ICANN

Moderator: Terri Agnew
October 12, 2017
10:00 am CT

Coordinator: The recordings have started.

(Andrea):   Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is the BC Members Call on the 12th of October 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? Thank you.

                  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. Sir, you may begin.

Andrew Mack: Thanks very much, (Andrea), and welcome everybody. Good morning, good afternoon. I don't think there's anyone for good evening yet. So I hope everyone is doing well. As you may have heard, we're having a little bit of

trouble getting in touch with Jimson so we're going to continue to work on that.

Our policy calendar is moved to the back half of…

Jimson Olufuye: Hi, Jimson's here.

Andrew Mack: Hello? Jimson, are you there?

Jimson Olufuye: Jimson is.

Andrew Mack: Oh wonderful. Okay good. Well then as I was in the process saying - we didn't think you were yet on. As I was in the process of saying because Steve is on a plane, he will be joining us in the second half of the call so what we're going to do is flip our traditional agenda. I would like to start us off with our operations and finance report.

And before I do, just a quick word of thanks to (Mark) and (Nevaldo) from the Brazil team. I'll talk a tiny bit when it's the appropriate time in the agenda about our outreach work in Brazil. But both of them have done some amazing stuff and I wanted to give a BC hats off to the two of them for all that they have done to support our efforts on outreach in Brazil.

Jimson, over to you, please.

Jimson Olufuye: Yes thank you, Andrew. And greetings to everyone. Let me also say plus one to that appreciation to (Nevaldo) and (Mark). Good job. And also to our chair, Andrew Mack, that spoke mostly at the event. Good job.

Yes right away to the invoice section, and then new members and I'll talk about the elections. But before them let me thanks Andrew for filling in for (Santo) (unintelligible). Thank you for the support. As many of you already know, (Santo) is (unintelligible) for Andrew is filling in for her. Therefore the (SYDC) is working around (unintelligible) all members are doing that, the services and quite a number of dues. But (unintelligible) to support membership that we have for FY '17 and the beginning of FY '18, we only have about six of them drawn, six that are drew for membership.

And many of the members are paid fully. Of the members that paid, about 50% used the online payment process on our payment platform submitted into the website. So if we could get some feedback (unintelligible). I was really hoping that more members would be (unintelligible) 50% membership. I'd be happy to get feedback from members that used that process for an improvement. (Unintelligible)

Andrew Mack: Excuse me, Jimson. This is Andrew. Jimson? Excuse me. I'm having - I don't know if other people are having the same thing. I'm having a hard time understanding you. Can you repeat what you said? You're looking for feedback or you're hoping to get feedback about what exactly? It's just the line. I'm having a hard time hearing.

Jimson Olufuye: Yes. About - yes about members' experience on the use of our online payment platform. Did you hear that?

Andrew Mack: Got it. About the online…

Jimson Olufuye: Good. Payment platform that we submitted to our website.

Andrew Mack: Okay got it. Thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Andrew Mack: Go ahead.

Jimson Olufuye: Okay. As I mentioned, close to 50% of our members used that platform and I was actually suggesting (unintelligible) for our - I said I would like to get feedback either from things we need to address to improve on the system. Having said that, we want to have new members. From the time of July 1 to this point, we've had about eight new members, eight new members. And I want to thank the outreach committee for the excellent job they are doing. They're doing an excellent job in vetting new applicants and (unintelligible) members of the BC.

So eight new members are coming. We have (Assembly) from South Africa, a network (unintelligible) from the Congo. We have (Franken Network Inc) from the USA and (Sitco IP Inc) from USA. We have (Hampa Technologies) from Nigeria, (Mack Hoten Technologies) also from Nigeria, and (Entala) from Kenya, and (unintelligible) from (unintelligible). Eight new members that have been approved by the executive committee we expect them to be in compliance by next week. So maybe by next week we'll gear up for about nine new members.

So altogether, we have 66 members now, six members, as of the end of FY '17, so 64 members we drew. We had eight members (unintelligible) members to 66.

Okay so that's on that. Maybe I could get - also talk about the outreach because it's connected to the effort of new members before I talk about the election. There's an outreach plan we proposed for (unintelligible) in

connection with the - with our success from it and hopefully that drives the ability to get more membership across the African region and include more awareness about the work of the BC.

So let me thank the Outreach Committee (unintelligible) the chair will be thinking about that shortly. There has been a lot of work and I thank you Mack for your activity.

Let me move to the election. As you know, we have elections every year and our policy - official policy is that you have the election commencing from November to December. And from end of December, new officers can get in shape with the old officers and then to take their seats by January the following year.

So the election timeline will be starting next week. The election timeline we can start election and with the submission being sent to all members. So let me just give you an overview, a quick overview, of what we expect next week, a quick overview of what to expect next week.

So beginning from the first day of October 16, yes on Monday, by Monday you'll get the e-mail in your boxes outlining the election process. So we're going to have two weeks of nominations beginning from November 4 to November 15, two weeks of nomination period. November 4 to November 15. And you have candidates submit or to come in by November 22, the (unintelligible) coming in by November 22. And then the candidate call will be on November 30.

The candidate call will be November 30. And then we'll have the confidential candidate voting of candidates December 4 to 8, December 4 to 8. So then the announcement will come a day afterward. So after this, then the new officers

will be able to get the update. And I want to encourage that the update of the first that we need to prepare - we need to prepare (unintelligible) so that the new officers will be able to ask for more guidelines as they prepare to do the work.

So all that we're doing (unintelligible) to the officer's position are available for election: the office of the chair, the office of the vice chair of finance and operation, the office of the vice chair of policy coordination, and the CSG representative to - the liaison to CSG. This is (unintelligible).

(Unintelligible) members are fully paid up that can be voted for, the community members that are fully paid up can be voted for. An important aspect of this election process is that if you want to make a nomination, please contact the person you would like to nominate. It's very important to contact, and once the person really understands, once the person really understands then you can proceed with the nomination.

And once someone has been nominated of course you need to (unintelligible) needs to either accept or decline. So the details will be in the mail by Monday and those are simple and straightforward. And it's very important we also be (unintelligible) as of this moment. So we are comprising it so that members that are drawn (unintelligible) will be removed.

So this is the election process (unintelligible) and so far this is our level of preparedness. So that's it for me. Perhaps there may be one question or another. I'm ready to pick it up. Thank you, Andrew.

Andrew Mack: Great. Jimson, thank you very much. Does anyone have any questions about the election process or any questions about the timeline, just while we have

that as open agenda item? Yes, Marilyn, please. Go ahead. Marilyn, go ahead. I see your hand up.

Okay while we're waiting for Marilyn, does anyone else have a question?

Marilyn Cade: I'm sorry. Are you able to hear me now?

Andrew Mack: Now we are. Yes, thanks. Go ahead, please.

Marilyn Cade: Thanks. I do have a comment. I'm not sure it's question but I'm going to phrase as it a comment. I have recently reviewed attendance record of all of the working groups and the CCWGs that we have BC members signed up for. I think those should be made public because if someone's going to stand for an office, I think it's important for all of the members to know whether or not they - the candidate has actually been able to fulfill their existing commitments.

Those records are available from the ICANN staff. It just occurred because I was looking at attendance records and I see that, as an example, and this is not about us but it is relevant, on the CCWG auction proceeds, the participants in some cases have a very, very low attendance record. And if we're going to nominate - if we're going to have nominees from the BC to take on major roles, I'd like to know that they have what their record of attendance and participation is and what they've already signed up to do.

Andrew Mack: Thank you, Marilyn. Any other thoughts on that? I have one for myself but I'd love to know if other people have a comment or a question. I - from my - this is Andrew again speaking. My own personal opinion of it is that I think these are big responsibilities and they do take time and commitment, and so we want to do whatever we can to encourage people to look seriously at whether

or not they can do them. And certainly some look back as to whether or not they've been able to do things in the past that they've committed to is not unwarranted.

I'm not sure that that's necessarily the best marker. I know for a number of people if you get involved as an observer or even as a participant in a working group that may go down a bit of a rat hole, it's sometimes difficult to see the value in being on every single call or every single e-mail. But I do understand the point of it and I think it's a very valid point.

Any other thoughts for people on that issue? Yes, Marilyn, I agree with you. If you take a seat, certainly fill it and especially if you have an important role to play as a representative of others. I think that's immensely important. Great.

Well I'm going to just jump in real quickly and again say thanks to everybody on - who is working on BC outreach. We are really seeing the results of them. We're seeing as we've got some new people coming out of our group, we've got a lot of new and interesting people coming into our group and a much broader geographical representation. And again, many, many thanks to everybody who's participating in that.

I'm going to turn it over to the council update. Susan and Phil, if you could pick it up from here, that'd be terrific.

Phil Corwin: Susan, did you want to go first or do you want me to lead off? Doesn't matter to me.

Susan Kawaguchi: Go ahead, Phil. That's fine.

Phil Corwin: Okay thank you. I'll be as brief as possible. We had a two hour council call this morning. We noted the change in one of the co-chairs for the new working group, for the working on subsequent procedures, where Avri Doria is stepping down as co-chair and Cheryl Langdon-Orr is taking her place. We discussed the budget cycle and the council's role in that, particularly for policy-related budget items. No decisions made there but we got that discussion started.

There was rather vigorous discussion of ICANN meeting planning, continuing dissatisfaction. Some people want more policy-oriented meetings, some less, some - it was note that the upcoming meeting in Abu Dhabi that an important event, the CCWG event, is taking place on day zero before the official opening, whereas at the last day of the supposedly seven-day meeting has nothing scheduled, which a lot of people booked air travel assuming there'd be events on the seventh day and there are not.

It was also noted that we had rescheduled two meetings last year because of Zika. And coming up this year, the coming year, no one could predict this but it's not at all clear that San Juan will be able to support a meeting in March. They're trying to do that but at some point the decision must be made. And who would have predicted that political instability in Catalonia might create problems for Barcelona meeting with the future of that situation very much in question.

So there was a lot of sentiment from council members for a more transparent and - process for planning these meetings that would take into account a variety of factors and that might narrow the range of places we go and make sure that they are places that are reliable and with reasonable visa requirements, air connections, all of that.

We had some planning for our activities at ICANN 60 and our meetings there with the GAC, the ccNSO, and the ICANN board. And then we had some interesting discussions on - in the any other business and particularly discussion about travel support. And I think forwarded that paper, which showed a steady increase in ICANN's monetary support for travelers over the past decade and there's got to be some consideration of whether that can continue.

And then there's this issue of - that I also forwarded a letter that came from (Craig Schwartz) at the registry operator for .bank and .insurance about whether a process to - creating a process by which a community TLD could modify its membership and registrant qualification criteria would be a policy matter requiring a new PDP or merely an implementation detail of existing policy.

My personal opinion so far is that it's implementation, but that is out there that registry operators face some obstacles in its dealing with GDD. And that situation was noted, was observed upon in the BC's recently filed letter on the changes in the .museum registry agreement, noting that for .bank and .insurance, GDD's insisting on a very well thought out, complex process, and there's nothing wrong with that, but that in closed door negotiations with .museum, they turned them into a - they transferred - transitioned them from a sponsored TLD to a community TLD and did so without any consultation with its existing community and adopted new definitions of who was eligible to register on .museum that basically make it an open TLD.

So that's pretty much what we covered in the council call. I don't know if Susan had any additional thoughts. And we'd be glad to take any questions. Susan?

Susan Kawaguchi: I think you covered it all. Thanks, Phil.

Phil Corwin: Thanks, Susan. Okay. So we're done, Andrew.

Andrew Mack: Great. Phil, just one comment, which I would like to emphasize is I can't tell you how much the feedback we've gotten from a lot of people in the global south who are friends and people that we want to be a part of the BC and a part of the community have said that this issue around moving meetings and around - especially the communication around moving meetings is an important issue them.

I've heard this from a number of people who felt that, I know we talked about it in the past, but as you're engaged in that conversation, it's partly the process and it's partly the way that it is communicated and to whom and when and even if it's just with an eye toward making the messaging more appropriate to the broader community, I - the feedback we've gotten in the past is that it has not been well communicated. So thank you very much for staying on that and making sure that the new policy reflects both good decision-making and good communication around that decision-making. Thanks.

Phil Corwin: You're welcome, Andrew. We'll take that under advisement.

Andrew Mack: Great. Are we ready for the CSG report, (Barbara)?

(Barbara): Excuse me. Yes. Can everyone hear me okay?

Andrew Mack: Sounds good. Please go ahead.

(Barbara): Okay great. If I could direct everybody's attention to Steve's policy calendar where he has channel three, that would probably be the easiest way to do this.

I just wanted to update everybody on CSG conversations concerning certain issues that we talked about in the earlier BC meeting.

With respect to our 30-minute meeting on the 28th of October from 8:30 to 9 with (Becky), (Marcus), and (Matthew), there were three ideas proposed as to how we could focus that, again keeping things at a higher level. Since the BC is quote, unquote, chairing the CSG for this particular meeting, I think it's our call. So if people have any preference as to what topic we might focus on in those 30 minutes, that would be great.

Andrew, I'd like to hand it over to you in terms of our discussion in the BC ExCom about a statement from (Marcus) and gifts and so forth.

Andrew Mack: Oh yes. I think - I'm not sure -- just one second here. Sorry about that. I - yes. In terms of a statement from (Marcus) and I think we're all in favor of that. We thought that that was a good idea that for something that was endorsed. And as Marilyn had volunteered to make a short statement and the presentation of a small gift, we were going to say yes to that as her kind offer.

(Barbara):   So my understanding is that the BC then wanted to hand it over to Marilyn to implement basically. Did I understand that correctly, Andrew?

Andrew Mack: Yes, (Barbara).

(Barbara):   Okay. Great. All right. In answer to Marilyn's question, we've gone round and round and round in the CSG about this and quite honestly, this was the only time they could shoehorn this in. You know, that's the answer we were given that the 30 minutes on the 28th was all that could be managed.

In speaking with the other CSG members, just to let those people know who were interested in engaging a bit with some of the new board members, it was pointed out that Sarah Deutsch and Leon Sanchez, who are members of the IPC constituency, likely will be at this meeting on the 28th in their capacity as members of the IPC. So that would enable an opportunity for informal engagement with them and so forth. So I just wanted to let everybody know that we tried to follow through on that as best that we could.

The ICANN staff was very clear that there was a very hard deadline for putting in requests for meetings with board members in terms of totally changing this meeting, that we'd passed that deadline. So this is a case where we're doing as best with what we have to work with.

Okay. I don't know if we can start earlier, Marilyn. I mean if people get there, you know, earlier we can try. But again, ICANN staff was pretty firm about making any adjustments to these times. We'll see what we can do. Okay in terms of Point Number 2 on under the CSG section. You probably noticed that there was a conflict between where our non-contracted party house meeting is scheduled and the council's Part 2 administrative meeting is scheduled I believe on the 1st of November.

And this is a particularly important council meeting because it is when the election results will be announced. And hopefully Heather Forrest's selection by acclamation and many members of the CSG want to be there for that meeting.

So I went back to Tapani and proposed that we – so we can go two approaches here. We can reserve say the 4 to 4:45 window that we have left over in that slot to discuss, begin discussions perhaps with the NCSG on what we want at the intercessional or whatever people want to talk about.

Or we can scrap the whole meeting and just agree to engage informally over cocktails at another time during the week. Tapani would like us to clarify what we want and he will take it back to the other members of the NCSG. So I welcome people's comments now on that.

Yes, my understanding Matthew Shears will attend the meeting (Chris).

Andrew Mack: (Barbara) this is Andrew. My sense is based on our ExComm calls that ExCommm believes not trying to put words in people's mouths. But ExComm believes it might be very difficult for us to get a lot of a 45 minute coffee with NCUC on the sidelines of other things. And a cocktail might be a better way to build bridges.

That was our thinking. Love to know what other people think. Perhaps we could do it as an early cocktail as opposed to a later one because we know a lot of people have dinners and other events. Thoughts from the group?

(Barbara): Okay so what is the time slot for what Marilyn? Okay the CSG, the non-contractor party had closed meeting was scheduled for November 1 from 3:15 to 4 and that conflicts with the CSG meeting or with the GNSO Council Meeting.

Okay Denise you know again ICANN was really strict about kind of you missed the window in terms of inviting board members. You know I will try but I can't promise anything. We did the best that we could. And so we will do the best that we can.

Okay Andrew so the consensus is what? We propose to Tapani that we scrap the 45 minute remaining and just try and do it over cocktails? And I will

propose a night that doesn't conflict with the gala with recognition of Steve Crocker and other events.

Andrew Mack: That would be my sense. But I would love to hear if there are any other people that disagree with that. Perhaps the way to do it would be to try to figure out if there is an evening that we could get together for early cocktails.

If there is not maybe we hold onto the slot for the 45 just as our backup plan. Does that sound reasonable?

(Barbara):   Yes, okay very good. Okay finally, the ICANN meeting with the board again in our CSG call very apparent that all three constituencies have deep concerns about how ICANN is handling the GDPR Whois issue.

But each has slightly different concerns. You can read what I included here. So on the CSG call we decided that we would devote, you know, probably 30 minutes of that hour and a half meeting with the board to – we are calling it a global discussion.

So it would be a discussion on GDPR Whois involving representative. The lead representative from each of the three constituency. So ours I am assuming would be Steve and we would address in general terms our concerns about the GDPR issue.

And then each constituency would use their remaining 20 minutes for a separate discussion with the board either on another element of the GDPR issues that concerns them or on one of the other questions that they forwarded to the board for their consideration.

So but what we wanted to avoid was a case where the board just dismissed an effort by another constituency to raise the GDPR issue on grounds that well we have already discussed that so we are going to move on. You know we wanted to underscore the importance of this to all three constituencies.

We can further refine this in our meeting. We will have a private meeting, a closed meeting of the BC before this board meeting and we can maybe decide at that point if we want to use our 20 minutes to talk about another aspect of the GDPR issue or address one of the other questions that we proposed.

Such as I thought it might be interesting to address the question proposed by (Chris) to ask the board how they think this first year of the IANA transition is going with respect to accountability and what they view as most significant accountability challenges over the year. But I certainly defer to the consensus of the BC.

Let me see if there are any comments in the chat. I have nothing else in the CSG section. Andrew if you want to move on.

Andrew Mack: Great I see Marilyn with a hand up and then we want to pass directly to Steve who has joined us on the call. Marilyn go ahead please.

Marilyn Cade: Thanks I just posted in the chat. I think that we should raise – and (Barbara) I really, really want to compliment on the idea that you have managed to push forward that we collaborate on a shared topic. I think this is a really step forward rather than dividing and conquering. So congratulations on that.

It is a shared concern. But that also means that each of the constituencies can then raise a couple of other topics. And I think the idea of the first year of IANA is an excellent one topic.

I would like to propose another topic for us to all think about and that is ICANN's and it is going to be a rough comment and I will try to refine it. The continued threat to ICANN credibility from other parties and why ICANN needs to continue to engage in the U.N. system.

I will come back in writing to the full BC with some ideas on this. But I think we from business need to be really understanding that the contracted parties are not understanding the risks and threats to ICANN.

It is not – the IANA transition did not solve all problems. We will have to figure out how we educate our contracted party colleagues on that.

But at least yes to your original proposal and yes to the first year on IANA. How are things going? And then maybe we add something if others would agree on what are the other risks and threats to ICANN? Thanks.

Andrew Mack: Great thank you very much. Everyone I know we have got a couple of things going, other business. So Steve I would like to toss it over to you real quickly if we could walk through what is left of our policy calendar. Thanks.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you Andrew. Steve Delbianco here. Look at Channel 1 please on the policy calendar and I have only two comments.

Since our last call, we have filed two very substantive BC comments both of them on October 3rd. So first I would like to thank Phil Corwin for his leadership on the comment on the .Museum sponsor TLD registry renewal agreement.

Our comments were very specific with regard to the notion of blowing up the notion of who our community is and the sponsor TLD. And showing inconsistencies between how ICANN's GDB is doing it on .Museum versus the way we have done it with the new gTLD applications.

We also pointed out our concern that RDS is being implemented by top down (fiats) instead of bottom up policy development. I think it is a strong comment. Anxious to see whether we get any reaction out of staff.

The second is a thank you to Marilyn Cade, John Berard, (Tola) and (Andy Abrams) for the comment we submitted on the NCUC's proposed changes to their charter. Thank you for that.

Moving down to the currently open ICANN public comment there is only one that I noted for us and it is a comment opportunity on ICANN's budgets for PTI, the Public Technical Identifiers subsidiary and the IANA budget.

I have noted in here that for PTI they have increased the budget by $800,000 over the FY '18 budget of $9.6 million. So it is about an 8% increase. And for the IANA functions which include RZMA and Root Zone evaluation, the budget is only $100,000 higher than their budget of $400,000 last year.

We need a volunteer from the BC who will help to draft comments on these two budgets. Do I see any hands?

Jimson Olufuye: Yes Steve the finance committee will look at that.

Steve DelBianco: Jimson thank you very much. Your efforts in the finance committee would be outstanding. Thank you.

Let me turn now to the GDPR and Whois. And I would ask Andreea would you please scroll the policy calendar to the GDPR and Whois section? That is there perfectly.

And Jay Sudowski thank you for volunteering to help. Thank you.

So Andrew with your indulgence I will try to spend about five minutes on the GDPR and Whois. This is an opportunity that the BC seized. They have a high interest topic at ICANN60.

The GDPR topic will brought up at many different intervals. The high interest topic session is just one where we have a little bit more than average control over the agenda and the panelists.

And I have solicited input from all of you and then (Barbara) and I worked with ICANN staff. It has mainly been Cyrus Namazi. He tried to come up with a significant topical and detailed analysis of ICANN's progress on reconciling Whois the GDPR given the implementation next May.

The structure that the BC put forth was to have no opening speeches but rather specific answers to questions that would detail the degree to which ICANN has a strategy here. What is its backup plan if elements of that strategy don't succeed?

And to the degree which they are soliciting input from the affected community as ICANN pursues it. Is that angle.

As you know from Johannesburg that Goran was hopeful that he could get some blanket public interest exemption from Whois because of his contacts with the European regulators and others.

It is cleared by now and I had a call with Goran yesterday. That isn't going to work. So the BC was among those demanding a backup plan and that gave rise to this matrix of Whois use cases and the task force that Susan has been so active on.

Even that may not succeed. And there is more unknowns than knowns with respect to GDPRs and so we don't understand yet how the individual European government will implement the GDPR in their national law.

Goran agreed on a call held yesterday with Jimson and I and (David) that he is going to need multi-parallel strategies on this including the pursuit of a delayed implementation while RDS is worked out.

And I applaud public discussion on all of this. The BC wanted to lead that Whois session at ICANN60 but ICANN staff was insisting that we have somebody with European legal routes to do it. And that is where we concluded that Thomas Rickert would be the right guy to be the moderator.

And Thomas has agreed he will stick to a structure of probing questions with answers and not allow long speeches.

Attached to the policy calendar I included the current published agenda for that session. And I think I just recently this morning circulated to all of you reaction from the non-commercial users constituency who had some ideas about changing out panelists and wanting to of course add one of their own to balance Susan Kawaguchi as a representative of the RDS PDP working group.

Since RDS and the notion of tiered access by validated participants is likely to be one of the parallel strategies we have to do.

In yesterday's discussion with Goran he revealed that he is very concerned that he doesn't exactly know where to go next. And I am grateful for the frank admission that his initial Hail Mary wasn't going to do it.

But now we are in a situation where we have to get very specific about ways in which we will claim there is legitimate uses for Whois data. Pursuing the idea of informed consent as perhaps an ultimate way out.

But the RDS PDP working group and tiered access is going to reemerge as something that needs to be done. I emphasized to Goran that the RDS PDP tiered access idea is something we arrived at years ago long before Goran came on board.

But I do think that the European governance GDPR as well as other governments seeking to emulate Europe are going to force us to move more quickly on implementing some elements of the RDS PDP.

So I will stop there and take a queue as to how to further inform our negotiating efforts on the panelists and the agenda for GDPR at ICANN60. Thank you.

I see a hand from Marilyn. Please go ahead Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: Yes I was going to try to type this but I am just going to say this. I hope Jimson is still on the call and if he is not I think (Omar) is on the call. I just wanted to make a comment on emulating Europe.

For some of the governments from developing country they are being encouraged to emulate Europe but if they have a different option well-defined

that meets their needs at a national level they will not necessarily follow Europe.

And I will just give a quick example here. In Africa, the council of Europe really tried to push the African countries to adopt council of Europe/Budapest convention. That did not happen but a parallel effort on cybersecurity laws emerged and is being adopted. It is similar to the Budapest convention but shows some unique characteristics.

I think we need to ask do we have a better strategy for some of the other countries? And what are we doing to promote a better strategy? Otherwise, yes we are going to find ourselves living in the umbrella of the European model.

Steve DelBianco: Marilyn I brought this up on the call with Goran yesterday and he is considering recommending that people in the BC and other interested stakeholders start doing direct lobbying to European governments as well as other governments. I was astounded to hear that as a recommendation.

And I don't know if it will ever be made public but perhaps that is the answer we will hear from ICANN. (Margie)?

Marilyn Cade: Steve sorry I am just going to make a quick…

Steve DelBianco: Sorry Marilyn go ahead.

Marilyn Cade: Very, very quick follow up comment. Many of us are going to be at the IGF later this year. I think maybe we as the BC ought to be developing a strategy before then and thinking about meeting with a very large number of

governments that are going to be attending that event. But we have to come with what is a better strategy if we are going to do that.

Steve DelBianco: Let's go to (Margie) and we will cut off this discussion and move on with the agenda. Go ahead (Margie).

(Margie): Oh sure. I had shared some comments on the list this morning about the agenda. A couple of things I wanted to raise because I think some of the stuff that the NCUC brought up was actually really helpful.

Has Goran or anyone at ICANN talked about whether they see themselves as a data controller here or has there been analysis to that effect?

And in particular are they including Dan Halloran in the discussions as the Chief Privacy Officer? Because that to me seems something we haven't really seen any indication as to what they are doing and what Dan's role is in particular.

Because that might actually help if they would accept or at least explain why they are a data controller. And so I don't know Steve if that has been something that has been brought up yet.

And then the other issue is, you know, as you talk about the panelist. You know now that Sarah is joining the board it strikes me that she would be an excellent addition to the list, to the panel list. Because she brings the business and the IP side and understands a lot of the uses related to that.

So those were some of my suggestions. And I also have additional questions that might be considered but I don't know if we are able to suggest them at this point.

Steve DelBianco: I pitched very hard to have ICANN take on the position of data controller since they are the ones making the rules. And I picked that up from comments you gave me as well as what was written in the (Wilson) memo.

I will go back to that to see if ICANN can add yet another panelist to the discussion. And I will do the same thing with respect to Sarah Deutsch. But we have a limited amount of influence on what happens with the agenda because ICANN staff has to recert itself to make sure it is not a BC only panel.

So that adds – let's keep the discussion on the list alive. But ask people to respond very quickly. I know that Tim Chen, (Margie), you have already come in and weighed in on the comments that I circulated this morning so please do it quickly in the next 24 to 36 hours.

One final note and then we will turn it back over to Andrew. On the call with (David) and Goran yesterday, Goran also talked about an upcoming announcement that ICANN is going to improve its document management system.

So there will probably be some discussion of that at ICANN60. Andrew over to you.

Andrew Mack: Steve thanks very much. I have one AOB item that I would like to just toss in which was brought to my attention by a couple of other people in the chat. Which is that our next BC meeting is scheduled for the 26th when an awful lot of people are going to be in transit.

And I am wondering if we have the flexibility – Number 1 do we want another meeting before Abu Dhabi? And second of all, if we do want another meeting between now and Abu Dhabi is there a time to do it that is perhaps a tiny bit earlier than that as many people will be in motion?

What is everyone's thoughts?

Jimson Olufuye: (Unintelligible) Andrew.

Andrew Mack: Yes sir. Go ahead Jimson.

Jimson Olufuye: Yes this is Jimson. Well I think we may need to reschedule that since we are going to be making (unintelligible) ICANN60 I think ICANN60 will take care of that. So I don't think it is (unintelligible) to have the meeting (unintelligible) as many will be traveling.

Andrew Mack: I am seeing a lot of people in the chat saying they will be in transit on the 26th. So will I. Is there anyone who objects to the idea of just canceling that meeting and picking it up at the BC private?

Okay I am not seeing any objections so I am going to recommend that we do that. I will also be – for those of you who are interested we will be recirculating really great reports that Mark Datysgeld did on the Brazil event just for anyone Whois interested. I have an English translation version.

And Marilyn last item you had one AOB that you wanted to drop into the agenda? Do you have it at the ready and can you do it quickly?

Marilyn Cade: It will be one minute maybe less. The CCWG IG, the (unintelligible) working group governance has been asked by in particular the chartering organization of the most hostile of the three organizations is the GNSO.

We have been asked to revise our charter. That work is underway. I am one of the members there. There are many others on the BC who are on that list.

The reason I raise this with all of you is there are two events that I hope you will be interested in. One is on Tuesday. One is on Wednesday. They are both at 12 o'clock, 12:15 timeframe for an hour to an hour and 15 minutes.

One is a public update on internet governance activities and the other is the face to face meeting of the CCWG IG with the board working group on internet governance.

I can't tell you which day these meetings are because we are trying to switch them so the public meeting does not compete with our event with the GAC. I pushed that very hard. I hope to make that happen.

But the important thing that I want to convey to all of you is I hope that and I will send this in writing. I hope you will put this on your calendars and forward the face to face meetings.

And also for the public meeting that we will have many BC members attending and commenting on how they have used the internet governance activities and how they influenced ICANN. Thanks.

Jimson Olufuye: Yes I have something to mention for members.

Andrew Mack: Go ahead Jimson.

Jimson Olufuye: Yes at the call yesterday with (Yuron) there was something of interested he mentioned that has to do with the budget. So (unintelligible) community (unintelligible) over that because like the ICANN inflow is kind of flat and costs is a concern in terms of cost increase and (unintelligible).

So (unintelligible) maybe the community will also begin to look at how to ensure the long term financial health of the organizations is incomes by and large flat and cost is maybe going up.

Just for also (unintelligible). Thank you.

Andrew Mack: Great. So now we are right at noon. Is there anybody else who has a point that they would like to bring up?

I am not seeing anyone and keeping with our BC tradition I am going to try to schedule – I am going to try to end us on time unless there is somebody in the chat or online who wants to make a last comment.

Marilyn Cade: Actually Andrew it is Marilyn. I just have one quick one. If everybody can make sure that they let Andreea know about their arrival, where they are staying, blah, blah, blah. I think that is still kind of outstanding.

Andrew Mack: Great. Good point. The more we know where we are all going to be, the easier it is for us to coordinate. I think that is good. Susan you are typing something and before it gets finished I wanted to make – before we finish I want to make sure that that gets finished.

A point you would like to share with the group or that just a…

Susan Kawaguchi: Sorry I was just responding to Steve. I will do that.

Andrew Mack: Got it. Okay no problem at all. Thank you everyone for another good meeting. Looking forward to seeing everyone in Abu Dhabi and there is a lot of stuff going on. We are going to – let's keep everything going on the list and many thanks for everyone's hard work.

I think we can call this one over.

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

END