

ICANN

**Moderator: Terri Agnew
November 16, 2017
9:00 am CT**

Coordinator: The recording has started.

Andrea Glandon: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. This is the BC Members Call on the 16th of November 2017. In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Adobe Connect Room. If you are only on the Audio Bridge, could you please let yourselves be known now?

(Sajda Ouachtouki): Hi, this is (Sajda Ouachtouki) from Disney.

Claudia Selli: Claudia Selli, AT&T.

Margie Milam: Margie Milam from Facebook.

Denise Michel: Denise Michel from Facebook.

Alison Simpson: Alison Simpson, MarkMonitor.

Andrea Glandon: Thank you. Hearing no other names, 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 Andrew Mack. You may begin.

Andrew Mack: Great. Andrea, thank you very much and thank you to everyone who is on the call and who was able to be flexible to move forward an hour. Really very much appreciate it. It was also, as a personal note, it was also great to see so many of you in Abu Dhabi. I think the BC was unusually effective at that meeting and I know a lot of people put in a lot of time, including some slightly unusually scheduled meetings. We had that one crazy day with five or six meetings in a row and everyone showed tremendous grace and tremendous perseverance dealing with the entire GAC showing up at our lunch, and we had positive meetings with NCUC and others. And so thank you all for your time and your efforts, and for coming together and a lot of really hard work.

I know we've got a lot on the plate and so I'm going to turn it over to Steve. For those of you who are in countries that celebrate Thanksgiving, a personal note of thanks to all of you and a chance to reflect a little bit on both what we've accomplished together as a team and what the BCUC has accomplished as part of the ICANN community. Thanksgiving for me is always a good time to reflect back on those kinds of things. And so much appreciation for all of your work together.

Steve, over to you, please.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks, Andrew. Andrea is loading the updated policy calendar. It's updated because I sent it this morning with initial drafts on two of the open public comment periods. In Channel 1, I'll skip directly to the open public comments, since we haven't posted anything new since our last call. Andrea, I think you're controlling the scroll. I would ask you to make it larger on Adobe. Thank you. You've just given us our own. So let's scroll down to number one. Number one on the open public comment is ICANN inviting commentary on the draft budgets for IANA and for the public technical identifiers. These are two entities within ICANN that were formed as a result of the IANA transition. These comments close in about 10 days and fortunately, we have for your review, a draft comment. It's attachment three to the policy calendar and let me thank Jay Sudowski and Jimson Olufuye for drafting that.

Their comment is largely about the presentation that ICANN used in presenting the two budgets. There's only about a 10% increase in the IANA budget and a 25% increase in PTI from \$300,000 to \$400,000. So it's not a significant increase for the larger one but we do want to be able to comment on it. Now, Jimson and Jay Sudowski did the work on this, on the line as well. Jimson also sent me additional edits this morning after I already packaged up today's update. So I'll send those around after the call.

Since we only have 10 days until this comment period ends, it's a great chance for BC members to ask Jay and Jimson about the draft. And again, it's attachment number three to the policy calendar. While I wait for a hand to go up, Jay, is there anything you'd like to add about the draft you and Jimson have prepared?

Jay Sudowski: Thanks, Steve. This is Jay Sudowski for the record. The only real thing I wanted to add about the draft is I think the biggest thing that we asked for,

really, was more granularity in the budgeting process. They're doing their typical ICANN thing, \$100,000 intervals. But it's pretty hard to subtract what's actually going on the more budget, those kind of increments. And then Jimson had some wonderful suggestions about how they could actually make their executive summary an executive summary, because right now it's not really a summary at all.

Andrew Mack: Steve, are you still there?

Steve DelBianco: Yes, Andy. So I'll send another update later today and BC members will have ten days to reply. Number two is rationale and the target level for ICANN's reserve fund. This is an important conversation about how the rationale and the level we're going to have for how ICANN sets aside reserve funds to cover its operating cost. This comment period ends November 30. Jimson, Jay, and Marilyn drafted a comment for you to review. It's attachment number one on today's policy calendar. You can open that if you wish you'll see what we did come up with.

They're suggesting that there be a separate enhanced reserve fund targets specifically related to PTI and IANA and those are the budgets I discussed in our first comment. And we said that the reserve fund should have its own standalone policy and be binding on ICANN to ensure that they fund it as a matter of budget priority. I think those are important and bold statements from the BC and fully support those. Are there any questions for the drafters? Or the drafters have any comments they want to add?

Okay. Thank you. Let me move onto number three.

Jimson Olufuye: Steve, sorry. This is Jimson.

Steve DelBianco: Go ahead, Jimson.

Jimson Olufuye: Just another important point members need to vote with regard to our comment on the reserve fund. It has to do with the root zone maintenance agreement with VeriSign because it's the call of the internet itself. So we're recommending that at least the reserve fund shall exceed the 12-month period currently in view. So for that particular function, we should extend up to 36 months to take care of any possible exigency due to the important nature of that particular ask.

So just (unintelligible) but to know that. That's also part of what we recommended. Thank you.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Jimson. The recommendation of the drafters is to go to 17 months and not just 12 months and I think that's appropriate. Any other comments? Let me move to number three. The internationalized domain names are non-ASCII character sets, are being implemented. The implementation guide is being updated. This is a comment period. It closes December 10. Andy Abrams, Paul Mitchell, and Olga volunteered to help draft and Andy created a first draft before he headed off on a little break.

I attached that. It's attachment two to the policy calendar. Attachment two. I do expect Paul and Olga to weigh in on that and when they do, we'll issue an update. So that comment period is not until December 10. Are there any questions or comments from BC members on the IDN implementation guideline?

The BC is paying attention this to the extent that letters in other non-ASCII scripts can appear very similar to Latin scripts and that can cause visual

confusion, sometimes intentional visual confusion and if it is, it will be used for purposes of defrauding consumers or end users.

Great. Number four, the proposed recommendations to enhance the accountability of ICANN through diversity. This is the first of four open public comments related to work stream two coming out of the IANA transition. As you recall, the bylaws we adopted in October of 2016 included nine specific projects known as work stream two. The work stream two projects were then executed by members of the cross community working group and their recommendations are out for public comment as well as approval by the chartering organizations of ICANN.

If their recommendations are approved, there is an overwhelming obligation for ICANN's board to accept and implement the recommendations, far higher bar than any recommendations that come out of GNSO or recommendations that come out of a review team. And this is baked into the bylaws. So these are our one shot to impose upon ICANN.org the kind of accountability improvements that we would not otherwise get through other community driven processes.

So now that I've elevated your sense of importance for this, I'm going to continue to solicit volunteers. Item number four is the recommendations to enhance ICANN's accountability through diversity. Fortunately, we have many volunteers so far, Mark, Jimson, Andy, (Christian Volpe), and (Marilyn Toulin Waudou). And this will be due the 15th of December and I realize that's a month away but I would ask the drafting team to get started right away on a draft that we can circulate for member review.

Number five, proposed recommendations to improve the ombudsman's office within ICANN, another work stream two project. Jimson, I think you were a

participant and observer in the ombuds group and their recommendations are modest but it definitely deserves some attention. So I would encourage any BC member who has had experience with the ombuds office, either within ICANN or at other organizations, to please volunteer to help the BC come up with comments on this. Do I see any volunteers or have any comments right now?

Jimson Olufuye: I will be in for that (unintelligible).

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Jimson. Appreciate that. Any other volunteers? Marilyn, your hand is up. All right, your hand is down. Any other volunteers?

Marilyn Cade: I raised my hand so I could speak. Is that okay?

Steve DelBianco: Sure, go ahead Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: Just to verify the protocol, when I'm recognized it's okay if I lower my hand, but I still get to speak, right?

Steve DelBianco: Go ahead, Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: Oh, thanks. I do have experience and would be happy to work with others. So just to put my name in whatever that pot is.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks, Marilyn. It's number five there on Channel 1, which is the ombudsman. So it's you and Jimson so far. Any other volunteers to help Marilyn and Jimson. Marilyn, hand is up. Anything you want to add? Okay, great. Thank you.

Number six is recommendations again work stream two and it's on ICANN's staff accountability. This one came out of left field during the initial transition. This notion is, is the staff accountable to the community, or is it accountable to management? Well, it's some crossover between the two, particularly staff that works with us on working groups. So a group was formed and Avri Doria, who's now on the ICANN board was I think the leading raconteur in that group. And they've come up with some rather modest simple recommendations to improve transparency and accountability of the work that staff does. This will be due in January, early January.

So a lot of us have worked closely with ICANN staff and we even have some former ICANN staffers on the BC right now. It's relatively modest comment. It wouldn't take much to go through. Can I get any volunteers who would help to work on that one, number six? At the very least, I would hope that we could ask Margie and Denise, as former ICANN staffers, to just give it a review and even if you just point out to us areas in there that you think are good ideas or unworkable, others on the BC could do the writing. But we'd certainly appreciate your guidance as former ICANN staffers.

Marilyn, your hand is up.

Marilyn Cade: I just had a question, it's Marilyn Cade. Could we be -- I didn't really fully appreciate this until I looked at the link and I think this is worth at least a discussion among BC members. Margie and Denise are -- they come from the staff but there are a lot of us also who have worked with staff and I wondered if we might even propose a discussion so we could then develop our comments.

Staff accountability is an interesting issue because it implies that the staff is accountable to the community even when they're having to report to the board

or to the senior staff. And I think it's worth our thinking through this with some expert advice.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Marilyn. The focus of the group they said was to assess the staff accountability and performance at the service delivery level and that is the departments in the organization, and they're not looking at the individual staff personnel level. The recommendations they made are just over two pages of this eight page document and I think the first thing we want to do is to have anyone with any level of interest in it to read that recommendation and see whether the recommendations in there deserve support or modification from the BC.

So Marilyn, I'll put you down as one of the interested parties. Any others?

Margie Milam: Steve, this is Margie. I'm not in the Adobe room. Yes, I'll help. I just don't really want my name on the -- as one of the authors. It's been so soon that I've left staff.

Steve DelBianco: I assumed as much, Margie. Thank you very much. If folks like you and Denise can give us some guidance, we won't list your name as one of the BC contributors. Marilyn, and I, and others could do the actual writing. We'd like your insights. Thank you.

Okay, two more. Number seven was recommendations on ICANN's jurisdiction. This is also work stream two and this is a big one. If you recall, during the transition themselves there were a small minority of CCWG members who wanted to change where ICANN is incorporated in order to accomplish what they felt would be greater independence of ICANN from the influence of the U.S. government or from any government. The work of this

group has been torturous to follow and there are several of us on this call that were part of the jurisdiction group.

In the end, the recommendations are very modest but impactful. The first thing they tackled was the idea that a government that issues sanctions against individuals and other governments could actually limit the ability of those individuals to participate in ICANN's multi stakeholder process. It might limit the ability of ICANN to do contracts with registry applicants for new GTLDs or registrars that want to come into play in a certain country that might be the target of sanctions.

Now, the U.S. government sanctions, which are known as OFAC, are only one of many. Many other governments, Europe included, impose sanctions as well and those sanctions can get in the way of the multi-stakeholder process and a private sector led organization like ICANN. So the recommendations in here talk about obtaining both specific and general sanctions relief from the U.S. and other places. The second recommendation has to do with when a registrar and a registry sign for a contract giving them a menu of choices they can pick for the venue for adjudicating any contract issues, as opposed to assuming it should be California law. This would be an opportunity to select other venues that are mutually agreeable to ICANN and the contract party when it comes to contract adjudication.

So I could really use some help from lawyers in the BC who understand the process, and in particular, anyone who's been affected by sanctions and that could be the core of the BC team that would review and comment on this. Do I have any volunteers? Again, legal experts and those who've experienced national government sanctions. Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: Steve, thank you so much for raising this. I'm just going to -- in the CCWG auction proceeds, we're just beginning to take this topic up. Got married to two, should not be disclosed to the world, okay. I hope that was a joke, but I think this issue has some broader implications. I'm hoping that some of our corporations that are trying to do business globally can contribute to this but perhaps also some of our SMEs that are at a ground level can also contribute.

I think it's a really important topic and I don't know how much I can contribute but at least in the CCWG auction proceeds, this topic is coming up and it would be good to have guidance from the BC in further examination.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Marilyn. The recommendations in here won't be troublesome for ICANN's board to approve but the controversy over this is that individuals on the working group from India and Brazil would prefer a broader examination of jurisdiction to include the possible relocation of ICANN to a different legal regime and that dissatisfaction they have is that they were alone in the group. There was only a tiny minority that thought that jurisdiction should make recommendations on moving ICANN.

So given that the controversy won't show up in the actual report itself but only in a minority report. At this point, I believe the BC can focus on what the consensus report was and comment on the sensible recommendations that are in there. And that would be this assignment. So I see that Marilyn has volunteered. Anyone else who can help with jurisdiction? A lot of you were observers of that group.

Okay. Thank you. I have one more on this calendar and then we'll move on. It is on operating standards for the specific reviews. The specific reviews are those four reviews baked into the ICANN bylaws now for WHOIS, security, stability, resiliency, the new GTLD program, and we also looked at

accountability and transparency, the ATRT. Those four reviews used to be in the affirmation of commitments, but it was the BC as part of stress test 14 that brought them in during the transition to be part of ICANN bylaws.

Staff and ICANN's board wanted to keep to a minimum the details that are in the bylaws and to allow staff to propose operating standards that live outside of the bylaws. And those operating standards would govern how these reviews are conducted. I think that's a generally good idea. So for the first time, after a couple of years of waiting, we've gotten a look at what staff is recommending and they're very sensible. Sensible standards for how the review teams come together, do their work, interact with (unintelligible) their results.

There was however one recommendation that really caught us by surprise and it was a recommendation to form a different community group a year before the review begins and have that group define the scope of the review. In Abu Dhabi, I made comments on that because I believe that is an unwelcome and unnecessary intrusion into the role of the team itself when the team comes together.

So my comment is in there in the policy calendar. I made that comment on my behalf, not on behalf of the BC, but I would hope that it could form part of what the BC does in response to these operating standards. There were several of you who volunteered to help draft. It's not due until the 15th of January but we ought to get started on that. Are there any other volunteers who would want to help? Jimson, when you said plus one, were you volunteering to help with jurisdiction or agreeing with something someone else has said?

Jimson Olufuye: With jurisdiction, Steve. I was supporting Marilyn with jurisdiction, yes.

Steve DelBianco: Right, but as I indicated it was only a minority report. It isn't in the recommendations so we don't need to comment on the notion of moving ICANN. You can if you wish, but it's not part of the recommendations. Marilyn, I'll add you to the list for the operating standards. I think you're already on there. Great. Thank you. And I can't volunteer Mike Roberts on his behalf. If you can get him on the phone or get him to volunteer, please do. We need the help.

Marilyn, your hand is up. Thank you. That's all for the current staff of open public comments. It's a lot of public comments. Susan, go ahead please.

Susan Kawaguchi: I just wanted to bring something to the BC's attention and I had promised to send this around to the BC during the Abu Dhabi meeting and I forgot. So I just did it this morning. But there is a questionnaire out there on travel and I'm just putting the link into the chat. I think it would be good too if either the BC or members responded to this questionnaire because they are drafting new travel guidelines and travel funding is very important to our group, especially for the smaller entities.

So I think we should have a voice in this. So maybe we can put it on the next policy calendar but I sent it to the BC in an email and the link is there.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Susan. The email will certainly get our attention. Is there a deadline for when they want that questionnaire to be completed?

Susan Kawaguchi: They said the end of 2017 but it looks like a little bit wishy washy. So they're going to start drafting the guidelines in 2018.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks, Susan. Earlier today, I circulated an email to the BC private and it comes from Graeme Bunton at the registrar stakeholder group. He was following up on a conversation we had in Abu Dhabi about the IRTP, that's the inter-registrar transfer policy, the locks that go onto records that prevent them from being transferred. And the interaction of that with privacy and proxy settings.

Those of us that were in that CSG meeting agreed on the principle that if a registrant made a change to their privacy and proxy that that shouldn't be the kind of change that institutes a 60-day lock of the transfer of a domain name. So given that, we discussed the principle but now Graeme is asking us for help on the process. It's a rather arcane process question about which group should cover the question of whether the locks should be in place for privacy proxy. I'm asking now on BC members who have experience with privacy proxy and inter-registrar transfers, can one or two of you please help examine Graeme's email -- I sent it to all of you this morning -- and give us some advice as to how we should proceed.

It's a process question and those of you with privacy and proxy experience could do it. Susan, thank you so much. I hope it will only take a few minutes to look at that. Okay, I'm going to turn things over to Susan to discuss a little bit on council, but first I thought I would insert -- you'll see on the policy calendar -- the next section is the GDPR and WHOIS. This is such a big topic that I tried to cover it for all of you by recapping everything that has gone before along with links to the relevant documents. All that's really happened since Abu Dhabi is that the GAC communique made a very strong statement that the GAC itself is advising the ICANN board to keep WHOIS accessible to the public, and that includes us, businesses and other organizations, for legitimate purposes.

They went on to indicate that includes combatting fraud and deceptive conduct, infringement, and misuse of IP, and due diligence for online transactions and communications. These are the principles and the legitimate purposes of WHOIS that we've always fought for and the GAC is agreeing with us and that's going to be helpful.

At the same time, we know that ICANN made a unilateral decision to change the way it's going to enforce the registrar and registry agreements to registrars and registries that are affected by GDPR and they've opened the window between now and next May for some models that could be used for enforcement. To that end, Margie Milam and several other members of the BC and the IPC formed a birds of a feather group to examine whether a code of conduct approach under Article 40 might be another model that could be used to preserve at least most of our access to WHOIS even under GDPR.

To get that going, we organized a conference call. We had it on the 14th of November and we had BC members, Margie, Denise, Alex, Mary Ellen, Tim Chen, Barbara Wanner, Jay Sudowski, and myself, and we examined different ways forward on diving into the code of conduct.

We don't have anything to report significantly because we are going investigations of the domain name association and ECO, the European or German Internet Association, so see whether their work would help to dovetail on the development of a code of conduct. And Margie, I believe you're going to speak with ICANN. As we get any news out of this group, we'll send it to the entire BC and again, any BC member who wants to join our little groups can just let me know via email.

Any questions on GDPR and WHOIS?

Denise Michel: Steve, this is Denise. I'm not in the Adobe room. I'd like to be in the queue.

Steve DelBianco: Please go ahead, Denise.

Denise Michel: Thank you. So in addition to important work on trying to identify a unified way of keeping a public Who Is complying with GDPR. I think it is important for the BC and other groups to not let the events from the last day of Abu Dhabi.

So (unintelligible) there is a really bad noise on the line. Can you guys hear me?

Andrew Mack: We can but it sounds like someone's alarm is going off.

Denise Michel: Okay if people could mute thanks.

Steve DelBianco: Time to wake up.

Denise Michel: It was highly unusual for (Goran) and then for the ICANN staff to make a unilateral sort of declaration of as they did with the compliance or non-compliant statement.

And in this case process matters very much. They ignored a very long sort of tradition and process that staff has of issuing changes, important changes in operations and programs posting those for public comment.

Or at the very least if they are changing some aspect of how they are implementing contracts. They will issue a notice for information and discussion.

And for one of the most important activities that ICANN has undertaken with respect to contracts and Who Is in more than a decade. It is unusual to say the least then to the detriment of the community to do so and ignore explicit requests.

That there be collaboration and coordination with the community and an opportunity to comment on this compliance statement and this sort of unilateral direction that ICANN has staked out.

And in particular at the bottom of that statement and Steve has circulated a link. There is a note about criteria and process to come. And that is particularly critical if we are looking at a situation where every registrar in the world can send to ICANN their own model of what they want to do with Who Is to comply with GDPR.

Not only are we potentially looking at a whole patchwork quilt of Who Is access. But we have no transparency or understanding of what ICANN will unilaterally decide when it comes to the criteria that they are applying or the process that they will use to accept or reject these models.

So there is a lot of important issues and activities embodied in that unilateral action and I would suggest to the BC and I know other groups are considering this as well.

That we get interested people together to write a BC statement laying out what we think is the appropriate community involvement and the appropriate direction on this compliance statement going forward. Thanks.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you Denise. I pasted a link to the statement. It is also in the policy calendar. And then in the chat Denise you can't see this if you are just dialing

in. But I put in the key two sentences whereby contractual compliance declared it will defer taking action.

So they would call it a deferral but only if an eligible contract party offers its model. And those models as they come in are certainly going to be an opportunity for comment.

But I see your point of getting on record now as wanting that process to be inclusive of the community. So besides Denise are there other BC members who want to take a hard look at that compliance statement with an eye towards developing a CSG if not BC only statement?

Any other volunteers? Tim Chen thank you. This compliance statement is very brief. All of you can quickly read it. If you recall (Yurin) summarize a couple of paragraphs from it during the BC sponsors' session at GDPR. And Jay Sudowski. Thank you Jay.

Okay that is all I have for Channel 1. Let me turn it over to Susan Kawaguchi on Channel 2 to talk about council. Susan.

Susan Kawaguchi: Thanks Steve. We don't have the agenda for the next council meeting yet so there is not much to discuss. But there are two issues that are really relevant right now I think.

One is the Who Is conflicts of law policy. And I would have to go back to remember to refresh my memory on exactly how this happened. But the PDP that was supposed to revive that really did not come to any resolution or recommendation that was – that worked.

And so the council took it on to – we dissolved the PDP and said we would basically provide some guidance and then maybe reform another PDP but it would have to be a quick one.

So Keith Drazek has provided draft language for a motion on wave forward to – for an exemption from Who Is. And I forwarded that to the BC this morning and that language so I would love input on that. So that we can ensure that we get the mechanism in place that protects Who Is and doesn't give a free pass easily.

And then the other issue is SSR2 Review Team. It is still on suspension. It is still with SOs and ACs as far as I know. And there was some discussion in the council list of maybe we should just suspend all review teams until we figure this out? Luckily that was pushed back.

So, you know, I will continue to advocate for the SSR2 Review Team to be unsuspended and I think we just need to let them get on with their work. One of the things that I was really concerned with in what the board session with the SSR2 is one single member seems to be raising a significant concern but the others aren't.

You didn't see that. All the other members were willing to work on things but the SSAC member was very vocal and it just seemed that he is holding the SSRT review team hostage almost.

And I think it is very significant that one community, one organization could have that much, hold that much weight to put six other communities on hold basically.

So we need to make sure those operating standards provide guidance on this. And we also need to push back as much as possible. So any guidance on that for the council because that will be a hot topic on the next council meeting.

Steve DelBianco: Susan it is Steve. I don't think we will want to wait until the next council meeting. And it ought to be incumbent upon (Heather) as the new chair of GNSO. She is one of the SO/AC leaders and this is in the hands of the SO/AC leadership. It is not in the hands of the board.

And the SO/AC leaders I know we have had some turnover. (Heather) took over as chair of GNSO. We know that (unintelligible) took over as chair of the SSAC. And during the handover on the last hours of the Abu Dhabi meeting I really feel like the SO and AC leaders dropped the ball.

They had a clear opportunity to send an unequivocal signal to Denise and the SSR team to use their Friday together and work on the definition of scope in terms of reference and determine whether they needed skills. Because there is a lot of openings on that review team.

This all made very good sense and I had conversations with (Patrick) and others, Alan Greenberg who all that made sense. But they really dropped the ball in the way they gave instructions to Denise and the team.

So if I were you I would please lean on (Heather) to take the lead with the other SO and AC chairs and get them to get on record at allowing this team to resume its work. To find its terms of reference and let the community know what kind of skills they need since they have many open slots.

So it is not for the board to do this Susan. It is really for (Heather) and the other SO/AC chairs. And one of them sort of has to take the lead or nothing is going to happen. Thank you.

Susan Kawaguchi: I agree completely and I do think (Heather) is pushing forward to unsuspend the – or move the suspension of the review team. Unfortunately all of the – she has put it in the communication in the email.

Most of the other SOs and ACs are continuing rumbling and grumbling as she characterized it. But provides no substantial, you know, there seems to be a lot of rumors but no actual concrete information besides this one member's, you know, issues.

One, you know, I think it was (Jeff Houston). So I will continue to push on with (Heather) but if anyone else has, you know, besides that if there is anything else we could do. Ideas are welcome. And Andrew?

Andrew Mack: Yes I was just going to second what Steve was suggesting. I was at those meetings in Abu Dhabi and they were immensely opaque. It wasn't entirely clear what the complaints were half of the time. And it didn't seem to be very focused on remedy.

And I think we to the extent that we can support (Heather) in calling the question and pushing for some action. If there a way forward let's talk about it. If there are specific issues that people need addressing let's address them.

But let's get it out there and to the extent that I can I think we want to bolster the strength of the team for sure but keep the work going. Thanks.

Steve DelBianco: Yes remember we have a new chair of SSAC and he is going to be much more sympathetic to these concerns.

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes. I agree. Okay thank you. I think that is it for me.

Steve DelBianco: Barbara anything you want to handle on CSG liaison. Channel 3?

Barbara Wanner: Sure. No I can just provide everyone with a brief update as to where things stand on the intersessional planning. We had a call I guess it was on Tuesday again just to refresh people's memories. This will be on the 1st and 2nd of February 2018.

The BC there is funding for seven person delegation from the BC which bottom lining it opens up one guest slot for us. So I sent an email out to everybody yesterday. Please let us know if you are interested. We have already heard some expressions of interest but I just wanted everyone to know about this opportunity.

Just briefly in terms of scheduling updates. We will meet with (Yurin) on the first day. We also have put in a request to have several board members present from the OEC as they did in Iceland. And the participants this year who are on that committee are Matthew, George Sadowsky.

Forgive me I am going to mispronounce his name but Khaled Koubaa, Avri Doria, Lian Sanchez and Rafael Lito. And Steve in particular intervened and suggested that maybe we zero in on three members to participate. Matthew Shears in particular.

We also talked about I think a very upbeat and positive meeting we had in Abu Dhabi as the non-contracted party house. And the sentiment of all

involved that, you know, we want to find a way to make things work. We want to find areas where we can cooperate and make for a more effective house.

In particular some of the topics we will delve into at the intercessional. We will request a session with ICANN legal and Dan Halloran to talk not only about GDPR compliance but also legal's response to some of the transparency recommendations.

And Michael Karanicolas who worked with – who I worked – I had the pleasure of working with and also Chris Wilson on the transparency subgroup. Was very interested in exploring transparency issues that will go beyond the Work Stream 2 effort.

We will also consider whether we have common ground. What that common ground might be in terms of (unintelligible) reference for the next GNSO review.

Also hope to work out board language on the selection of board seat Number 14. There will be a discussion of outreach best practices. The new gTLD subsequent procedures update.

And then in terms of this budget working group and again I invite Jimson to make some comments. It was my understanding that when we were talking about this it was not so much in Iceland.

It was more finding a way for the non-contracted party house to come together with respect to our powers under the empowered community structure to challenge board decisions in terms of the budget.

Not so much to create a common budget for the non-contracted party house.
Jimson do I understand that correctly? Are you still with us?

Jimson Olufuye: Yes this is Jimson. Yes Barbara you got this correctly.

Barbara Wanner: Okay.

Jimson Olufuye: (Unintelligible) of something in the contracted – subcontracted party house with respect to budget is because of the empowered rights we have right now in the empowered community structure.

So they need for streamlining of the respective budget view so that rightful function can be properly performed when the time comes. So you are right Barbara.

Barbara Wanner: Okay great. Okay so we will have another planning call in two weeks. I also just wanted to acknowledge that I am in receipt of Marilyn's email. And during our next planning call I will put in a very strong request to have remote participation available for those who cannot participate in person.

And as a matter of fact I will probably communicate that to ICANN staff in advance of the planning call so that we can have that as an agenda item.

So that is it and I am happy to take any questions.

Andrew Mack: Barbara this is Andrew. My hand is up and I'm not sure if you can see. Just two quick words. Three quick words actually. One is that I wanted to compliment the BC. I know that we – that meeting was kind of an awkward time for everyone and it was unclear whether we get enough people in the room.

You really exceeded all of our expectations by showing up. By being really engaging and frankly by being really collaborative with the, you know, with the NCPH and I think that the meeting went immensely well.

I was struck by the fact that we have a lot of points of overlap and that there is – at least it struck me that there was a lot of opportunity to build and strengthen that relationship which hasn't been always so great. So congratulations to everyone.

And special thanks to Barbara because I know that that was a really, really hard meeting to schedule. You spent a lot of time trying to find first a cocktail that we could do it and then a place that we could do it and then a time that we could do it.

And much of the work in getting things set up goes unnoticed. And I happen to know because you talked about that was a really hard one to get done and thanks for it because it turned out to be a very valuable meeting.

Barbara Wanner: Thanks very much Andrew. And I was very, very pleasantly surprised. You know were expecting nobody to show up and long and short the media center was packed. So it was great. That was great. And I thank everybody for their support in attending that.

So that is it for me.

Andrew Mack: Great Barbara thank you very much. We are a little on the short time side. So Jimson you want to jump in real quick about invoices and new members and welcome our new members?

Jimson Olufuye: Okay thank you Steve. This is Jimson Olufuye well we don't have any invoice issues anymore. (Unintelligible) got to be invoicing and (unintelligible) that has (unintelligible).

So thank you all for your (unintelligible). On the new members. Yes we have three new members. After the Abu Dhabi meeting. I would like to welcome again three of you (unintelligible).

(Unintelligible) Abu Dhabi that is talking about (unintelligible) welcome. Please (unintelligible). Also to welcome (unintelligible).

(Unintelligible) like to welcome (unintelligible) from Nigeria (unintelligible). So (unintelligible) committee for their hard work for (unintelligible) finalize their (unintelligible).

(Unintelligible) from the election with (unintelligible) decided that the election (unintelligible) extended by two weeks. We already have the (unintelligible) requirements for (unintelligible) there is nothing like that actually. (Unintelligible) but we do have some position for Nom Comm.

So everyone is free to be nominated. So based on the (unintelligible) looking at December to wrap up December 20th to wrap up for the (unintelligible).

We are looking forward to finishing our (unintelligible) for the election. So that (unintelligible).

Andrew Mack: Jimson. Excuse me this is Andrew. The last couple of lines got really muddy. Your phone line is a little bit unclear. Could you repeat what you just said?

Jimson Olufuye: I was saying that by December 19th we should be (unintelligible) through the election and then by (unintelligible) and that by January 4, 2018 (unintelligible) participate in council meetings (unintelligible).

That is what I said. And I said (unintelligible) two week extensions (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Andrew Mack: Can I make a suggestion my friend because the line is not super clear and I know because some of this is stuff that you are either sending or have sent an email.

Is it possible for you to resend the schedule, the updated schedule so everyone knows to the BC private list? How long and allow people to come back if there are any questions. Because I think most of it – most of what you are just saying was about scheduling.

And I want to make sure that I see (Steve's) hand is up. I want to make sure that if anybody – if we have any other business. We also have a couple of seconds for it. Is that okay?

Jimson Olufuye: Yes that is okay. It is all right.

Andrew Mack: Thank you sorry. It is just that the line keeps coming at least from my side coming in and out and it is a little hard to hear. Steve you had a hand up. Did you want to jump in real quick?

Steve DelBianco: I wanted to offer on behalf of all the officers in the BC to do confidential communications with any BC member that would like to think about running. We have 12 more days of an open nomination period.

And if any of you are just thinking about running for policy coordination chair I want you to feel free to reach out to me and I can explain a little bit about how the job is done. How many hours you should expect and both the rewards and the challenges of doing the job.

I do want to encourage others to stand. This is how we attract leadership into the BC. So all the officers are open to take your questions, inquiries and to give you encouragement to stand for BC elections. Thanks Andrew.

Andrew Mack: Great thank you Steve. I absolutely on behalf – second that. And if there is any way that any of us who have served or are serving can be of assistance to you as you are thinking of running. We are interested in having obviously more people interested and more people knowledgeable about the process.

Jimson is there anything else that you wanted to touch on? Or does anyone else have any other new business? I know we are at...

Jimson Olufuye: This is Jimson. I don't know if the line is clearer now.

Andrew Mack: Just a tiny bit. Yes sir.

Jimson Olufuye: Okay well the other thing I wanted to mention is (unintelligible) to thank Andrew Mack the chair, Marilyn Cade (unintelligible) committee members both in Nigeria.

And then ICANN staff like Chris Modini, Richard Lamb and (unintelligible) for their (unintelligible) outreach that took place in Abuja in conjunction with the Africa Summit.

(Unintelligible) all BC members (unintelligible) they played very active roles. We have more than 100 participants at the event. The message was well received scaling from (unintelligible). That is just what I would like to add. Thank you very much again.

Andrew Mack: Great Jimson thank you very much. It was an honor to participate and I know on behalf all of the BC participants we thought it was a terrific event. Now is our third or fourth of these that we have been connected to.

We are hoping to continue to see strong member developments not just in Nigeria but across the continent and (unintelligible) is certainly a big part of that.

I would also like to compliment Jimson and the conference team. Continuing to get ICANN participation and leveraging their resources is the way that we can continue to do more on outreach and broaden our base and frankly get them more on our, you know, on our team in terms of building outreach.

I know this happened with our event in Brazil. Our events in Brazil that were so successful and now again in Nigeria. I think that is a great model for us going forward.

Anyone else before I close the call? I know people have hard stops at 11 o'clock and it is now 10:59. Last call. Okay then let me thank you all again for a great call. Thank you Steve for getting us through a very dense policy calendar.

Happy Thanksgiving to those of you who have the time to put your head up and say hello to your families and all that kind of thing. And we will be speaking soon.

Again to echo (Steve's) point. If you are thinking of running or if you would like to know more about the process please do reach out to people who are in management or leadership or who have been. We are all happy to help you. Thank you.

Coordinator: Thank you. Once again the meeting has adjourned. (Unintelligible) if you could please stop the recording. To everyone else please remember to disconnect all remaining lines and have a wonderful rest of your day.

END