ICANN

Moderator: Terri Agnew
January 18, 2018
10:00 am CT

Operator: The recordings have started.

Andrea Glandon: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. This is the BC Members Call on the 18th of January 2018. In the interest of time there will be no role call. Attendance will be taken by the Adobe Connect Room.

At this time, we have participants who are on the audio only and that is Jimson Olufuye, (Adetola Sagbesan) and Margie Milam.

I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise.

With this, I will turn it over to Claudia Selli. Please begin.

Claudia Selli: Thank you very much and welcome everybody. I just wanted to simply update everyone on the request that have been sent out in the past couple of weeks, so please take a look at what we sent out because we'll be really dependent upon the deadline. So there is the GNSO Council standing committee on budget and

operation. The deadline of interest is today. Then the CROP ICANN61 deadline is also today.

The two North American Business (unintelligible) for potential new members of the BC, the deadline is also today. And then there is the request of no objection for funding the fourth office through the BC, and the deadline is on the 19th of January. Finally, I also sent out NomCom review, whose comment are due by the 2nd of February. So if you have anything on that, it would be good so that we can respond on time.

We have (unintelligible) the agenda with starting with Steve with policy discussion, the council update with Susan and Marie and CSG report with Barbara. On operation and finance, Jimson will certainly dig more into what I already anticipated with the CROP and budget request. So I will just leave the floor to Steve. Thank you.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Claudia. Marilyn Cade, you've got to mute your phone. It is your phone. Please, Marilyn. Marilyn, are you there? Thank you. Okay thanks everyone. (Andrea)'s going to put up the policy calendar, which was sent yesterday, and I'll go through it quickly.

We've been very busy in the last two weeks. Marilyn Cade, please mute your phone. Marilyn Cade, please mute your phone. (Andrea), can you disconnect Marilyn, please? Thank you.

We did four comments on January the 14th regarding Work Steam 2 on ICANN accountability, and I want to quickly thank a superb effort by BC members who did drafting. Marilyn Cade, Jimson, (Mark) and (Tola) all helped the draft to comment on diversity. And then Jimson, Marilyn helped along with me on the comment for ICANN's office of ombudsmen.

We did a comment on ICANN staff accountability, and Stephanie Duchesneau did the lion's share of the work on that, where Marilyn and I did some editing. And then there were recommendations on ICANN jurisdiction. This was a tricky one. Claudia, myself and Marie Pattullo put that one together and got that one in as well. So fantastic work there.

Then on January the 15th earlier this week, we did a BC response on Hamilton Law Firm's legal analysis memo, where they had responded to BC comments and questions on GDPR compliance and Whois. I want to really thank Margie Milam and Tim Chen for drafting that. And sure enough just as we were drafting that, ICANN published three new models for GDPR compliance and Whois, and we're going to ask the same group of folks to help prepare a BC response on the models.

And then finally, on January the 15th, we filed a really substantive comment on one of the review team recommendations. This is the Competition, Consumer Trust, and Consumer Choice Review Team. That's known at the CCTRT. This is a review that is required under the ICANN bylaws. It's a review of the new gTLD program and to see whether it did promote and improve consumer trust, choice, and competition.

So big thanks to Marie, I worked on it as well, Denise Michel, and Chris Wilson, who went back and forth on the final three days on a refinement to certain parts of the recommendation. So we ended up with a really substantive comment that sent to the CCTRT. There will be another bite at that apple as the CCTRT puts out its final comments for review. So great work everyone on that.

Let me slide down to the part of the policy calendar that refers to the two current open ICANN public comments. Both are due before our next BC call. So one is due February 1, the other is due February 2. That means we aren't going to have another call to discuss those, and I need to encourage BC participants to pay attention to these. Of course I'll do a last call when there's three or four days left but we're going to need to work on this more quickly.

The first is proposed changes to how ICANN conducts its meeting strategy for the midyear policy forum and the annual general meeting. I'm very grateful that Marilyn, Claudia, (Christian Bope), (Arinola), (Michelle) and (Mark) have stepped up to volunteer, but we're late on getting those volunteers to get a draft comment that I can circulate. This is due February the 1st and we want to give BC members 14 days of review.

That's what our bylaws call for, and we usually come very close to the 14 days. So I will ask Marilyn, Claudia, (Christian), (Arinola) and (Michelle) and (Mark) to please pull together some of your draft talking points, because it's fine if we circulate your draft talking points for BC review so that other members and colleagues can think about while you're refining the actual text of what the review would say.

Let me stop there to see if any of those members would like to say anything about what your preliminary thoughts are on the BC's position regarding these two proposed changes to ICANN's meeting strategy. Anyone? (Arinola), Marilyn, Claudia, any thoughts on this? Okay, look forward to getting something turned around so that you guys can review it.

The second and the only other open public comment is on ICANN's staff worked for a long time on a set of operating standards that they want to use for these ICANN community reviews, and these are reviews just like that

CCTRT or the Security and Stability Review, the SSR2. And on those reviews the bylaws are rather explicit about scope, they're explicit about process, the size of the team and where they come from, and yet there are specifics about how the team actually conducts its work, how it fills vacancies when people leave and resign, and it's appropriate to have a set of operating standards that are not inside the bylaws but are still subject to community review to make these reviews go better.

So we embrace that concept; however, we're not in agreement with all the recommendations they've come up with. I want to thank Faisal Shah, who led the draft for the BC, and then Susan, myself, and Marilyn and (Lawrence) had a call and had done a back and forth on - a few times to get to the current draft. The current draft is attachment four on the policy calendar.

So I'd like to see whether Faisal, Susan, Marilyn, (Lawrence), if anybody wants to comments further on where we stand. We don't have any controversies amongst us drafters for that current draft, but this will be the last chance that BC members can discuss it on the call. Faisal, would like you to say anything about it now?

Faisal Shah: I mean I think we, I mean it's 37 pages. It's pretty comprehensive and it'd be great to have other people take a look at it because there are quite a few areas that might require at least, you know, some additional commentary. I think we pretty much addressed most of the substantive issues, the first being whether or not we really need a scope drafting team separate from the actual review team itself.

I mean that really is kind of the lynchpin of this - of these comments, along with, you know, how, you know, people are nominated, you know, and the team itself and the composition. So it'd be great to get additional thoughts

from other BC members if they can take a look at it and let us know whether there's anything else that we should be addressing besides what we've already done so far.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Faisal. Now the 37 pages is what the staff had put together. The comment that Faisal and the rest of us have drafted is only three pages long, and it's the fourth attachment to the policy calendar. So I'd invite you to open it now and do a quick look at it.

What Faisal has brought up is exactly true. We focused most prominently on strongly objecting to staff's proposal that there be a scoping team formed a full year before the actual review team comes together. And I think this was an awful idea, and our comment very strongly argues against that. And then we went in and looked a few other areas where their comments could be improved so that teams would work better, and this is based on experience that we had.

And I want to be sure that we picked up experiences that, Susan, that you've experienced on the teams that you've worked on; Denise Michel and the work that she's done on SSR2 is another area. We want to be sure to pick up things that we - lessons that we should have learned when it comes to those teams.

So in particular, I think we've got the right people working on this right now. Are there any other questions from BC members on the current three-page draft attached to the policy calendar? All right thanks again, Faisal, and others who worked on that.

Let me move on to the next item, which is the GDPR and Whois. The only thing I've added to this timeline on GDPR and Whois is that on January 12 ICANN posted models for compliance, and I posted a link to those, and we

sent a BC response on the 15th of January for the Hamilton legal analysis memo. I want to thank (Margie) and Tim for that. What we would be appropriate now is to solicit a list of volunteers who can review the models for GDPR compliance and can assist the BC at coming up with a reaction to those models.

I'm going to count on (Margie) and Tim for sure, but who can help with that effort? Thank you, Tim, by the way. Tim and (Margie) for sure. Who else? Alex Deacon, fantastic. So I'll ask you folks to jump on this. It is not a public comment period where ICANN posts a closure date. A lot of this is being done in a really kind of behind the scenes way at ICANN. So what's essential -- thank you (Ellen), (Mary Ellen Callahan) -- okay fantastic.

And Chris is noting that on the ICANN blog, they want comments by January 29th. Even though it's not an official public comment period, they want comments back to that email list by January the 29th. So we're already in a situation where we're not going to be able to have 14 days of review on the BC. So let's please work quickly at coming up with our reactions to the models that they have so far.

And again, if we believe that those models are inappropriate for the use of business users protecting our brands and protecting our customers from fraud and confusion, we're not going to be shy about saying so, but the more specific we are the better. I also believe that if we raise questions, those questions then will be handled by Hamilton Law Firm, questions about the actual models themselves, and we shouldn't be shy about suggesting alternatives as well.

So, so far we have Alex Deacon, Tim Chen, Margie Milam, and (Mary Ellen Callahan). Any other volunteers who can help on that? Thank you, Faisal.

Faisal Shah: This is Faisal. I can help.

Steve DelBianco: Fantastic. Thank you. All right, so we have our marching orders on GDPR and
                  Whois, so before I turn it over to Susan and Marie for Council, are there any
                  questions that I can field on GDPR, Whois, and the current list of public
                  comment periods? I see two hands up, (Margie) and then Susan. Go ahead,
                  (Margie).

Margie Milam: Sure and hopefully you can hear me okay, I'm on the bus.

Steve DelBianco: We do.

Margie Milam: One of the things - yes, one of the things I wanted to point out was that even
                  though comments are due by January 29, I think it would be really better for
                  us to consider filing sooner than the 29th. If you take a look at what happened
                  in the last few weeks that there were model submissions on January 10, there
                  were three submitted, and yet ICANN went ahead and published the three
                  models two days later without even evaluating what was submitted by the
                  people that submitted models or the legal analysis.

                  So I think if we want to be effective in any way, we need to get this out sooner
                  than the 29th, and so I just want to see if there's agreement in having perhaps
                  an earlier date to submit the comments.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks, (Margie). I do want to note that part of the reason that the models
                  were simply dumped out there and published was a lot of us, including the
                  BC, have asked ICANN to be as transparent and immediately transparent as
                  possible what's going on. So it's not a surprise that they would have just
                  dumped those to the list without a lot of analysis there. Susan?

Susan Kawaguchi:Susan Kawaguchi for the record. I want to agree with Margie and also sort of push a point a little further is that, you know, it really - it seems, appears, let's put it that way, that, you know, ICANN asked for community to gather together and work on, you know, proposed solutions and models and if you look at some of Göran's posts, you know, consult with different members of the community, which I think some of these models did, or all of them did actually, and - but there's just no way that ICANN synthesized the models proposed by the community and published, you know, less than 48 hours later.

So I think we should comment on that. But if they're asking for input from the community, we would appreciate some thought about that input and, you know, it was - it feels to me like, okay, they checked the box, "Oh we got some input from the community but this is what we think anyway."

They'd already drafted their three models and, you know, and in actuality there's probably only several ways to go at this, but, you know, so it's not rocket science but I do feel like they did - they're giving lip service to community input and they have a plan, they have a strategy and they already have a model, they're just trying to lead the community to that model. So maybe that's my paranoia but I think we should address that in the comments too.

Steve DelBianco: Susan, let's assume that's the case, because even in Abu Dhabi, they talked about models based on .Amsterdam, on .EU, and I believe that we end up seeing things that they believe are likely to pass muster with the European data protection authorities. So. We certainly had a very strong hint that they had a base for the model in mind and they weren't shy about that.

So we've got to respond by saying how those models are inappropriate or come up with a better model, but I don't think at this point we have any significant benefit by suggesting that the process they're using is insufficiently transparent. Our best bet on process is to claim that they have completely skipped what the procedures require and what the board approved in Whois compliance with national laws.

They completely skipped that process and the BC, thanks to some work by Denise Michel, sent a very strongly worded letter asking ICANN specifically why didn't you follow that process and please follow the process from this point forward? ICANN is ignoring us on that. So we should continue to hammer that point. And, Susan, anything else you want to add there?

Susan Kawaguchi: No, that's it. Thanks.

Steve DelBianco: Great. Denise, anything to add before we move on?

Denise Michel: Yes and I apologize, I'm not on - in the Adobe Connect room at the moment. But I think, as is evidenced by this conversation and also some of the questions that I previously saw in the chat room, there still seems to be a fair amount of confusion over the timing and the process that's being followed by ICANN. I think it would be to everyone's benefit to get some clarity.

So I would suggest that the BC just send in right away just a couple of process questions to clarify what ICANN's doing and when they're doing it by, not substance, just clarifying the process of what ICANN intends to do here and at the same time work on substantive comments. I've spoken to many other company reps and other organizations and there seems to be a lot of confusion over what's happening just in terms of process and timing.

So I would suggest that the people who are going to be holding the pen and working on these comments first send an email in today from the BC to clarify what the timing and process is and then continue with the substantive comments. Thanks.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Denise. Let me at that point turn it over to Susan and Marie as our councilors on the BC for channel two.

Susan Kawaguchi: Thanks, Steve. And, Marie, please chime in anything you would like to report on. It was a pretty light meeting in some ways. We only had one vote, which was creating a committee to - a GNSO Council committee to review the budget and provide comments. We approved that. Other than that it was a lot of updates and discussion of ongoing issues in the community.

And we did have a good discussion on SSR2 team, and the GNSO drafted a letter to the SOs and the ACs, and that was sent out this month also. But we still can't - GNSO's trying hard to lead the other SOs and ACs to get the SSR2 back on track, and I'm seeing no hope in that. So I'm not sure what the next step is but the board knew exactly what they were doing and they knew that it would - confusion would reign, so we're stuck with an SSR review team that can't work now for, what, almost three months. That's a huge problem.

And then the GNSO is also drafting comments on the operating standards for review team, so I've helped draft that for the GNSO Council. So some of that hopefully will - well anything I drafted will align with the BC comments. And actually that draft right now takes some of the issues a little father, which I was surprised at by the other stakeholder groups.
And that's about it. We don't have an agenda for the next meeting yet. That'll come out next week. Chris, did you have a question?

Chris Wilson: Yes. Hi, Susan. Thanks. Can everybody hear me okay?

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes.

Chris Wilson: Great. Just a quick question. On the SSR, the board actions on the SSR team, did the council I guess - were they were aware of the letter from (David Redell) and TIA administrator (Redell) and was there any discussion about that letter within the council on this issue?

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes, yes. Yes, we did. And, you know, the council's view is we just need to put the SSR team back to work and that we are in the midst of - we've had one GNSO member from the team that resigned for work, you know, commitments, other commitments. And so we are selecting another GNSO-nominated candidate for that slot, but, you know, it's very difficult, according to Heather, that to get the other SOs and ACs to move off all of the rumors and innuendo.

There was a survey done of the members of the RT which provided some guidance on maybe they need some extra expertise but, you know, there wasn't a huge conspiracy going on on the SSR2. So. Marilyn? Is that you, Marilyn, or is that somebody else coughing?

Marilyn Cade: My comment was not about this, so I'll just thank you for this report. I'll just - I had a different comment, I'm sorry I'm choking. So I'll just come back at a later time.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay. Thanks, Marilyn. All right. I think that's it for the GNSO.

Claudia Selli: Thank you, Susan. Barbara, do you want to give your update?

Barbara Warner: Sure, Claudia. Thanks very much. I'll do - go quickly through the intersessional meeting and then give you some highlights on what we can expect at ICANN61.

With respect to the intersessional, which will be on the 1st and 2nd of February in L.A., I have basically, oh, four or five points here. Steve included the agenda as one of the attachments, so you all are at liberty to review that, and you'll see that the BC is co-leading three sessions on important topics, the first one being reconciling GDPR, Whois. And Steve will be our co-chair, our co-lead on that on behalf of the CSG. He will be joined by Stephanie Perrin from the NCSG. And, Steve, if you want to jump in now concerning what you hope to accomplish or what your plans are for that session.

Steve DelBianco: Hey. Thanks, Barbara. As the agenda shows, there's actually two and a half hours spaced over two continuous sessions on the second day of the intersessional regarding GDPR and Whois compliance. So the co-chairs would be Stephanie and I, Stephanie Perrin and I for the first 90 minutes, and then Vicky Sheckler with the IPC, along with Tatiana Tropina from the NCSG.

So the four of us, I arranged a conference call. We're having a four-way call tomorrow so that we can coordinate and have a really I think a cohesive agenda that walks through the compliance challenges that we'll face. But at this intersessional, think about it, there's no contract parties at the meeting but you realize that the NCSG has publicly said that they believe GDPR is a great opportunity to kill Whois once and for all. And that's the attitude they're going to be coming from. And I don't think it's going to serve the interests of all of us at the intersessional to simply have a shouting match about that.

So the challenge, you know, as Barbara indicated, the challenge is to try discover the common ground, understand where we disagree, and to be creative at ways of navigating through this.

I do think that the GAC will be a whipping boy for the NCSG when they look at the Abu Dhabi GAC advice since it insisted that ICANN find a way to maintain business access to the Whois records, and that flies in the face of the fact that a lot of the governments and the GAC members are from the European Union and it's the European Union's data protection authorities that are actually causing this rift or problem.

So we are grateful for ideas as to how to organize the slots that are on Friday morning. And as I said before, the first call will be tomorrow. As we emerge from that call and come up with slides and an agenda for those two sessions, I will circulate them to the whole BC for quick reaction. Thanks, Barbara. Back to you.

Barbara Warner: Thanks, Steve. The second topic that we'll be covering, as you can see on the agenda, is ICANN transparency. And it's my pleasure to co-lead that session with Michael Karanicolas who was one of the co-rapporteurs with Chris Wilson for the transparency subgroup.

And basically, what we will be doing is reviewing key elements of the transparency subgroups report, in particular, Recommendation 15, which calls for greater transparency with respect to ICANN Legal and ICANN Legal's pushback on that and refusal to endorse that recommendation.

We will encourage discussion about this among the various constituencies and I know Steve is prepared to intervene on the importance of challenging ICANN Legal on that pushback because of the fact that Work Stream 2 and

the work coming out of that is the community's last and best chance to improve ICANN's accountability.

So I hope that will be a lively and spirited discussion and we are very hopeful to get John Jeffrey to speak because he has the gravitas, if you will, to make important substantive comments on that.

If not, if Samantha Eisner represents ICANN Legal on it, then it will demonstrate to ICANN Legal that the concerns about ICANN Legal's pushback on that recommendation is not limited to the non-commercial stakeholders group, that the BC shares many of those concerns.

If there is enough time, we'll devote maybe 15 or 20 minutes really to educate the broader non-contracted party house on these various data transparency initiatives, not only the ODI but the information transparency initiative.

You may recall that's a very comprehensive project aimed at sort of archiving all of ICANN's comments, materials, and so forth. And we are concerned that maybe not enough people within the non-contracted party house understand what's going on here.

So there won't be any policy recommendations coming out of that element of the transparency discussion, but I think it's important to educate and generate comments from the house on that topic.

Then finally, Jimson will focus on further Work Stream 2 recommendations with Rafik Dammak. Jimson, I don't know if you've had a chance to talk with Rafik yet about what you want to focus on. If not, no problem but I just thought I'd turn it over to you if you care to offer any comments.

Jimson Olufuye: Yes, thank you very much, Barbara. This is Jimson. Well, I got the invite yesterday for us to begin the discussion. So we will commence the discussion any moment from now with Rafik and ICANN staff.

Barbara Wanner: Great. Okay, second very, very important point that was raised in previous BC discussions and through email streams and so forth is that I just want to clarify that this intersessional will be open to the entire non-contracted party house community via the Adobe Chat. I have a link to that chat. It's on the NCPH intersessional wiki space.

I'm happy to send that link to the entire BC private listserv if that would be helpful. Very happy to do that. I also reconfirmed with ICANN staff that they will have transcripts of all the sessions too. So there you go.

The third point I'd like to make is we will have a 90 minute session with Goran as well as a one-hour lunch with the Board. The Board meeting probably will not be terribly substantive, if I can say that, because it will be a one-hour meeting over lunch out on a patio, which is not really conducive to an organized discussion.

So the thought was that we'll engage with the specific board members that are at our respective tables and then take those subjects and the nature of that engagement back with us to ICANN 61 and use it maybe as a jumping off point for our CSG meeting with the Board at ICANN 61, which I'll talk about in a minute.

With respect to our 90 minutes with Goran, I think that will really be based on all of the issues that have arisen because this 90 minute with him will be toward the end of our second day -- the issues that have arisen and have been

discussed earlier in the intersessional. So I think that's probably how we'll focus our time with Goran rather than zeroing it into a specific agenda.

Fourth point I'd like to raise is that there was a desire expressed for takeaways from this intersessional. Some items that staff would have to follow-up on and some items that the sessions co-leads and the community will follow-up on.

If possible, we will endeavor to develop a joint statement. I understand that that was issued at the Washington meeting. It's not required but there was considerable support expressed for some sign of joint statement that demonstrated efforts by both sides of the house to build a bridge and emphasize our areas of common interest and concern.

Finally, the BC requested a white boarding session with Theresa Swinehart and her MSSI team. So that will be an important opportunity for us to weigh in on strategy issues. So I'm happy to take any questions now about the intersessional. If not, I'll proceed to giving you some highlights on ICANN 61.

Steve DelBianco: Barbara, it's Steve. The whiteboard sessions were not something we requested. It was ICANN who offered them, either joint or with individual SOs and AC and constituencies. And when they made that offer, the BC said yes, we'd be glad to do it and don't have much idea about who will be involved from ICANN other than Theresa, but the idea is that we would look ahead to the rest of 2018 and what kind of issues and priorities ICANN management, ICANN org should focus on. That's my guess but we didn't request it out of the blue. It was something they offered and we said sure, we'll do it.

Barbara Wanner: Thanks, Steve. Thanks for that clarification. Okay, moving onto ICANN 61, it's kind of a good news/bad news situation. I'll start with the good news. I would say the schedule for the BC and for the CSG is virtually identical to what we had at ICANN60. We'll have a Saturday meeting with Becky, Matthew -- with our GNSO board members, Becky and Matthew. That will be from 8:30 to 9:30.

Let me just say before I get into the nitty-gritty of the schedule that Andrea, and she has the patience of a saint, and I, and Wolf Ulrich on behalf of the CSG went round, and round, and round trying to break this up so we wouldn't have this marathon of meetings on constituency day, which is Tuesday, the 13th.

And that proved to be impossible just because of all of the meetings that were scheduled at conflicting times that our members are all involved in -- GNSO meetings, cross-community sessions, opening ceremonies, the public forum. You name it and there was a conflicting meeting held at that time. But I just wanted everybody to know that we really gave it our best effort to try and space these meetings out and we just couldn't make it happen.

The good news is unlike for ICANN60, which nearly drove Andrew and I crazy, the bulk of the planning regarding the CSG meetings will not full on our shoulders this time. So we can skate through those meetings and not have to worry about leading them or whatever. But just to let you know, we do have a CSG meeting with the Board and we have to consider, or I would urge us to consider how we want to focus the BC's 30 minutes in our meeting with the Board. I would welcome your comments on that on the listserv.

The CSG has requested a meeting with Goran. We will need topics as was the case back for ICANN 60 as to how we want to focus the CSG's meeting with

Goran. Do we want to talk about -- Wolf Ulrich suggested further discussion about staff driven inputs to community reviews and I don't know how we want to take forward the SSR2 example, but that came to mind. I don't know how we want to proceed more on GDPR with Goran, but we can certainly offer those as topics for our CSG discussion with him.

I just want -- I'm very interested in what the BC and who the BC wants to talk about in both our open and closed meetings. I, in the BC ExCom, circulated some topics for us to consider and some people for us to consider meeting with.

I'll just read them briefly here and if you want, I will recirculate this to the BC private list. And I would welcome your feedback because that in turn will help Claudia and I determine our agenda for both the BC open and closed meetings.

One example I had was engagement with ICANN GDD about BC priorities. This again would be with Cyrus and Akram. ICANN Legal or Theresa Swinehart regarding GDPR WHOIS.

Perhaps a joint meeting of SSR2 with Denise and Heather Forrest to update on how that is coming. At least one hour -- okay, forget that, I'm sorry. A budget briefing by Javier or his senior staff. Oh, a breakfast meeting. This goes back to an earlier suggestion that Marilyn had meeting, a breakfast meeting with the new board members, Avri, Sarah Deutsch, Matthew.

And then finally, Jimson has proposed that we continue to talk with designated ICANN staff on how the ODI is proceeding, David Conrad or Jeremy.

So I can recirculate these to the list. As I said, your input is very important and will help us design agendas for both the open and closed meetings of the BC so that the meeting is worthwhile for you. I think that's all I'd like to say and happy to take any questions.

Claudia Selli: I see Marilyn with a hand up.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you, Claudia and Barbara. Thank you for that really wonderful update. I just want to make a couple of comments, and Steve, thank you for posting the list of cross-community topics but I frankly am not sure those topics are the most advantageous to the business constituency for cross-community events.

I also just want to comment that the CCWG auction proceeds has a request for a public town hall and I would urge that we support that. And also, the CCWG IG has asked for an event -- a public event -- to address the improvements, changes, challenges, whatever, to what the CCWG IG on internet governance would look like in the future.

I don't see any of those in this list for cross-community topic proposals. The one that is most of concern to me is the idea that I see you're posting, Steve, that these are of vital interest to the BC, but let me please speak. I think we need to have a public event -- a public discussion on the CCWG auction proceeds at this meeting.

There's a few of us, (unintelligible) myself, Wado, Lawrence is an observer, but there's a lot of progress on this and I think it's important to have some kind of a public discussion on that topic in particular.

Thanks. Steve, I'm just going to make a final comment. Cross-community topics have to be not just about us, but about everyone else and I'm just going to ask that we really I don't think why we would support a walk in the shoes of a new gTLD registry operator. We are the BC users. We're not the contracted parties. So I'm just going to ask us to think again about what our priorities are and also to understand that we have a couple of CCWG working groups that we need to provide comments on in one way or another, whatever that is.

Steve DelBianco: This is Steve. I would ask Andrea to try to address some of the questions in the chat. Those are seven topics and they were submitted through an open process and the BC solicited interest in topics and we did submit a WHOIS compliance, Whois question. I believe number seven is ours.

Andrea, what -- how many will they select for ICANN61 and what will be the process of getting AC and SO leaders together to come up with a consensus of which ones to select?

Okay. Andrea has clarified for those of you not seeing the chat is that four will be chosen, and Andrea, you said those have just been announced. So which four have they selected, Andrea? Claudia? Claudia may be having audio difficulties. So I believe next on the agenda was items that Jimson would cover.

Claudia Selli: Yes, sorry, Steve, I was muted.

Steve DelBianco: Go ahead, Claudia.

Claudia Selli: The next item is for Jimson. I also think that some of the topics that were addressed, I think they are of interest to the BC. So yes. Jimson, do you want to give your update?

Jimson Olufuye: Yes, sure. This is Jimson and greetings everyone. I would like to begin by providing a clear explanation with regards to CROP and COP. Because I've got to ask (unintelligible) more information on that. CROP is the Community Regional Outreach Program.

Basically outreach program for which we need (unintelligible) to ICANN to support our outreach efforts and the COP that is the community onboarding program is (unintelligible) ICANN initiative (unintelligible) where it's the mentor and the mentee and you can recall that Marilyn is the mentor for this program and Arinola is the mentee.

So CROP is for outreach and outreach within the region or it could be outside (unintelligible). So like Claudia (unintelligible) the call put out an expression of interest for members to express their interest in using CROP for outreach (unintelligible) ICANN61.

We can also use CROP for (unintelligible) region outreach for individuals or within Africa or within Asia. So we have two CROP slots next a little before (unintelligible) CROP (unintelligible) and then one out of region for CROP slot. So we just have two in region CROP (unintelligible) right now.

So let us take advantage of this and I believe for the outreach committee, they are working on an outreach in San Juan and (unintelligible) for this resources. (Unintelligible) go now elimination of credible field or board member (unintelligible) with particular (unintelligible) BC (unintelligible) North American review.

(Unintelligible) that BC initiative and thank the ICANN for support and funding for funding the match for two (unintelligible) or the board member

(unintelligible) association for each ICANN meeting, like (unintelligible) Claudia. In North America, we have two spots for anyone that qualifies and also ICANN62, we also have two slots. We need to express interest or (unintelligible) so that we can work on this (unintelligible).

And just to remind members about the request we made (unintelligible) for no objection. If we do not hear any objections by the deadline, we'll go ahead with (unintelligible) project (unintelligible) individual to ensure that the fourth officer of the BC participate in next two ICANN meetings.

As Claudia mentioned in (unintelligible) finance committee and the (unintelligible) committee fully followed the process and (unintelligible) the collection in line with the charter.

I don't know if Andrew Mack is on the call but I believe (unintelligible) provide more information about the outreach (unintelligible) for fund one. And towards the fund one BC, ICANN61, it was announced it will be publishing a newsletter as usual.

So if you have any article, relevant article could (unintelligible) especially from BC point of view, please send the article to Andrea. We have until the end of this month to submit any articles to be published.

Also, to let us know that this time around additional newsletter will be translated to Spanish. So if you can (unintelligible) within that deadline, generally (unintelligible) than it will (unintelligible) translated into Spanish and for publication.

Every year, we do (unintelligible) support our activities like the (unintelligible) workgroup that is required (unintelligible) assisting officers

who come to (unintelligible) requests, even (unintelligible) follows, you can say that the positive (unintelligible) has not been (unintelligible) to (unintelligible).

Also, project requires (unintelligible) and development execution (unintelligible) now. You have until the end of this month to chime in our FY '19 budget request.

So I'm saying this because the outreach committee will be (unintelligible) away (unintelligible) if there's anything you want or (unintelligible) for FY '19 would be -- or some special outreach, or summit, or what have you, this is the right time to tidy up the proposal with the need can propose, what have you.

So you have until the end of this month to tidy that up. Outreach committee members please submit. Okay. I think right now, I'm through and I want to take the opportunity to welcome all our new (unintelligible) like Laicana from (unintelligible) meeting for the first time. So we hope you continuously engage and be part of what we do here.

So I think this is where I will wrap up and I (unintelligible) a time (unintelligible) mailing what you (unintelligible).

Marilyn Cade: Thank you, Jimson. It's Marilyn Cade. I just wanted to comment about I made a proposal that may have not been broadly circulated about the idea of a business summit at the AGM in 2018 and I know that will require a draft proposal. And I wanted to volunteer to work with others to create that.

The NCUC and the at large have both had summits that cost ICANN about $100,000. I don't think we can ask for that amount of funding with the budget

cuts. But we should be able, perhaps, to ask for $50,000 to have a business summit.

There will be senior GAC attendees. I've talked to a few of the business associations from Brussels area, the European area and also to our members, Michelle and Chris, about the idea.

So I just wanted to propose if anyone's interested that we could collaborate on making a proposal for a business summit the day before the ICANN Barcelona meeting and use only part of the BC funding but ask for significant ICANN funding and just wanted to propose that as something that I would look forward to working with others on. Thanks.

Jimson Olufuye: Thank you, Marilyn. So please don't forget (February 24th) is the deadline for us to turn in proposals to (unintelligible) the (unintelligible) area for members and also provided (unintelligible). Thank you. Claudia, back to you.

Claudia Selli: Thank you, Jimson. Is there anyone that has other points to raise? I don't see any hands up. So the next meeting will be on Thursday, the 8th of February. We moved the call due to the intersessional and we'll speak then and stay in touch by mail. Thank you very much everyone for participating. You can close the recording.

Andrea Glandon: Thank you. Once again, the meeting has adjourned. Operator, you can stop all recordings. Everyone else, please remember to disconnect all remaining lines and have a wonderful rest of your day.

END