is a statement that we could use. It's not pursuant to a public comment. We could use it during the debate that occurs in Montreal. There are elements here that would feed into the work that the CCT-RT team is doing as well.

Mason, I wanted to give you a chance to walk us through it. I have it on the screen for everybody. I've already given you a comment offline. So did Statton Hammock. Go ahead, Mason.

MASON COLE:

Thanks, Steve. Good morning. Can everybody hear me?



---

STEVE DELBIANCO:

We do.

MASON COLE:

Okay. Thank you very much. I think you summarized the situation nicely just now, Steve. What precipitated this draft was two things. One, there was an early statement made by the Registry Stakeholder Group about wanting to narrow the definition of abuse down to security threats and otherwise talk about a narrow remit for ICANN in the area of DNS abuse. That goes against the interest of the BC and others within ICANN who are interested in a broader definition of abuse as a way to try to address some of the harms that are happening in the DNS.

There also was a statement by the GAC recently, and when I'm finished I'll try to put both those links into the chat. Both those groups are staking out positions in advance of the session in Montreal. My idea was that it would be a smart thing for the BC to get on record early so that the discussion wasn't dominated so terribly by one set of interests.

What we've learned about the discussion in Montreal, I believe, is that the contracted parties have done a pretty good job of trying to narrow the scope of the discussion down to areas where they're already voluntarily combatting abuse and talking about those things, areas where they're already combatting abuse. We need a broader discussion of that, and I wanted to get the BC on record in advance.

Steve, actually I don't see the document on my screen. I don't know if that's a problem with me or it just doesn't show up. But regardless....

---

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Yeah, let me check on that. Anyone else? Give me some indication in chat. Can anybody see the document? I'm sharing it right now. Nobody can see it. Chris Wilson can see it. If you're in the Zoom room looking at the main screen, at least some of you can. This is odd. Let me ask those of you who cannot see it, please just look at yesterday's e-mail from Mason Cole. It's a page and a half long. You can bring it up on your own machine.

MASON COLE:

The thrust of the statement is that we make specific requests of the ICANN community, such as discouraging a narrow definition of abuse, discouraging use of a PDP to address abuse. Because, as you correctly point out, Steve, ten years ago there was a communitywide effort on the abuse subject, and that's a good building block for addressing abuse now.

ICANN should do a better job of defining the purposes of abuse-related data collection. Once those purposes are identified, ICANN can determine whether or not abuse definitions by outside sources can be a reference to the ICANN community. We know ICANN certainly isn't the only group that's addressing abuse, and there are some outside definitions that could lend some credence to what we're doing inside ICANN.

We also ask for stronger contractual obligations related to DNS abuse. And then we want to bring in the SSAC and the GAC as bodies [of advice to the] ICANN board to build on the GNSO's existing definitions because they're authorities on the area of abuse.

---

So we have some very specific asks. We provide some context in the statement as well with some reasoning about why we're interested in the area of abuse. And then we wrap it up by saying that we're all looking forward to the discussion in Montreal. What I would like to do is put this out well in advance of Montreal and have the BC on record so that when we arrive in Montreal we're prepared for the discussion. Thank you, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thank you, Mason. I do appreciate that you worked to draw upon prior BC comments and PDP. I've encouraged you to modify the document so that you include the definition that you referred to in the second bullet so people don't have to go track that down, and I gave you the two sentences on that. Would you be willing to do that?

MASON COLE:

I am willing to do that. That's a good addition.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Okay. Anyone else? There were several of you who volunteered to help on DNS abuse: Tim Smith, Ben Wallis, Claudia Martinuzzi. If you would be so kind, take a look at this page and a half from Mason before you even turn to the CCT-RT. Because this is a chance to establish the principles the BC wants to draw on, and we can feed that into the comment we do on the other document.

Mason, Chris Wilson asks in the chat, "What would we be thinking in terms of stronger contractual obligations?" That's the fifth bullet point.

MASON COLE:                                 Sorry, I was on mute. Can you hear me now?

STEVE DELBIANCO:                         We do.

MASON COLE:                                 The contracted parties are going to try to keep the definition of abuse very narrow to security obligations. What we're looking for is stronger contractual obligations [on the part of] contracted parties that obligate them to address [inaudible]. If you look at the [inaudible] definition of abuse as defined back in 2010, you've got abuse that causes actual and substantial harm [inaudible] material predicate to such harm or is illegal [or] illegitimate and otherwise considered contrary [inaudible] design of [inaudible] such a purpose [is] disclosed.

That's a building block that we can use to help better define abuse built into ICANN contracts for registrars and registries, obligations on their part to address abuse. So [inaudible] about contractual obligations that you think would be useful to advocate for, then I think we're all ears and we'd be willing to entertain those.

STEVE DELBIANCO:                         Chris Wilson, do you have a follow-up for Mason on that? Okay, and Barbara Wanner is asking, "Can the BC provide a speaker for that high-interest session? Well, of course, we could, Barbara, but it's a fight to get it in. The GAC put themselves forward as the organizer of that

---

session, and at this point only Claudia is even on the e-mail list because she's the chair of SOs and ACs, the e-mail list where people debate that. So, Claudia, what is your current read on the opportunity for us to get somebody at the table for that session?

CLAUDIA SELLI:

Steve, the latest mail that I received concerning the session I forwarded to everyone. I will, of course, inquire the possibility of having someone at the table. But you saw the mail that I forwarded, so there is nothing recent that I have received. [And we have checked as well] the list. Also, Chantelle has checked it, so there was nothing more than what I forwarded.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

I believe that we should assert our interest, as if it's not assumed already, assert our interest in having a representative, and Manal will be the key to getting us on there because as the GAC chair, this is a GAC panel. We always include the GAC when we organize high-interest sessions, and I'll bet that Manal will reciprocate.

Okay, let's move on. Margie and Mark, thanks for being on the call. It might be your tenth hour this week already of ICANN calls. I'll return the screen back to the policy calendar to give you an opportunity to update our colleagues on what's happening in EPDP Phase 2. Mark and Margie, please?

---

MARGIE MILAM: I'm driving, so if Mark can jump in, it's probably better. But I can respond if Mark isn't available.

MARK SVANCAREK: Okay, can you hear me?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Perfectly, thanks.

MARK SVANCAREK: Okay, well, Margie always does this better than I do, so I was waiting for her to speak. Let's see, Margie, I'm sorry. Remind me what we were working on this week because I'm drawing a blank. I'm sorry.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Well, remember, Mark, that yesterday's call went pretty well, and part of it was this notion of a broadly supported letter to ICANN's board trying to get them on the record as to what kind of a role and responsibility they may take.

MARK SVANCAREK: Yeah, that is true. There is a real need to get ICANN to just give us some boundaries on what they are willing to do. Are they willing to be some sort of a conduit that data passes through, or are they willing to hold it? Are they willing to become sort of a joint controller or co-controller who take on the responsibility of performing balancing tests such that they take the responsibility for all of those balancing decisions, or are they

---

planning to be something else? Are they planning to create contracts that oblige a contracted party to hand over data? Which could lead to a situation where a contracted party disagrees with the decision and then there's some sort of a conflict and the conflict resolution would have to be defined.

These are the high-level questions that we need them to answer, and so far they've been pretty cagey about it. And it has not been helpful to our deliberations because now we're starting to get into the definitions of what an access system would look like, an [inaudible] system would look like. We're getting out of the theoretical and into the practical, more or less. So we need to have some concrete boundaries that we can work against.

I'm checking my notes now. Sorry. I was doing something else.

MARGIE MILAM: Mark, [inaudible].

MARK SVANCAREK: Okay, go ahead.

MARGIE MILAM: I can jump in, Mark, if you want.

MARK SVANCAREK: Please do.

MARK SVANCAREK:                   Please do.

MARGIE MILAM:                   Okay. Yeah, just so the BC understands what we'll see in Montreal, the group is working toward talking about building blocks. So every meeting we have, we address a specific building block where we try to reach agreement on some sort of policy recommendation. So we won't have an initial report by Montreal, but we'll have building blocks that talk about things like accreditation, [inaudible] policy, those sorts of things, what kinds of acceptable use policies would there be.

So it think the plan for Montreal is to have a discussion with the community on where we think we're going in the initial report, but it won't be very detailed. And so the input that contracted parties have been asking ICANN for is really important, what Mark just talked about. Because the notion is if ICANN is willing to be the full decider of [reveal] requests, then that helps us in defining our policy recommendations. So we don't want to waste our time if ICANN is unwilling to do that.

So there's this letter being floated asking ICANN if they're willing to be the sole discloser and if they're willing to handle all of these requests that would come in through the SSAC so that the contracted parties would not have to even evaluate the requests. So that's a very important piece of the puzzle. Once we know the answer to that, we'll be able to define the policy recommendations around that.



---

I think the contracted parties are a little skeptical that ICANN is willing to take that responsibility, and that's the reason that the request is going out. And then it will help the entire group to know whether ICANN is willing to play that role.

So that's basically where we are. We're having [multiple] meetings as we lead into Montreal. In each of these building blocks, you'll see some very high-level principles but not a lot of detail. But it will at least be something that we can talk about in Montreal.

MARK SVANCAREK: Steve and Margie, what did you think about Becky Burr's replacement of Leon Sanchez as our liaison?

STEVE DELBIANCO: She's a contracted party but very fair and looks out for the broader perspective of how ICANN has to navigate amongst governments and do the right thing. So she has a very good big picture, very articulate, but she has previously worked for contracted party and is now an independent attorney. I think it will be an improvement because she'll be more active than Leon was.

MARK SVANCAREK: That was my impression yesterday as well is that she was much more active, and that was just her first day. And her activity was generally advantageous to us, so that gave me a little bit of optimism.

---

STEVE DELBIANCO: Mark and Margie, thank you for all your doing on this. It's a tireless, thankless job, and I guess I'll see you on the prep call today and another two-hour call tomorrow morning. Thanks for all you're doing.

Let me turn to GNSO Council. This will be a very quick report because both our councilors have other commitments today and there was no Council meeting in the intervening two weeks since our last call. So there's no news on Council. This is the part where I sometimes turn to an update. Denise, anything you want to add on SSR2? And, Tola, I see that you've joined. What is the current status at ATRT3?

DENISE MICHEL: Sorry, Steve. I was having trouble getting off mute. The SSR2 is finalizing draft recommendations to discuss with the community in Montreal. And then after Montreal, there will be an update and then an official posting of the draft report. I'll have some substantive input soon from the team.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Got it. So I should say expect a presentation in Montreal? Not just a [inaudible] report?

DENISE MICHEL: Yes.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Okay, thank you. I appreciate it, Denise. Tola, anything you want to update us on quickly on ATRT3? Tola, can't hear you.

ADETOLA SOGBESAN: Can you hear me now?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yes, we do.

ADETOLA SOGBESAN: Thank you. [inaudible] call earlier. Just got off ATRT meeting a few minutes ago, and I just tried to have my lunch. Okay, we're [through all] the responses from the [inaudible] and I was able to [chip in] with Jimson [inaudible]. I had waited this long thinking that it would be possible for [the edit], but since I was gone I have listed what Jimson added. And, unfortunately, we had [inaudible] we're on Item 3. We have the one we – it was Question 6 that Jimson had provided for the [edit]. So what we have concluded was to allow every other one to be concluded, then we'll go back to the ones we have passed.

There will be no call next week because we are [inaudible] to have a face-to-face meeting in two weeks. No, no, by next weekend in Singapore, and at that point, we're going to be [inaudible].

One of the things I would like to report on was the trend we were seeing when it comes to the percentage of agreed or disagreed and maybe [it will be] very important when we are responding to. It's not limited to GNSO responses though. It's a common thing that we observed. There are some cases we have 58% strongly agree and 42% disagree.

---

Now one of the things we discovered was having 42% of the community disagreeing with any idea is substantial. So today, we're wondering how [inaudible] do we make it [inaudible] such that we don't have as much as 48 people disagreeing. We could have maybe 20% strongly disagree, 10% disagree and I will be able to state in our recommendation that this particular item whereas 50% and above approve of it, the vast majority of the community still disapprove in this [inaudible].

STEVE DELBIANCO:

All right, thank you, Tola. Appreciate that. Great update. And later in the call, we'd like to hear whether you've been able to get your visa. We'll do a survey of everyone else too.

Barbara Wanner, I'll scroll up on the policy calendar to the Channel 3 section on Commercial Stakeholders Group and turn it over to you. Barbara?

BARBARA WANNER:

Thanks, Steve. I'd just like to highlight two things for today's meeting. The first one being that the CSG needs a new representative for the CCWG auction proceeds working group. The person would assume the role that Marilyn Cade has held following ICANN 66. The CSG agreed to allow Marilyn to continue in her capacity as a CSG rep because we were very, very close to ICANN 66. There was only about two months left of work on that working group.

I'm getting a lot of feedback. I'm sorry. Anybody else?

In any event, the ISPCP and the IPC are canvassing their members to see if there is any interest. This person will pick up that responsibility following ICANN 66 when the auction proceeds group will issue their draft report. So please let me know if you have any interest in taking this on.

The second topic has to do with changing the structure of our meeting with the board, with the CSG's meeting with the board at ICANN 66. It's kind of like just when you think we have a good approach to this as we have been working on with our CSG counterparts at recent ICANN meetings, they change the game on us. What the board would like to do is devote the first 45 minutes of our session with them to addressing topics that they want our feedback on concerning the strategic plan, the operating and financial plan, and then the work plan to improve effectiveness of the multistakeholder model.

So action for the BC to consider, I don't know if we're going to have one more meeting before Montreal. Perhaps we can discuss it there or definitely in our closed meeting, is who we want to serve as the lead discussant on those topics. For example, Mark and John and other folks working on the multistakeholder model comments might be good lead discussants on that issue. I know Jimson has always taken the lead on commenting on the financial plan. So I just offer that as suggestions.

Then we have to decide how we want to use our 15 minutes in the remaining 45 minutes of the session. Which those remaining 45 minutes will be divided between the three CSGs. So do we want to devote it to one topic – our thoughts on EPDP 2? Or do we want to devote it to some of the other issues that are of concern to us, such as the global

---

---

public interest framework? So again, perhaps we can revisit this either in the BC closed meeting in Montreal or if we decide to have another meeting beforehand.

That's all I want to focus on today. And just one final update. To the relief of us in the CSG, the NCSG has agreed to do an intersessional as Day Zero event in Cancun rather than spending money to meet in L.A. That's it, Steve. Thanks.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Great update, Barbara. Tracked right with the elements that you had in the policy calendar. Thank you very much. That's it for the policy calendar so, Claudia, I can turn it back over to you.

CLAUDIA SELLI:

Thank you, Steve. Going back to the agenda, on the ICANN 66 just to confirm that for the BC open meeting we're going to have Cyrus Namazi coming. And the second speaker, we have been contacted by Professor [inaudible] who is writing about ICANN legitimacy study to basically present some [findings]. So we are finding a slot also in the BC open meeting just to give you an update on that. If there are any questions or requests, let me know. Otherwise, I will leave the floor to Jimson to give an update on the operation and finance part.

JIMSON OLUFUYE:

Okay, thank you very much, Claudia. First [inaudible] on the BC officers election, the process is still ongoing. I would like to ask Chantelle to brief us. Where are we now, Chantelle?

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Hi, Jimson. As everyone is aware, the BC officers election is currently ongoing. [Ballots] have been sent to the primary representatives of all paid BC members. That voting window will close today at 23:59 UTC, which is I believe 4:00 Pacific, 7:00 Eastern for those in North America and, sorry, I can't do the math on that at this point. But it closes today. If you haven't received your ballot, please contact me and I will follow up. Thank you. Jimson, over to you.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Okay, thank you, Chantelle. Immediately after the BC officers election, we will have the committees election for the chair of the committees. But this time around, we only have the [inaudible] committee that will be involved. The other committees like the finance committee [inaudible] has the vice chair. Finance and operation has the chair. And of course, there is a three-year time limit for members of the various committees. The first two years and one more year.

For the outreach committee, the BC has [inaudible] decided following the [resignation] of the [former] chair that the vice chair [of] finance and operation [will] coordinate it. So [inaudible] being the ExCom liaison to the outreach committee.

And then the structure to change slightly. As you can recall, the outreach committee is an ad hoc committee. It is not an established [inaudible] committee. So the structure is such that it will be based on the ICANN regional meeting activities and [the members] should be mostly on [interest] basis.

For example, we have ICANN 66 now in Montreal, so [it is expected] that members that are more in North America will be more engaged so that we ensure that we have a robust outreach in Montreal. But this time around in Montreal is going to be an in-reach, and I will talk more about that later.

So that is about the elections. So after this officers election, we're going to have the committees election for the chair of committees. Chantelle will be sending out notifications for that.

Secondly on the membership dues, we have attained about 88% compliance rate. We started following up with delinquent members, and we're hopeful that we'll be able to get them fully back with us.

Next on the 20<sup>th</sup> anniversary celebration, expression of interest to be in the committee, well, it closes this Friday. [inaudible] extended to this Friday, October [13]. So we're still recommending members who have been in the BC for up to ten years or more [inaudible] joining so that we can bring [inaudible] together and make it a huge success.

Lastly on outreach and also on in-reach, for Montreal there is a plan for in-reach as you are aware. In-reach to get members together so that we can get to know more closely and we can as members share some common issues. I believe the issue of – there are parts [inaudible] going to be very entertaining. We have our Andrew and Marie who will be coordinating with others. [inaudible] an opportunity for us to share [inaudible] interesting subject matters.

Also with regards to ICANN 66, IPC has been planning an outreach event in which the subject of discussion will still be on DNS abuse, what other

---



---

measures could be taken to ensure there is safe navigation in the DNS space. We have been invited to join them on this, so I sent a note on the chat. Perhaps some [inaudible] might be interested in speaking there. So please let the ExCom know if you would like to speak at that forum.

And again, let me thank Tim Smith for his coordination [on the] ground concerning the in-reach. Tim, on this call, would you like to provide some overview of where we are right now? Tim, are you there?

TIM SMITH: Hi. Yes, I am here. Can everyone hear me?

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Yes, we can hear you. Please, go ahead.

TIM SMITH: Okay. Yeah, so I have been scouting some locations. Actually, I've been scouting websites because I actually do not live in Montreal. But I am familiar with Montreal, having grown up there. I did find a nice place called Vieux-Port Steakhouse. A little bit of French, bit of English there. It is located on Rue St. Paul, which is about ten minutes from the conference center and the main hotels.

This is for Wednesday, November 6, in the evening for a couple of hours in which we want all BC members and potential BC members to come and just enjoy each other's company. But also certainly [inaudible] get to know each other a little bit better but also try to get some more

---

support and more engagement and more activity within the business constituency community.

So I've got some hors d'oeuvres organized, and I've got some drinks organized. You mentioned Marie and Andrew Mack. We will be putting together some sort of a program that makes sure that everybody gets involved, engaged, has a few laughs, and just generally enjoys themselves.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Okay, great. Thank you so much for that.

TIM SMITH: [inaudible] for details on that. There were a couple – oh, okay.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: All right, well, Tim is going to send us more details. So perhaps [prior] to Montreal we will get more updates. Thank you so much, Tim. Really appreciate it.

Then Chantelle actually sent a request to [inaudible] members that will be in Montreal. So please send in your information so that we can get you the customized information as much as possible.

And then we'll get to some of the outreach. There's this outreach in Ghana with [inaudible], a member of [inaudible] from Egypt will be doing a BC outreach in Ghana at the conference, a special conference, talking about BC. Alaa, are you on the call? Is Alaa there? Alaa, can you

---

give us more details about it? Can you give us more information? Okay, maybe Alaa is not on the line.

Also, there are plans for outreach at IGF November 2019. So information will be coming out [inaudible] who will be at the event. We always encourage more business participation at those events, and a number of our members have been very active at the IGF, including Steve, Mark, Barbara, Claudia, and many of our [inaudible] many others. So we'll be getting some more information so that we can coordinate effectively for IGF 2019.

So on this note, I would like hand over [inaudible]. But at the same time I would like to quickly mention this since Tola is still on the line that while we're talking about ATRT3 we also mention that it would also be a good idea for you to pull maybe your colleagues aside and then have an informal chat with them concerning our position [inaudible] with regard to [inaudible] seats, the CSG, [inaudible] what you have based on our points anyway so that you can [inaudible] be possible to reduce the number of objections to all those positions [inaudible] from [inaudible] engagement. Thank you.

ADETOLA SOGBESAN:

Thank you very much, vice chair. It is noted. Hopefully, [inaudible] it's pretty easier when we are at face-to-face meeting in Singapore other than exchanging e-mails. I will try to follow that up. Thank you so much.

---

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Yeah, that is very true. So on this note, I'll hand it back to Claudia. Claudia, back to you. Thank you.

CLAUDIA SELLI: [inaudible] Jimson. Just to check if there are other questions or issues that anyone wants to bring up now. If that is not the case, I will give you back ten minutes of your time and we'll speak on 23 October. The meeting is adjourned. Thank you, everybody.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**