

**ICANN
Transcription ICANN63 Barcelona
GNSO – BC Meeting
Tuesday 23 October 2018 at 1515 CEST**

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:
<https://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Claudia Selli: The open meeting. I know, Andrea, you wanted to do an announcement.

Andrea Glandon: Welcome everyone. I just want to remind everybody to please state your name before speaking for the transcription. We've gotten a few back and they're not very clean, as clean as we would like. So please state your name before speaking. Thank you so much.

Claudia Selli: Okay. I would like to start the meeting. First of all, you have the agenda in front of you and we're going to have at 3:30, Cristina Monti from the European Commission DG Justice doing the GDPR presentation. Then we're going to continue with the policy discussion, and we're going to have another guest from ICANN, Cyrus Namazi to continue also discussion with him.

And then if - continue with the policy discussion and then with outreach engagement and Mark is going to present as well the result of the study that is ongoing. But I wanted also to start the meeting by thanking one person, which maybe might not expect that, but it's Susan Kawaguchi.

We wanted really to thank you for the great work that you have been doing. And, you know, you have been volunteering for every possible role. We know you like to smooth out any problems. And so we have a little idea here to help you in smoothing out problems. Please come because (unintelligible). Okay. It's just for smoothing out problems, then ...

Susan Kawaguchi: I actually use this.

Claudia Selli: We also have - but then we also need you to be tied to us. So these might help you as well.

Susan Kawaguchi: Oh, definitely, but you're not going to tie ...

Claudia Selli: No. And then this. Keep it tied to your chair. It's a glue. You find a piece.

Susan Kawaguchi: That was Marie. Well, thank you very much and I really enjoyed the experience so far. So I would encourage anyone to go for that and I've learned a lot and thanks for all your trust with the new assignment.

Steve DelBianco: Absolutely. Thank you, Susan.

Susan Kawaguchi: Thank you.

Claudia Selli: Okay, so let's continue. And I think maybe, Steve, you can start with the policy calendar if you agree, although you - we need to continue probably discussion afterwards.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks, Claudia. Steve DelBianco for the transcript. I'm your vice chair for policy coordination. And in this phase of the meeting, we do this every two weeks when we're on the phone. We walk through the calendar of just completed and pending public comment opportunities. We move to then a discussion of council's upcoming agenda, and then finally in channel three,

our CSG liaison, Barbara Wanner talks about activities and decisions that have to be made there.

So we don't need to deep dive into anything in particular today, but the best document to use is the policy calendar that I sent around on Sunday evening at 9:45 p.m. It's labeled policy calendar. Each BC member should have one. We'll have it up on the screen as well.

First thing I wanted to do was to cite a couple of comments we've submitted since our last meeting two weeks ago. On October the 13, we filed a comment on the proposed profiles for RDAP. And RDAP has been much in the discussion this week.

Mark Svancarek and Stephanie on Sunday did a panel on RDAP. I think it was Sunday. Might have been Monday. Maybe it was Monday. Did a panel on RDAP, and it really did show a lot more capability there that's almost ready to go. The demo was particularly good. And I know you said that Google's got a server stood up ready to go.

Stephanie Duchesneau: Yes. It was actually our server on the demo.

Steve DelBianco: Excellent. Verisign and others have gotten it ready and it's obvious that it's ready to be a replacement for 443. It's also clear that it could be easily adapted as a tiered access to the non-redacted, the non-public WHOIS data, if and when we develop policy and legal clearance to pursue that. So it was really - it was an excellent opportunity.

The comments we filed on the 13th were the result of some compromise and consensus. They're always a challenge to do that. For instance, Stephanie came in with some edits. I tried to find a way to accommodate a couple edits right away. Other edits we're able to finesse, because our goal in developing comments is to have it be a consensus comment.

When it can't be consensus, we will hold the majority vote, but we hardly ever have to do that. I think once in the past five years that we have voted on a policy position. And I think that's a testament to the willingness of people who do contribute to know that literally everything you put out there is in front of all the BC members.

I'll usually go after it as an editor to try to determine whether there are elements of that that conflict and if they - if I can't resolve that, then we have to get the members involved. But thanks for everyone who contributed to that. And I did mention Mark and Stephanie, but also Tim Chen and Alex Deacon helped, as did Faisal and Margie, and thanks for your good work on that.

The last paragraph of that comment on RDAP is where we indicated the BC's for the second time. The BC support for the pursuit of the unified access model, which we discussed extensively in the closed meeting. I don't need to get into that now, but that was the basis of the public statement I made at the microphone yesterday.

Back on October the 5th, we commented on proposed next steps for ICANN reviews. Barbara and I have worked that one out, and we basically endorsed ICANN orgs proposal on what to do in the reviews, even though their proposal didn't reflect what the BC's preferences were in the earlier comments we filed. Some of the proposals we had were overcome by events. So it came down to us taking ICANN for the best available path forward.

Okay. Those are the two comments we submitted since our last meeting. Let me turn to the part of - page one, which is the current comments that are open. The WHOIS review where Susan Kawaguchi is the vice chair of the review team.

This is one of these reviews mandated in the ICANN bylaws after the transition when we brought in four specific reviews and made them part of ICANN'S commitment. This is a specific review on RDS. It's the second review, so that's why they call it the WHOIS 2 review.

I'm happy to suspend. We have our guests here. Thank you.

Claudia Selli: Thank you very much, Cristina for joining us today at our BC open meeting. And as already agreed, we would welcome your - some thoughts about the GDPR and the next steps. Of course.

Cristina Monti: In any case - well, first of all, thank you very much for inviting me to this session. Hello. My name is Cristina Monti I work in the European Commission. Until recently, I used to be the GAC alternate representative in the GAC, but I have recently switched responsibilities and I am now in DG Justice where I work in the unit dealing with international data flows and protections, which is basically the unit dealing with the international dimension related to the GDPR. So one way or another, I'm still involved in the ICANN world.

So today, I was thinking about offering some perspectives on the ongoing discussions on the review, on the reform of the WHOIS system. I know that some of you are actively involved in the many processes that are taking place, but maybe not all of you have the same level of understanding, because we know that these is a sort of complex process with several moving pieces and it's in evolution as well.

So - but before I go into that, also just to clarify, what is the role of the European Commission in all this debate and discussion? So the European Commission, although we are originally the organization that proposed the legislation for the protection of privacy in Europe, the European Data

Protection Regulation, we are not responsible for the actual enforcement and application of the rules.

These are the national authorities, the national data protection authorities who are in charge for the implementation. And this is an approach similar also in many other fields. It's not just something special only for data protection. You have national authorities who are independent authorities in charge of the application and implementation.

So as you know, I don't want to go into the whole saga and history of this reform, but just I would like to briefly recall that this is not really a new issue. The concerns relating to the public availability of personal data in the WHOIS system is something which was raised several years ago by European data protection authorities, and even in the ICANN community, there were many discussions over the years on how to ensure a more balanced system, where the different interests of the various stakeholders are properly taken into account.

And unfortunately, the process wasn't really successful. And I would say that with the entry into application of the GDPR, there was finally a push to find - to move forward and find a sustainable solution. Now, we are in a situation where we are still not with a final solution.

I would say that we are sort of in the middle. As you know, the GDPR entered into application this year in May. And in response to that, ICANN board approved a temporary policy according to which some - well, the personal elements, the personal data elements in the WHOIS database are still collected, but by the registries and registrars, but are no longer publicly available.

And registries and registrars should provide this data to interested third parties who show a reason to have access to this data. And the registries

and registrars should do that in a reasonable way. So this is what the temporary policy says.

However, as the GAC has made very clear and also many other stakeholders have also made clear, the WHOIS registry also has some very important functions in terms of public interest. And this concerns on one side law enforcement, on the other side also cybersecurity experts and, you know, the cyber security community and as well intellectual property rights holders.

and I'm sure you - as being in this community, you are all very well aware of the usefulness of the WHOIS data for a number of public policy interest purposes. So after the adoption of the temporary specification, basically two main processes were launched.

So on one side - in parallel I would say. On the one side, you have the so-called expedited policy development process, which is tasked to basically make sure that the temporary specification becomes a policy coming from the community. And it's called expedite because they have a fixed timeline to achieve their goal. They should be able to arrive at the final policy by May 2019.

I will also would like to highlight that this is I think the first time that such a policy process is used in the expedite form. So also to note that in a way, we are sort of in uncharted territory. So I think that in a few years' time, when we look back at this experience, there will be many lessons which can be learned also in terms of the methodology and the approach used by ICANN and the community when dealing with these sort of challenges where the community and different parts of the community tries to find ways to arrive at shared solutions.

So this is one process. The GAC is also - although this is a GNSO process, the GAC is also involved there, basically also to bring forward the public interest angle. And there - and then in parallel, ICANN also given the

concerns in the community that, you know, there was no easily available access anymore and that this access is not provided in a consistent, predictable and uniform way, so there were pressure and also the Commission, the European Commission, exerted our influence to basically say, we need also an approach, a structured approach to ensure access to those users who need it.

And we insisted and highlighted that also the GDPR has baked in, you know, the tools and mechanisms which provide for access to personal data, provided certain safeguards and conditions. So under the GDPR, solution should be available.

But of course it is up to the - to ICANN and the various parts of the community to work out together on, you know, the practical ways and means to implement these in an effective and reasonable way. And so this is the process which is looking for - to solutions for a uniform access model, which is based on an accreditation system.

Now ICANN has put forward two papers on this issue, first one in June and the second one in August, basically putting forward questions to the community to help frame the discussion. So this is basically where we are in the process.

I hope I'm not bothering you because maybe you already are fully aware of all these details. From my perspective, I think it's important again to stress the fact that also there are ways and means in which those who have a specific interest should have access to this data.

And this is also what the European data protection authorities have clearly mentioned in their recent letter to ICANN in July I think. So after the approval of the temporary specification, the European data protection authorities, which are now together in the so called European Data Protection Board, has

issued a letter providing also specific guidance to ICANN on a number of aspects.

And they clearly mentioned that, you know, data protection is of course a fundamental human right. At the same time, it's not an absolute right. It's a right that needs to be balanced according - in function of a number of factors that need to be taken into account.

And the data protection authorities also highlighted a number of very practical and legal aspects that would need to be taken into account. The first step of course is to have a very clear definition of the purposes. Why is this data collected in the first place and how it is further processed?

So you need to have clarity in terms of the different processing activities which take place in the WHOIS system and the various actors involved and the purposes. At the same time, they also highlighted - maybe I'm going into too many - into too legal details, but I think it's very important also to make the discussions advance.

They clearly highlighted that it's necessary not to mix the purposes of those who collect the data and process it, and then the purposes of those who are let's say the third party who then request this data. And there are quite detailed provisions also in the GDPR who make a father distinction between the accesses which, you know, to data, to personal data to which law enforcement need to have access.

I mean what I'm trying to say is that for law enforcement, there are very specific and different conditions and safeguards that needs to apply, then for other kind of third parties.

So it's important to keep in mind that law enforcement for instance, first of all they have specific needs and requirements, but they have to base their actions and also, you know, the processing of personal data on national

legislation. So there are very different conditions that need to apply to different third parties requesters.

So these are some of the remarks I wanted to share with you, but I'm open to any questions if I'm able to answer. Of course I don't have myself the final solution on how the model should work in the end. But of course I think it's in the interest of all stakeholders in ICANN to have a model which is stable, final, predictable and in line with the requirements of the different stakeholders.

And in the end, ideally we should have a WHOIS system which is better than what we have now in terms of data accuracy for example.

Claudia Selli: Thank you, Cristina for this insight and also for your comments. I don't know, Steve, if you want to react directly or if I just open. Okay, I'll open the queue. If anyone want to start with a question, please raise your hand. Okay. Steve, why don't you break the ice?

Steve DelBianco: All right. Cristina, Steve DelBianco here. Were you present for any of the board discussions today on this topic?

Cristina Monti: I wasn't because I just arrived, but I heard and maybe this is where your question is, I heard about this ideas of ICANN potentially becoming sole controller. Is this what ...

Steve DelBianco: That would be a little bit of an oversimplification. We understand that the registrars, registries and ICANN are co-controllers for the purposes of gathering the data, processing the data through the chain. But for the unique use of third party access and for that use alone, we are all enthusiastically investigating whether ICANN for that use alone, would be the sole controller.

And it would turn to the registrars as a processor to provide mandatory responses if ICANN knew it was an accredited code of conduct based

requester who provided appropriate reason, and that all of the transactions were logged for purposes of audit.

If we can come up with such a thing, I would love your estimation of how we might package that proposal to get guidance or approval from the Data Protection Board, if they give such a thing and how does one approach and present that? We talked to other commission people who have different opinions on how to package it, how to phrase it, who should do it and where, but I'd love your opinions on that. Thank you.

Cristina Monti: Well, I know that everybody's asking how best to reach out to the data protection authorities, which questions should be asked and this kind of input. I would like to also reassure you that European data protection authorities are fully aware of these discussions.

The European Commission for instance is a participant in the meetings of the European Data Protection Board, and we are there also to provide clarity. And we are fulfilling this objective of building - being a bridge also because the European Commission has to cater for different interests and the opinions as well.

And that's why we are trying to build this relationship and this communication also with the data protection authorities. And I think that this has been very useful in the sense that we see that the discussions are really now moving into a much more constructive and solution oriented approach.

Steve DelBianco: Let me ask you a follow up. When you use the word discussions, does this mean you envision ICANN having a conversation with the board, or is it more formal where we present a package and ask for feedback?

Cristina Monti: Well, until now there has been an ongoing dialogue in the form of exchange of official letters. And then also more informal contacts to follow up to those. I think that it's also very important to keep in mind that the data protection

authorities have many, many cases to deal with, and they cannot - they have different timeframes in which they work, and not always coincide with ICANN working methods.

So ideally, I think that after - at this stage for instance, after this exchange of letters and so on, ideally a package should be put forward to them. This is also again my personal view, but I think it's very important not just to ask specific questions and then sort of oblige the DPAs to give limited answers, but to present a package.

I would even think about possible scenarios. How would this work in practice? In the case of ICANN playing a stronger role, somehow lifting the responsibility from registries and registrars as well. You would need a detailed legal analysis of, how would this work in practice? And on top of that, how would data move in such a system? Because if we are then talking about international flows of data, then you have to also consider the relevant requirements under the GDPR.

So there are a number of issues that you need to put on, you know, on paper and you have to have different scenarios whereby you explain first of all, the purpose, have a clear definition of the purpose. And then further to that, so why are you processing the data? How are you doing it? And then all the other relevant criteria.

again, I would like also to remind that the whole idea of the GDPR is not to have certain stakeholders shift responsibility from one to the other, but rather to have clarity, to have a clear system whereby you know where the data, what is being done with the data, by whom and therefore to keep the relevant actors accountable.

I would put it more in a way that it is about accountability rather than liability, but I understand of course that there is always this sort of maybe

exaggerated fear of fines. It's true that the GDPR in comparison to previous data protection rules in Europe, now has more teeth.

So there are ways and means to make sure that these rules are effectively implemented, but the idea is not to punish, simply to have clarity and to have a system whereby you know where the data - it's really about having a sound management of the data in a transparent way.

Steve DelBianco: Cristina, one last follow up. The degree of risk that a registrar would take if they responded to these queries that ICANN was authorizing and being accountable for, the question is, we understand that the data protection authorities can bring enforcement actions that include fines, but can others bring individual private actions that also involve fines under GDPR?

Cristina Monti: I'm not sure I got your question. Fines are sort of one of the - of many mechanisms, and I would say would be the last resort that data protection authorities have. So before getting to fine, there would be a number of ...

Steve DelBianco: That was my question.

Cristina Monti: ... but not after ...

Steve DelBianco: Not so much about what step, but who. Could others bring measures that could make their way all the way to a fine?

Cristina Monti: Well, courts are also, you know, courts.

Steve DelBianco: Individuals.

Cristina Monti: No.

Steve DelBianco: Okay. Like they're not ...

Claudia Selli: I have in the queue, Zahid and then (Jamin).

Zahid Jamil: I'm so sorry. I'm not an expert on GDPR, but - because I don't come from anywhere near ...

Cristina Monti: I think nobody is.

Zahid Jamil: Well, glad to hear that. My question was, I think you said the GDPR basically relied upon enforcement by national law. So how can we be sure that fines would not be the first or at least the second protocol? It depends on the national law. It depends on what the DPA in that particular sovereign country does and it could be different in different countries. Or have I misunderstood that?

Cristina Monti: No. What I tried to say, maybe I was not clear enough, is that, you know, under the GDPR, you have several legal basis on which you can process personal data. Consent is one of them. Legitimate interest is another one and you have others.

Law enforcement and in general public authorities cannot rely on any of those basis. They can only use one, which is the one for public authorities, which is different. So they cannot rely on legitimate interests. They have to rely on the legal basis for public authorities, which then is about applicable legislation.

So if you are a public authority, there must be legislation or, you know, there must be - you must be given a mandate to perform your mandate. And under that mandate, then you can process data.

Zahid Jamil: I think my point was really that, depending on the way that the particular DPA in a particular country or IC in a particular country is set up, it would kind of depend on how they feel that they want to enforce and do fines. And is there a way that you give guidance of saying, don't be - don't enforce too much?

Don't give fines all the time, because it might be that you have a DPA in one particular country that might be sort of aggressive, right? And this may vary in different countries. I'm just ...

Cristina Monti: Yes, I think - now I got your point. So I think that this was the case before the GDPR where you had the more fragmentation in the way each independent authority would implement and apply the rules. With the GDPR, you have a much stronger coordination among DPAs, and you have specific mechanisms.

And indeed, you now have the European data protection board where they together make decisions that are then uniformly applied. So I think that maybe this is one of the positive things that can really help and simplify and bring certainty and clarity.

Claudia Selli: (Jamin)?

(Jamin): Hi Cristina. I will join the list of people who are not expert in GDPR. My question is more about this ongoing debate about natural vs legal persons. And I know in your new role, that kind of comes a bit more to the fore where you're talking about consumer protection and colleagues in the European commission are very clear that when it comes to consumer protection, transparency is key.

And from our - well, at least from my point of view, part of that transparency is being able to contact us when things go wrong or when you have a question. Hence I think the reason why we want to see a clear split between legal personalities and natural people and how they're treated in a matter of things on the WHOIS database. Is there anything that you think could be done to help clarify that part? Because at the moment, it seems that it's being quite confused.

And even though there are some points being made from the EDPB side

about if legal personalities are represented by individuals with that info who have information that can be withdrawn or masked. Could that be accompanied by an overall obligation to at least be contactable through another meaning? Let's say it's not true. That's not personal identifiable data.

Cristina Monti: Well, on the distinction between natural and legal person, GDPR is clear. It doesn't apply to legal persons. Now, my understanding is that it was - for a number of reasons, it was decided that under the temporary specification, you would have the same set of uniform rules without this distinction being made for a number of reasons that, you know, ICANN also itself explained.

It is true that also when you are dealing with legal persons in the WHOIS system, you might have elements of personal data which could identify a specific person. Like for instance a specific name and email address containing the name of the person and this is personal data.

Now, there could be different ways in which this issue could be addressed. And that EDPB suggested precisely thinking in the recent letter that for instance for admin and tech contact details, the registrant could be invited at the moment of the registration, to provide an anonymized or (pseudo) anonymized email address or just say contact at, I don't know, admin at company dot com.

So there could be ways in which this could be facilitated. And the data protection authorities even provided some elements there. Then there could be also other technical possibilities in which this could be done. And I think that this is also an area where really now discussions should be - should focus.

What are the technical possibilities and ways in which the WHOIS system could be arranged in a way that it's compliant with the GDPR, but still

facilitate all the different usages? And I think that there could be many paths to be explored there.

For instance, I would be curious also to know that in the temporary specification, you now have - according to the temporary specification, you have links or web forms to contact the registrant. And I'm not sure how this is working in practices, if this is something that is being really implemented or - but in the temporary, specification is an element which was there. So this is maybe an open question to you.

Zahid Jamil: I'll let my more expert colleagues with the experience on the ground maybe respond to that question. Maybe just as a follow up, I think that clarification which is indeed very helpful, I would just hope that that clarification could be passed on to your colleagues around the discussions on the dot EU regulation where there's a risk that we're seeing in some of the context.

That distinction is kind of being jumbled and would allow people to kind of circumvent the idea of actually providing any contact information, even if they are legal personalities.

Cristina Monti: Maybe very briefly on that issue. We know that this distinction between natural and legal person is addressed in different ways by country code top level domain names registries in the WHOIS. And there has been an interesting presentation just now in the GAC by center - the European Association of Country-Code Top Level Domain Names also showing the diversity of weighting in which this is done.

But I take your point on the dot EU specifically. As far as I am aware, the intention there is not to change the current policy that you rate, the registry of dot EU has basically because it was already in line with the data protection rules that we had before and now already has a policy in place to address the GDPR.

This update regulation aims at bringing the regulation more in line with the current needs, but it's not focused on the WHOIS at all. I mean the idea was not to touch that specific aspect. But to be honest, now that the commission made the proposal, now it's in the hands of the core legislatures, parliament and member states in the council.

And to be honest, I'm not aware of where we are in the discussion and possible amendments, so.

Claudia Selli: Yes please.

Statton Hammock: Statton Hammock from MarkMonitor. I wanted to answer your question about, I think you were referring to the anonymized email address and web form relays and the effectiveness of that. To your question, a lot of registries and registrars haven't actually implemented that, even though the time spec requires them to do. They just haven't either gotten to it or I don't know. It's not there.

For those who have implemented it though, it's a pretty unreliable way to contact a registrant. We don't get information that gets confirmation that the message has been received by the registrant. So it's a pretty unreliable way to do contacts.

Denise Michel: Hi. This is Denise with Facebook. Just to follow up on that, also to note that it's highly ineffective and often dangerous to relay WHOIS requests for bad actors who are conducting phishing attacks to simply relay the request for WHOIS to that bad actor. So there's quite a ways to go to work out the effectiveness of the system. Thanks.

Claudia Selli: Okay. So if there are no other questions, I would like to thank you, Cristina, for taking the time and come discuss with us and engage with us. Thank you very much and yes, looking forward to continue the conversation.

Cristina Monti: My pleasure. Thank you very much. Bye.

Claudia Selli: Steve, back to you.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks, Claudia. Steve DelBianco. On the policy calendar, at the bottom of page one, the email that I sent out on a Sunday night is the best thing to have up in your browser since it has hyperlinks to the relevant elements. I want to review just two or three of the currently open public comment periods, particularly to solicit feedback on a couple of drafts, as well as get volunteers.

The first one up is the WHOIS review team. Susan Kawaguchi was the chair - is the chair of that review team, and they've put out their draft recommendations. The good news is they've asked for our feedback in the form of responding to a suggested template.

And I want to thank Denise, Michelle and Jimson on previous calls for volunteering to draft the BC responses to those questions. Those comments close 4 November, with a seven day required response period (unintelligible) from Denise.

That would mean we'd want to circulate to all of you by the 28th of October in order to give you seven days to review our responses. This would be a great time for other BC members to volunteer to help with those responses. And let me ask whether Denise and Jimson think they could get us a draft by the 28th. Or not. Any other volunteers to help with the draft?

Thank you again, Denise and Jimson. Susan, while she's the chair of it, can offer a lot of feedback, but it's probably better that she's not listed as a drafter. So Susan, please provide your guidance as to particular parts of the response document that you believe need attention and your colleagues will be able to focus their work.

Susan Kawaguchi: So I did do that, but Jimson and I apologize. I didn't send it to you. I left you off that email. So I'll send it to you.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks, Susan. Appreciate that. As part of the glue, we're talking about using to keep you. All right, the second one up, number two is a draft operating plan and budgets for PTI, the technical identifiers corporation of ICANN (unintelligible) all the transition, and IANA, another entity that ICANN runs as part of the transition.

So those comments close the 12th of November. And I want to thank Jimson for drafting both comments, comments for PTI and for IANA and I attached them on that Monday night - Sunday night email, attachments one and two. Jimson, you have very brief comments. Give us the essence of what you're proposing and see if your colleagues have any questions.

Jimson Olufuye: Thank you, Steve. This is Jimson Olufuye. Well, let me - for the benefits of new members, let me just say what PTI is about. PTI is as Steve said, is part of the outcome of the transition and is Public Technical Identifiers. And this body responsible, core PTI and the asset board is an affiliate of the - of ICANN itself and its oversight services or work has to do with political parameters, the internet normal resources, domain names.

So they have a budget of about 10 million, around the same figure last year. Last year we made a series of comments which they've responded to this year. For example we asked for concise executive summary, which has been reflected in this year's presentation. And they are also giving comparative analysis.

We asked for a comparative analysis with preceding year. And so they provided it. So basically it's 10M and it's still okay, but we observe some arrows in the competition. So we asked them to fix that. It has to do with (unintelligible) positions.

So once that is done, I think is clean. That is quite compact and light. The same thing for IANA. Largely, IANA has to do with IANA services like policy development processes. It has to do with IANA, which ICANN itself works on, not PTI. ICANN works on this one.

So that budget is about 10.9 or 10.7. So it's still light and - but they made the same mistakes in the competition. You know, for example when they gave us that - the difference between FY'18 - FY'19 and FY'20 is minus 0.1%, and yet it's the same in our figure, 10 million, 10 million. And yet they say there's difference of 0.1%.

So it's not clear. So we asked them to fix that and it's okay. So that's the observation I've made so far. Thank you, Steve.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Jimson for drafting. Any questions for Jimson on draft comments? Great. Seeing none, we move to the next one. The next two, numbers three and four are not due till the end of November. So we have over a month for that, but this is the time I need to solicit a volunteer from the BC to draft a comment.

First one, number three, is our initial comment on the big cross community working group who's working on new GTLD auction proceeds. Marilyn Cade is the CSG, Commercial Stakeholders Group representative on there. We also have participation from (Waudon) and from (Tola).

Now, the BC did comment three years ago on this, on auction proceeds. And this has been an issue where we presented principles to govern the process. But now we have much more specific initial report elements that we need to respond to.

So we want a volunteer, hopefully from those of you that have been focusing this closely to draft the BC comment on that initial report. So all we need

today is a volunteer and we have four weeks to work on it. Tola, hand up. I love it. Tola is volunteering and I'm sure that Marilyn will work on this as a representative as well.

And Waudo is not in the room. Who else is interested in the auction proceeds procedure? Marilyn, go ahead.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you. Marilyn Cade. I'm very happy to work with Tola on it. I will push pretty hard to ask for some of the rest of you to consider working with us on it because the level of complexity of the comments I think is really important. And I will also need to be coordinating.

I would really hope that the IPC, and I believe they will because both Brian Scarpelli and also Anne is very interested in the issue. I would hope that the ISPs also will submit different comments. But if you haven't previously worked on submitting comments, this might be a good way to get at least the soles of your shoes wet.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Marilyn. We are always looking for BC comments that don't require tremendous amount of institutional history or the mastery of acronyms, since those create opportunities for brand new entrants to get engaged, putting up a comment.

And on this one, you have plenty of help because Marilyn knows this so well, and you have a set of principles that the BC approved as I said three years ago, to sort of give you a sense as to what the BC thinks about this. So don't let this opportunity pass.

It's a great option for a new entrant to the BC to get engaged in the comment process. And I don't think you'll find it particularly daunting. And I find another hand. Okay, we'll come back to that later then.

Number four is also due the 27th of November, and this is the final report on

the Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review Team, which is a bylaws mandated review of the last round of expansion of the new GTLDs.

And this review team, which has taken two years to do its work, has a final report now. And we did comment back in January this year on their initial draft report. All we want to do is to see whether the comments that we've made in January, as well as the comments that others have made, have caused the report to change in a way that we should do another comment.

This one should be relatively easy. On the last to comment, it was Marie. Thank you for helping. Myself, Denise, Michelle worked on it and Chris Wilson from Amazon. We don't want to always rely on the same people to do the work.

So who is interested in helping to comment on that report? Mark Datysgeld. Thank you, Mark. Anyone else? Mark, Stephanie, great. Any others? Thank you very much. The final one is the SSAC review, which is an organizational review required by the ICANN bylaws, done by an outside party.

It's required and we need a volunteer to draft a BC comment. Ideally, it would be a BC member who is very intimate with the way the SSAC, the Security Stability Advisory Committee works.

Marilyn Cade: And may I nominate Scott? He's not here.

Steve DelBianco: You've just been volunteered, Scott. Are you in?

Scott McCormick: Sure.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Scott. Much appreciated. The currently open public comment period, I always have a section in the policy calendar now on what's going on

with modifying WHOIS to comply with GDPR. And I believe that we've covered this exhaustively between the CSG and the BC closed. I want to skip that and mention that the Privacy Proxy Implementation Review Team is on hold.

And I'd like our councilors, which are currently Marie Pattullo and Susan Kawaguchi, and then Susan is term limited. So after this meeting, Susan will step down from council and Scott McCormick, who is right over here on this side, will be our next councilor as elected.

So I will turn over channel two of the policy calendar for the three of you to handle it jointly. Educate us about what we'll see when council meets tomorrow in public, and we can watch them go through their - this debate and discussion and motions.

And then council will meet again when they see the brand new councilors, and that's where the selection of the council's chair will happen. So Susan, Scott and Marie.

Susan Kawaguchi: So this is Susan Kawaguchi for the record. We're going to start with the issue of the IGO, INGO (unintelligible) PDP motion. We discussed that a little bit in the closed session this morning. Things are evolving with the other stakeholder groups and contracted party house, and it looks like there may be a consensus to withdraw the motion to allow the communities more time to make a decision on the final report and what steps to move forward.

What we discussed this morning was there's five recommendations that all are against GAC advice, but, you know, were the GNSO. We're not here to do the bidding of the GAC, or we should listen to the GAC, but - and in the PDP, they provided lots of input in this PDP at times.

So but the - we discussed this morning about taking - approving four of the recommendations and the fifth we would not approve and hopefully be able to

find a mechanism to send that over to RPM working group, because it's basically made an amendment to the UDRP.

Now, looks like the IPC and maybe this in the registry, which we'll want to withdraw. So we might want to support that process.

Steve DelBianco: Question. Best to withdraw the motion?

Susan Kawaguchi: Withdraw the motion.

Steve DelBianco: The controversy in question, recommendation five, we don't have to get into the details right now, but the ideas that are floating around are not ideas that we've taken a formal position on before. But in the fleeting moments tomorrow, our councilors will be forced to make a decision.

I believe that Susan had an approach we've discussed before that we want you try to accommodate the apparent problem that recommendation five creates. And we ought to be creative about doing that. So the BC doesn't have to approve a method. It just has to decide, where do we go to have work - further work done on that?

Susan Kawaguchi: Correct. And we do have a council - a closed council, somewhat closed council meeting tonight just to discuss the motion. So this will continue to evolve. And so we may get back to the BC via email tonight with actually a plan.

Steve DelBianco: Can our council elect attend that?

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: And we've just updated our email list at the BC to reflect Scott's new email address. He's chief technology officer for Hacker One, Hackerone.com. A lot of you have heard of that company.

Scott McCormick: Security compliance. I run compliance with the company, not CTO, for CSO.

Steve DelBianco: It's only a matter of time. So the idea is we - Scott hasn't been getting all of the appropriate emails. I think we've remedied that this afternoon. Can you be there tonight for the council dinner?

Scott McCormick: Yes. On my schedule.

Marilyn Cade: I'd like to ask a question. Marilyn Cade speaking. It's sort of a political strategy question. Susan, I do not disagree at all with, this is the GNSO. We do not have to always agree with the GAC. But we are in an interesting situation it seems to me where in another very important area, that is the area of the GDRP and WHOIS, we are getting - we're going to get the - perhaps the wind beneath our wings from some of the support from the SSAC and the GAC.

If the motion were withdrawn and the proposal came from the IPC and the registries and we just accepted the withdrawal, would that be in our interest politically with the GAC?

Susan Kawaguchi: Susan for the record. So yes, we would - so Donna of the registry takeover group, brought the motion to the GNSO council. So she would have to step up and say, I'm withdrawing this motion and we would follow along and agree. And I do apologize for making such a strident comment about the GAC. That's not really what I meant.

It's just that you have to take everything into account, not just GAC advice when you're looking at the final report and recommendations, because this is GNSO policy development, so.

Steve DelBianco: Susan and Marie and Scott, I also put on the BC policy calendar item six on your agenda tomorrow, which is a motion to terminate the next generation of

WHOIS, the next generation registration directory service PDP. So could you comment on that motion? Is that still on the table and what are your thoughts on that?

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes, and I was a vice chair of that PDP for quite a while. Stepped off and then stepped back on to ...

Steve DelBianco: Rescue it.

Susan Kawaguchi: No, not to rescue it by any means, but to - (unintelligible) needed to retire. So I ended up being co-chair with Marc Anderson of VeriSign. And it became very clear, once the discussions of the EPDP being created, that we - you know, this was a duplicate - yes, there's probably going to need to be another PDP to develop policy surrounding things that the EPDP didn't cover fully, but it would require such a charter change that let's just start over with a new PDP and a new charter.

As some of you may know that RDS PDP came from a long - it was a board initiated PDP. It came with specific tasks. And the EWG report was part of that charter. And so as a co-chair and being deeply involved in this process for a long time, I think it's time to terminate, wait till we figure out what the EPDP covers completely, and then the GNSO most likely will be tasked with creating or drafting a new charter for a similar PDP.

So that's not on these policy - I just say policy project list. So that's not something we're voting on tomorrow, but just to let everybody know, proxy privacy was PDP and there was - the report was accepted, the recommendation to create the policy and implement that.

It seems to me that staff has decided we were not going to implement that. We're going to hold off till after the EPDP because there was, in their minds, too many GDPR implications. And - but when that was brought to our

attention on Sunday, they did say that we could send emails saying, reasons to continue that implementation.

So personally I feel like we should move forward. There's a lot of critical reasons for having accreditations for the proxy privacy providers. We can make sure that those adhere to GDPR, the process. But I think we need to not step back. We had too many PDPs stall or not go to policy.

Steve DelBianco: Right. The BC I believe fully supports the idea of continuing that. Over 30% of the generic top level domain registrations use privacy and proxy today prior to GDPR. And even after we implement our unified access model, you realize there still could be privacy and proxy registrations.

So the accreditation of those, who are responsible to relay and respond is still going to be relevant. I'm just amazed that it would be put on hold or consider stopping the implementation, unless it's solely for the reason of staff and volunteer burnout. I could see that, but there's not a policy reason to suspend implementation. What is the reason given?

Susan Kawaguchi: It wasn't very clear. This is Susan for the record. This - it was not very clear. I have heard some discussion from the contracted party house that A, it's too expensive to do. That has been one of the roadblocks in the implementation. And that it's unclear how useful it will be once GDPR writes.

So my view opposes that completely. And I also think - I haven't looked into this yet, but we need as a - the GSO needs to look to see, what rights do we have to say no? We said implement. We mean implement. And if it's a GNSO vote to do that, then we know where we stand.

But simply having staff, what they've done in my opinion, is slow rolled this for the last six to nine months and now it's just stopping. But we can put - exert pressure and move forward. And anecdotally, don't have statistics to rely on, but I think that number is going up drastically from 30% because I am seeing

that registrars - some registrars, it appears they may have to comply with GDPR, flipped all of their registrations to proxy, their proxy registration.

Steve DelBianco: Which they're allowed to do.

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: But it's certainly not keeping in the spirit of WHOIS.

Susan Kawaguchi: Right.

Steve DelBianco: Any other questions for Susan and Marie. Next item on the agenda is the expedited PDP on the temporary specification. We've discussed this a lot, but I did want to stop and make sure that you all knew and thanked our representatives on there.

Mark Svancarek over here, raise your hand. Margie Milam is our other representative on the PDP, and I'm your alternate. I've been attending all the calls and trying to find a way to fill in if Margie or Mark are not available. Are there any questions for Mark or I on the EPDP? Okay, great. Jimson, go ahead.

Jimson Olufuye: Yes. Jimson speaking. Based on your assessment and the way the work is progressing, we made that target of the cup for the EPDP to finish his work?

Steve DelBianco: It has to finish its work because the temporary spec expires. The only question is, what is the scope of what the policy will do? There are some modest versions of policy that we discussed in the closed meeting. There's aggressive versions such as requiring a differentiation between legal and natural in Europe and otherwise.

So the spectrum of what can get approved is also the constraint of the time it will take to get it done. So it's very difficult for me to assess what will be

accomplished, but I can feel fairly confident that we'll deliver an initial report. It will get comments and there'll be a final report and then we'll go to council for votes. And that will happen by March, with an implementation set for the end of the - end of May. I think we'll stick to the timeline is my view.
Stephanie?

Jimson Olufuye: Sorry. Start training the public comments for the WHOIS?

Steve DelBianco: That's right. Yes. That timeline was explained in the high interest topic session yesterday. It's very aggressive and compressed, but there's nothing like a deadline to focus your mind on having to compromise and get something out the door. Stephanie?

Stephanie Duchesneau: Yes. Sort of in the same boat, but having my jaw on the floor after hearing that the initial report was expected out in 16 days. For the folks who have been participating directly, like do you have a sense of whether that's feasible and what's happening between now and then to move from where we stand now to something that isn't going to be in a position for public comments? So are those comments going to be very open ended or do we expect a concrete proposal by then?

Mark Svancarek: Mark for the record. I do think that we can achieve those dates. There will be caveats in this. There will be certain areas that are called out as - there was, you know, lack of consensus on this issue. One side said one thing. One side said another. I don't think there's going to be too many of those. So I think it'll be a valuable report, and I think it will be basically on time.

Claudia Selli: Okay, thank you. We have our next guest here. Cyrus, thank you very much for being with us today. And yes, I will leave the floor to you for some comments. And then if you're happy to take some questions, I'm sure that members will have a lot of questions for you.

Cyrus Namazi: Thank you very much and thank you for the opportunity for me to be here. Always available to help answer any questions. I don't really have much of anything in terms of opening remarks. I know our time is limited. So perhaps to make it more interactive, I'll pause and wait for any questions that you may have that I may be able to help to answer for you.

Claudia Selli: So I'll take a cue from members.

Steve DelBianco: I'll give you one question to start. How was your role changing in the anticipation of Akram's departure?

Cyrus Namazi: Well, that's a good question. So just prior to coming to Barcelona, as you likely know, Akram left the organization. I had one of my senior directors who ran our registry services team also leaving the ICANN organization. So there's been quite a bit of vacancy, many big shoes to fill.

So for all practical purposes today, I'll be acting in Akram's stead as the head of GDD. The only other change is that the operations of the IANA functions, which was on the GDD, at the moment has been transition to David Conrad, who is the ICANN CTO. And as you might know, he used to actually run the IANA function many years ago.

So I'll be wearing for the time being I guess three hats, that of Akram, that of our registrar services team, and that of my old hat until the dust settles. And like I said, we really haven't had a chance to sit back and review how the organization should be set up.

Göran needs to get his arms around what he wants to do with GDD and role that's left vacant because of Akram's departure. But I'm hoping and in fact I'm quite confident, we have a very strong team in GDD as you like to know. And the real work is actually done by these individuals and they're all committed and fully on board.

Steve DelBianco: Cyrus, we have many new members of the BC who may not even know what GDD is. If you could explain GDD and the scope of responsibilities, particularly how they interact with compliance.

Cyrus Namazi: Yes, I'll be happy to. So GDD is the unit of ICANN organization that actually helps define policies and services, implements them and operates them and maintain them essentially from cradle to grave. If you look at the sort of the life cycle of policies that come through the multi-stakeholder bottoms up process, our policy team under David Olive, actually helps sort of manage the - support the policy making machine, the GNSO for the most part.

Once that proposed policy sort of clears the GNSO and the board, then the board actually directs it to the organization to implement. And that's when it comes to GDD, and then we work with an IRT that we form to help define the exact language of the policy. And then we have an operations team that then implements it and puts it into practice essentially.

There are other functions that we're involved with. The managing our relationship with our contracted parties is a big part of what GDD does, as well as owning the contracts that we have, our contract with our contracted parties. The registry agreement, the register accreditation agreement, RAADs are all owned and managed by our department.

The other function that you may have known about was actually the implementation of the new GTLD program back in 2013 when we finally began actually processing applications and doing the delegation. All of this is done in GDD.

GDD or Global Domains Division is roughly 25% of all of ICANN in terms of personnel. I think we're at about 89 if I'm not mistaken. And to your question, Steve, about the role between us and the compliance team. I'll actually borrow a phrase from my predecessor, Akram.

GDD is really the compliance department because a big part of what we do is provide training and education for all of our contracted parties to stay in compliance with their contract. And then when they are out of compliance is when the compliance team then really goes after them and investigates them.

So another part of what we do is really providing relationship management with our contracted parties to help us better understand their needs, their requirements, their challenges and vice versa. And throughout this engagement, like I said, we provide quite a bit of training.

Obviously there's a lot of newcomers, relative newcomers in this space, both on the registrar side and registry side. And this type of training helps them understand their obligations under their contracts, and also provides them a conduit into the organization in terms of having questions or issues that we can help them resolve before they actually sort of run afoul of our compliance department.

Steve DelBianco: You know, you said cradle to grave with respect to GNSO policy implementation. And I realize that the next generation directory services is headed to the grave, early grave, but we're concerned. We just discussed before you walked in this notion on moving ahead with the Privacy Proxy Service Accreditation Implementation Project.

And we were actually expressing the BC's view that it's still important to accredit the privacy proxy service providers, because a third of the new GTLD registrations have privacy proxy. And that number has probably gone up significantly since the implementation of GDPR and will persist even for a unified access model.

Some of those registrations will be privacy proxy. So you can well imagine that we're troubled by the suspension. Maybe not an early grave, but the suspension of the privacy proxy services implementation. Could you walk us

through the why that's been suspended, and explain what do you think will happen next?

Cyrus Namazi: Thank you, Steve. Yes, I'd be happy to. I wouldn't quite call it suspended, but I think this was really facing the music, if I can use that phrase, in terms of the level of uncertainty that the May 25 enforcement date GDPR has introduced into the process.

We spent a tremendous amount of money, resources and energy on all things registration data. I had my team actually do an investigation and report basically of all the things that we do that have to do with registration data services.

And there are 13 services or policies that are in different stages of their life basically. Privacy proxy that you mentioned is in the stage of life that is in IRT, essentially the policies being defined, getting ready for implementation. We have state WHOIS that actually has cleared the IRT, but has been sort of stopped because of issues related between the registry operator for common net and the registrars and their agreement that's between them.

And then, you know, obviously a dozen other issues. And we're coming to a realization that the uncertainty in terms of interpreting the impact of GDPR in various levels and at different angles related to the type of work that we do with the PII, the Personally Identifiable Information, has really made it prudent for us to take a step back and instead of putting our heads down and sort of looking at the tree, take a step back and look at the forest and see, are we spending our time, energy, resources wisely?

Is there an expectation that sometime in the near future things will be so different that we probably will be forced to go back and actually redo some of the things that he will be doing in the meanwhile?

And I think the conclusion is that A, yes, there is a good likelihood that, you

know, the world of registration data services is going to be different May of next year and beyond. And B, the uncertainty around interpretation of some of the components of these services, and I think I mentioned that to you, Steve, and Vicky and others this morning in your engagement with the board.

The components of it, it actually assessed their privacy proxy services that are really in the stage that we decided we were not comfortable to move forward with them. Now, this doesn't mean that we're stopping this, you know. Vicky asked me, are you going to the European Data Protection Board to get clarification on this?

Not only on this, but on many other areas that have to do with the interpretation of GDPR we're engaged with them. And obviously those of you who've been tracking that, we've been very upfront and transparent about all of those engagements. It's moving slow.

The Data Protection Board is not very forthcoming with their sort of interpretation. Everyone understands that. So I didn't want us, us meaning the org and the IRT and subsequently the community that will be asked to provide public comment on the proposed policy language, to really spend much more time based on the uncertain sort of language that we would end up with if we maintained course. So this is really a frank sort of disclosure of where my head is at and where Göran's head is at in this regard.

Barbara Wanner: Okay. This is a question from someone who is admittedly not very technical in terms of understanding how the registries work, but we saw a demo the other day of how the RDAP system would work. And it seems that it will not be that difficult or - I don't know if that's the right description, but it could easily be adapted to provide that sort of tiered access for a unified access model.

So I'm wondering, do you have any sense for how ready and willing and able

the other registries and registrars are to implement - embrace the RDAP? I know VeriSign is far and away ahead of the game, but how about the others?

Cyrus Namazi: Thank you, Barbara. This is a very good question. In fact, the implementation of RDAP is also something that is within the realms of GDD's remit. So to be able to essentially get to that utopia that you described, which is, you know, having the registries data services transitioned to RDAP, and then having a system in place by which legitimate access can be accommodated, requires several steps.

So the first step is actually implementing RDAP. RDAP is sort of the foundation and the platform on top of which a system can be made to provide legitimate access accreditation. So right now, we're on - in sort of step one of this whole process.

So we've worked with the volunteer group of registries and registrars following the board's direction based on the temporary specification, to define what's called the profile for RDAP. And in fact, Mark here I think is an active member of that group, and Stephanie as well, and probably others that I'm not looking at.

So that - in fact the public comment process for the RDAP profile, which is a necessary sort of technical component for that is close. Now, we're going through sort of interpreting and analyzing the comments. There are some - there were some gaps actually between us and the drafting team, us meaning the org, in terms of what we think is the minimum necessary requirements. So we're working through all of that.

There's also a certain number of service level agreements and reporting requirements for RDAP, which is also being worked on, with a sort of a similar drafting team. We're hoping to sort of close the gaps there and be able to post that for public comment.

All of this will lead to a package for RDAP that I hope will be ready sometime - maybe I'm being a bit too optimistic, before the end of the calendar year. And the next step from that is that ICANN then issues a legal notice to all of our contracted parties to implement RDAP based on those profiles and SLA and reporting requirements within 135 days.

The 135 days is actually sort of the length of time that's in the registry contract and RAA. So if all of these things go as planned and we don't get derailed by some unforeseen situation which actually happens to be common based on my experience of six years at ICANN, sometime I think in the middle part of 2019, this platform will be in place.

Now, the second component that's necessary to achieve the system that Barbara was describing is actually putting together an architecture and a system on top of this platform that will provide the tiered access. So that also is not a trivial undertaking and - right.

It's something that is going to take architecture system development. There's probably going to be APIs that the contracted parties have to implement to be able to speak into this system. As you know, Göran has been advocating this centralized model that will have quite a bit of impact, right, quite a bit of impact on the architecture of it and, you know, the time that it takes to implement and all of that.

And then on top of that, the rules of accreditation can be programmed into this. So there's all these steps. They don't have to be done necessarily in purely serial fashion. I hope to be able to actually leverage sort of more of a parallel process so that we can shorten the time that it takes to get to the system.

But from my perspective, the key missing piece at the moment is the rules of accreditation, which is something the EPDP has put in their charter, that once

they actually get their policy done - the work done, then they'll be working on that. So, you know, and that one is not even going to be done on an expedited sort of PDP process.

So these are - this is an area that I think the community, considering how important it is for us to get to this sort of finished system, can really help perhaps energize the team to continue at the same pace and come to resolution and come to form.

And even once that policy development is done, the implementation of it also takes some time. So you can - you know, if you do a back of the envelope calculation, you're looking at years before we have this done.

The good thing about being down this path, which I wish we had gotten down two, three years ago, we would have RDAP done and a whole bunch of other things, is that we can finally sort of move towards closing off port 43, which is a very arcane process. And in fact frankly, part of the reason that I have 13 active projects within GDD...

Claudia Selli: Okay. Thank you, everybody, for being here today to the...

Cyrus Namazi: ...spend quite a bit of energy and resources on a service that was defined 20 plus years ago and we have band aids here and band aids there and all of that. And there is many other benefits in RDAP that I'm sure you know or Mark and others can speak to that. So it's a very long answer to a short question. Hopefully that's helpful.

Claudia Selli: Yes, Denise.

Denise Michel: Hi, thank you. I'm wondering if you could give us an update on cross field validation? As you know that was in the 2013 RAA and it's been five years of work. I assume, and we actually haven't seen the results of that. And so I'd

appreciate a status and then also your thoughts on how it'll be implemented given the current state. Thanks.

Cyrus Namazi: Thanks, Denise. Another good question. So cross field validation for those of you who are not very familiar with it, is a component of the 2013 RAA that actually based on certain criteria and mutual agreement by ICANN Organization and the Registrar Stakeholder Group, will then require them to actually do certain validations of a registrant's information, personal information like address in the city and whether - the city they put in their address exists and, you know, the street exists, something to that affect.

So we've been involved in discussions with registrars, as Denise mentioned, for almost five years. And progress has been, admittedly, very slow. This is not a trivial undertaking to actually run a global system with all the right attributes in terms of accuracy and response time to queries and that sort of a thing, and then the cost of it. So we've actually, in the past year or so we've driven this forward to a point that we issued an RFP to provide us with information on what types of systems are available, what are the sort of criteria in terms of their performance, getting an idea about the cost of running such a system.

And this is the stage that we're at at the moment. We've been involved with registrars to actually define now what are the common requirements for such a system to make it technically and commercial feasible, which is actually the language that's in the RAA. And in that part of it we've been stuck a little bit. And unfortunately because of Jennifer Gore's departure from ICANN, we were hoping to be advancing that conversation here in Barcelona but because of her departure it's sort of delays that a little bit.

We're also hearing arguments from the registrar side that, you know, there may be impact of, you guessed it, GDPR in this as well because they'll be sending, you know, somebody's personally identifiable information to some third party that may not be in Europe and they'll send it to some server in

some other place. So all of these things - this is actually another one of those 13 services that I was telling you, that has a GDPR angle in it.

I don't know where we're going to go with this. I plan to have a discussion with the registrars. I don't find them to be that motivated to some extent because they're overloaded just dealing with all things related to GDPR that's impacting them. And maybe this is another one of those that we need to come to terms with and decide that, well, let's hold off and see how the world is going to look come May of 2019 when the EPDP is done. But we haven't made that determination yet.

Denise Michel: Could I have a quick follow? If you could just explain a little bit further the - so the cross field validation is a fairly simple procedure that pretty much every company that does business on the Internet does today. And we continue to do it while implementing GDPR. Do you feel like the registrars need help from companies that are doing this successfully? And I guess in line with that, what's your plan if the registrars in question simply don't want to implement it? How - what do you see as your responsibility to fulfill this long outstanding obligation? Thanks.

Cyrus Namazi: Thank you, Denise. Obviously yes, there are a number of companies that actually provide this sort of a service both as a service to be sold, these are the ones that we reached out to, as well as companies like Fed-Ex and UPS when you actually go fill in online for, you know, a label they immediately check it and come back and actually correct what you put in there.

Part of the challenge with this system that we're looking at is that it needs to be truly global and we have not managed really to identify a provider that has an acceptable level of accuracy in their database. We haven't even defined what acceptable is. But you can imagine that registrars would not likely sign up to a system that, say, has 10% error rate when they're signing up a registrant and trying to sort of close that and enable their domain name and

things like that. But I think there are ways to get around that, frankly, I don't think it needs to be done immediately.

I'm hoping once I actually have a replacement for Jennifer Gore, and we resurrect these discussions, maybe we can come count on you, frankly, to come help us with some of these - if you know of experienced providers or if you in your organization your company you have experience with it you can help us with it. At the end of the day, as I mentioned earlier, the language of the RAA is quite clear; both ICANN Org and the Registrar Stakeholder Group have to approve whatever this thing ends up being.

And if they don't approve it then I would probably call that an impasse and we have an impasse process how that, you know, under Göran we put in place. Well I'll have to take it to my Board to see what direction they'd like to give me.

Stephanie Duchesneau: This is Stephanie Duchesneau. I have a quick follow up on Denise's question also. With respect to the legality of this approach of using a third party provider for cross field validation. Has ICANN specifically looked into that? I know this is going in a million different directions right now so it's possible you haven't. But has ICANN looked into that? And if so, what is the posture?

Cyrus Namazi: Yes, thank you, Stephanie. We've looked into it but we haven't really reached a sort of definitive conclusion on it again, because of all the uncertainty that exists. And sometimes, frankly, we even reach a conclusion and then, you know, the contracted parties have their own conclusion, you're well aware of some of these sort of mismatches and things like that. Not a good answer to your question but, no, we really don't have a good handle on that at the moment.

Claudia Selli: Okay, well if there are no other questions from the members, I would like to thank you very much for your intervention and for engaging with us and look forward to the next occasion that we might have.

Cyrus Namazi: Thank you all very much for your time.

Claudia Selli: So in theory we should have a break but I wanted to ask you if - what would you prefer, would you prefer to have a 10-minute break now shall we continue the discussion and then maybe finish a bit earlier? Yes?

Claudia Selli: Okay perfect then, Andrea, let's go for it if you can warn the transcript that we're going to continue. And I think Barbara, it's up...

Claudia Selli: ...10:03, yes.

Barbara Wanner: Okay, thank you. Thank you very much. I just have two brief items to share with the group. As I said this morning at our closed meeting, I was approached by a few members of the ISPCP who expressed keen interest in convening regular teleconferences with other members of the CSG to enable our respective participants in the EPDP to share information about what was going on in the EPDP and really just to enable better coordination and information-sharing.

That received a positive response from BC members at the closed meeting so we'll take that forward and prevail upon Chantelle to set up an Adobe chat on occasions. I'm thinking it would probably be, what, about once a month, is that too soon, once every six weeks? Margie, what do you think? Is Mark still here?

Margie Milam: Yes, that seems fine.

Barbara Wanner: Once a month?

Margie Milam: Yes, yes.

Barbara Wanner: Yes, okay great. And then the second item that we've talked about ad nauseum, in my view, but has to do with our vote for the new chair of the GNSO Council. And again, we spoke about this at some length at this morning's closed meeting. I believe there is a preference within the BC to just be very transparent about our intentions and to instruct our councilors to vote for our preferred choice for the GNSO Council Chair, Keith Drazek, in both rounds. Did I get that right? Does anybody have a concern about proceeding in that way? Please let us know.

Steve DelBianco: To clarify it would be all rounds because there might even be multiple more than two, so...

Barbara Wanner: Okay.

Steve DelBianco: ...along the lines.

Barbara Wanner: That's it for me.

Steve DelBianco: The mention of Rafik as vice chair, is that part of the plan?

Barbara Wanner: Yes, so then during the Council's meeting I guess it will be tomorrow we'll express interest in having Rafik continue as vice chair as a means of building a bridge or with the NCSG understanding that they're probably counting on the fact that he'll serve as a second term as vice chair as per an earlier agreement that was worked out with them. But, no?

Steve DelBianco: It's baked in and let's take the opportunity when we don't vote for him, to at least indicate we do support him for vice chair; that's the plan.

Claudia Selli: Just one thing I think maybe it would be worth it as well for the councilor to reiterate the fact that we already expressed the support for Keith back in I think it was in Puerto Rico or Panama just to say that we...

Steve DelBianco: I recommend we not say that.

Claudia Selli: Okay.

Steve DelBianco: Because then it seems as if we didn't even consider Rafik.

Claudia Selli: Right.

Steve DelBianco: We did.

Claudia Selli: Okay.

Steve DelBianco: We had an equal amount of time interviewing and if we had become convinced he was the better candidate we could have switched, so I ask you wouldn't bring that up at this point.

Claudia Selli: Sure.

Barbara Wanner: No, I'm done.

Claudia Selli: Andrea, can we have the calendar for the agenda up? I think that now we have the outreach strategy if I'm not mistaken but I don't remember now by heart. Okay perfect. So I think it's over now to Mark. Mark? Yes? No? It's to you? Okay, sorry, Mark, it's - you are after, it's Jimson.

Jimson Olufuye: Thank you very much. Before Mark comes in. This is Jimson. From finance and operation, first on operations, we are fully aware that the timeline for the officer's election has been communicated so we're ready on the nomination period starting yesterday and to end November 5. And that is for officer's

election for the chair, the two vice chair and the CSG. So if you desire to nominate anyone please consult and then we can send the message to - nominate the person on the list.

Please review the timeline on the list, maybe for the benefit of our new members, Chantelle could just send this timeline again to the list. We have some new members that are joining. Nearly after the officer's elections we will have the committee elections. We have two committees that this applies to, the Credentials Committee and the Outreach Committee. By virtue of our charter, so every year there has to be an election for chair in these committees so we within the group so they may decide to re-elect the current chair but for a maximum of three terms.

And on membership, I would like to recognize that we have new members with us joining, and we're happy to have our first member from Ghana, Secure Reach Consult of Ghana, that's (Roger), you're welcome. And also we have new member Handy Network, Handy Network's LLC (USC), represented by Jay Sudowski is not here now. And of course we know Scott, Scott is representing HackerOne is a new member. But of course Scott is not new to us. So you're welcome formally.

Okay, now I want to use opportunity to appreciate the Credentials Committee of - that Andrew Mack chairs, they've been doing a lot of work, there are some new members as right now they are considering, working on, so we're expecting to announce new members time goes on.

Members who can recall there was a time we put on the list request for expression of interest for disaster recovery support for our data - online data and finally responded and there was (unintelligible) so it has been completed, I'm happy to let you know that, that if anything happens to bizconst.org our primary website, we have a strong backup with (Check Date), the ExComm has reviewed this.

Then on outreach, yes, the - we had the outreach at AfICTA, the BC was responsible of the section bringing AfICTA from it in Nairobi. This has been a partnership that's been on now for about six years and this year we have a number of our members that spoke, that spoke virtually I want to use opportunity to recognize member that spoke and that's outreach in Nairobi Kenya called (Felli) spoke at that event. We also had Marilyn spoke, Andrew Mack also spoke and Tola - Tola was it, yes, was also around and Waudu actually was also on ground.

So I'm going to pass this materials around so you could take a look at it. The BC contains is right there so that you can see the extent of packaging, BC FAQ sheet, which is right there, those that participated in the events used the opportunity to know more about the BC and we believe that at the end we have more membership coming from there.

I have a message from the organizers and they say that I should give this plaque to the chair of the BC that spoke and the others also. So I would like to invite Claudia Selli for this plaque please. And also Marilyn Cade, please. Sorry about that.

Marilyn Cade: I didn't. I didn't.

Jimson Olufuye: Thank you so much, distinguished speaker award present to Marilyn Cade.

Marilyn Cade: So thanks to all of you for your continued support to AfICTA...

Marilyn Cade: Great way to expand access and awareness.

Jimson Olufuye: Yes, that of Andrew Mack will be given later. Similar outreach we had and meets and greets yesterday reaching out to others, about 65 people in attendance. We have a good number of the Board right there, so I don't know if Marilyn that led the outreach want to say one or two things?

Marilyn Cade: Thank you, Jimson. Creating an outreach event in - here in Barcelona, even with - we had - tried to partner with two Spanish associations, both of whom committed to bring Board members and staff and then were summoned to Madrid. But we were extremely fortunate that we did manage to have several new potential members come and we also, as all of you saw, we had 70% of the Board who attended as well as Göran.

But one of the outcomes was an invitation from Digital Europe to work with us in follow up to do something related to reaching more of their members, Digital Europe has 29 national ICT associations as members. And we also have a request from the - one of the associations that had to - (Amatek) here who had to cancel on us at the last minute, but they would really welcome the opportunity to have a video conference with some of our officers and some of our members to talk about shared interest.

Now the one thing I will say to all of you is if you listened to the speech of the Red.es Director General in the opening ceremony, digitization is the key thing that Spanish associations and Spanish business are focused on. So in the request they made, and I'm looking at Paulo because I know that's also an ongoing interest of your association, but if we're able to devise an agenda for a one or two hour Zoom call we should try to include a segment that is relative to the interest that Spanish business has.

And the overview that you got from David's speech, I can also send around. They have a - kind of a blog that explains in more detail how they intend to cooperate to bring 500 new businesses online and their interest in the BC is really going to be driven by the fact that we have shared interest in the online business world as opposed to it's specific to a particular policy issue.

And I hope we can take them up on that request because I think it is something that we have in common, very interested in security and stability of the online business world; very interested in digitization, the changing world of work and their interest in ICANN is more related to those interests and then

how - what we do at ICANN on policy affects the ability for business to be successful online.

Jimson Olufuye: Thank you very much, Marilyn. Very noted. Still on outreach, ExComm has approved some form of outreach during the IGF 2018 and that is respect to remote hub where we supporting remote hub in Abuja Nigeria where business people can be invited and BC will be introduce and awareness created.

Yesterday, during the outreach that we had here, Marilyn and I got an invite - please or sort of that should be around physical outreach for the French business people in Paris during the IGF. It was communicated to ExComm to see how could take that forward.

Then finally, on ICANN 64, yes, we in communication with some ICT association in Asia so that were able to assist to mobilize businesses in Japan to be available for ICANN 64 where we can then conduct an outreach. Chris Mondini, that's always been available to support us. He pledge his support again towards that. So on this note I will stop; if there is any question. Okay, Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: My question is about Kobe. I - the company I used to work for, the global corporation I used to work for, AT&T, owns three businesses in Japan. And I spent a considerable amount of time subsequently as well working with Japanese companies in trade associations, professional associations. It's extremely difficult to get Japanese businesses to travel outside of Tokyo.

And particularly unless you have the endorsement of the (Kadonren), and we can develop contacts there fairly easily, but unless you have the endorsement of the (Kadonren) or the Japanese government as host extends the invitation to the Japanese companies, companies like Fujitsu, the bigger companies, it's very unlikely that they will even - they will travel to Kobe, just time wise. And I think Chris is aware of that and has been discussing that.

Claudia Selli: Can I just jump in? It's Claudia for the record. We have arranged a meeting with Jia-Rong based on Japan tomorrow at 10:15. I have sent this around to members if anyone wants to - would like to come along, and I think I just received the answer from Mark. So the idea is really to discuss how to best develop our engagement there. So we will start the discussion and we will report back to the members of course and see what is the best way, but we're starting ahead of time in order to see what we need to do and what we need to mobilize as well. I think we have a lot of companies who have as well businesses there or contacts so we can certainly use those.

Jimson Olufuye: Very good. Any other question, comment? Okay, so in the absence of anyone I will turn it to Claudia or Mark, right?

Claudia Selli: Yes, thank you, Jimson. Yes, there are slides so if you'd like to present your study, Andrea, if you could put the slide on? Thank you.

Mark Datysgeld: Good evening everyone. So in continuation to the presentation we made back in Panama, I'm giving the (presentation) on behalf of the three consultants involved in this research, that's me, Mark Datysgeld, plus Andrew Mack and Gabriella Szlak; Gabriella is from Argentina; Andrew currently based in Washington.

So just a refresher, we are trying to understand the low participation of Latin American businesses in - within ICANN and particularly within the BC. In this case we made a little bit of a progress in terms of defining what exactly are we supported to be looking for, what are our key drivers.

And what we have come to is that first we are going to identify the issue and constraints, then see what are the viable approaches for these actors instead of approaching them in a generic manner what fits them better based on their experience and then see what participation models we could come up with

that would help their engagement, that would help them stay after the pitch. So that would result in an increased participation.

So there are different parts to the study. It's not something that can be synthesized in a very monolithic way; there are different moving parts of it. So there is already some data available from ICANN and some data that we have been asking for them. And some of it is stuck behind the (ODI), it's not yet released; we are hoping that until it's done maybe some of it can come out but whatever is available we are already using.

We also performed a study of the top 100 websites of each of the Latin American countries, but in the sense not the top ones that are accessed, the top local websites which are the ones who in theory are the most exposed to DNS abuse and any kind of other matter that would be of concern within ICANN. This is just to get a feeling out of what is hot in the region, quote unquote, what are the websites that are potentially members, not in a generalistic sense, but the ones that are really dependent on the DNS.

On top of that, semi-structured interviews are being performed with some of these identified actors and other relevant ones in the sense that we want to get a clear idea of whether they have been approached by an Internet governance body, how do they react, did they have a structure that is able to handle a participation in a (modern) environment and so on. After all that is done, we intend to engage directly with the ExComm with a report and then in Kobe present the final version of the report for the entire constituency with the recommendations.

So quickly looking at this, we can see that the ALAC region is that thin, very thin slice in the bottom. We saw recently a very significant growth of the African participation in the region and we are having a look at that as in how did that take place. But in terms of Latin America we are looking at it as a separate case.

We did list some data from the onboarding program that was carried out earlier and refined it a little bit so the Fellowship Program could be a way in for actors, however that's very thin, 2% slice in the second graph, is the amount of actual LAC business people that come in through the Fellowship Program, so that's a very small pool of people coming through and that is part of the theory that we have that these people are being filtered which I will explain a little bit later right here.

Sorry, this is the most content-heavy slide but it's actually the constraints that we have been identifying so far in our interviews and within the data sets which is first and foremost, there is no awareness. ICANN doesn't engage directly in the region with most of the - even trade associations, even - I'm not talking on a micro level, even at a macro level, there's a very hard time in terms of engagement; they don't understand what ICANN is, never mind the BC.

But another one that's surfacing very clearly is the issue of language. So out of the data that we have, only have to publish and speaks English, but what is more concerning is that the profile of the kind of business people from Latin America that you would get in the BC is over four years old, that's the profile most leaders. And exactly within that demographic that's where the least amount of people speak English.

So the lack of materials, there is basic engagement material but any more complex engagement is not detailed in Spanish or Portuguese to any considerable degree. So this is a problem that we should be looking at.

The business culture in Latin America is not very geared towards participating in this kind of discussion, it's often felt like the government should be doing the driving instead of the businesses themselves. And some countries is even seen as a little bit of something that's not entirely legal, so there's that.

The (unintelligible) is where I come from the point of the Fellowship, we don't understand yet because we don't have the data if the business people are applying and being rejected or if they are not aware that they have this opportunity. Speaking, you know, this is very broad assumptions that we - now I'm in the field of assumption for this one in particular, from what we have been talking to people, a lot of people get rejected on the basis that their companies could pay for it if they were interested. So we want to have a more serious look at this in case there's a - the data set makes it available in terms of the applications. So there is the matter of the costs as well, which we are very well aware of.

In terms of what is being done, there are interesting things happening in the region in terms of outreach. There's a strategic plan and an implementation committee, however in 2018 due to the many policy problems that we have been having, it has been a little bit on the slow side. But it's looking up. There are opportunities coming in the next year. And whatever decisions we end up arriving could be implemented together with the strategic plan. We could couple any of decisions we make with the general flow of the community, so there's that.

There's also a road show that goes to different countries promoting interaction with businesses, however the data is still not available of how that is - has been going on. ICANN staff does tell us that we will have access to that information eventually so we're looking forward to it.

And some interesting things that started this year, they're doing policy readouts, there's a Latin observatory of DNS data, they're doing direct ccTLD training, webinar for governments and the youth observatory, it's a youth initiative from (unintelligible) has been growing a lot, has also been getting space so there is a lot of activity but at the same time this is not reflecting directly in business engagement.

So when looking at what are the viable approaches, we decided to see talking to them directly what kind of approaches have been working for them in terms of the other bodies they take part of, of what are the associations they're taking part in, what are the other initiatives that they're members of. And roughly these are four examples of how that works.

So first would be the BC as a sort of VIP, very, quote unquote club, it's, you know, it promotes high level networking, it builds contacts and potential partnerships outside of the region that would be a way of selling, quote unquote, the BC to them. Yes? Please go on, Steve.

Steve DelBianco: Hey, Mark, thank you. The expectation was a quick overview because this is preliminary.

Mark Datysgeld: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: Your file report doesn't even show up until Kobe. This is an interim because we had a late start. What I would recommend is just give us a preview...

Mark Datysgeld: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: To go into this detail would exceed the expectation of a five-minute presentation and five minutes of Q&A. And you're revealing all the great things that are going to be in the final report.

Mark Datysgeld: I was afraid of underselling this as an investment of the BC and I don't want to seem like we are being not trying our best to do - to go that extra mile. I just don't want it to be seen that are not really trying to dig deep into the interviews and so on. But I will try to be briefer, Steve. Thank you for the reminder.

We are identifying different ways in which we think they are already doing the participation how we feel we could try to sell that better. So as far as the

participation models go, initially three ideas. One would be reaching out to the trademark associations directly; that is how - what the actual LAC staff has been suggesting to us. Instead of going to the actors individually, just go for the trade associations. There are limitations to that and we do think that, you know, this is something that can be worked up better.

The other based on the top websites that we have been observing we do notice there are specific groups such as news associations, banks and financial associations that do show up as very active and could have a place in our presentation, it's just a matter of seeking out how to better bundle them. And this Model C is promoting potentially instead of us seeking directly promoting local ambassadors who could themselves by support from the BC seek out in their region who they feel are, and so instead of us guessing we could have people doing that for us.

So as far as the actions are concerned, some very preliminary actions that relate to that, well, to be very summarized about it, the materials would have to be worked on. We do have Latin members of the Communication team and there is a strategic plan, we could work together with them to do that. We could reach out directly using those vehicles that ICANN already has available. We need to engage with more talk with them because they are making themselves available the only problem is we don't have a clear way of reaching out to them.

So very summarized, sorry for exceeding our time a little bit. Thank you for now and if any questions.

Claudia Selli: Thank you very much, Mark, for the presentation. I just would like - yes, there are questions already so I have in the queue Zahid and then Christian.

Zahid Jamil: I'm happy to see that we are a VIP club or at least perceived to be. What I wanted to ask was you said that you don't have the data yet to see what kind of applicants from business were applying and how they were being treated,

as well as the numbers on it. And I'm sure that you can get specific names, but to that - to the extent of anonymization, or typology have you tried, and what - what stopped the Fellowship Program from giving your or ICANN Org giving you this data?

Mark Datysgeld: I wish I knew. So the ODI data set does include Fellowship applicants but the data set is completely obscured. It's not one of those where we have a portal or some sort to have a look at; it seems obscured. So we have made both under our individual capacity and as the BC a request for that data set to be released and hopefully it will be prioritized, that's at least what we're thinking, because there's no practical reason with anonymization for it not to be released.

Andrew Mack: Zahid, this is Andrew. I just wanted to jump in on that real quickly. I mean, we know that ICANN has a bunch...

Claudia Selli: One second, Andrew, because we cannot hear you. We are trying to have the volume up. One second.

Andrew Mack: No, no worries.

Claudia Selli: Now we should be able to hear you.

Andrew Mack: Okay thanks. I was just saying, you know, Mark and the team have worked very, very hard to try to get as much data as is possible from ICANN. We know two things; we know that they are collecting data on attendees and, you know, a lot of information about the kind of attendees that are coming to the meetings themselves but also they're collecting some data on the kinds of people that they're reaching out to for the road shows and other activities in-region. We want that to be much more robust.

And as part of this exercise one of the things that we're hoping to find is exactly where the gaps are. So both who are they not reaching but also what

data is not - is and is not being calculated and captured because this is one of the things long term if we're spending a ton of money and if they're spending a ton of money to try to do outreach we want to make sure that it's oriented in such a way that it really throws out data that we can use and get better over the course of time.

Claudia Selli: Thank you, Christian, over to you.

Christian Bope: Okay thank you, Mack, for this great job. For - on the statistics, I just want to get clarification, when you say 5% of - for Latin America and for for Africa, have you also considered like the (unintelligible) is only in terms of number participation or is also in terms of contribution?

Mark Datysgeld: So, no, right now we are not looking at volume of contribution; it's memberships only. If you think that's a relevant point I would ask that you please forward it to us in a - doesn't have to be anything too big, just a paragraph describing what is the rationale and we would be very welcome to include it if it's a data point that you find relevant, please explain to us and more than happy to have a look at it.

Claudia Selli: Any other questions? Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: Thanks. Marilyn Cade. There is a very, very rough analysis that Omar and I did of the Fellowship Program ourselves by hand. And to Zahid's point, up until a certain point the bios of applying Fellows, sorry, the names and titles and affiliation of applying Fellows were published and then those that were approved their bios were published. Having nothing to do with the recent data privacy issues, ICANN stopped doing that. But I did, and then Omar duplicated part of the work and extended it, I did a by-hand analysis of roughly 500 applications by clicking, by looking them up online.

And the bias is not necessarily that people think that business can pay for themselves; the early bias was actually just completely opposed to the

inclusion of business because of an experience where several people came, identifying themselves as business and they were actually using the Fellowship Program to approach our BC members to apply for jobs and to ask to be hired. And so we had a very difficult experience.

But the other issue has been that up until now there has not been a single reviewer of the - throughout the entire life of the Fellowship Program that comes from the Business Constituency.

Mark Datysgeld: To complement Marilyn's point, I think there won't be other because in the new process the entire GNSO gets one reviewer and that's the entire GNSO unless there's a big push from the CSG, it's going to end up being somebody from the NCSG again, so the general idea is that, you know, but thank you for the experience, Marilyn. I will make sure to look into that if you want to discuss this further.

I had a look at it and I compared that with the stakeholder group analysis tool, one of the people from ALAC is making it, it's about 700 of the people who we have the data with, the ones that got in. And, you know, 10% are businesses, that's very small in comparison to the potential of the community so there is something going on there. We should be able to find out something about that.

Claudia Selli: Zahid.

Zahid Jamil: So in the NomCom one of the concerns we always had was where is it that we're grooming people to be coming to leadership positions? Sure, for the Board this is not what we want to use, but the Fellowship does have the effect of greater participation and does have the effect of, you know, possible leadership roles in the ALAC, the GNSO and others that the NomCom has to pick from. And we don't have people to pick from if these people haven't gone through this process.

And we're spending a lot of this money and when we're looking for businesses all we're getting is NCSG and ALAC or we're getting governments, we're getting regulators, former regulators or about to be regulators; regulators who have been funded to come to the ICANN meeting. And it just doesn't make any sense to me. So yes, I would say push.

Mark Datysgeld: Just a broader call is anybody feel like they have any influence on the (ODI) on this level we would really like the data set so if anybody feels like they could expedite, help us expedite this.

Claudia Selli: Okay, Mark, I gather that you had an announcement to the BC, is that correct information that I have or...?

Mark Datysgeld: Oh it's small. I just have been attending as a consultant for the past five meetings, getting my bearings that are coming from the NextGen and the Fellowship and I'm submitting my application to become a formal member of the BC and going forward and would be very happy to participate as my own micro-business, so.

Claudia Selli: Thank you. That's great. Happy that you can be on board. If there are no other points that members want to bring up I think the meeting is adjourned. No, Marie, sorry.

Claudia Selli: Yes. Marie please.

Marie Pattullo: Bearing in mind the timing I wasn't going to bother mentioning this earlier but if we've got two minutes, I'd really like to stress how important it is and how happy I am that the BC has given us a mandate to vote for Keith twice, three times, four times, whatever it may be. Purely because there is so much politics, there is so much backstabbing with so much bad feeling right now, part of which you all know about this infamous PDP 3.0 that business has to be seen to be transparent and reliable and stand by what we say we're going to do and do what we said we were going to do.

I mentioned briefly PDP 3.0, which is an awful title but there is an awful lot of issues that - are an awful lot of issues to do with membership behavior throughout the entire community. And this evening I know we're going to be talking about this as well and I didn't realize but now I do that this evening will be recorded so I'm not sure how much can actually be said in that space.

But I would like you all to be aware that when the documents come out - and the document itself is very neutral about incremental changes to the PDP. But we do need to be standing up and responding to this in a very clear, transparent, reliable, business is great way. There are real, real issues here. And if you want to know, I won't tell you in a recorded session, but you all know what I look like, come and find me. Thank you.

Claudia Selli: Thank you, Marie. Yes, Zahid has a question.

Zahid Jamil: Just a quick question. I know - I understand about Keith, that's fine. Apparently we're going to support Rafik as vice chair. Are we getting anything in return? Are we getting anything in return for that?

Marie Pattullo: He's already going to be vice chair, that's already agreed.

Zahid Jamil: So we're just going to - that's - it's...

Zahid Jamil: Okay.

Marie Pattullo: If we did vote for him or didn't vote for him he would - because the process he'd still be vice chair.

Marilyn Cade: Marie, would you - for newer people would you maybe explain the - it's not an automatic, it's we reserved the right to acquiesce again, so it's not - we've acquiesced I think is the point, right?

Steve DelBianco: It isn't acquiescing, we worked, and all of you helped to support a procedure. And under the procedure the vice chair, we alternate between the CSG and NCSG, but their second year if they want to serve a second year is automatic unless we really raised significant concerns to remove them from the ballot. So it - that's a big lift. And I don't see any reason to do that because Rafik is fine as a vice chair.

Claudia Selli: Jimson, did you have anything to - under AOB?

Jimson Olufuye: Yes, under AOB, this is Jimson speaking. Just to remind members that for this election if still anything pending in terms of dues, please expedite the process, otherwise you may not be able to vote, but acknowledging that this point we've attained 84% compliance with membership dues. And I want to thank all members who responded. This for information. Thank you very much.

Claudia Selli: Philippe, you - yes, yes, sorry, Tim.

Tim Smith: Hi, it's Tim Smith; we're on all other business now, are we? Okay, I just had one thing, on the call this morning or in the meeting this morning we were talking about who was going to IGF, and you asked us to share if we were going to be on a panel or doing anything at IGF, so I just wanted to share with you I'm going and this will be my first time and I'm quite looking forward to it and seeing whoever is going to be there.

And the reason we're going is because a year ago my association, which is the Canadian International Pharmacy Association, was invited to be part of a panel at RightsCon, which was in Brussels, at the time, to discuss protocols or access to medicines over the Internet. And from that we developed something, a group developed something called the Brussels Principles on the sale of medicine over the Internet. So and it's based in the right - the human rights to access to medicines. And so we've refined those with a

committee of health researchers who have also done work with the UN and with the World Health Organization, so we're going to IGF to discuss those.

And today we just launched a website called brusselsprinciples.org so I share that with you for information and I invite you to look at the principles. We do accept endorsements of the principles if you choose. And but I would - I welcome any feedback on those. So and we'll be talking about those at IGF. Thank you.

Claudia Selli: Thank you. If there are no other issues to bring up or any other comments I will adjourn the meeting. Yes, the meeting is adjourned. Thank you so much, everybody.

END