

---

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the BC Members call on Wednesday, January 29, 2020. In the interest of time, attendance will be taken via the Zoom room.

I'd like to remind everyone to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid background noise. With this, we'll turn it over to Steve DelBianco to begin. Steve, please go ahead.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Chantelle. I have the policy calendar shared in the Zoom room and I circulated it yesterday at about midday east coast time, so please take a look at that. I would like to walk through ... Since the last BC meeting, we have not submitted any public comments. Nothing was due. It's the year end, so they tend to slow things down a bit.

But we have, at this point, seven open public comments, two of which are due this week and the rest coming up in February and they require our attention and discussion today.

The first is that Jimson was good enough to draft a BC comment on the new procedures for the root zone key signing key rollovers. Those comments close at the end of this week. Jimson first drafted that and I circulated it back on the 11<sup>th</sup> of January. I'm now going to share that in the chat, so that you can all take a look at it. We need to figure out if there are any [final] comments, and if not, we need to get it brought up.

---

*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.*

---

Give me a moment here to highlight it. Is it showing in the Zoom room, Chantelle?

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Yes, it is.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Great. Thanks. Sometimes, I struggle with this product. Jimson, you're on the line. Is there anything you want to add with respect to this draft comment, and have you had any opportunities to consider revising it?

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Yeah. Thank you, Steve. I do not have any additional input to that, but I think we should be able to address some fundamental, procedural requirements and enforce what they've already stated. So, I think it's okay. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Jimson, I've highlighted on the screen then. What we have in here is your notion that they needed to add a step in the cycle called replication, and that's good advice for them. We'll see what kind of a response that brings.

The other is that you do endorse the distinct phases that are done. So, the BC has a relatively simple comment here where we're endorsing the plan but asking them to pay some attention to the notion of replication.

---

I'm looking at the queue. Any other BC members want to make a comment on this?

Okay. Great. Thank you. So, Jimson, I'm going to finalize this and submit. It may be submitted, since it's very brief, as a BC email. But thank you, again, for your work on making that happen. Let me get back to the policy calendar. I hope that's on the screen.

JIMSON OLUFUYE:

Yeah. My pleasure.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thank you, Jimson. Now, on the policy calendar, the next one up is our draft comment on the accountability and transparency review, the third one. So, they call it the ATRT-3. Those comments are also due at the end of this week.

We have a representative from the BC, Tola Sogbesan, who is the representative of the entire CSG on ATRT-3, which is difficult to do because these review teams have only 21 people on them and the entire CSG only gets one.

So, in September, we responded to the survey. Tola and I didn't get too much help with that, but we managed to put that in. Unfortunately, the review team didn't pick up any of the things we asked for, so this is an opportunity to bring them back in.

So, last Thursday, I circulated a draft comment which then received supportive comments from Barbara Wanner and Tola, and attachment

---

three to this email, which I'll bring up in the Zoom room, is our latest draft. And I highlighted additional suggestions that we put in there. So, I'll share that right now in the Zoom room. You can open it up as the third attachment to what I circulated yesterday. It should be in the Zoom room, and any of you who wish to open it up in Word can simply click on the attachment that I added to the policy calendar.

Since this went out, I had added the comments in yellow where the BC went in to further make some suggestions that we had put in on previous comments this idea on two Board seats, going to four Board seats for the GNSO is in there.

We talk about expanding the size of the review teams because 21 members would never work if it was a consolidated review. And I picked up on some suggestions that Barbara and Tola had in their emails.

So, ordinarily, at this point of the call, I'd say are there any other comments? And we would just submit it. But last night, Denise Michel [inaudible] came back with some concerns. She doesn't want us to enforce this consolidation option. And Denise did a pretty good job laying out the rationale for her approach. Denise, I don't see you on the Zoom but are you on the phone?

DENISE MICHEL: Yes, I am. Thanks, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO: I don't see any other hands up first, so Denise, let me give you the floor to talk through how you think we should modify the comment. It isn't

---

sufficient to simply disagree with the comment. We need to know what we should say instead. Thanks, Denise. The floor is yours.

DENISE MICHEL:

Yes. And thank you, Steve, and Barbara, and Tola for working on this. My apologies for being late in Facebook's contribution on this. I was overseas on business travel.

I think there are several things to agree with and I also agree with several points made in the draft comment. Where I think we need to reconsider our approach is with the specific community reviews. That's SSR, WHOIS, CCT, and ATRT-3.

I think the organizational reviews, moving them to a workshop and feeding them into a holistic review every—I think they're suggesting seven years—makes sense, along with restating the BC's position on representation.

I think doing away with the very lengthy and almost annual reviews of organizations will help with volunteer fatigue, but the idea of creating a new two options, unfortunately were given by ATRT-3 apparently to address fatigue but I think they've taken a wrong turn on this. They're proposing to take four very critical and complex reviews that require a lot of significant expertise and assessing these most important areas of ICANN and they're proposing to roll them into simply one [full review] every seven years.

This would essentially remove the ability of the community to reasonably assess ICANN's needs and need for improvement in these

---

important areas and would remove, essentially, a very important accountability tool [inaudible] accountability tools that the community has and was, as you know you, Steve, in drafting this language, is probably the IANA transition bylaws. It was the major mechanism that the community agreed to in agreeing to the IANA transition.

So, I think there is a better approach to dealing with the inefficiencies and problems that have occurred with reviews and the specific reviews directly, and that is not to create a new bureaucratic structure to pick and choose recommendations to implement and not to roll reviews into one mega review, but to improve how we do specific reviews.

The SSAC recommended that only one specific review be done at a time. I think the BC should endorse that SSAC proposal and encourage ATRT-3 to look at that. I think that would help not only with community volunteer fatigue but would also support an improved experience with [inaudible]. Really straightforward things can be done to support, to improve the specific reviews—having only one at a time, revamping the implementation of these specific reviews.

We now have three significant review teams that have found that, while staff claims to have 100% fully implemented the recommendations from the previous reviews, three review teams have found that, for a substantial number of recommendations, the staff actually didn't implement these.

So, revamping the way that the ICANN Board and staff approaches implementation, provides implementation plans, budget estimates, and tracking could go a long way towards improving these specific reviews.

---

And limiting all of the reviews to one year, as ATRT is limited to one year, would also help decrease volunteer fatigue but also increase a more streamlined and effective process with appropriate support.

I can outline some really common-sense approaches to improving specific reviews, making them more substantive, more effective, and also limiting the cost to the community in terms of time and energy. And I'd be happy to put this out on the list right now. Are you there?

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thank you, Denise. I noted three things that would have been done. You did say only focusing on the specific reviews. One idea is not to support option two, but instead, to suggest something different, to embrace it. What they had is option one, which is an implementation oversight team—a new structure—that presumably would oversee the way the staff reports on the implementation of prior reviews. Did I take that right, that you wanted to adopt option one with respect to specific reviews?

DENISE MICHEL:

No. I also don't think option one is necessary or the right approach. I think we already have the mechanisms that we need with some additional guidance to implement recommendations. Each recommendation should have an implementation plan and a budget. Any budgetary issues and dependencies should be folded into the annual process that the community uses to consider budget priorities, make recommendations when the Board makes decisions. There should be straightforward tracking and reporting on implementation. The CEO

---

should be responsible for ensuring that recommendations adopted by the Board and implementation plans posted by the staff and approved by the Board are actually implemented.

They really haven't made the case that some new bureaucratic entity is needed to simply implement recommendations. I think we have all the tools and processes we need to implement the recommendations right now and make choices if tough choices need to be made. I don't think we need a new bureaucracy to do that.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Okay. So, what would work I think is for your colleagues to really consider it. If you were to draft an email that explains specifically what you would like to do on the specific reviews—and I've noted the idea of picking up on the SSAC comment, one review at a time and that requires adjustments to the timing and sequencing, and implementation review plan oversight, limiting recommendations to only one to happen at a time, which we covered earlier, and to make sure that they last only a year in duration. And then you had some others you wanted to bring up.

So, if you were able to put pen to paper on just those things, I will take the responsibility of folding them in to a comment that is otherwise okay because I want to preserve a lot of the stuff that I had in yellow, preserve a lot of the stuff with respect to the organization reviews and volunteer fatigue.

A couple of things I wanted to note is that when the surveys came back, what the review team did was to note that there's widespread



dissatisfaction with the reviews and fatigue was only one element of it. They tapped into that to say make it simple. And as the author of the IANA transition document, we brought the reviews over from the Affirmation of Commitments and we brought them in as close as we could to the Affirmation as we brought them into the bylaws because we did not want to generate a whole new controversy with the community over what should specifically be in the reviews. We said that it was easier to bring them over and make them permanent because we knew the Affirmation of Commitments would be expired as soon as the transition was over.

So, we didn't, Denise, take a hard, hard look during the transition at whether those reviews could be significantly improved, although I did change them to be every five years instead of every three and I came up with the idea that every part of the ICANN community needed to have a representative and fought to make sure that CSG would at least have a team member. So, we made a few tiny improvements but not nearly enough.

I think that if you were to write this up, your colleagues in the BC would have a chance to evaluate that, modify draft. It is due in three days, though, so can I get you to commit to give us just the specific review part sometime today?

DENISE MICHEL:

Yeah. I'll put it out on the list now.

---

STEVE DELBIANCO:                   Excellent. And then people can react to what Denise has put on the list. We can do so now as well. And then I will separately start working it into a revised draft, so that if it came to the approval of BC, that that edits can be advanced.

So, looking now for the queue. I see Susan and then Mason. Go ahead, Susan. Mason, why don't you go ahead, and we'll get Susan after?

MASON COLE:                        Okay. Can you hear me, Steve?

STEVE DELBIANCO:                 We do.

MASON COLE:                        Thanks. Goo morning, everybody. I just wanted to lend a bit of support to what Denise is suggesting. In reading through the recommendations, I'm troubled by options one and two as well. I don't see the utility [of] moving reviews to a [inaudible] process and the sort of grand review of certain mechanisms related [inaudible].

So, I'm interested in seeing what Denise circulates today, but I just wanted to lend support to the idea that we should lean away from a couple of these recommendations and maybe [inaudible] what the SSAC recommends.

---

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thank you, Mason. Susan. All right, Susan, not hearing you. Let's hear from any other BC members. Is there a general sense to stick with the draft that was circulated last week or to move it [any] direction? Or do you simply want to wait and see what edits Denise comes up with? Some reaction would be helpful from BC members on the call.

Okay. So, a couple of folks have answered that they'd like to see the edits. I'm always glad when people engage, but it's always better if you engage when I circulated the original draft as opposed to waiting until the last minute. We're all busy and I understand that that's the explanation. All of us get—myself included. In fact, I'll have to make the same explanation for why I don't yet have a draft for the DotCom because there's so many other things going on. I'll get it to you with more than seven days to review it.

All right. So, Denise, thank you for that. I look forward to getting it on the list and then I'll start to fold into a revised version and everyone will have to react pretty quickly since it's due on Friday.

I'll return in the sharing to the policy calendar. The next item up is dates for future ICANN meetings. We are not going to comment on that pursuant to what BC members said on our last call. Is there any BC member that would like the BC to say anything on the new ICANN meeting dates? Looking for hands and seeing nothing.

The next one is due the 14<sup>th</sup> of February. And on this one, the long-awaited report from the Auction Proceeds Cross-Community Working Group is in. Anne Aikman-Scalese represents CSG on that working group. If you remember, Marilyn Cade had represented CSG some time

---

ago before she resigned from the BC. So, Anne Aikman-Scalese is our representative and she circulated sort of an intro as to what we should look for in this report and I thought that was quite helpful, so I continued to attach it to the policy a lot. It's the second attachment.

On last week's call, we had Jimson volunteer and Jimson volunteers for practically everything in the BC, so I am very interested in seeing at least one other BC member who will volunteer to help to examine this report for how should ICANN dispose of a few hundred million dollars in auction proceeds. It's not a specific approval of who gets the grants. Rather, it's an approval of a process by which the community would identify potential places to spend that money. Can I get one more volunteer? I see Mark Datysgeld will take a look. That will be helpful, Mark. I appreciate that. Once again, it's the same people that volunteer for everything. I'd like to see if we could get somebody new. This is a relatively easy one. Andrew Mack, thank you. Another perennial volunteer. Anyone else? Can we get some new member? David Snead, thank you. That's great. I'm more than happy to do that.

So, David, Andrew, and Mark, the key for you is to open a second attachment to my policy calendar, which is Anne Aikman-Scalese's note, and then you can look at the BC in December of 2018 a year ago when we commented on the initial report, so that you know things the BC had already approved with respect to this.

Some of it has to do with the way in which they solicit and select. So, it's due the 14<sup>th</sup> of February, so we want to have something circulated for your colleagues to review by the 7<sup>th</sup> of February, giving them seven days, pursuant to our charter. So, that's ten days away. I think that's

plenty of time to go through, and for the three of you with Jimson's help to come up with something. And I'm here to help as well. Thank you very much David, Andrew, and Mark.

The next one up is the DotCom agreement, also due the 14<sup>th</sup> of February. I've already had comments back. I read Zak Muscovitch's post on behalf of ICA. Andy Abrams has sent me some thoughts on this, and then Alex Deacon also sent some initial thoughts. Mason Cole, you had promised also to give me some initial thoughts, because at this point, we're going to take the comments we did on biz, org, and info on last BC call and made the point that we said that ICANN should not be a price regulator, but it is my understanding from the last call that the BC will okay if you have price limits that were supported by the competition authority claiming that they have authority here.

So, instead of saying that ICANN should not be a price regulator, ICANN can defer to a regulator who claims to have jurisdiction if it comes to the regulation in cap on prices because this did not take the lid off of DotCom prices the way Org did. Instead, it imposes a limit to say that the prices can go up over a six-year period by about 4.5% a year over a six-year period.

This would be fine to take any comments. Mason, thank you, if you give me—and it doesn't have to be formal input, Mason. What Alex and Andy Abrams provided were just an email with some general thoughts. And I shared with you Andy's. Then, Zak, I have a very formal comment because I know what Zak filed already.

---

---

Are there any other members interested in getting involved in the DotCom? Okay, fantastic. Thank you.

I have just two more to go through. The sixth comment isn't due until the 25<sup>th</sup> of February and it's the routine opportunity for us to comment on ICANN's financial plan and operating plan and budget for a five-year period as well as next fiscal year.

Jimson has volunteered already to [we have] the finance committee come up with that draft. And I know that Tola and Mark Datysgeld also volunteered to help. Jimson, where are you in that drafting process? Should we expect something in the next couple of weeks?

JIMSON OLUFUYE:

Yeah. Yes, Steve. I think we'll get something by ... Before the end of next week, we will get something in [inaudible].

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Great. That'll work fine. Plenty of time. Four weeks away. Then, finally, Denise Michel and Scott McCormick are members of the review team—a specific review team—for security, stability, and resiliency. SSR-2 it's called. It's another one of these long marches. It's been over a year. The Board had paused it at one point. Denise and Scott resumed the push and they finally have a draft report. Those comments will be due by the 4<sup>th</sup> of March.

So, this is a specific review created in the Affirmation. We brought it into the ICANN bylaws and it's one of the reviews that would get

---

collapsed and combined into a single large review if we adopted option two on the ATRT-3 report. So, this is exactly on point.

We need volunteers to help draft this comment. We will certainly get guidance from Denise and Scott about parts of the draft where the BC's interest could be better represented. They had to come up with a consensus here.

Chantelle, if you're able to identify which phone needs to be muted, I would invite you to do that.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Sure, Steve. Checking.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Please. Denise, would you and Scott like to offer any guidance as the BC starts to unwrap your report and come up with a BC position?

DENISE MICHEL: Sure. As I noted, the team found that a significant number of previous SSR recommendations had not been fully implemented and recommended that they be taken care of. A strong focus of the report's recommendations involve hardening ICANN's internal systems relating to SSR, adopting ISO standards, which most companies have already done. A fairly straightforward recommendation.

A strong focus of the report aligns actually quite strongly with the BC's general position on taking steps to help prevent and mitigate DNS

---

abuse. So, I think you'll find a number of recommendations in there that align with the historic BC positions. It would be great to get additional guidance and feedback, though, from BC members on how the report can be improved. Scott?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yeah. Scott, what would you add?

SCOTT MCCORMICK: Sorry. Pardon the background noise. Exactly what Denise said. There's definitely ... We were kind of surprised at how many recommendations from SSR-1 weren't completed fully. So, obviously, I think that needs to have some heaviness to it. Again, staff says that some of these things are completed when they're not.

Then, obviously, the review that we did on the current situation ... Again, I come from an auditing background. I do this regularly. ICANN tries to say that they're exempt from where standards don't fit their model, which is just, frankly, bogus. So, on that account, I think we welcome comments.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Denise and Scott—in particular, Denise—when you write up the suggestions for how we revise our ATRT-3 comment, could you cite the SSR-2 report in particular on the shortfalls that it found on the staff's report of implementation from the prior review?



---

DENISE MICHEL:

Sure. Actually, we could cite SSR now, WHOIS, and ATRT-3—all three of these reports—about all these review teams have issued reports [inaudible] significant portions of the prior recommendations were not implemented.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thank you. And I can dig up the links and the footnotes to do that but I want to make sure that if we can cite findings of other groups to support this idea, let's get them into our ATRT-3 draft. Thank you. Any questions for Scott or Denise? Roger Baah, thank you for jumping in and volunteering on that, as well as Ben Wallis and Mason Cole. So, Roger, Mason, and Ben. Thank you very much. Susan Kawaguchi. That's fantastic.

Okay. Next up is our modifying of WHOIS policies to comply with GDPR. Mark Svancarek and Margie Milam are representatives on the Expedited PDP time are in Los Angeles this week with a meeting that's taking place on a face-to-face basis. Janis Karklins is the chair of that group and he is pushing so hard to have the working group come up with some sort of a model that incorporates automation for accredited requestors of data. And the dispute is on can we automate the responses, where the disclosure of the non-public WHOIS data goes to an accredited requestor who is given a legitimate reason.

This isn't new. It's the same thing we talked about probably almost two years ago as what needed to come up with as a centralized automated way of disclosing WHOIS data to accredited requestors.

---

So, we are still working on this and encountering a great deal of resistance from the Non-Commercial Stakeholders Group, and therefore we are attempting to find common cause with ALAC, GAC, SSAC, and the contracted parties house. We'll certainly need the contract parties or we'll never get it through Council, so that's an essential element. My hats off to Margie, Mark, Brian and have just done an amazing job—Frank as well—at trying to move closer and closer together.

I'll give you a highlight. The current thinking is that you can automate a lot of the submission and recording and logging, even the returns of the results process, but the difficulty is to show that we may have to evolve to a point where a query from accredited entity would be an automatic disclosure because what stands in the way of that is that the contracted parties will not do an automated disclose unless they have an assurance that the liability would not fall to them for an inappropriate disclosure. So, we are still working on the same issues but I feel like we've made a little bit of progress, especially in the idea of getting the contracted party house to coalesce around something.

I don't know that identity behind all the phone numbers, so is a chance that Margie or Mark, are you on the line to give any further updates? All of you are free to listen in on the feed of the meeting in Los Angeles that will begin in less than an hour. So you might want to dial in and follow the progress. Are there any suggestions or comments you want me to pass along to our delegates at the EPDP?

Okay. With that, I need to turn it over to our councilors because channel two of the policy calendar is up next. I believe that Marie is unavailable

---

but Scott is here. So, Scott, I'll turn it over to you to talk about the Council section of the policy calendar that's on the screen.

SCOTT MCCORMICK:

Thanks, Steve. So, we had our SPS meeting in LA next week. It was very useful. There were quite a few new members of the Council. Heather was flown in, our previous chair of the GNSO, to do a little bit of education. [Becky] came in to do a little bit as well. We had a great meeting with the Board.

On that, we had two votes that went down last week. One was the nomination for ICANN fellowship and then the other was the GNSO [inaudible] Committee. And I am very bad at pronouncing name, so I will let the record show that.

Let's see here. What else do we ... So, [Marie] and I talked last week. We're kind of splitting up our duties. I'm taking more of the technical side of security aspects. She's taking on more of the policy side and I realize I've been not as present for as much as I have been this last year, so I'm trying to step up my efforts.

But on the curative rights protection mechanisms, again I'm just getting up to speed on this. It was definitely in discussions quite a bit, so I will let Marie comment on that or if there's any questions, please comment on email.

Other than that, am I missing anything here? Yeah. We did make that note to the Council that the draft report [dropped] last week and then the ATRT-3 is there as well.

STEVE DELBIANCO: All right. That's great, Scott. And your next meeting is not until the 20<sup>th</sup> of February, so we won't even see an agenda until the 10<sup>th</sup> of February. Anybody have questions for Scott, our councilor at GNSO?

Chantelle, thanks for putting the link in there for the EPDP. And if any of you have an hour today, please listen into the browser stream. You won't be able to participate but it is a fascinating exchange of ideas as we try to converge on something out there. Thank you, Scott. I don't see any hands up, so I'll turn it over to you, Barbara Wanner, to pick us up on channel three for the Commercial Stakeholders Group. It's in the Zoom room. All yours.

BARBARA WANNER: Okay. Thank you very much, Steve. Can everyone hear me okay?

STEVE DELBIANCO: We do.

BARBARA WANNER: Okay, great. Rather than going through this blow by blow, I wanted to give you as much information and writing as possible for you to reflect on at your leisure. What I want to highlight is that the way planning stands right now, there are three possible meetings at ICANN 67 that are being proposed as possible pre-ICANN 67 teleconferences instead because of scheduling difficulties.

---

The risk we always run of one of these meetings conflicting with EPDP-2 or one of the other important working groups.

So, in particular, these three meetings are the CSG meeting with the GAC, the CSG meeting with the Contracted Party House, and the CSG meeting with our board members, Becky and Matthew.

What I've done here is I know this is tedious and it drives us all crazy but it's the way the game is played. We have to identify in advance the topics or questions we want to address in these specific meetings. If you have any concerns with what I've proposed, please just send me a redline revision and I will send that on to my CSG colleagues.

I just wanted to note, too—and I forwarded this to the BC [private]—that Matthew is quite open to speaking to us. He is keen to continue in board seat 14 again. That is one of the issues that we will have to consider in the CSG closed meeting, I believe.

So, my question to you is would you like to keep that meeting with Matthew and Becky as in person at ICANN 67 for the CSG or for the BC perhaps as part of our closed meeting?

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Barbara, I would say that it is essential for us to meet with Matthew and with Becky. I would take it either as a BC closed or as a CSG closed because Matthew has to understand that we haven't reached a decision on endorsing yet, and on the last call we had two weeks ago, we invited BC members who are aware of other candidates to be sure and let us know because this is the time to begin recruiting a candidate that we

---

think would be acceptable, because as we discussed two weeks ago, the rules that we agreed to—the rules in the GNSO—are for board seat 14 has to be a consensus candidate between the NCSG and the CSG. It is not a take turns processes like it is for the vice chair of Council. Back to you, Barbara.

BARBARA WANNER:

Okay. So, I think that I could feed that into the CSG discussions on Friday. Again, if people have any very strong views about meeting virtually with either the GAC or the Contracted Party House before ICANN 67, please just send that along to me or indicate that in the chat and I will also share that with the CSG in the ExCom when we talk on Friday.

Also, too, if there are any specific issues that you want to address, we need to know that. In particular, our approach to dealing with the Board meeting. Again, we've gone round and round on this for the past several ICANNs but I think what has worked for us is to use the first 45 minutes as a dedicated CSG session with the Board concerning EPDP-2 and then divide up the remaining 45 minutes, 15 minutes each constituency, to address a topic of our specific interest.

So, I need to know what your specific interest would be for the BC's allocated 15 minutes, just so we have our ducks in a row and we go into these meetings with our act together.

I think that's it, Steve. I'll just await people's feedback. Oh, just one last thing. We have approached Philippe Fouquart as a possible vice chair to replace Rafik and he is not adverse but he wants to reflect more to

---

ensure that he has enough bandwidth. I think he would be a good choice because it would represent a rotation throughout the constituencies. That's it, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Okay. Denise has her hand up. Denise Michel, please go ahead.

DENISE MICHEL:

Yeah, thanks. And thanks, Barbara, for all your work with the CSG. A couple of things. I think some of us have heard from a couple of people who might be interested in serving on the Board, so I think it would be useful to have some further conversations about how to handle potential candidates as well as the incumbent in terms of interactions with the BC.

I'd also just like to offer that I think the BC has pretty important issues that are pending and should be addressed in Cancun. I don't find our meetings simply with Becky Burr and Matthew Shears to be productive and I think that our time could be used in a more productive manner if we identified a couple of really critical issues we'd like to have informal conversations with board members about and invite more board members to join in that conversation.

I don't think that listening to Becky and her strong contracted party perspective has been as particularly valuable for the BC and I think what would be more valuable is if the BC identified a couple of really high-priority issues it would like to have an informal conversation with board

---

members about and then invite a number of board members to come and join in that informal off the record conversation. Thanks.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thanks, Denise. I will say, though, that the exchange that [Marie] and I had with Becky in Montreal was really pretty frank, maybe even a little antagonistic and pretty refreshing that we got to the bottom of what's going on in DNS abuse and the lack of contract enforcement, particularly with spec 11 [3a3b]. At least we got it all out in the open.

I don't believe there's any benefit to having them give us a report. Like you, I believe it's all about the dialogue and you know I never shy away from asking Becky hard questions. So, I'm happy to find opportunities to do that. It doesn't have to be in a closed meeting. An open meeting is a fine way to do it as well.

BARBARA WANNER:

In terms of the high-priority issues that we want to identify, and in turn invite relevant board members, I can receive those suggestions online or perhaps we can add it to the agenda our next call. I don't want to be placed in a position where I have to climb inside everybody's brain and try and anticipate what they regard as a high-priority issue.

So, either this is a case where I need member feedback and I'm happy to do that liaison, if you will, to get the board members invited, but different people have different conceptions of what they consider to be a high-priority issue. It would be helpful for me if we could get this



---

either through email streams or a discussion in our next call or something to that effect. Thanks.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thanks, Barbara. I wanted to note, too, that the ISPCP (the Internet Service Providers Constituency)—they're the third leg of the CSG—they've been much more cooperative lately in the EPDP through their representative, Thomas Rickert. He feels gratified that the joint controller notion has come back around to where he always thought it was. But more importantly, he's been very helpful to us on trying to automate as much as possible of the SSAD model. So, Thomas has been great, and if there's anything you could do on your CSG calls to convey the sense of solidarity of the CSG over at the EPDP, I think that could be helpful, Barbara.

BARBARA WANNER:

Thank you. I will. I'll convey that to Wolf-Ulrich, who I'm sure will be happy to convey that to Thomas.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thanks. Do we have any questions and ideas? Denise brings up the good point that if you can figure out a candidate who might be willing, beneficial to us and acceptable to the non-commercial side, don't waste a minute. Get on the phone. Talk to that person. See if they're interested in that board seat 14. Then Denise, I believe the next step then is once they've given you their consent, I would love to have them on the next BC call or we could even set up a separate BC call for a

---

candidate like that to see if they can gain the endorsement of the BC as a big improvement. If that's the case, then we have to start the campaigning to get the rest of CSG and the NCSG to accept them as a candidate since it will be a competitive race against Matthew Shears.

So, I think those steps are find a candidate that you think fits the bill, get their consent, and then we have a phone call with BC members. Does that sound right, Denise?

DENISE MICHEL: Yes.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Great.

BARBARA WANNER: Steve, I would say, too, then I think it's important for us to have a call with BC members, but then also, as I said last week, both the IPC and ISPCP are in favor of continuing with Matthew, so perhaps after that, a call with the CSG would also be useful.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Right. And after that, a call with the NCSG. But I thought the right place to start is the BC.

BARBARA WANNER: Right. I agree with you.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

And looking ahead to Cancun, if this candidate that you're able to identify—not just Denise but anybody—that candidate is part of the ICANN crowd, it would be outstanding for them to do some meet-and-greets with BC and CSG members when we're together in Cancun. That would be where things really need to come together for this challenger to Matthew.

Okay. That is all I have on the policy calendar. I don't see any other hands up. So, Chantelle, would you please put the meeting agenda back into the Zoom window?

All right. Thank you, Chantelle. Next up is the operations and finance report from Jimson. So, Jimson, we'll turn it over to you.

JIMSON OLUFUYE:

Okay. Thank you very much, Steve. Well, as usual, we prepared an additional budget request. These are requests that are outside the regular ICANN budget process, budget [inaudible].

So, we have two budget requests we are submitting. We are submitting BC leadership development and this enables potential BC leaders to attend ICANN meetings in their region. Mark is using this—Mark Datysgeld—[inaudible] ICANN 67 in Cancun. It has really been beneficial. The only time we don't really use it is maybe when we have events in developed region, like in Europe, North America. But it's always there [inaudible].

---

[We're] also looking at the possibility [inaudible] the other members within close regions or [other regions] that could use that [inaudible] because the current [inaudible] is that only members in that region that can use [inaudible]. So we are putting in for that.

Also, we are putting in for ICANN to support our BC outreach materials, the printed outreach materials. That is newsletters, fax sheets, and the [inaudible].

On CROP, we are also [inaudible] Community Regional Outreach Program, [inaudible] facilitate and enable members [inaudible] outreach at the [inaudible]. The use of this tool has been limited to only [in region]. So, we are putting in the comments that it can be used by other members that are outside of the particular region [inaudible] outside particular region, it's always used [inaudible] and it was when the ICANN meeting took place in Europe [inaudible] North America. And in Cancun, [inaudible] at the last minute [inaudible].

So we are putting in the comments that [inaudible] outside the particular ICANN [inaudible]. This comment is coming into the draft comment on the ICANN FY21 budget. CROP is in the main budget of ICANN, so the comment in regards to that [inaudible] respect to the ICANN [FY21] budget proposal. This is already in the works.

So, in summary, we are submitting two main budget requests [inaudible] making comments on CROP [inaudible] FY21 ICANN budget.

Next, to operations. As I mentioned a fortnight ago, [inaudible] of BC membership FY20. I'd like to request that we check our databases online and also review the requirements [privacy plans with ICANN].

---

[inaudible]. We also got permission [now] to access the BC minutes or past minutes [inaudible].

I want to thank you all. Many people responded. We checked the BC database [we are compiling]. Many of you responded and we've [taken direction]. Maybe we will do the last one and [inaudible] perfect. [inaudible] by just saying the last update [inaudible] very last update. Please take the time and look at it. If you are not providing profile about yourself, you can at least provide about the organization. Let it not be empty. Please [inaudible] something.

Then on the BC 20<sup>th</sup> Anniversary Celebration, it's still scheduled and [inaudible] part of the materials for that event. As mentioned last meeting, we are working on the outreach [which the] Business Community Cancun [inaudible]. Then we'll have an evening out. The details of the evening [inaudible] get together. A celebration is being worked out. I don't know if Andrew Mack is ... Andrew Mack, are you there?

ANDREW MACK: I am here, Jimson.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: [inaudible].

ANDREW MACK: Yeah. I can give a real quick overview. So, we are, as everyone agreed, trying to plan a kind of an evening out. We wanted to do it as simply as

---

possible and the [Gems] Band, which brings with it a fair number of people that we might like to reach, is looking for a sponsor. So, we've spoken with them and they're able to do a lot of the logistics and things like that. The question is the venue. We spent a bunch of time on the phone with the Hard Rock Café in Cancun a couple of days ago trying to get to the right person and trying to get them to respond to our request. We're trying to do it as simply as we can with the budget that we have and it would be basically presented by the BC. So, it's a win/win. We come in to help make [Gems] possible and then we have a big audience for all of our celebration things and we'd be able to be effectively like the MC in between pieces of that event.

The biggest challenge is that it's spring break and we may or may not be able to get the space, so I will get back to you as soon as we possibly can.

We'll also work with Mark about getting everybody up a little video thing. There's a format for that and Mark can speak to that, if that's still happening. But we're trying to do this in a way that is close to the venue and makes it as easy as possible for people to attend, including if they have other things that they need to do on that same evening. It would either be the 10<sup>th</sup> or the 11<sup>th</sup>, depending on availability the Tuesday or Wednesday.

JIMSON OLUFUYE:

Okay. Thank you, Andrew. Mark, you want to say something about the video you are working on with John [Berard]?

---

MARK DATYSGELD:

Thank you, Jim. Thank you, Andy. So, I'm a little ... First of all, apologies. I'm a little late from the deliverable which is getting a survey out to everyone on the BC. We'll be assembling a video, just kind of getting everyone's face in there. It's nothing too complicated. It's a one-minute long video. I will be circulating a template shortly. I've just been stuck kind of deciding on video format and such, but I think we're about good to go, so look forward to that. We want to see your smiling faces, talking a little bit yourself. Real simple stuff. And that will be assembled as a very snappy montage that will play over during the event. That should be pretty cool.

And as far as the video with the timeline of the companies on the BC, that is proving a little more challenging than I thought it would. We don't really have other communication of when the companies joined. Chantelle has been really helpful with that and we're looking into it. But if anybody has any insights, if anybody has been around a very long time and has a clearer idea on dates and such, please reach out. This is proving more challenging than I thought it would be. We'll get something really cool out. It's just a process that's taking a bit. So, thank you very much, everyone.

JIMSON OLUFUYE:

Yeah, Mark. Maybe it's possible everyone can at least give feedback with regards to when they joined. For example, maybe [inaudible]. We can say we joined in 2012 or [inaudible] period. I think that's personal information can provide useful information for when everybody joined. What do you think?

MARK DATYSGELD: Yeah, that sounds good. When I circulate the email very soon about the videos, I'll make sure to include some requests. I'm just giving everyone a heads' up. But for sure, that will happen. Everything is already planned and pretty much ready to go.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Yeah. So, part of the response will be, yes, we joined [inaudible] because membership of the BC is actually not individual. It is company based, organization based. Thank you very much.

JOHN BERARD: Jimson, this is John, if I might.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Yes, please.

JOHN BERARD: So, if anybody in the next little while bumps into either Becky Burr or Theresa Swinehart, I encourage them to return my calls. I don't have any hard questions. I just want them to tell me a little bit about what the weather was like back in '98 and '99 when the constituencies and stakeholder groups came into being. But I'm trying to reach each of them because they were, as they say, there at the founding. Thank you.



---

JIMSON OLUFUYE:

Thank you very much, John. Actually, John is [inaudible] to do a little [inaudible] about how we have evolved, how we started. So, those that could provide some important information that are on the call, please reach out to John so that he can fill in the blanks. [inaudible] remaining on a newsletter. We want to translate the newsletter but we're waiting for that to be [inaudible] because we feel that such a milestone period like that is an opportunity to really now how it was back then. So, thank you, John, Andrew Mack, and Mark Datysgeld for all the work that you are doing. And also to let you know that we are making a backup plan in case the first option of [Gems] [inaudible] backup.

On this note, I would like to turn this back to Steve, but of course just to note that we will be having GNSO Council election soon. So, [inaudible] will be finishing [inaudible] this year. So, we are giving you a heads' up those that will be interested in [inaudible] for the election to begin to prepare. We are [inaudible] around every [May] to start the process. Thank you very much, and back to you, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thank you, Jimson. We are now up to all other business. Do any BC members have a topic for all other business? Going once ...

Okay. We are finished with two minutes to spare. Thanks, everyone. You can end the call, Chantelle.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN:

Thank you, Steve. Goodbye, everyone.

---

JIMSON OLUFUYE:

Thank you, thank you, thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]