

**ICANN Transcription – Abu Dhabi  
GNSO – Commercial and Business Users Constituency (BC) Open Meeting Part 1  
Tuesday, 31 October 2017 15:15 GST**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording. 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.

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

Andrew Mack: Good afternoon everyone. Welcome to Meeting Number 5. This is what they call in football terms injury time. So, good for us.

Thank you all for your contributions during the different meetings that we've had today. It's been a really, really busy day. My name is Andrew Mack, I'm the Chair of the BC. And glad to see you all here.

I'm going to try and keep this simple because we started a little bit late and because I think most everybody knows each other. So if there's anybody who hasn't - who wasn't at one of our earlier meetings today, if you'd like to introduce yourself, raise your hand and please do that.

Steve DelBianco: (Unintelligible) if you're a BC member?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Andrew Mack: If you're a BC member or if you're not a BC member (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Andrew Mack: (Sam) you introduced yourself this morning, yes?

(Sam): I did.

Andrew Mack: Yes, okay. Great. No it's okay. We already - okay. Great. Fantastic.

So then with that out of the way, very efficiently. Steve DelBianco, our Policy Chair take us through the policy calendar please.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks Andrew. This will be relatively efficient compared to our ordinary interactions because I think we have a really limited calendar on policy. And most of the controversial issues we've already covered. So I'll ask staff to please bring up the policy calendar PDF in the Adobe room. If any of you are not in Adobe right now, you can always look at the policy calendar that I circulated yesterday. Look for an email from me in case you want to find it.

Since our last meeting, there were no new public comment period closures. So we can skip directly to channel two, the current ICANN open public comments.

There are currently five open. And of that list, the BC needs to figure out a little bit about assignments. Give me just a moment here. I'm finding it difficult to follow on in the Adobe with the micro-small print, so I'm going back to the original email that I circulated yesterday.

All right. The first one is on draft operating plans and budgets. This isn't due until the 26th of November and we currently have volunteers -- Jimson Olufuye and Jay Sadowski. It's not really the best practice to rely on the same people every time for certain topics. We need to broaden pool of those who are contributing.

So this is again the public technical identifiers, this is what PTI stands for now, and the IANA budget. These are relatively interesting budgets. They're higher than they were a year ago, and we have to follow on to the post-transition bylaws to block these budgets, not just comment on them.

So ideally, the BC's comment would be the basis for our decision as to whether we would step in to try to block a budget. I highly doubt it with these two items, but Jimson and Jay, thank you for volunteering for that. Unless you have something you want to add right now, we'll move on to the next one. Great, thank you.

The second one is we need a rationale and target level comment for ICANNs reserve fund. These comments close at the end of November. And the reserve fund is right now targeted to 12 months of the operating expenses and they are asking comments on their rationale for the existence of a reserve fund. Duh, you need a reserve fund, and for what target level is. And that's a robust discussion.

The first attachment to the policy calendar was a draft that Jimson, (Marilyn) and Jay worked up. And they list three different issues and make specific requests for updates. It's the first attachment to yesterday's policy calendar. Jimson, Jay and (Marilyn), if you wish, you can talk to us a little bit of what's in there, ask for further BC input. Otherwise we'll discuss it on (unintelligible) and in the next BC call. Jimson, anything you want to add on that?

Jimson Olufuye: Thank you, Steve. This is Jimson Olufuye. Well the issue of ICANN reserve fund has been quite hot over time. We've had a lot of questions about the

policy (unintelligible) policy (unintelligible) policy (unintelligible) that the policy is embedded in the investment policy.

So because of the importance of the reserve fund, we - in the comment we are requesting that it should be separate reserve policy, reserve fund policy. The documents provided talked about rationale and (unintelligible) 12 to 17 months provision for reserve.

Currently, there just are five months of operating budget reserve available, so, and that is (poor). So we are recommending that we should take this very seriously in view of the importance of ICANN, having this global internet identifiers, and the importance of this to the internet - to the global internet economy.

We also said perhaps, with regard to the (route) maintenance, there has to be better consideration for reserve for (route) maintenance activities. Currently we do know that the (route) maintenance activity is being taken care of by (unintelligible) agreement suppose something drastic happens. And this is very critical. So we're also looking at 30-month reserve provision with regard to this, to the (cost) duration for (route) maintenance activities.

So, basically we are saying that, since we're having portion policy discussion in the community, the importance of the reserve fund, that perhaps that should be a (first-line charge) for such discussion for reserve fund. Reserve is very important (unintelligible) (DPRP) is coming up, we don't know the situation that will arise. We should be ready to be able to mitigate any (unintelligible) risk that could come afterwards.

So we want a (unintelligible) reserve policy. Also want that there be more provisions for the (route) maintenance activity and that that should be first-line (charge) for reserve fund when it comes to discussion out to (unintelligible) another (funding available). Yes, that's it.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Jimson. Any questions from BC members? Chris Wilson?

Chris Wilson: Thanks, Steve, and thanks, Jimson, for, and Jay, for doing this. And I have no problem with 17 months, but is there a specific reason why we chose 17 months as our - is that (unintelligible) changed from 12 to 17 months, or am I misreading that? Was that ICANN's change?

Yes. So, are we comfortable with the range, I guess, is the question? Or what's...

Jimson Olufuye: Yes. (Dave) provided a rationale (unintelligible) most of known government organization, for-profit organization have that range of 12 months to 17 months. Initially the 12 months. We said, well, that's okay. But because of the (unintelligible) (transition) processes (unintelligible) and what-have-you (unintelligible). So what is available now (unintelligible) about five months, unlike 12 months that was projected. So now, say, that (unintelligible) within 12 to 17 months period. The emphasis is that most of the mechanism in place to effectively replenish, not draw down on the reserve.

Steve DelBianco: Great, thank you. Any other questions on this?

Appreciate it, Jimson, Jay and Marilyn.

The next one up is a comment period, which I call a second-level comment, on IDNs. That's Internationalized Domain Names. These are domain names and scripts other than the Latin script. And we create (here today) an entire structure (and ability) of protocol to use IDN names. And it was part of the - it's always been available at the second level and domain name. For instance, I know there's almost a million IDN names at the second level in (unintelligible). But what we do with the new (GGLD) program was to allow them to exist at the top level.

And I want to (unintelligible) your attention because, remember, some of these scripts other than Latin, when they're rendered on a screen, sometimes look like Latin. There's (unintelligible) script characters that look just like the O in Latin. So, C-O-M (unintelligible) not really be com; it could be disguised domain names. And to those extent, the extent to which a lot of you here are with companies, that want to protect your customers and users from fraud, you'll want to pay attention as to whether cybersquatting and fraud is occurring in scripts other than Latin, which have the ability to fool people visually.

Are there any BC members these companies are having experiences with IDNs who could volunteer and look at this comment and consider the BC draft? I'm looking at the companies around the table. (Andy Abrams) first. Go ahead.

(Andy Abrams): Yes, we are facing these issues, and I'd be happy to take a stab at the first draft.

Steve DelBianco: You can always count on (Andy Abrams).

(Paul Mitchell), did you have something to add? Thank you, (Paul).

Anyone else? That's excellent. Thank you, (Andy) -- (Andy) and (Paul).

The next one is proposed recommendations from the CCWG on Work Stream 2. We have nine projects. Remember, I shared one on (SOAC) accountability, but we have another group, led by Fiona Asonga who's in ISP, on diversity.

And that accountability through diversity recommendations are lightweight recommendations. They don't require quotas and mandates, but it still is aspirational about how we should increase the diversity -- geographical, gender, cultural diversity -- here within ICANN linguistic diversity. So we

need a BC member to volunteer to look into that comment and help the BC to formulate that.

(Mark).

(Mark): Seen as (unintelligible) for our general mission, what we have been trying to accomplish within Latin America and the expansion of the BC to other regions, I feel that it's fair and it's something that we have been looking at and talking (unintelligible) communities, so we can possibly provide some interesting input, at least I hope so.

Man: Yes. And I will support (Mark) on that.

Steve DelBianco: Fantastic. We'll probably have (Mark) and Jimson, and now let me move down the table.

Man: (Unintelligible) speaking. I think we're willing to volunteer in this group. Thank you.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you very much. Anyone else?

Andrew Mack: I'd be happy to as well.

Steve DelBianco: Andy Mack as well.

That one is due to 15th of December. Marilyn Cade, go ahead.

Marilyn Cade: I want to volunteer so we have a little gender diversity.

Steve DelBianco: I guess I could volunteer to create a little age diversity, because you're not going to get us there.

Marilyn Cade: I'm not going to get you (unintelligible).

Steve DelBianco: John Berard?

John Berard: So, a question about this list. Does the BC comment on every open - every open question, or are there ones that we pass on?

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, John. As it says in that bottom note under Channel 1, I say that the BC policy coordination chair selects topics based on member interest. I select the topics that I put in here when I say selected open comment period. I don't always surface for you all of them. So the first link in there is the current ICANN public comment pages here, and a lot of you know where to find it. Please, if you discover an open public comment that I either overlooked or inappropriately excluded, please tell me, and we'll put it on the agenda.

Do you see anything now?

Okay. Keep me (honest) on that. I definitely try to target the things I believe are relevant. So, for instance, bringing of the IDNs, I ordinarily wouldn't have brought that in, except that I was aware of some cybersquatting problems and consumer deception issues. Okay, thank you.

And only one more to cover. Jimson? Okay. One more to cover. It doesn't close until January of 2018, which sounds like a long way off. But I want to bring it to your attention. It's the Operating Standards for the ICANN Specific Reviews.

The ICANN specific reviews are what we've been talking about for the last hour with the Board of Directors. You guys (unintelligible) right? CCT review, (unintelligible) review.

And I wanted to emphasize the staff itself believes that the bylaws are high level, and we need something more specific as to, for instance, how a review

team selects its members for diversity, or how a review team replaces a member who disappears in the middle of a review team. And so I think we should applaud the idea of having this standards and operating procedures document as sitting alongside the bylaws. But I don't think we should let staff develop it without significant amounts of community input.

So, during the whole transition, I did conceive that there could be such a document, and I put it into the recommendations for Work Stream 1. And now, for the first time, we've seen a draft of it.

I (unintelligible) to save you 20 pages of reading, is that the only part of it I really have a problem with, and I mentioned this on a work session yesterday, is that they believe that a full year before a team begins, that the board would cause a different little sub-theme to come together and write the terms of reference to write the scope of the review. And that the board would have to approve that by a two-thirds vote.

So they were inserting a brand-new process in advance of the review, where people that would come up with the scope prior to soliciting volunteers who will then have to live with that scope. And as I said yesterday, not on your behalf but on my experience, I think that is an unworkable method. And I would be interested between now and January to understand how those of you who've participated on teams feel about that, since it would be great to know whether I can oppose that on behalf of the BC, that my proposal is that we oppose that idea, but the rest of what's in there is quite helpful.

I'll take a queue on this. Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: Thank you, Steve. I'm going to not comment on that, but just as my first comment, because I want to comment on something else.

I think that one of the challenges that we face in the review teams has been the (forcing) limit of one designated representative per SG. And, depending

on the topic, we sometimes find it very, very challenging to get the right skill set, both experience or (class) technical, or whatever. So I would also like us to look at that document with an eye to: do we actually think that the extreme limits that sometimes get set on the numbers that people who's going to be on the review teams give us what we need?

The second point is, and everyone who's been around a while knows I feel very strongly about this, that I really think the names need to come directly from the SGs and not go through a filtering process at the (GNSO) policy council level. And then, so I'd like us to also look at, in the past we've been told no, we can't have that many people, it'll be imbalanced. But I think we're seeing with the complexity of work that it may be necessary to try to get some flexibility on whether more people are needed on review teams.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Marilyn. Before I go to (Denise), when I converted the (AOC) into the bylaws, I dramatically changed the composition of the team. In the (AOC), there was only one from the entire GNSO. So I pushed hard to have more than one per GNSO. I got to three, I tripled it. The three times seven, since there are seven (ACs) and (SOs), comes to 21 review team members. I have to tell you that I had to fight to get to that level. There are many folks in the (CCWG) who thought that was a crazy quantity that it was way too many people to have on a review team. But as you well know, not everybody on a review team does the work, right? I'm not going to surprise you with that.

So the second thing I did was I wrote an entire process by which the AC and SO chairs would select candidates. But (now) there is no filter on candidates. Anyone can volunteer to put their name forward as a candidate for the pool. It is the AC and SO chairs who pick from that pool, so, who's - which of the three from GNSO, who are the three from CCNSO, who are the three from (FSAC).

And then I wrote a section that says, that if we didn't set up with 21, then the open slots are selected by the AC and SO chairs. So if the BC had four or five people, we could put all those names into the pool, in order to round out to 21, we have the opportunity to (unintelligible).

So the new rules, and I'm glad that you volunteered to help me write this BC comment, then the new rules give us a lot more capability than we ever had before, gives the GNSO three times (unintelligible) members, but we need to put qualified names forward and then lobby for their selection. And I think that in the case of SSR2 we were successful. I believe we were successful at ATRT3, while we tried.

But we also know that, once a team convenes, members have a tendency sometimes to disappear and resign. And when that happens, for whatever reason, the names we put forward from BC are in the queue, and then we continue to advance them through, in the GNSO we have a standing selection committee. Susan Kawaguchi, our councilor, helped to set up that committee, and Susan, I believe you chair it right now. So we're on a very good spot to see that when openings occur on existing review teams, that a BC member can make their way up.

(Denise)?

(Denise): What are we talking about? I thought the other, and thanks for raising the operating procedures, which are good to finally have, seven months after we started, the SSR2. I think they also inserted a line in there giving the board authority to review, approve, or reject the scope in terms of reference of every review team.

So, did you flag that, did I miss that? Because I think that's something that the BC and (CFG) should discuss, and really goes to the heart of, are these independent review teams? Does the board have the authority to direct them? And those types of issues. Thanks.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, (Denise). Perhaps we should reserve some time to discuss that, because it's my opinion that we didn't change a thing. The (ARC) said the board shall cause a review to happen. And number two, the board's responsibility is to adhere to the bylaws.

So if the board has to fulfill its responsibility to cause the review to be not just started but completed, and if the board has an opinion that the review is not headed towards satisfying the bylaws, either the shells, or exceeding (unintelligible) then the board, it is within, my opinion, it is within their right to alert the community that we are not going to make - we are not going to (unintelligible). So that's just my opinion and we can go down that road; perhaps today is not the right time for it. But I don't think you could ever say that they've exceeded their authority, but we might have an interpretation of whether they have done anything unilateral as opposed to simply flag something for the review team and flag it for the community leaders. And that was the content of a lot of the discussion we had in the board session.

(Denise), you had a follow-up?

(Denise): I think you're conflating two issues. We're not - I'm not talking about the suspension of the SSR2 team. I'm talking about the language in the draft operating procedure that gives the board the authority to approve or reject (scope) in terms of reference, which is different than, you know, flagging for the (unintelligible) they disagree with something. So, do we want to give the board direct authority to say no to an independent community review team on their scope in terms of reference? That's the question...

Steve DelBianco: Absolutely not. And part of...

(Denise): ...what's in there right now.

Steve DelBianco: Well, is it in the section where they have a one-year advance process of coming up with the standards terms of reference and giving the board a two-thirds vote. I believe that's what you're talking about. And I believe we should categorically reject that entire section of the review team. Putting the board back on the track where the most they can do is flag for us.

We're good with that? (Unintelligible) to participate in the team, you've got enough on your plate, but when Marilyn and I got the draft together, we're going to ask you to look at that. Okay. Susan?

Susan Kawaguchi: So, first of all, I volunteer to help (unintelligible). No problem.

And just a little bit to your concerns, Marilyn, I had a lot of concerns about watching the leadership team on the council who, you know, do a pretty fair job most of the time on filling spots, but there was no transparency. And that's what I was concerned about.

So, we -- Ed Morris and I -- drafted a proposal. And now we have the (unintelligible) committee working for almost nine months. And part of the requirements the charter says require, but we aspire I guess is a better word, to make sure that each constituency stakeholder group is represented in receiving (those fees) on the teams, review teams. Or like we just (unintelligible) liaised.

And so we don't, you know, have a strict schedule for (rotating) but, looking at the criteria of the candidates and their expertise, and then we'll go back and say, okay, you know, BC has done very well, we've had a placement on each review team, the last two review teams. ATRT was a little different. And so it went the other direction and, you know.

So we're getting real representation of all the groups in the GNSO council. And I think that's critical. But we are having a hard time with the candidates we received. And there's always that bias of, oh, I know that person, I've

worked with them. They work hard. So therefore, we'll place them on the team.

But you know what? When I was on the review - (whose) review team, I had never been on a review team before, and I think I was a great candidate for that team. So, (Denise), (Margie), might disagree on that one, but - so we need to also allow new people to come in, and so we need everyone advocating for them. And so, I'm not sure exactly how we do that, but more candidates would be helpful.

Steve DelBianco: This is great opportunity. If we can actually - we can shape those operating standards, which are brand-new and will be used for the first time and will probably be around for a few years, so we're in a great position to do that.

Faisal Shah, I think you also join us on that drafting team?

Faisal Shah: Right.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Faisal, and welcome.

All right. The next item is the GDPR question...

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: Go ahead.

(Lawrence): I have my hands up on the Adobe. I'm also volunteering for that.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, (Lawrence). Much appreciated. Thank you. Any other hands on this?

Okay. The next section is on GDPR. And what I've done is simply (unintelligible) the resources I've been circulating to you over the last several

days. There are a few things in there that are new. What I put in there was the IPC obtained a legal memo and they circulated it two days ago, and that's the second attachment to today's policy calendar. But I don't think we need to discuss that section as much as the next one, which is the panel on GDPR which are coming up two days today. It's 10:30 in the morning on Thursday. The BC helps to organize that panel. And I've put together, with your assistance, the questions and who the panelists are.

Thomas Rickert will be moderating the panel. And representing the RDS PDP and the business constituency will be Susan Kawaguchi. So, Susan, I wanted to see whether your - you have a few minutes to discuss the approach you want to take on Thursday and (solicit) some other (supportive) ideas from BC members. That's up to you.

Susan Kawaguchi: I'd definitely like to hear any ideas. I mean, I think we had some learnings out at the last session with (Goran), and we can push forward on a few of those points. But tell me what you think.

Steve DelBianco: Those of you who watched the interaction with the board saw that Susan did her best to ask the very specific questions about the interim period, the standards. We all develop that in the closed meeting this morning, and watched how the CEO managed to avoid answering any of those questions. So it would be great to know how we can phrase it a little differently on Thursday so that Susan can press (Goran) for answers.

I want to remind you that we were successful at getting (Goran) to represent ICANN on the panel. And Susan's (unintelligible) the panel and Thomas is moderating, (Goran) will be sitting right next to you, which will give you an opportunity to do more and more probing.

Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: Thanks, Steve. Marilyn Cade. I might not prefer that we do more probing. I wonder if we might come up with some questions, and I have one, I may get the article wrong, Susan, so I'll go back and check, but, like, I have a question of whether ICANN has received any specific ideas from the data commissioners of things that might work. And it might not work universally but they might work.

For instance, I'm under the impression, I'm under the impression, so I'm not saying this is the fact, that Article 40 has been mentioned. And that is about a code of best practice. I think that we could probably talk to somebody on the European Commission staff that's here, and find out. Because that may be, you know, that's asking for more information, but if Article 40, with some modification or enhancement, is a solution even for a 12 to 18-month period, and would solve much of the problem, I haven't heard that particular question asked. And I may have the article number wrong.

Steve DelBianco: We do have Article 45 cited in there - I'm sorry, (Recital 45). And the questions that we put to the panel include, question number two, what has been the feedback from the E.U. DPAs to ICANN's engagement attempts? What does ICANN plan for the next round of engagement?

So let's slip it into that second question. When Thomas asks that question, Susan, come back with, wait a minute, what about Recital 45? And if you discover that recital number that you're going for, and it's other than 45, would you please email Susan? Thank you.

Marilyn Cade: I have one other example. And maybe we need to do a little more exploration on this. But, is the negotiation process that went through, that happened, that is (unintelligible) to safe harbor, between Europe and the U.S., which led to industry forcing the FTC to accept this - they did not want to manage the safe harbor, you know, is there any precedent that we could ask them to look at?

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Marilyn. Any other suggestions for how Susan can more effectively - (Margie).

(Margie): And I think there hasn't been a discussion or a legal analysis yet on the public interest exemption or kind of the - what ICANN's role is as sort of, you know, (unintelligible) mandate. And I'd like to explore that. I mean, like, I was in the session that Thomas Rickert ran (unintelligible) kind of walking through the GDPR stuff. And he made the statement that that's been, you know, proved, you know, disproved. But I haven't seen anything in the public record that shows that. And so that's something I think.

I know, one of the questions will be, what are additional things that the (Hamilton firm) could look at? I think that might be one.

Woman: It would be great if we could draft a question to submit to go back to Hamilton too on that. So we should look at the Hamilton memo, figure out where to ask that.

Steve DelBianco: I would refer you to question four. It is happening tomorrow. Question four says, and this has been circulated to you two weeks ago, is ICANN seeking a public interest exemption for Whois as it operates today? Article 6.3 Recital 45 indicated apply where the task carried out in the public interest and the data processing is necessary to comply with a legal obligation under EU or member state law.

So (Margie) that pursuant to the discussions we had, that is in the plan. It's the fourth and final question that Thomas promised to put to the panelists. We know they're probably not going to answer that. So we are taking all this rhetoric and we're saving it up for the BCs submission to the next phase of the Hamilton work.

So that's not an official public comment, so it's not on the public comment list. And what did (Goran) say today about when they're going to close this? He

used the expression, "Couple of weeks." And let's take that as a one week. And within a week, the BC needs to say, given that Hamilton is assigned to do this, what are the questions we would put to Hamilton for their next phase of work?

So (Margie) can I ask you please to send me whatever you have in mind for that? And then I'll put out a reminder to all BC members. You had a follow-up.

(Margie): Yes. I just wanted to confirm. I mean, I remember seeing the draft, but, so the agenda hasn't changed for the session since this week's activities.

Steve DelBianco: It did change. The questions one through four are now guaranteed to fit but all the other questions will only be as time permits. That's the only change we made to the agenda.

(Margie): So on the submitting questions to the Hamilton memo, the IPC has the Taylor (unintelligible) memo, and that - and I have not read all of that thoroughly. But there are questions in there. And so the IPC, specifically Brian Winterfeldt, is pulling those questions out and submitting those to - for the Hamilton memo. So we're just - if we just keep pounding them with more and more questions and, you know, (beating), I think it's a good thing.

Steve DelBianco: Susan, the questions you pursued today with the board, several of them get to the compliance standards for GDPR that would be appropriate for the interim period. Remember that questioning line? So let's put that in the next Hamilton assignment.

Susan Kawaguchi: I would agree with that...

Steve DelBianco: So I'll look to you for that. (Margie), you're going to help me with the public interest Article 45, and Susan, with respect to what the interim safe

harbor/safeguard, so that we understand how we can operate while you're finishing your work on (RDS PDP). Go ahead.

Susan Kawaguchi: Sorry. So, during the board session, on the question, is this just going to be an internal directive or is the board going to adopt that temporary emergency policy? (Chris) (unintelligible) asked me which we would - would we prefer on that.

Steve DelBianco: So, which do we prefer?

Susan Kawaguchi: I really couldn't, you know, I sort of put it back on him, you know, what works for...

Steve DelBianco: Have you all done an emergency process for (RAA)? Don't know?

Man: Not that I'm aware of, no.

Steve DelBianco: (Unintelligible).

Woman: I don't remember (unintelligible) having that triggered.

((Crosstalk))

Man: No.

Steve DelBianco: Could you check? Do your best to help us understand. Dive into the Web site. See if you can figure out whether we've ever invoked the emergency temporary procedures in the (RAA) and registry agreement. That way we'll know whether it's been done before. Could I ask you that as a favor?

Susan Kawaguchi: It - the privacy proxy guidance page, you know, which - you know, that was an emergency policy. So, was that a directive then?

(Margie): No, no, no. That was part of the specification and the (RAA) negotiation. So, those are (unintelligible) specification, so that was temporary. But to my knowledge, I don't think that that language has ever been triggered but I don't really know how to find that.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks. Thanks for trying though. Appreciate that.

Any other questions on GDPR? Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: Is that a question that we could ask? So it's - then the staff does the work?

Man: Yes, we can ask, the same thing. I would imagine that would be in the resolutions that the board has passed. It's just laborious to go through them all.

Steve DelBianco: My favorite two staffers are now BC members. So, who do we ask?

Somebody in GDD?

Marilyn Cade: Or (David) (unintelligible) someone on the policy team, right?

We have someone here from on the policy team. (Unintelligible) (Steve).

Steve DelBianco: (Steve), please, would you take that onboard, to discover whether the temporary emergency procedures in the RAA have ever been invoked before? Thank you, (Stephen).

All right. Next item up, we're going to be hearing from Bryan Schilling about the consumer safeguards. I'll skip that. And until Bryan shows up, let's keep proceeding.

So the next section of this is up to our councilors, Susan and Phil. Phil is following on along in Adobe. And you'll see in the policy calendar I indicated

the six items on council's agenda for tomorrow that are relevant to us. And I'll give Susan the opportunity to walk through that and take your questions.

Susan?

Susan Kawaguchi: Sure. So you'll (unintelligible) who actually the BC endorsed as the - as a candidate for the liaison to the (GAC) was selected. So he'll be put in place. And that was done by the (Standing Selection Committee).

So, ongoing reviews. I mean, I think with the SSR2 issues, we have an opportunity to have the GNSO council do a call for action and talk to all the SOs and ACs, because it's not the board's duty to get us all together, but none of the SOs or ACs are talking about being, you know...

Steve DelBianco: I'm going to follow up on that. Sitting next to (Cheryn), he's the new chair of the board. He (did an aside) with me, and then after the section just concluded, he promised that while we are here, there will be a gathering of the SSR2 team, board organizational effectiveness committee, and the chairs of all the ACs, SOs and constituencies.

(Denise), there's a session scheduled for tomorrow, I believe, or Thursday, with you and the OEC. Do you remember when that is?

I'll let you look that up. But (Cheryn) was wondering about using that slot to involve the AC and SO chairs and constituency chairs. I thought that perhaps the beginning of that meeting should just be you and the OEC, Organizational Effectiveness Committee. And then the second half of that meeting, you might invite chairs of the ACs, SOs and constituencies in, so that the community could have a conversation on how to get things back on track. (Denise)?

(Denise): It's two to three on Thursday.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, (Denise).

(Denise): Yes. (Unintelligible) I think...

Steve DelBianco: Keep us apprised of...

(Denise): Yes. I think the SSR2 team members will operate by consensus. There's a lot of concern because we've been getting a lot of misunderstandings and erroneous information coming out of the board, and so this is the first time the team - this is the first time the board has ever talked to the team. So I know that different team members are eager to dispel a lot of misunderstandings. How long it's going to take, I don't know.

Steve DelBianco: Would you object to the chairs of the AC, SOs and constituencies observing your interaction? So that we'll get a better understanding about this he said, she said.

(Denise): Just like the chair (unintelligible) council and the BC, I do not make unilateral decisions for the SSR2 review teams.

Steve DelBianco: Is that an open meeting from 2:00 to 3:00 p.m.?

(Denise): Yes. I have no idea how the board has structured it.

Steve DelBianco: All right. I'll commit that Andrew or I will be there for the BC. And if it's open, we'll have the opportunity to observe. We may not have the opportunity to speak, but inevitably, if it's an opportunity for all of the other AC and SO chairs, it starts to get to what Susan's asking about.

So, Susan, you might bring this up at the council tomorrow as an opportunity, not a mandate, but an opportunity to get the other ACs and SOs involved.

Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: Marilyn Cade. I, like others, like to think that the meeting - that a meeting would be open. But I also have a bit of a concern that I kind of heard coming out of (Denise)'s comment, that this is the first time that there's been interaction. My original interest was, can the meeting be open to observers? And now I'm kind of thinking, if this is the first time there's been a conversation between the full group and the board, that that might look a little bit like angels hovering or demons dwelling, right? As opposed to an opportunity for improved communication and clearing up misunderstandings, etcetera.

So, you know, I kind of going to back away from my idea that observe - that having it open would be a good thing, since there hasn't yet been even an exchange. That would be my first point.

My second point is a question of concern about whether, given short notice, whether the chairs of the other SOs and ACs are going to be available. And that may be something of a challenge. I'm not - I'm just making it as an observation.

Steve DelBianco: And (Denise), work it out with your team and with the OEC. And if it's available to be open, Andrew and I will commit to be there.

Over to you.

(Denise): Okay. Since the board doesn't talk to the security review team, I'm not - I can't commit to talking to the OEC. But if I find them, I will certainly ask them. But I just want to say, I think going out on a limb for the security review team, I think the team would be really appreciative of your efforts to try and resolve this quickly as the team is in limbo and does not know what to do with its Friday meeting slot. Thanks.

Steve DelBianco: But I hope you'll recognize that's exactly what we tried to do with most of our interaction with the board, okay?

Susan.

Susan Kawaguchi: And I also, just one last point on that, you start adding up, you know, all the SO, ACs, I think we have a majority on our side, I think. That's the way I perceive it. So - and because there's no process to this, it's like, well, could it be simple majority or, you know. So, you know. Anyway, there's got to be a lot of compromise and hopefully we can get that moving forward.

We have an update on the GNSO review recommendations. The last I heard about that is that was pretty onboard and no issues.

There is an issue with the reserve fund and long-term financial planning. The GNSO council is trying to put together a financial committee to - that is a standing finance committee, similar to the standing selection committee to review the full budget, because it's always sort of ad hoc and last-minute, and we're becoming more and more concerned about the finances.

And I know that -- I cannot remember and I apologize -- but there is something crucial in the community (GTLBs) seeking to shed their community obligations, and I can't remember what the real...

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: Yes, I do have that for you. Phil circulated the draft motion this morning.

Phil, if you're listening on the phone and can speak, please talk about that. Meanwhile, I'll bring up the motion. Craig Schwartz shared it with Phil. The anticipation issue would come up in council. And the action requested was for BC councilors to support the registry stakeholder group position, where the development of a mechanism for a community (GGLD) operator to amend its (Specification 12). So it sounds as if they're requesting, the registries are

requesting developing a process, a machinery for doing that. That may be on your discussion panel for tomorrow.

Phil, we are watching you type. If you'd like to speak, by all means.

So, Phil, while you're doing that, we just had Bryan Schilling enter the room, and he'll be joining us for the next segment of the agenda. After which, Susan, if you'll have anything else for council? Great. And then, so, after Bryan has concluded, (Barbara), we'll go to you (unintelligible) for CSG that we have not really covered. Okay? Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: Marilyn Cade. I have (unintelligible) to make a comment about the idea that GNSO policy council is planning on establishing a standing financial committee. And I'm sorry, I wasn't aware of that. I'm going to ask that maybe vice chair of finance and operations, and I might talk with Susan and Bill. I have a concern about that because, right now, the work on the overall ICANN budget is done by a budget working group, and the, up to now, the council has taken on and controlled the part of the budget input that is about policy development.

And I know how much work it is, but maybe Jimson could speak about it, we have a process by which a few BC members are working actively on looking at the overall budget, providing comments, etcetera. And I frankly, I got to tell you guys, I'm not enthused about adding more work to the policy councilors, and I'm also not enthused about the - some of what I think will come out of a standing committee that is more concerned about not spending "their money," meaning the contracted parties, as opposed to looking at the overall health and budget.

And I can tell you that the organization, that in the budget working group, that (Xavier) runs, which is very open and transparent, he does a very, very good job. A new standing committee within the council is moving away from the

constituencies having the kind of input that I think they need to have. I know Jay participates, but our vice chair is here.

Woman: To respond to that, Marilyn, this has been ongoing and a request has been made and actually right now I can't remember who's really sort of backing this. But it hasn't moved forward at all. Nobody is standing up to say, yes, let's do this, though there's always this last-minute rush, if anybody have any input on the finances.

So it is reassuring to know that - and I knew that there was another mechanism. I just didn't know how well that worked. But if this did happen to move forward and get, you know, this new committee, finance committee, was created, it would be similar to the way the standing selection committee, and those are not necessarily councilors. It is members of each community. So they could be councilors, because like I'm on it just because I have a vested interest in it. But, you know, you do not have to be a councilor to be on the committee. It could be part of your own community stepping up and doing that.

(Chris): This is (Chris). We'll return to Bryan real quick on - I see this as a second item that (unintelligible) other relevant work on the council that Phil is following I think the (unintelligible) (GO) names work. Maybe (unintelligible) know that, the list. Curious what the status is with the (unintelligible) conditions for working on (Work Track 5). I haven't sat on any council discussion today or this week rather, but I think all of us would be curious to know kind of what the status of that is. So, if Phil can hear me (unintelligible) just a brief summary, that'd be great, if possible. Thanks.

Man: I've got a quick council related question as well before we move on. I'm wondering if the council has considered making any changes to the procedure for handling who (unintelligible) with privacy law, specifically what criteria could trigger that. And if not, it could be an interesting option, kind of

a circuit-breaker for GDPR, ICANN staff cannot get it back together in terms of put that model as an implementation model.

Woman: So there was a PDP on that to modify it, and which turned out to be pretty unsatisfactory, and want to say, maybe in India, I was involved in a discussion to sort of broker a deal with the leaders of the PDP and members, that they move forward with a recommendation and a motion that no one was satisfied with, so that we could sort of clear the desk about PDP, and then we generate another one.

I don't know where we are on (seeding) a new PDP for that. I know that some things are in the works. I can find out. But it would be handy if we had a good process right now.

And maybe that's one of the solutions we offer, that, let's put this together really quick, you know.

Steve DelBianco: You know, I love that Jay Sadowski serves (unintelligible) on the (nom com), but having him involved in the BC meetings today makes me wish we had someone else on the (nom com), so that Jay could get engaged in the policy. But that'll come next year, right?

All right. So we'd like to introduce Bryan Schilling, the Consumer Safeguards Director for ICANN, and welcome him into the table. As Bryan is making his way up, I'll ask staff to scroll up just above Channel 2, to where I indicate Bryan's latest proposal, if you scroll up just above Channel 2, you'll see Consumer Safeguards. See it right there? Contractual compliance and consumer safeguards.

Because I've been telling the BC more and more not only about your Webinar, Bryan, and you did visit with us in Johannesburg, but the notion of you having three initiatives, the idea of existing safeguards, the types of DNS abuse that could fall within your arena, and then finally gaps and your

capabilities to address them. So that was what we assumed you would talk about today, but we have no idea. Do you have slides, do you have presentation? How do you want to handle this?

Bryan Schilling: Thanks, Steve and Andrew, it's great to be back in front of the group. And no, I don't have slides, and I think that certainly encompasses three of some of the points I would like to raise, which is really a reflection of the Webinar that we did have in September where we were asking for community input and feedback to some of those questions.

We, prior to that Webinar, we published a summary of what we thought are the current existing safeguards within ICANN's remit that were pulled from the articles of incorporation, the bylaws, and the contracts with registries and registrars. And so we wanted to put that out there as kind of the discussion point.

We had a great turnout for the Webinar, around 100 participants. But the comments and feedbacks has been a bit slow. And, you know, lots of focus on GDPR and other aspects of it.

So, one of the things I wanted to raise today that isn't there, as I've been thinking about ways to facilitate this discussion, and one of the things I did clarify and I want to just reiterate again on the - from the Webinar, is this - consumer safeguards is a new department within ICANN that is separate from contractual compliance. So the Webinar was titled Contractual Compliance and Safeguards. We had (Maggie) there to talk about compliance. But it's - this isn't envisioned - it's not in the enforcement role. I've got no powers to go after contracted parties. There's no discussion of that.

But what we view it as is kind of three prongs. One, to facilitate discussion in the community. To focus in on some perhaps definitions in the areas of focus for abuse. And to have discussions about gaps. And we backed away from

earlier thoughts of having a working group, because we want to start - have it be less formal conversation and maybe over time it will organically develop into something with some PDP efforts there to address gaps that will surface in these conversations.

But, shifting back to this group, and one of the things we've been thinking about to raise it, is to also educate the community. And I've had some conversations, you know, Steve and I had a phone conversation probably in July, and it was very educational, informative to me, where he talked about some of the aspects of abuse in domain names, specifically as it relates to ticket brokers and venues, and I found that to be very interesting. And as I have talked to others in the commercial space, in the IP space, I've been learning a lot in terms of process that you go through to represent your clients or to address areas of infringement activity.

One of the things that we've raised with the registry group and will with registrars is the potential conversation about what they do on their own outside of the contracts with ICANN to address areas of abuse and infringing activity. We don't - I don't want to push anything out there. I understand very much that some of the activities that private actors do that want to keep confidential for various reasons, but - so the request here for this group is, is that something that would be of interest? Would they be willing to talk more about some of the issues and use facts, so that we can fall back on the bylaws and focus on fact-based policy-making. So that's kind of the fourth topic out there for this community. But that's about all I had to present today, and open it up for comments and questions.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks, Bryan. I'll give you the first question, as those of you get in the queue. I came with a 90-minute cross-community high-interest topic yesterday on DNS abuse reporting, they're call it DAR. (Denise) Michel was on there as well for Facebook.

It seems to dovetail perfectly with respect to what goes on in number two, the types of DNS abuse that may fall within the remit. But I note that Jamie Hedlund was on the panel but you were not. And so I was confused, because it struck the DNS abuse that's in the safeguards should have been part of that group. And if you're not, how do we - how are misunderstanding the delineation of responsibilities?

Bryan Schilling: I don't think there is - I mean, Jamie is - he's my boss, so he oversees contractual compliance and the consumer safeguards department. So, to answer both areas and topics in the same sense that Dave Piscitello wasn't up there and he and others on the OCTO team have been very instrumental in developing DAR. So there was no - that doesn't signal anything, other than that Jamie, instead of having Maggie and I up there, Jamie could, you know, handle both things. And there were questions there about how contractual compliance might use some of the DAR reporting.

I think that's interesting with the addition of the consumer safeguards role at this point in time, you know, OCTO developing the DAR, is that we're really in this - a lot of conversation about abuse, and hopeful that I can facilitate and kind of narrow some of that conversation, instead of it being in so many different areas. So I think Jamie was up there representing the consumer safeguards department in that capacity.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks, Bryan. Were you in the room?

Bryan Schilling: Yes...

Steve DelBianco: That's a relief. What's - so you've given us your reaction to what you heard, but also the - I think the feedback to Jamie would be that you and Maggie sitting there would have given us more specific answers than we got from Jamie. Because the one question Jamie responded was a non-answer. And had you and Maggie been there, I would have imagined that you could have

each done a deeper job to the question that came from the audience. So in the future, we'd rather have you and Maggie than Jamie.

Bryan Schilling: I'll let Jamie know that. I do think...

Man: (Unintelligible) bad about you.

Bryan Schilling: Right. I think it's - that's - maybe in the future we will be able to. But there seems to be so many kinds of unknowns as DAR continues to develop, and, you know, OCTO mentioned it. He didn't get a chance to review it, but it's going to be going out to - for reviews and community comment. So I don't think we're in a spot yet to give specifics as much as we are (so) dancing, and Jamie is a much better dancer.

Man: So, Bryan, first of all, thank you, and again thank you for being here. We met first in Jo'burg when you were about five seconds into your job, and I remember you saying, I'm sorry, I just started yesterday, or something like that. So it's good to see you here and it's good to see you, you know, well ensconced.

One of the two questions (unintelligible) which is, what is OCTO? And if you could be so kind as to help us not only understand the acronyms that you're using but the tools you're developing, and how you think they're going - are they long-term, short-term tools? Who has the access to them? How much push (unintelligible) in the marketplace versus perhaps some things that we can find if we know what we're looking for? That would be very helpful for us.

Bryan Schilling: Yes, and that reminds me, this is Bryan Schilling again, for the record, so, trying to pick that one up again, as well as the ICANN acronyms.

But OCTO is the Office of the Chief Technology Officer for ICANN. That's led by David Conrad. He's on the executive team.

The tool that we've been referring to, I don't know if it's - I believe it's DAAR, is the Domain Abuse Activity Reports. Interestingly enough, it was originally called DART, and ICANN received a copyright infringement notice on that. So the legal team advised and we came up with the new name for it.

I think - I would rather not speculate or talk about how that tool might be developed and used. It was certainly not something that was part of, and I know it's been underway for a while, and I think that's a lot of what the high-interest topic that Steve was referring to yesterday was questions about how will this potential tool be used?

I can say, as David Conrad explained and I believe there was earlier today a further discussion on it, it is an aggregator of various publicly-available resources out there that already report on abusive activity within the DNS and elsewhere, and will somehow compile those various sources that are vetted and approved and are going to be examined by experts to kind of get that stamp of approval, and then produce that one set of metrics versus folks having to go to 13, 14, x number of sites independently to do the research.

Man: And just to be clear, because I've received a lot of emails, DAIR, we're not talking about the same thing?

Bryan Schilling: I haven't heard that one. Yes. It's either DAAR or DAR. But I'm pretty sure it's...

Man: Okay.

Woman: I think it's D-A-A-R.

Man: Okay. I'm worried of acronym (unintelligible) so. (Margie), you had your hand up. Please.

(Margie): Yes. Part of the discussion in yesterday's panel also talked about the DNS abuse study. And I don't know if you've seen the BC comments to the public comment period for that report. But I'd like to bring that to your attention, because that report highlighted some really serious bad actors in the registrar space, I believe, the registry space, and with really high degrees of abuse, you know, like astronomical. And that strikes me as something that your role might be helpful in looking at the total tools out there to see how you can actually make an impact with, you know, the extremes in that case, ones that are experiencing greater than 50% abuse. And that's the kind of thing that it might involve collaboration with the compliance department to see, you know, is there enhanced compliance activity or auditing you can do, others aspects of (RAA) that can be, you know, pulled into to try to, you know, focus on the areas where there's significant levels of abuse.

Bryan Schilling: This is Bryan. Thank you. I haven't seen that report but I will go to it.

I think that's one of the questions, I'll segue, where we put out a summary of the safeguards. And, you know, I think looking at those safeguards and looking at what all of these reports tend to suggest is there's a few bad actors, and that question is, are the safeguards that ICANN currently has in its remit sufficient to address those? And, you know, are there the gaps that need to be addressed within that and have a conversation about, you know, do those contract provisions, are they sufficient enough, you know?

And let me just - yes. So I think, you know, we put out those summaries and would be - look for feedback on that, want to have that question. And that's something I know Jamie has been raising before I was brought into this role, which they have that discussion and conversation.

(Margie): And just to follow up, how do you propose having that kind of conversation? Because sometimes language in a contract can be - it can be interpreted in different ways. And this might be the kind of thing where you encourage a dialogue with the different departments at ICANN, whether it's legal,

compliance, you know, whatever, to say, can you interpret this language to enable ICANN to take some, you know, more intensive action for these, you know, bad actors?

That's certainly something that I'd encourage and I think a lot of people in the BC would think that that'd be useful.

Bryan Schilling: Thanks for that suggestion. I think one of the things that I saw with the Webinar was, and perhaps this is why the feedback has been slow, and I've been trying to think, well, could we focus in on more specific issues, which is what we're asking, but the questions might have been so broad and the audience so broad that it was - I said to some other groups, that maybe we're trying to boil the ocean here instead of trying to think about ways we can make a cup of tea.

So, perhaps looking at the existing safeguards, we could start to pick a few of those and focus in on them, have a conversation, raise them, and then, you know, can take that internally within ICANN and see what groups, and then have a focus on this is just drawing one out there, Spec 11, you know, 3A, just as an example. Not saying that that's one that needs to be talked about, but really looking at that and kind of narrowing in on that and seeing other gaps there.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you. Susan?

Susan Kawaguchi: Thanks. I was wondering if you could expand upon the three, the gaps within ICANN's capabilities. And what information are you looking for there? I'm a little confused.

Bryan Schilling: This is Bryan. Thanks, Susan. Really kind of what I was just saying there is, you know, we put out the safeguards looking at that and having a conversation of, is there more that - is there something missing within ICANN's remit and consistent with articles of incorporation and bylaws and

our mission, that the community would like to see filled. And how should we fill that gap? Is it through the policy process? Is it - does that go into the contracts? That kind of discussion and those gaps.

Hopefully that - I know it's vague, but I think there's nothing in the contracts that says, as far as I've read, is that, if a registrar or a registry is found to be hosting a domain that is 100% distributing malware, that's, you know, a concrete reason to do something about it. You know, there are things in the contract, like, is it a registrar must or is it the registry, sorry, has to have certain language in there, like Spec 11, the registrant must not engage in X, Y and Z activity. But the only check there is that, if that has that language in the agreement, not, you know, necessarily that they have to prohibit or do other things.

So I think a conversation about, within the community, whether or not we have sufficient capabilities, or if not, do we need to have more, and what are those capabilities?

Woman:

Well, for example, and I can't pull this off, it's 3.7 something, but it's about a master proxy registration. And it's - and some of this will be addressed with implementation of the PPSAI, but - and I used to send this out all the time, I used to be with Facebook and, prior to that, eBay, and so have done a lot of enforcement, domain name enforcement. And so when a registrar refused to provide or even relay an email or provide any contact information, you know, basically it says, if they do not respond and take action, then they're considered the registrant, essentially. I mean I'm paraphrasing here.

Well, great, it says that. And if it happens to be a good registrar and they get a little bit concerned, then they'll go, okay, we don't want to be considered that. But that language, you know, other than taking that language and going, you know, filing some sort of litigation, didn't give us much.

And so if that's the type of thing you're talking about, beefing up some of the contractual language, or...

Bryan Schilling: If the community suggests that's an area, potentially, you know, have heard historically that there are kind of bets, I think one question is, you know, what is actually taking the steps to do an investigation, you know, and kind of those areas that have been issues in the past and over the time, especially since the 2013 contracts, bringing those up to the surface and having the community discuss those is really what we see this role as being here for.

Steve DelBianco: Jimson?

Jimson Olufuye: Thank you, Bryan. A major challenge is with enforcement, because if you see that a lot of gaps (unintelligible) some measures (unintelligible) practice to mitigate (unintelligible) the confidence in the process. So you also said here, we also can see here gaps within ICANN's capabilities to address abuse (that will be filled) by other entities within the community.

So, one of the things I've identified, which (unintelligible) jurisdiction, in terms of how do you identify (unintelligible) malware, how do you shut down those things, how do you collaborate with this and that. So, and now we have the (unintelligible). So what are you doing to interface with them in terms of find a way to promote collaboration for effective approach to combating abuse and overcoming this jurisdictional challenge.

Bryan Schilling: Thank you, Jimson. We certainly are speaking with the (GAC), you know, understand the (GAC) and (ALAC) were the primary constituencies behind this role. So, you know, we, back in Johannesburg, met with the public safety working group. We did not - we're not invited this time, so I must have said something back then.

But I think that question too is, you know, when we talk about other entities, as I mentioned in the beginning, one of the things that I think might be worth

having in a discussion is, what are the contracted parties doing on their own to address abuse?

To the point of jurisdiction, that's a very challenging issue just from - in terms of like, if you look at governments utilizing the legal process and the bad actors located outside of their jurisdiction, how do they work with cooperation either on a police to police or using mutual legal assistance or other mechanisms that are existing there. And I think that's a much bigger question that encompasses a lot of activity and issues besides just DNS and registry and registrars.

I do know there's some conversations out there, you know, other entities, there's internet and jurisdiction group that is addressing this it's Bertrand de La Chapelle. So those are areas that are being discussed, and ICANN is listening to those conversations and part of those discussions.

Sorry to be vague there, but we - to come back, we are speaking with everybody in this role, and want this role to be an open door and have everybody come to us, which makes me realize I'm kind of late for the IPC meeting, but.

Jimson Olufuye: What I just think is key is that we should be involved, we should be in the conversation, and we should be proactive about what we need to do, because of great (unintelligible).

Steve DelBianco: Great, Bryan. Well, thank you very much. If you're late for the IPC, we don't want to keep you. I think everybody's at that point in day when the sooner we can get all of our business done, the happier we'll be. Appreciate your coming.

Bryan Schilling: Thank you. Appreciate the invitation.

Steve DelBianco: So I'm going to ask to shoot it back, I think, Susan, were you finished with your report?

Fantastic. Okay.

Then (unintelligible).

Man: (Barbara)?

Steve DelBianco: Yes. So, (Barbara), why don't you give us your (PSC) update?

(Barbara): Okay. I just, you know, we've had a few meetings already, we had the prep meeting on, I guess, on Sunday, and that enabled us to plan for a meeting today with the board. So in terms of CSG meetings for the remainder of the week, we have a meeting tomorrow with a contracted party (house) at 10:30. Let me get it right. Time. Yes, 10:30. And so it will be right across the wall there, hall, Section BC.

And again, at our prep meeting we talked about focusing on them with questions like ask the contracted party house to talk about their letter to the board about the GDPR and what they think about the prospects of a patchwork of solutions, what they might be doing to ensure compliance, correct? Something like that, Steve?

And then, what the compliance landscape might look like. Again, I guess this goes to the question of that interim period, what they would like to see in terms of the interim period. So, those are two questions that we might address with the contractor party - contracted parties.

And then, our only other meeting then would be with a non - as - we would meet as the non-contracted party house, both the CSG and the NCSG. This would be after our council meeting tomorrow, at 3:15 to 4:00. It's the so-

called admin meeting, when we'll consider Heather - formally consider Heather's nomination and the vice chair selection.

So there was an understanding that there would probably be no one available to meet with the NCSG from 3:15 to 4:00, which was - 3:15 to 4:45, which is the time that we were slotted. So there's been a lot of back-and-forth email with the non-contracted party house, and that's the way we've determined is we will, just whoever can show up will show up, and we'll meet from 4 o'clock to 4:45.

And a couple of things we might specifically zero in on in that very small window is really putting some meat to the bones of the proposal at the intercessional last year to form a budget working group, and then perhaps their views on board accountability and how the SSR2 issue was considered. So those are just some ideas. If there's a critical mass tomorrow that is able to attend that meeting.

Steve DelBianco: So, (Barbara), just to be clear, that's tomorrow. And where will that - that'll be a coffee, right? Where will that be held?

(Barbara): Yes.

Steve DelBianco: And could I ask a favor, if you would circulate that around to the BC list so that people who might be able to attend can? I think we do, in the interest of continuing to build that bridge, want to have some critical mass on behalf of the BC there, and especially from people who maybe have some familiarity with the intercessional process.

(Barbara): Okay. According to the master list here, it's in the Media Center. So if you went to the DNS Win reception the other night, that's where it is.

Steve DelBianco: Great. Anything further?

(Barbara): No. There'll be another intercessional planning meeting after ICANN 60. So I think it'd probably be more appropriate if I briefed people after we have that second meeting, just to make it more current.

Steve DelBianco: Okay. Thank you very much, (Barbara).

So I'm running down our agenda, and we have (Xavier) who is expected to be here at 5 o'clock leaves us a little bit of time to try to advance some of the things that we had (unintelligible) but I think that's - it's going to work out fine.

Would like to go through a, in the 15, 17 minutes we have, would like to go through a quick discussion of our outreach efforts. And if we have enough time, run through other business. But let's talk a little bit about outreach and I'm going to give just a broad outline for those who are not very active in this. It came up this morning in an earlier meeting.

We have a tremendous, tremendous outreach effort and a tremendous outreach team, and I want to celebrate that because we've done a lot of really good work. We have some new members that have come out of our outreach efforts, both this year and recently. We've had two big - well, we've got a series of events that have gone on this year. We had one in, I believe - we had one in Afghanistan, we've had one in Kenya, we've had one in Uganda, if I remember correctly. We had a big one in South Africa. We've also just had two in Brazil.

And what is exciting to me is this is very much our intent. We have made a commitment as a BC to become more global, more diverse, more multilingual, more different parts of the business community. And I think we should all feel good about the efforts that we put in, and frankly, about the results of that.

I'm going to - I would love to leave a moment for other members of the outreach committee who are here to talk a little bit about the work that they're

doing, again, briefly to talk about the events that they participated in, if they would like, the Brazil events briefly, and the (unintelligible) event. But also anything else that you'd like to mention because (unintelligible) has been a big focus of the BC over the last 12 months.

Jimson, Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: If I could just kick it off (unintelligible) by noting a piece of paper or presentation. Andrew -- Marilyn Cade speaking -- Andrew and I had spoken and I did prepare an overview PowerPoint, we didn't have time to get to this morning. And I did commit and it will be posted, and I think that's the best way to deal with that long (unintelligible).

It will include some summaries, and I'll come back to Brazil and also to (OLA), so that we'll have examples. (Omar) has pictures and summary. But it is an overall overview of what we've done not only in referencing the activities we've done but referencing the fact that (we're required) to have an outreach strategy document and that we have completed that.

We took the option of having an overall outreach strategy plus (Crop). What we're required to do is (Crop). But we did an overall strategy. And that has been reviewed by the board and (unintelligible) by executive committee, and is posted. And I just thought, Andrew, it would be worth mentioning that to the members, because we often run out of time, we don't get to spend this time on thinking this through. And I want people - we wanted people to kind of have a sense that there is a plan, there is a structure, things are in writing, and that outreach plan is posted. But we also have now the summary. And we'll be enhancing it by adding in one page for each of the outreach events.

So, just to say that will happen. And then the members will have this as a document.

So, back to you on the details.

Steve DelBianco: Great. And I do want to commend Marilyn personally for all of the heavy lifting that she and (Chantelle), our staff support, did on taking the many ideas that we had as part of an outreach strategy and pulling them all together in a document that might actually be readable, which is no small amount of work.

I also want to pick up on something that Marilyn just mentioned. We had a responsibility of putting together a (Crop) document so that we could get access to (Crop) funding, which is funded outreach support. And we made a conscious decision as an outreach group to bring them all together as an entire strategy.

And I hope that everyone recognize, number one, that was a lot of work, but also we're doing it on behalf of the BC because we want to make sure that every single thing that we do as the BC is coordinated, and that if the BC members are contributing their money to support outreach, that we get the most, if you will, bang for the buck. So, pulling together ICANN resources and (Crop) resources, other ICANN resources, as well as BC resources, in a targeted way. That's exactly what we've done.

I also want to commend other members, who are not members of the outreach committee, we got tremendous support when we were in South Africa and we got members out of that event. We've gotten tremendous support in Brazil and have gotten new members out of that. Your efforts, you who are typically not as involved in outreach, are really very, very important to what we do and are very important to - I mean, the results on the ground that you can point to that the BC has really flourished as a result of this and has new members and new energy.

It is incumbent upon us, and I'm looking at the - I'm looking at the onboarding pilot and I want to hear a little bit more about that, but it's incumbent upon us to not just get new members but also to bring them into the BC and to give them what to do. (Mark), thank you for translating the documents, and for the

wonderful report you did after the (unintelligible) and get people involved in the rest of the policy work. And I know it takes some time.

I want all of us to make sure that we do whatever outreach we need to, not just to get people to the door, but also, once they're in the door, to help bring them into the work that we're doing, because we need that perspective.

Jimson, you wanted to jump in. Please.

Jimson Olufuye: Yes. Thank you. Well, I think, Marilyn, I still want to speak to this presentation, on the why we get feedback on that (unintelligible) yes (unintelligible) so I don't know, maybe (unintelligible) continue, or...

Man: We can (unintelligible) and finish up with outreach later if you'd like to jump in now.

END