ICANN
Transcription ICANN Panama City
GNSO: Business Constituency Open Meeting
Thursday, 28 June 2018 at 09:00 EST

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page
http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

Claudia Selli: Thank you very much everybody and welcome to the BC Open meeting. Chantelle I think the recorded are started correct? So thank you very much Göran for being here with us and thank you for taking the time. You know this is an open dialogue so I don't know if you want to make any statements or since we have been hearing from you throughout the week if you prefer to have more question and answer. And we are typically a constituency that asks you a lot of questions so I don't know how you prefer to go.

Steve DelBianco: And one suggestion.

Claudia Selli: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: Claudia its Steve. Göran everyone here was present at the CSG discussion yesterday when you were taking questions and we ran out of time. So one suggestion is to simply pick up where we left off as opposed to starting over with an explanation.

Göran Marby: I'm fine with that.

Steve DelBianco: Fantastic then. I might ask the first question.

Göran Marby: Have I ever been able to stop you? And by the way if you wonder why I have Theresa, Akram and J.J. with me is because I realized during the IPC meeting yesterday there was some questions I couldn't answer so I decided to bring the people who actually know something with me. As you know I'm just a monkey in their (unintelligible). Do you see the lines? Yes please what's the first question?

Steve DelBianco: Great the EPDP charter is being worked on now. And of course it has a part in their about the need for developing policy around the use of RDAP which would be the protocol that would replace Port 43 for doing queries. And it's a great idea. It's long overdue. I'm glad we're doing that. One suggestion though is that as we work this out eventually somebody may get an accreditation system that the Data Protection Board and other regulators would give legal clearance to. It could happen in six months, six weeks or two years I don't know somebody will.

But when they do it would be ideal for ICANN to have built a RDAP that not just capable of displaying the public Whois but an RDAP that if it receives an authentication token with credentials and if it receives the purpose that, that RDAP will return not only the public Whois but the nonpublic Whois. And that the contract party answering that query would have legal assurance, clearance -- I never say certainty -- it have some sufficient legal protection that they could respond and even be mandated to respond to that query. But this delivers from an engineer's perspective as a unified access model but not a unified accreditation model because accreditation could end up being very unique to the groups, law enforcement, cyber security as each of them has unique codes of conduct they may have to adopt, implement and enforce.

I'm really continuing to press on what I said Tuesday night in the panel that we did together is that accreditation happens outside of ICANN but ICANN assists in obtaining the legal clearances and conversations and asking the questions. And that assistance is valued. But what I shame is if we actually accomplish that but we didn't do the work inside to build a technical unified

technical mechanism that receiving an accredited request can respond in a uniform way.

Göran Marby: I'm going to start and then I think I'm going to hand over to Akram thank God is here. But so the more general progress as you know right now we are - we don't have any given solution in mind in that sense. We're trying to seek legal guidance. And then as you know if you actually look at the unified access paper that we sent out it's actually contradiction in terms. There are things in there that the contradict each other and that's on purpose.

So if I understand it correctly what I would like from you then is to break those questions down so we can put that into the paper so when we start talking through the DPAs we can ask those questions. That I think seems to be the sensible thing to do. Akram?

Steve DelBianco: Göran that would be helpful as a parallel track I love that because that's the accreditation track. But building the capability of a unified response has to actually start by getting the scope into the PDP.

Akram Atallah: Thank you Steve this is a very good question. What I can tell you at a high level is we have a Whois Web page today where you can go and create a Whois from all of the registries and the registrars and right now it support basically Port 43. And in the near future what we do is we're looking at a client not that client that will actually sit behind that and for the registries and registrars that will support the RDAP you will be able to query from that. And we plan to make that call also available for everybody else so that they can put another client up and running and have that ability as well.

So that will actually get you what you want except for one thing that I cannot - that's a legal matter is whether the registries and registrar would accept that when it comes from ICANN it is justifiable or verified enough that they will be able to provide you data. The registrar or the registry that has the data still have to work it on their own whether they will give you data or not right? So…

Steve DelBianco: But what that misses is the RDAP you talked about is the RDAP that only displays public Whois.

Akram Atallah: No.

Steve DelBianco: I'm asking you to get on board with the idea that we eventually - all right.

Akram Atallah: If you provide the token and you have the access rights and it provides you the full data if you don't provide the token it provide you just the public data.

Steve DelBianco: That's the best news I've heard all week. Yes how close is that to being? Is that in writing in any place? I went to the RDAP wiki page and I didn't see that there.

Akram Atallah: So that's the plan of what we're - what RDAP can - that's why we have - we need RDAP is because it allows you to do that right? So RDAP has those features. It's in the profile that you put in. And it allows for tiering and multiple more than just to tiers the public or the whole thing it allows you to tear it into levels as well. But the idea is once we agree on the token methodology and all of that it will be included in the spec.

Göran Marby: But we still also have - there are unanswered legal…

Akram Atallah: Agreed.

Göran Marby: …concerns. One of them is for instance for the extra transfer of the token be seen as transport of personal data which is, you know, we can say that oh probably not...

Steve DelBianco: The certificate so…

Göran Marby: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: ...there's no people information it's probably encrypted.

Göran Marby: Encrypting doesn't matter. Encryption doesn't matter.

Akram Atallah: I actually agree with Göran. We have to make sure that every registry and registrar that is sitting in their local jurisdiction has the information that they need to be able to decide whether there is an issue with their local laws to provide the data or not. So there will be information other than just the license in the token so thanks.

Steve DelBianco: Was that the best news all week?

Göran Marby: What a week you had. Next question.

Tim Chen: Thanks Denise. Tim Chen from Domain Tools for the record. Thank you Göran, and Akram, and Theresa and J.J. for joining us today. In one of the afternoon sessions I think it was Tuesday- Göran, you and Catherine seemed to be at odds on whether or not some of the GAC advice you received was actually legal if I'm remembering correctly. And I've heard that potentially the SSAC 101 advice, you know, that concern may also be there for that.

If that's true and if I'm remembering correctly from that session with Catherine is there – what happens next if there's a disagreement on whether or not advice that ICANN's receiving from your advisory committees is actually legal to follow? Is there a way that the community can follow-up on which section at least the SSAC is fairly specific on what it's trying to recommend which of those recommendations may not pass legal clearance with ICANN's attorneys and how that plays itself out so we have some clarity as to what the resistance might be if there's a legal resistance and what the resolution of that might be?

Göran Marby: First of all we just received the SSAC and we have not done anything with it. It's in the process. When it comes to the first place I think I will ask J.J. to give a comment.

John Jeffrey: Yes in both cases those are advice that come from the advisory board to the - from the advisory committees to the board. And we do an evaluation and we – and in the case of the GDPR application to first the calzone model and then the temporary spec and now other work that's going to go on including the work that'll go on inside of PDP and the GNSO. We assume there will be many questions at various layers in terms of legal advice.

And as we can see already from the application of the temporary specification there's differing legal advice from for example from what we believed could be included in information that could be collected inside the temporary spec from advice that's being provided to the registrars. So I think there's a lot of open issues in terms of legality. Those open issues will apply to what is being presented from the GAC in part or in – or from SSAC in part because there are different interpretation levels of what that information says.

And when we've inquired with the European Commission with individual GAC members it's unclear whether there was – whether the differences between what the DPAs are saying, what different advice points are coming from different law firms whether to ICANN or to others and whether information that's being provided more generally whether there are consistencies across all of those. And some of that relates to the ambiguity of the language being used, and some of it relates to the ambiguity under the law, and some of it relates to how those laws will be - how compliance will be sought against those laws.

So for example we've had a number of people come to us this week and say we disagree with the approach you're taking on X or Y. And we've said please submit that into the public record. If you have different advice that supports or takes a different position then we take or it takes a position that's

consistent or inconsistent with advice that's being provided through the community submit that. And particularly where you can make those records public that's very beneficial because then perhaps we can all align on the framing of the question at the starting point and then advice that's being applied to that as we move into the policy and the compliance against the temp spec.

Göran Marby: I mean one of the general assumptions of this is that somewhere we have to nail down certain things to be able to proceeds. And the DPA's advice that we've been fortunate enough to have has guided us in the direction. Now we are, you know, we are left out and now we're going into the next one which is very much by the unified access model. Thank you.

Denise Michel: Thanks for your time. Could you walk us through specifically how the GAC communiqué conflicts with European law? And I have a follow-up question? Thanks.

John Jeffrey: So I don't have that off the top of my head and if we had the question in advance I might have been prepared to answer it. We outlined a few of those issues on that panel the other day but we're happy to answer that more formally. And I'm not sure it conflicts with European law. I think one of the questions is essentially if we hear from a DPA a certain approach to some provision that is also in the GAC approach and the GAC advice and those things are different we're asking the European Commission what we're supposed to do with that. And we're asking for additional clarity both from the DPAs and from the European Commission in communications that we've had.

There certainly isn't alignment from what we're hearing in DPA discussions, what we've seen and legal advice that's been presented and what we've seen from legal advice that's been provided at the registrar level and the GAC advice. We've heard from a couple of attorneys that have approached us this week that they believe that we're not looking at it the right way that

they provide advice to Fortune 50 companies and they see it this way. And I've suggested that they provide us more information about their legal briefings and present that into the public record so that can be considered as well.

Denise Michel: Thank you. Yes there seems to be a lot of confusion around this and people are under the impression that ICANN org is indicating that the GAC communiqué is in conflict. So get written clarification I think will help lots of community groups on this issue. And then more broadly in terms of getting things in writing as a follow-up the BC has submitted a number of very sensitive inputs on GDPR. The latest of which is over 20 specific questions about the temporary spec before that several letters on GDPR.

None of which we've received a substantive response on. And so I'd like to just make a request that we do get a substantive written response to our latest as well as the previous submissions. That would really help I think the business constituency and others get validation that all of our hard work and engagement on this issue with ICANN is being heard, and taken into account and would also help us in our further engagement on this issue. Is that a commitment we could get? Thanks.

Göran Marby: Note your request.

Claudia Selli: Any other question I'd like to take a queue? Steve.

Steve DelBianco: No.

Göran Marby: Good morning Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: Good morning. My name is Marilyn Cade. I'm always afraid the software won't recognize me. My question is actually at the end of these questions would it be possible for us to ask questions about the budget?

Göran Marby: I'm here. You can ask me any question. And I have I ever stopped you from asking questions? I may not always answer them reminder I don't have Xavier in the room and we have $135 million budget so I might not be able to answer every question.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you, Marilyn Cade again for the software transcript. I think from the BC perspective and we have submitted comments on the budget we always submit comments and do analysis on the strategic plan and operating plan. There are several members from the BC who are actively working in the ICANN Budget Group. And we have our own finance committee and budget analysis internally led by our vice chair of finance and operations.

So the issues related to ICANN governance overall and budget are I think, you know, I make these statements just to indicate and put on the record the fact that we're very committed to and understand as business people the importance of a stable predictable budget. One of the areas that was of concern to us in the -- and it's reflected in our comments are public comments -- is the decisions that were taken to significantly curtail and affect such things as the special budget request which is funding that we use to engage in outreach and support that is really customized and reflective of our understanding of the business user community that goes far beyond recruiting entities who are businesses but they are focused on the DNS industry such as registry registrar.

And while you I think you understand that for us we appreciate the importance of the DNS industry participants but we believe that there must be balance and inclusion of the broader part of the business user community as well to support ICANN and to support ICANN not only in the policy we develop inside of ICANN but also the external ecosystem which can really effect ICANN. So looking ahead and without asking you for a commitment I'm just suggesting that looking at our comments and looking ahead as the revenue situation perhaps stabilizes and improves could you foresee the idea of re-establishing some of the funds that have gone directly to support the

community work not just the work that and outreach it is done by the ICANN staff?

Göran Marby: I never - first of all I hope your comments were well received and we answered them for the budget process as well. Let me take us back again because I think this is insanely important is that I don't think that the budget process overall works very well. I think that we have too little time to actually discuss something that is so important because the budget is the place where the community and we the board and org comes together and actually form what we're supposed to do because it's not in the budget it doesn't exist.

And that's why we have 300 budgets or something running and an insane amount of decisions actually to be made. And there's a lot of balances in as well. And the San Juan meeting I think was very good because we sort of went - formally we think that we talk about the full budget but 85% as I said so many times of the budgets are actually dependent on previous decisions. We have three meetings per year. We have an IANA function. We are doing things all the time that is done by previous decisions.

Over the last couple of years after this session we more accountability measures, set up CUC. All those things take resources. And I - so I wanted so we went also - and one of the things are the reviews. And that's why we have the - and I plead - pleaded many times please come in with comments. We made a proposal based on our understanding of what discussion was in San Juan when it comes to reviews. And I took upon myself to put up public consultation papers about reviews.

And it turns out it was not only about the money itself it actually turns around fatigue in the community because the cadence is not - the cadence of reviews are not – it's not ideal. So please comment on that. I'm saying that extra –yes you are business people. And the other thing is that it seems like coming in here many people think oh that's a dumb decision. I can't do that

decision without the community actually community makes the decision. So that's one thing.

But another thing is this which I think I realize now after being here is that the timing of the review the timing of the actual budget process is not ideal because we do very few things that spans over a fiscal year. You know we of course know we will do the expedited PDP in 12 months because we have to. But many other places we have our multi-year so why do we have a year budget? So one of the things I'm sort of thinking about because you told me so is the GNSO Councilors have talked to me about it let's look into the whole process of the budget and maybe have a two-year budget. But we build an individual opportunity for sessions with the community and we have to look into the meetings at all of that.

So the community really have the ability to have that discussion during a longer period while we lock down the budget for us for two years. And that's the place because the problem is we have - we don't really have a place to have the discussion. We have the Xavier sessions when you come in and ask specific questions like this but - and that's easy to say what we want. But the thing I believe is that the community has some balancing things to do.

Steve DelBianco: Yes.

Göran Marby: So we are probably coming out with a proposal about to change but then we have to sort of change a lot of moving parts to be able to do this. For instance it takes 15 months know to do a 12 months budget because…

Steve DelBianco: That's crazy.

Göran Marby: …with IANA which is sort of start with IANA, then do the ICANN budget, then bring back IANA budget into the ICANN budget because we only have one pile of money. And then we have and I think you've done - have you done the trend things here?

Steve DelBianco: Yes.

Marilyn Cade: Did you like it?

Steve DelBianco: Yes definitely.

Göran Marby: So what happens with that now is it comes into the ICANN Board as an input for their proposal for a five year strategic plan. So thank you very much, very important. So how do we combine ICANN five year strategic plan with the operational plan it becomes than the budget. We need to soothe these things in. So would that answer your question because I should not answer that question because it's a community discussion how to balance those things out? My responsibility is to take everything in and then throw the first out. But we – I think that in that we need to have a better – we need to balance out some questions. So thank you for that is always. And it was Göran for the record by the way. I forgot to say that.

Claudia Selli: Göran are you okay to take the last question?

Göran Marby: I'm always appreciative of coming here and talking to you. I think it's an honor to do that. And I'm very happy about the fact that you haven't asked me any question so far but I haven't answered five times already this week.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks Göran is Steve DelBianco. On Sunday we concluded the work of a Cross Community Working Group and Work Stream 2. These are the enhancements to accountability and transparency that grew out of the transition of IANA. So I want to thank the legal team and Theresa's MSSI team for cooperating with the co-chairs and rapporteur because on Sunday we really did get closure on four outstanding items about which board had public interest concerns. And presumably we also got clearance from org that all of our recommendations are feasible some may be frightfully expensive and take a long time but they're all feasible.

And we confirmed that yesterday with the Sam Eisner. So it seems ridiculous to be taking four years to do something like that but Work Stream 2 was completed on Sunday. If the chartering orgs approve it all we'll be delivering on to board and org a set of 100 recommendations that you will sequence over the next several years budget permitting. And I think that those will be the completion of the items that we wanted to accomplish under the leverage that was created by the transition agreement. So Theresa and J.J. thanks for your work on that.

Theresa Swineheart: Thank you.

Göran Marby: Okay.

Tim Chen: Thanks Göran. This is just a comment if I may speaking mostly on my behalf. This is Tim Chen at Domain Tools and on behalf of our customers in the regime that we have now with redacted Whois data as everyone knows it makes a job of security practitioners much harder. And so the context that I would like to convey to the members of the executive team who are here today is that it makes other efforts that are currently underway within ICANN incredibly important to continue to focus on because it's clear that it's going to be some time before there's a final resolution on the Whois data.

Every day that passes is a day that the security practitioners worldwide are impaired. Things that help include the privacy proxy work that's going on right now and making that much more accountable and accurate efforts to push through the thin thick transition so that makes I think the playing field much more manageable on certain ways. So, you know, we're very supportive of that and hope that approved policy can be made manifest.

And then supporting the compliance MSC members of your compliance team here in the audience today and the work that they do is incredibly important from making Whois data accurate to bringing what I'll call rogue registrars

and make them accountable. And so if they can't do the work that they normally do in part by accessing certain data fields that have been available in Whois other policies the ICANN does support clearly to the extent that you can push those things through would help. And so I hope there's continued focus on other ways that we can provide accuracy and accountability broadly in DNS outside of just this one conversation about GDPR and Whois. Thank you.

Göran Marby: It's always fun. Some people think I do too much other people think I do too little some people don't think I do anything at all. I think that over the – I mean I think that ICANN org have shown a very good track record over the last nine months when it comes to...

Steve DelBianco: I do too.

Göran Marby: ...or actually a year. We met in Johannesburg a year ago, we didn't have anything. Not even a plan because we couldn't have a plan we, you know, there's no –what there was no process that we could set up. And you and I discussed this. I said I went out and said that one of the first things we said at that time we didn't even – we didn't have the ultimate understanding legally of what ICANN orgs legal responsibility is.

We had a notion of it and there was a lot of discussions and of course people come up and said you are this. But for ICANN org as a incorporated California nonprofit to come up and, you know, actually state that that's a fairly big thing. So the first thing we did really was to come out with the fact that we were a data controller and that spinned off, a joint data controller. Do I say the right words? I can't remember right now J.J.? Some sort of data controller.

And the – that's, you know, that started the process because I'm the ICANN CEO. That means that I have to make a decision along something. But I invited the community to participate in what we're doing called the consumer

process. And we ended up and what ended up on the other - and I said all along I'm going to make a decision. And many people were opposed to that but we ended up in temp spec. And that's me making a decision.

During that time we were extremely helpful to give guidance under DPS. Many people didn't think that we will get any guidance at all. And here is the catch the only reason I got guidance is not because we worked like hell to get that because ICANN multi-stakeholder model. That's the only reason why we can stand up and talk to the people we can talk to. They will not care about us if we are seen as a lobbyist organization, trade organization, special interest organization that throws each other under the bus all the time.

It's the multi-stakeholder model and ICANN and if you excuse me as an institution and a brand. And I think we've shown I mean remarkable working together. It's not - haven't been easy. Sometimes because of angry positions and hundred years of discussions it's hard to move yourself. B we did it. And now we're entering it even harder space and that is that we don't know right now if you can have an unified access model because it's not that easy to get that into the - yes there are people now actually we can do that. But you also have, you know, we can't go off by saying that. We have really to understand how this is possible.

And the way to do that in this uncertain world - and by the way we are one of the few ever doing the GDPR now transition who actually got any advice at all. I read that the - you - the financial institutions around the world are asking for a carve out so that they don't have to implement GDPR very much because of the same reasons you're talking about it will not give them - have you seen the story? They didn't - they haven't got it. We got it. So now going forward we will do the same approach as we did last time. We will come up because the DPA has asked us to come up with something that looks - something they can discuss.

By doing that we have to ask specific questions I will commit again that even - we asked the community to come in to help us with the questions we can ask to get the understanding if we can do unified access model the same way we did before. We also asked DNS we said before if you would like to reach out directly to the ones - although some of you are representing company's which has contacts in Brussels. You have one of the most connected persons in Brussels sitting next to me. I know that because he (unintelligible) shakes me before as well. And but to stay on point on this to be – if I give a lower probability to get good advice from the DPAs this time and I've been open by saying that because this is a harder question ask. We need to work together.

Steve DelBianco: Göran this is Steve. The task of asking DPB the Data Protection Board whether you can do a unified model I don't quite get that because the community will develop policies that'll create technical capability to do a query and get nonpublic back. The community will do policies about the degree to which the contract parties can be required to honor these requests and that all happens inside.

It strikes me that the main question for Data Protection Board would be that once a group has come up with an accreditation scheme with a code of conduct and that group takes it to the Data Protection Board with your help then that group is asking Data Protection Board with this code of conduct, and this accreditation scheme, audit capabilities may we get legal clearance to begin to respond to these queries? And that kind of a conversation only happens I think once we have an accreditation of some group. Maybe it's law enforcement, maybe it's the consumer protection group, maybe it's the trademark protection but whoever first past the post would be the test case of an accreditation model based on a code of conduct that we take to the Europeans.

Göran Marby: You're not wrong. I mean it sort of a hen and an egg situation that one. And for instance Europol is looking into an accreditation model. And yes of course that's, you know, if they would do an arrangement about this voluntary

arrangement one of the things that we can put to the table is that we actually have a relationship with the contracted parties. But yes I mean we are – I'm very much in favor for that.

The small difference is that I mean they actually are now coming to the same conclusions that we are to be able to do this next step there has to be a member state engagement. And Eurpol is a European institution so they're not of the GDPRs itself which is my understanding, European institutions are not – they have laws that says that they can actually do certain things.

But still it seems like they're now come into the basic fundamental questions who - are there ways to provide who assigns the accreditation houses formally. And how do you align that then because the guidance of our accreditation houses are set up on their individual basis on the 28 member states. You've all seen this…

Steve DelBianco: There's lot of work in it.

Göran Marby: So how do you take that from having a united alignment on an accreditation house for 28 member states plus the other ones which contains the EU countries and how to have a certification process for that? So it sort of goes back again how to unify it all over the European Union area? So we're back again. But I agree with you if law enforcement comes up with something…

Steve DelBianco: Or somebody else.

Göran Marby: Yes I think that law enforcement probably because their an European institution have - but it's sort of - they came up exactly the same questions as we've had which we actually posted first time we did the calzone model. And yesterday, you know, I shared this before it's just that it's so insanely interesting that then suddenly other laws comes into effect as well...

Steve DelBianco: Sure, sure.

Göran Marby: ...like the fact that maybe to say that when police force asks a quick query you have – and it's not a due process you have to notify the person who they're requesting about. That would be only for police forces. The law is undefined too many cases. We also have the legal case which I hoped you follow which I think also shows that ICANN as an institution especially ICANN org is fairly committed to the temp spec that the board decided upon. I - we can of course comment more about that and basically I have to leave.

Steve DelBianco: Well, you know, thank you for that. You mentioned the chicken and the egg dilemma on this but we need the capabilities technically. At the same time there's a parallel conversation with legal with – to get legal clearance for accreditation bodies. So with respect to chicken and egg we don't quite see it that way. It's, you know, honestly whichever one comes first if you give us the egg and we'll bring home the bacon.

Göran Marby: Yes but it's also, you know, it's also that it's – and if it's not my role to say that the effort you're doing or someone else are doing is the best. That's I, you know, I can't take sides in a continuous discussion. And therefore we ask all constituencies please provide me - because in the model you're having as well you have legal questions. Maybe we haven't thought about those legal questions.

Steve DelBianco: Right.

Göran Marby: Add those legal questions and we will put them into document we will ask them.

Steve DelBianco: Right.

Göran Marby: I think you can say that we were fairly transparent when it came to the question we asked. And we were also very transparent with the answers we got from the DPAs.

Claudia Selli: Thank you very much Göran. We are very appreciative of the work that you're doing and the effort that you're putting and spending time with us. We certainly look forward to working all together as a community. And yesterday, you say that we might team to other model of doing things. So we will be happy to take part in this new way of doing things.

Göran Marby: Yes, just to mention, one of the things we are thinking of doing is to have - because there's so many moving parts. We have the expedited PDPs. We have - I don't know - we - I don't know actually how GNSO is going to organize themselves yet. They have to tell us…

Stevel DelBianco: Figuring that out now.

Göran Marby: …yes, if it's going to be a part of the expedited PDP or not and so on. But there's going to be things that we do them.

Stevel DelBianco: Good.

Göran Marby: And then you have the whois review and some other things. And I - we are thinking of doing a - and Theresa gave me the idea -- that we did in the Tourin decision that we sort of have a informal call with the constituency SAs and their leadership every month so just to update. We update you, what we are and maybe we can update each other so - because I don't want to lose time coming into Barcelona.

                And sometimes I realize that regardless how many times I write things in the blog, not always I get the message through. And that's my problem not yours. But we have to make sure that we get information out so we can focus on the things that are actually on the table instead of reiterating back to things that might - should have happened ten years ago, 15 years ago. Thank you.

Claudia Selli: Thank you very much and welcome to David so - and Matt. We really appreciate you taking the time to be with us. I will - in the interest of time, I will leave the floor to you for - I think you have a slide to present us. Thanks.

Matt Larson: I do. Good morning, everyone. I'm Matt Larson, VP of Research in the Office of the CTO. David Conrad is the CTO. And we're here to talk about the Open Data Initiative and give you an update.

With me also is Jay Daley, who's an open data subject matter expert and one of two fantastic consultants that's helping ICANN with this project. And I do have a short slide deck that I will go through very briefly in the interest of trying to put you back on schedule. Is it set? No. Could I have the slides, please?

Stevel DelBianco: Let me get it.

Matt Larson: It's okay. There we go. So as I say, I'll be very brief. The Open Data Initiative is our effort to make as much of ICANN's data public as can be made public barring restrictions on the data, you know, for privacy reasons, licensing reasons, whatever. But our attempt is to be - to fall open with this data.

And to do that we're going to have develop all the policies, processes and procedures necessary, which itself is a lot of work, and then of course making the data itself available, which requires a software solution, which we're in the process of procuring.

So let me give you an update on just where we are. An important goal was Göran's blog on May 10 where he made a public statement that - where he went on the record establishing a strong commitment to open data for the organization.

Right now, we are very nearly complete with an RFP to acquire a SaaS open data platform. The final supplier selection is underway. Our target was the

end of June. We're not quite going to make it but that's been a significant amount of work. We used ICANN's standard RFP process to work through that and we're nearly complete.

Another significant effort was creating what's called a data asset inventory. And this is the catalog of all the ICANN data sets So it's required talking with many people as you might imagine within the organization, to not only find the data sets but who owns them, what they consist of, how they're updated, what restrictions there might be. So it's more than just a list of data sets. It's a list with quite a bit of meta data about each data set.

And that list we've made public, the initial list. It's important to point out, that is a living document that will never be completed. It will always be a work in progress. But the initial draft of it is currently open for a public comment. It's open until the end of July, not only the data set itself but the priorities of the Open Data Initiative. So as of now, I believe we received two comments, so I would be grateful if people could - okay.

So in progress, the course is to - creating this public data catalog and the portal. This just means setting up the platform itself and starting to get the first data sets on it. And then there's a lot of documentation that's going to go around to creating a governance model so that we can make open data a part - a sustainable part of the ICANN culture.

You know, if we just procure the software and put some data sets on it and focus only on the technical aspect, we won't begin to be complete and create something sustainable but we'll achieve a goal.

There's a Gant chart no one can read but it is in the slides and you can zoom in on it and read it if you're interested. Here are the highlights of that. So as I say, by the end of June, we're hoping - not quite going to make having the vendor selected and having that taken care of.

We're also hard at work at all the policy documentation. So the biggest those is the open data policy that will describe the overall framework. And that is very nearly complete. More documentation by the end of July. We're hoping to have the mission and vision completed.

And then by the end of August, this is when the platform, the SaaS platform, is actually up and running and we have the first data sets in it. And by the end of September, we'll actually have a calendar of data set releases. So in other words, we'll have a schedule of what's coming. This will be based on the public comment that you're going to help us - give us feedback on prioritization of what to publish when.

We have - you know, we only have so much bandwidth to make data available because we want to do this in a sustainable way. It's just not a matter of a one-shot deal taking a data set and putting it on the platform. It's developing the processes and the pipeline necessary to keep it updated on that platform. And so by the end of September, we'll have a calendar, a schedule, showing what our intent is.

And then finally the Open Data Advisory Group is part of the overall process that we're putting in place to make this an ongoing part of the ICANN organization culture. And we hope to have that done by the end of October.

So with that, those are the slides that I have. And I would be happy to take any questions.

Claudia Selli: Thank you. Steve?

Steve DelBianco: Thanks, Matt. Steve DelBianco. Jay worked with me on - as an advisor to the Marketplace Health Index. And we continued to say throughout that to (Moukesh Dustapher), who's done a superb job, that it was necessary to dovetail tightly with ODR so that any of the data that's being collected and published is part of a marketplace.

And that's exactly the data that's in here, to eliminate duplication of cost and effort, to eliminate conflicts in data -- you get it from one system and then you get a different answer than the other -- and to make sure that they're drawing from the same data repository. Can you give us some assurance that there's complete coordination there?

Jay Daley: Sorry, this is Jay Daley. This is a big task and it has multiple levels at which it needs to be delivered. And the level that you're asking about is not currently the level that we're working at, okay? The current level is about identifying and freeing up those data sets.

There is an understanding that we now need to work at the integration level above that, of integrating those data sets, finding key data attributes that exist in multiple data sets and linking those together so you can do those.

Then beyond that is then the sort of avoiding duplication level, okay? And that's some way off I think before that's going to be achieved. So - but the benefit is that if the data is made open and available then anybody with the knowledge and the tools can remove the redundancy themselves and at the very least get, you know - they may get too much data but they get what they need in that way.

So it is on the plan. It's part of an overall data governance, you know, methodology that needs to be implemented. But it's some time off before we get to that stage when we say right duplication has been avoided.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Jay. So meantime, since this marketplace health somehow made its way into the key performance indicators and Akram's comp plan, there's a lot of pressure to deliver that. And it may need to be delivered, the Marketplace Health Index, prior to the completion of ODI. So that implies that (Moukesh) and his team are going to be independently getting the data that

eventually will also be in your inventory and only then be able to eliminate duplication of effort.

Jay Daley: No. I think there's a misunderstanding here. They're going to - what they are doing is working on the creation of a - of some data sets, which would be data sets that would appear in this inventory as a list of data sets, okay, and would then… And so conversations have already taken place with them and their contractor as to how the data they're collecting would be made available to be published through the Open Data Initiative. But that's the level at which this is operating at.

Steve DelBianco: Yes. And then one final question. I know Denise has one. As we go through the inventory, there's a lot of fields in there that we'll want to comment on. If it would be helpful to us to understand what it means, when I look at the inventory -- and there's a row that we care a lot about, the Domain Name Abuse Activity Reporting System, the DAARS, and under the column labeled Published, there's just a no in there as opposed to a yes or restricted.

So what does it mean, as we analyze this data in terms of prioritizing the ODI because prioritization is part of this, when it says no under Published? Does that mean no forever, no not yet? What does that mean to us?

Jay Daley: It means no, it's not published. Yes?

Steve DelBianco: Could it be?

Jay Daley: That is a conversation that needs to take place about each individual data set. So if it's something you wish published, then we need to understand that you wish it published. And then the conversation takes place about any potential restrictions, licensing issues, confidentiality issues and other issues associated with that.

Matt Larson: Sort of to clarify is we comment on this question about prioritizations. It's fine for us to indicate to you, hey, we went through the inventory and found 15 rows that are only no or planned and we'd like them to elevate to please do it as soon as you can.

Jay Daley: Yes, definitely.

David Conrad: And then to be clear, that's specifically what we're looking for.

Denise Michel: Hi, Denise Michel with Facebook. Thank you so much for this presentation and congratulations, David, on recruiting such talented and knowledgeable people to help steer this really important effort.

I just wanted to provide a little more context to the - not only the business constituency but also the ISP constituency and the IPC constituency's interest in this. We have a - I think - well, we've been interested in and asking for this type of public data for quite a long time.

We reiterated that request in like a year and a half ago in January in a joint letter. And we've had several conversations since with OCTO. And in fact, in the response to that letter, I recall that ICANN acknowledged that we've been talking about providing public data since 2014. That's a long time.

So we're really glad to see that we can expect the data and that it sounds like you're on schedule. And I think it's - we have a little bit of a chicken and egg challenge here because of the years, you know, our data scientists and we've provided a fair of input with little to show for it in terms of actual public useful data from ICANN. The data that was published was data that we all already had.

So, you know, getting some useful public data out there I think will help incentivize more people in the community to see that there is value in this --

and I believe there is a lot of value in what you're doing -- so we can get more people involved in providing you input that you need for that.

So moving on to a question, when do you expect the DAAR report to be report from the very, very long legal review apparently it's in and we can start to see that published on a regular basis? Thanks.

David Conrad: So we anticipated to have DAAR - the DAAR reports available for Panama. Unfortunately, certain legal matters came up that had four letters that seems to have distracted the legal team from being able to do the necessary review on the reviews that we had outsourced to provide input - to provide publication to the community.

My anticipation is that after we get back from Panama, it'll be maybe a week or two weeks when we'll be able to publish the reviews that we had outsourced to some data security professionals along with samples of the planned reporting structure. And hopefully within - definitely before Barcelona but hopefully within the next month or so be able to actually begin publishing the reports in some form.

So the - we apologize for the delays. It's just a number of factors were involved, including challenges in finding data security professionals who were willing to sort of go on the record because those folks tend to be a little reluctant to publicize themselves. But we've solved all of those problems and we have the reports in hand. We're now just waiting on sort of the bandwidth within the legal department outside of GDPR to move things forward.

Denise Michel: Thanks. Just a quick clarification. So by the end of August we can expect to see an actual DAAR report published?

David Conrad: That's the plan, yes.

Denise Michel: That's the goal? Okay, thank you.

Claudia Selli: Last question, Mark, if you'll - sorry. Please, please.

Jay Daley   I just want to go back to the first bit you said before DAAR. So just to remind you that we've tried a number of times to have a conversation about the letter. I've managed to have one brief conversation with Mark McFadden but otherwise, after multiple e-mails and things, we're struggling to engage with the business constituency.

So if you were able to look at the things that we produced over the last couple of months and send it to you, that would be very useful. Thank you.

Denise Michel: Yes, just to follow up. I appreciate the challenge there. I think the BC definitely intends to respond to the request - general request for comments. But again, part of the challenge is that over the years we have engaged in the past on - in, you know, specific ways.

But at this point, given all of the other, you know, commitments of our time and resources, it's difficult to free up time to spend a lot more - you know, spend a lot more time on individual discussions without I think a stronger confidence that we'll start seeing really useful data that'll come out of this.

But we'll certainly continue to work on this with you.

Jay Daley: Just to note that we did try quite hard to have a dialogue before the public comment came out to make sure that your concerns were available. But that's wasn't able to happen, and so we went ahead without that.

Claudia Selli: Mark?

Mark Datysgeld: I would like to think that I have been following the project from the start more or less. I also had the pleasure of sharing the table last meeting with Jay

about open data. And one thing that's not very clear to me is the scope of the project in this certain - in this particular sense.

Is the ODI a broader approach towards working with data on the community? Or is the ODI the end in itself? As in, once we start working with those data sets and producing research, is the ODI a place to evaluate, take those data points and work with them as a community, a systemic approach to that? Or is the purpose of the ODI surfacing those data so the community can work and any collective effort of any kind or any such thing should be taken elsewhere, in a working group of some sort? What is the end goal of the ODI?

Jay Daley: Within the Open Data Space generally, the broad strategy that an organization might wish to adopt is to look at this at three levels, one of which is raw access to the data. A level above that then is to extract specific insights from that data. And the third level above that is to be able to tell a story using those insights but then inform somebody about something.

In the RFP process for a platform, we have asked for functionality at all three levels. The initial plan though solely concentrates on the publication of data. And no plan has yet been put into how that might move up to the insights or the storytelling level, okay, because there's that much work to do at this level. So that's currently where we stand with it.

Jimson Olufuye: Thank you. This is Jimson Olufuye speaking. David and team, welcome and want to thank you for the presentation. I could recall that this will not be major requests of the BC that we'll need to have data and - across the spectrum of data sets.

My question is in view of the GDPR, we're talking about open data and GDPR, you know, data protection, are you closely monitoring the possible opportunity vis-à-vis a condition, access and the feeder mechanism to the ODR infrastructure? So are you also looking at that possibility going forward?

Jay Daley: So the answer is that this is intended to be open data and open data only. And it - there is no plan or consideration for a tiered access model that gives accredited people access to any other form of data. This is solely concerned with open data that we've made fully public to everybody.

David Conrad: Yes, and to add, you know, part of the data assets inventory is going through and identifying those data sets that we have the ability to make completely open.

                 For data sets, and, you know, as part of the comment, there are undoubtedly going to be requests for data sets that are not currently available to be made fully open, and that - you know, when those are identified as being a high priority, that will result in us going back to, you know, those data sets, the sources of those data sets and figuring out, you know, what parts of the data we can make available through redaction or what, you know, license terms we need to negotiate with however the data is being presented.

                 So that's why prioritization is sort of key for us to be able to… And, you know, none of that is quick. So that prioritization is important for us to be able to figure out where we spend our resources to get the biggest bang for the buck.

Claudia Selli: Thank you all very much for being here with us. And yes, thank you for your time. Thanks.

David Conrad: Thank you very much.

Claudia Selli: Okay. So we have 15 minutes left and we had - we have an (unintelligible) twelve past - ten, fifteen past ten because there is not a meeting taking place here. So Mark, you are here to present the LAC project. It would be if the presentation could be kept short so that we'll leave room for question and answer. Thank you.

Mark Datysgeld: Thank you, Claudia. I'll try to make myself as brief as possible in the interest of time. Some of you might have lost it under the GDPR storm, but we did send the base methodology of this research during the week. I'll try to explain the key points of what's going on and hopefully you can get a good idea of what's going on.

So if you could please scroll down to the goals part, what we intend right now is to find where the participation challenges in Latin America are keeping actors away from the business constituency space and, more broadly, the business space within ICANN.

And we're not just coming from the perspective of what are these challenges but we also want - would like to think about participation models, additional participation models that we as a community could come up with that could increase the chance of these actors engaging as well as looking forward into the future other areas in which the BC does not have the same range.

Right now, it's focused on Latin America but what we would like to do is find what kinds of participation models could work better for those who are not yet able to join the BC.

So moving ahead, we have made some initial findings that stem from the data that is already available right now. We had a big surge of Latin American participation during the Puerto Rico meeting, up from 6% in Abu Dhabi to 25% in San Juan. However, the business participation remained stable, between 12 and 13%.

And what could - that could lead us to think is exactly where are the business stakeholders. And that sort of question is what we're setting out to answer. What - why can - what is the failure point of reaching them? And how can we as a constituency help more than (unintelligible) 21 or anything like that, what we as a constituency can do to help engage those members and bring them on board?

So we have a slide called challenges, if you could please slide down to it. We have identified some challenges based on our experience engaging with those members. Yes, challenges. So these are challenges we identified as we engaged during last year and Nivaldo did a big push for that and subsequently Andrew helped and a lots and lot of community members with the help of GNSO and the Ex Comm. We have been trying to reach those actors.

And what we have found so far are these initial challenges, right? They go all the way from awareness, that is simply understanding that ICANN exists, which is in itself a problem, but it goes through language. The region does speak less than 50% - less than 50% of the total people speak English. That can be a very harsh barrier, you know, an English-speaking community.

There's the complexity with which we are used to discussing but also the business culture. Is the business culture in Latin America already primed for this kind of participation? Or do we have to sync from what tools are already in place and build from there, and try to get something that fits for them that makes sense for them as a stepping stone.

Also the question of filtering. Are the people getting here? Do we manage to select them via fellowship? Do they get somewhere in the process? How is it that these members are not exactly reaching the community, right?

The question of business rationale, which we do discuss a lot, which is, is there a value proposition that is in place for them to be in an international policymaking forum. And what would be their interests?

So moving on to the data sources, we already have some data available. And I'm happy to report actually that that expanded (unintelligible) meeting. We want to look at the - we are conducting interviews directly with those actors who are and are not included to understand what their processes are. But in

this case, we also want to look at the data participation for the meetings which is already available, look for some participation data that is not available and look at the fellowship data.

But in the fellowship data sets, we have those who are approved, which it's a very small amount of business actors. But during the onboarding program it will surface that out of these candidates, very few were qualified to join the business constituency. So what we are asking is for the data of the applicants.

And I'm happy to report that ICANN staff is very willing to support up. We have been engaged in conversations with them. And as far as I understand, they are very willing to help us surface that data.

So we also have a few other sources like the data from the LAC Road Show that has been conducted the past year and other miscellaneous that we might too to enhance our research.

So as for finding interviewees, we have been tapping into the contacts that we have made over the years in the BC and the broader ICANN community. But we would also like to enter a stage now in which you as a community of commercial members try to come to us and say, I have this one business that I think is very important that should be here, I wish it was here and I would like to have it included in the survey.

Yes, Steve, please.

Steve DelBianco: Mark, it's Steve DelBianco. I wanted to remind all the BC members that yesterday, Gabby Szlak sent us all of the slides Mark's discussing in an e-mail. And the first attachment is the slide deck.

And Mark, my request to you would be that this is the first item in your presentation where you're asking us very quickly for some feedback because

I imagine given the interview scheduling, you need to know as soon as possible about people to speak with.

So when we're concluded today, I would ask you to follow up on Gabby's e-mail with the reminder to the BC just to follow up on today's discussion -- I need by July 3 the names of people to interview, I need by July 10 the following things -- because with so many moving parts… What did you call it, the GDPR storm, right?

Mark Datysgeld: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: With so many moving parts, it's essential to give us specific follow-ups you need from us. Thank you.

Mark Datysgeld: Thank you for the comment, Steve. I will be sure to do that. So we would like to - that we are seeking the people who you as a community have already identified that would fit the space and we, during our engagement, have identified would fit the space so that we are looking for leads that are consistent with the objectives of the BC.

So moving on the approach -- and I promise to be brief -- we have developed a semi-structured questionnaire. What that means is we are doing interviews that are the fullest at structure and order of questions so that we avoid context bias and a series of other methodological flaws. But at the same time, we do want to keep an open-ended section in which they can just speak from their heart exactly what they're feeling about this.

So the nature of the questions being considered, which is the next one, I would just very briefly read one. So we - instead of asking directly about ICANN, we are asking for instance the fourth bullet point: What kind of benefit does your company expect from joining international groups or coalitions such as ICANN? What benefit do you think you will receive from that participation?

So if we understand that kind of question, we may more towards creating more meaningful models instead of simply offering to them what is strictly already in place.

So the focus on additional evidence of participation, that is the following slide, is how we - how do - how can we achieve this without straining ourselves and straining the constituency in any way. We will try to deliver something that is manageable and that is realistic in some way.

So just to finish up, this is our idea. These are our plans. We have been developing it for I think over two months now. And we are ready to get started. And the only thing we need is that - we will keep reporting to the community and we hope that the community will report back to us and we can move into something that's solid and stable. So thank you very much for your time.

Claudia Selli: Thank you very much, Mark, for your presentation. Steve, you have a question?

Steve DelBianco: Hi, Mark. One quick question from Steve DelBianco. Chantelle, would you move to the prior slide on avenues for participation, prior slide? Thank you.

So Mark, thinking ahead, deliverables from you three on this project will include an assessment of what you learned in the interviews. But the most important thing would be recommendations for things the BC can do, which will address those concerns and achieve the objectives you laid out.

So on this slide you have three bullets for potential things we could do. And I always jump to the end to understand let's make sure we come up with things that are possible to do. I'm sure you'll be creative in being responsive to what you learn.

But I would appreciate if you had any more insights about what these potential tools we have at our disposal that'll end up being delivered because they won't be restricted just to Latin American participants. It may be that we can use them for Asia where we…

Mark Datysgeld: For sure.

Steve DelBianco: …have a terrible participation rate so far and we really need to increase it.

Mark Datysgeld: So one of the things that we are looking positively at is the fact that ICANN staff is - has been supportive of this initiative and is willing to participate. So we do intend to give feedback on constituency level but we also want to target the community leaders from ICANN from the region and potential other regions about what can be done.

So what we are looking at for instance, is there a system in place for us to implement not translation of the entire process but could summaries be produced that somehow help those actors engage, for instance in their native language, in whatever native language we are trying to reach, even if for a brief period of time as a transition tool.

Do we have any idea of how we would structure a leadership program in which members of the community or the BC would help those members ease into the constituency? So we are looking at those kinds of solutions that we do intend to create.

Claudia Selli: Thank you. Thank you, Mark. We have two minutes left so Andrew, I saw your hand's up. Literally, one minute. Thank you.

Andrew Mack: Claudia, thanks. I could do it in less than one minute. First of all, as the old guy on the - on our survey group, I don't think there's much I'm going to - I would add to what Mark has said, just to inform the group that we've - we have actually already started with our interviews and we've gotten very, very

positive responses so far. We're integrating some of the suggestions that our interviewees have given us.

And we've been very positively impressed that they are happy to help us get more interviewees. And we're really counting on the BC for their inputs on that side.

The other piece is is that there is a lot more ICANN data than we had originally expected, and we're very pleased with the level of pickup from the ICANN side. We think we'll be able to balance our interview questions with a lot more hard data which I think is going to help our analysis.

The last small point is in terms of taking this to other regions, for sure we think that there's going to be applicability. But as always, a little bit of local is very important. And so we'll want to - we'll - you know, as we go forward with the BC, we'll want to take what we've learned in Latin America and work with local BC members and representatives to build that out. Thanks.

Claudia Selli: Thank you very much, Andrew. As we have one minute left, I would suggest that if there are any questions for Mark and the team, please send it to them and they will respond to you. You can share it in the BC Private because I would like just to, if we can put on the agenda, we're not going to go on the policy calendar obviously but we just had a call.

I wanted to remind you that the budget of the BC has been circulated to you so take a look at that. Ex Comm approved it. If there are any questions or anything, just look at the budget that was approved and you can always reach out to us.

Yes. For the elections, you have been seeing the mail going on. We will add - Susan unfortunately is term limited on the GNSO councilor so a seat will be needing someone. Think about it. And you can always, you know, reach out

to Susan and to Marie to have more information. And then so the elections, I think the timeline for nomination is the 9th of July.

Steve DelBianco: It's the open.

Claudia Selli: It's the open, yes, the open nomination.

And then last point that I wanted to raise with you and to remind is that we - there are also the results of the GNSO election…

Steve DelBianco: No. Chair.

Claudia Selli: Chair, yes. If you recollect, in Puerto Rico we already discussed that. And we knew that Keith Drazek had an interest in that. And as a BC, we agreed to support him. So I just wanted to reiterate that. And I see Jimson has a question.

Jimson Olufuye: No, just information with respect to election. You know, just to -- this is Jimson speaking -- just to remind members that according to Section 4 of the charter, committees too are subject to election. So committee members in the outreach committee, in the credential committee, need to prepare for election also within your group in November. Thank you.

Claudia Selli: Yes. Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: Thanks. It's Marilyn. I'm sorry, Jimson, would you just clarify again, meaning within the group for the chair role or prepare to be elected to the committee?

Jimson Olufuye: Oh, okay. So it is Jimson. To elect the chair of the committee so to elect the chair of the committee. We have enough membership in the committee already. So for every year, the mission of the charter requires that members re-elect their chair.

Claudia Selli: Thank you, Jimson. If there are no other points and questions, I would adjourn the meeting. Yes, Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: It's - I - it's Marilyn. I don't have a - I just want to make an announcement and a request to you as the chair. We don't have time here to deal with detailed discussion about the CCWG auction proceeds or the CCWG IG.

But it would really be timely if we could put each of those on an upcoming virtual call, even though they might - you know, they don't necessarily fit totally under the calendar that we have right now. But it's important I think for us to get the members updated on both of them. And you and Steve might talk about whether you even feel we might have to ask members for an extra 15 minutes because there may be a lot of questions about both of them. And I'll make sure we do a prepared presentation ahead of time.

Claudia Selli: Thank you very much, Marilyn. And you request is noted. The meeting is adjourned. Thank you.

Chantelle Doerksen: Thank you. I'd like to remind members that are in the room, please take a few of the BC newsletters for yourself and for your colleagues as part of outreach. Thank you very much.

END