

**ICANN
Transcription ICANN64 Kobe
GNSO – BC Session
Tuesday, 12 March 2019 at 15:15 JST**

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

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

Claudia Selli: Thank you very much everybody and welcome to the BC open meeting. So we have few slight changes into the agenda for today's meeting. Chantelle if you can share the agenda thank you so much. So we're going to start with the Open Data Initiative presentation with the guests that are coming to speak. Then – sorry. Then we're going to invert - change the items instead of the LOC Study presentation. The LOC Study presentation is going to be done after the break, and we're going to have the people, the team from the consumer trust, a consumer trust review team that are coming, Mark Zuckerberg and no sorry.

Steve DelBianco: Jonathan Zuck who's the chair...

Claudia Selli: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: ...and Drew Bagley.

Claudia Selli: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: This was a pick up on BC member's interest this morning to deep dive into...

Claudia Selli: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: ...what should we do in reaction to the way the board regarded the CCTRT recommendations.

Claudia Selli: And then we're going to go into break. If we have ten minutes Steve is going to also prepare us, I mean have - dedicate ten minutes into the other items and then we're going to have the LOC presentation start after so around 5:00. And then we're going to continue with the agenda. So if we the people from yes from the open letter initiative are already here we can start the presentation.

Steve DelBianco: (Unintelligible).

Susanna Bennett: Hi everyone. This is Susanna Bennett. I'm Chief Operating Officer of ICANN. And thank you for inviting us to here. I know this is your session so we have a pretty brief coverage of this and look forward to seeing all of you at the at the Thursday workshop on Open Data Program. I have been assigned to oversee the implementation of the initiative that started by OCTO Function Group and really feel privileged to do that. This is - we all know this is a very important program for the whole community and for ICANN organization as well. So that Matt?

Matt Larson: Well I don't have much to say except to thank Susanna and (Victoria) for taken over the Open Data Initiative. And it's now the Open Data Program changing the name to reflect that it's going from its original status as a research initiative to now something that's being operationalized by the org. And I'll second Susanna's mention of the session Thursday morning and would encourage everyone to come to that for a more full treatment. This is just going to be more quicker overview and try to entice everyone to please come to Thursday so what I why don't I turn it over to (Victoria).

Victoria Yang: Thank you very much Susanna and Matt. Hi everyone. Good afternoon. My name is Victoria Yang. I'm a ICANN Operations Program Manager. Thank you very much for inviting us this afternoon to provide you a brief update on the Open Data Program.

So this next slides shows that what we have been working on since ICANN 63. So first off after OCTO launched the pilot successfully and to see the demonstration joining ICANN 63 we different functional teams within the organization have been collaborating on designing the platform not just from a visual (expect) that it aligns and complies with ICANN's branding guideline but most importantly the functionality part of the platform. We want to make sure that the functionality that we need are customized and build into the platform.

So we have been working towards that. Other than that after the public comment that we had last year on the data (set) inventory we realized the need to refine and update that inventory. Part of the refinement will be including some of the data set that is list mess and not included in Version 1. So we are working on refining that inventory to be more inclusive. Simultaneously we are also working on developing a data, a set inventory management process. So this process will help us to ensure moving forward the data set inventory is up to date as we have new data registered as there is need to updating the existing data will retire some of the data due to privacy or security concerns, how do we manage the management of this inventory. So we're developing a process on that as well.

Lastly we have been working on developing the data relief process. So the goal of the data relief process is to ensure any data release to throw the open data platform is consistent especially now with the increasing privacy and the security concerns. We want to make sure that the organization consider the privacy right as well as the legal – as well as ICANN's legal obligation when

we publish every dataset. So this process is critical to the success of the Open Data Program.

The next slides actually describe at a very high level our proposed draft approach to – for the data release process. I know that today we only have 20 minutes here so I'm not going to dive into the details because this is going to be the main objective for our Thursday Open Data Program workshop. I would really encourage everyone to join our Thursday session. As mentioned this process is quite critical so I am – I believe that everyone's input to the development of this process will be very critical to the success of this program so I look forward of seeing everyone there.

So with that I know that this is a very brief update and you may have a lot of questions. I will use the rest of the time for Q&A and if we don't have enough time to answer everyone's question please feel free to reach out to us while we are here in Kobe. We're hopefully to see you on our Thursday workshop. Thank you.

Claudia Selli: Thank you very much. So I'm looking around the room to see oh Steve you have already a question.

Steve DelBianco: Yes, thank you very much. There were two points you brought up in the initial that the BC has focused on for a long time. One was this idea that being concerned about privacy if that should lead to the redaction or suppression of a publication The BC's advice to I think your predecessor on this project was to first consider ways of anonymizing, depersonalizing data so that it can be published and that would be a superior solution than to just simply suppress it. And the second question has to do with a resolution on the CCT but I'll let you respond first to that one.

Victoria Yang: I don't have a very specific answer yet to your concern and absolutely that's one of the main reason why we are so careful designing the data released process is to make sure that we consider the privacy and security concern.

And I did quite a lot of research together with other teams so just to - what you said there is a method called a de-identification which is to remove any sensitive data or data that is identifiable before we, you know, make the data available publicly. So that is one of the methods to do so. And we are definitely looking into it and this is actually part of the data release process, yes.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you. And the second question this group has been very active the BC has been very active on the community-based review of the prior round of new gTLDs. And we're very supportive of many of the 36 recommendations that team put into the board. As you may have heard last week, the board voted to move 17 of them, half of them into the pending status, pending ICANN org where you work coming back within six months with some answers. And I read the entire board resolution and not once did they mention the Open Data Initiative as a potential place that that data might already be available or could be added to or maybe some of this data could be derived from what ODI has. So when we previously met with your group and David's group we had always said the ODI should be very conscious of what the CCTRT was proposing in an effort to merge those. Had - did the board work with your group before it decided what to say about the CCTRT recommendations?

Susanna Bennett: That's a very good point. And organization-wise that we have been trying hard to make sure that we align in various areas so I'll take that note back and to make sure that we are more aligned going forward. Thank you.

Steve DelBianco: But that would mean you're not aware of them asking you prior to parking 17 of them. They didn't come to you to say do you already have these data items?

Susanna Bennett: Not that I'm aware of.

Steve DelBianco: That's too bad. And so I would encourage you to look at the resolution that the board approved on March 1 and the primary reason given to park half of the resolutions. Half of the recommendations is about data and data is what you're all about. So there's a chance that you might be able to come very close to meeting and thereby eliminate the need for the board to park those recommendations. Thank you.

Victoria Yang: Thank you for that. And I was in the public forum yesterday and I heard the comment. And actually assurance that a lot of the recommendations based on data. And Goran is going to work with the organization to look into that.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Victoria Yang: Yes thank you.

Man: Jimson?

Jimson Olufuye: Yes this is Jimson Olufuye. Thank you for the presentation. Two quick questions first was a follow-up to Steve's question. Are you looking broadly the issue of efficiency, organization or operational efficiency as you design your open data program? Well they add value to the overall desire for more efficiency in the general impression of our org? And secondly, what is the timeline you have in mind for this to be fully rolled out. What timeline do you have in mind?

Victoria Yang: So I will address your first question first. (Intermoza) is efficiency one of our overall goals for this program. I believe partially yes because as we go through the segment and we determine datasets can be released we are going to do the next step of assessment which is to evaluate the plus and minus of having a data set extracted and transferred and loaded automatically.

So it depends on let's say the frequency of the data could be an example if a dataset is only updated every half year or even once a year it makes business sense maybe to just manually upload it. If a dataset is updated more frequently that can be a candidate for us to design a better pipeline which as a result will enhance the efficiency of our data collection and publication. So yes overall as a result the program will enhance their efficiency.

Interim of timeline unfortunately I don't have a timeline yet. We are working very hard together internally with, you know, I'm working with legal, I'm working within IT and, you know, other departments who are all involved in the development in order for us to start operationalize this program. So I don't have particular timeline that you might be looking for but I would say that as we make progress on this program I will make sure that we have consistent communication with the community. And if you, you know, you want to have a close follow-up you can just reach out to me.

Claudia Selli: Other questions?

Man: (Unintelligible) information.

Jimson Olufuye: Well maybe just for information but the benefit of our members here actually it is one of the key initiative that BC really push forward because more and more transparency is fairly regard to data and (unintelligible) view so just to also let everyone know that is quite important to BC. Thank you.

Victoria Yang: (Unintelligible) noted, thank you.

Claudia Selli: Well I don't see any other question in the room or in the chat so thank you very much for the time that you have taken. I don't know if you want to say something else.

Victoria Yang: I just thank you and hope everyone can make yourself available to come join our session on Thursday to discuss on the process. Yes.

Claudia Selli: Thank you.

Andrew Mack: As many as we can.

Man: Twenty-five minutes from now.

Andrew Mack: Okay, great. Well thank you all very much and I want to welcome and also extend my apologies to (Gabby Black) who is on the phone from Buenos Aires and I don't know, zero dark 30 in the middle of the morning. I'm Andrew Mack. This is Mark Datysgeld. Mark and Gabi and I have been the team working on the participation study for Latin America. We started about six months ago. We really appreciate the opportunity to do this study. My goal is to give you a very, very brief overview of what we did, why we did it and then to engage as much as possible with the rest of the BC in a conversation about what questions we have, what we think we can do to go forward and make the most out of these new opportunities with Latin America and more broadly with emerging markets. And I think that we have some really good news to share about what is possible and some creative approaches that have come up as a result of working with and speaking with business leaders across the regions.

So next slide please. Throughout the study team. The study team is the three of us. I'm based in the US as you all know, Mark in Brazil and Gabi in Argentina. We chose this particular team and we think it's a strong team for a bunch of different reasons well as slightly different business backgrounds, Gabi being a lawyer, Mark coming from an academic background and being a consultant and myself being a consultant as well. But working with a lot of larger companies bringing an interesting diversity of past experience and past time with ICANN and past time working with different parts of the region.

Why this study? Well as you all know we – we're - part of our charter is to reach out to and to be representative of a global business voice. Now as you may know we've had some really great success over the last few years in building our membership including and a lot of new members from the Africa region. But we've continually struggled in Latin America and that's a bit of an odd thing for us as a study group when we were looking at it. Latin America is 1/10 of all humanity. They're a very fast growing region. They face a lot of issues related to the Internet and have a lot - huge growth and e-commerce and all kinds of other pieces of our ecosystem. And yet historically there's been very, very limited, very limited BC representation from Latin America. And we wanted to understand why that was and what we might be able to do about it so that we capture the voices of Latin America and feed them into what we're trying to do.

Our goal was to start with the challenges and understand them but to go well beyond that and go directly into what are things that we can do where is where are the opportunities and there is money left literally lying on the table that we should be picking up. And Steve as I, and I were talking on the way in and way up to Kobe and one of the things we discussed was we want to make sure that we have the discussion that underlies all of this. Why should the BC care?

And we think of the BC should care for two reasons. They were business guys so they want to approach it like, you know, like a, you know, like a business proposition. Why should the BC care? Well we should care because we want to truly represent international business. We don't want to be caught off guard with this difference of perspective that we don't understand it. And we want to have the ability to say in front of other constituencies just how much we understand about these different regions especially Latin America.

And the second one is frankly to protect our members and our agendas. Many of the members of the BC do business in or with Latin America. We need to understand what they – what their day to day is like and why it is that

- why is that they're not just participant and what might be on the horizon, what might get them more excited?

Next slide please. Thank you. So we have three realizations, three points of departure if you will okay? First outreach is hard and it's especially hard for the BC to do alone. As anybody knows from having gone through the Panama event it was terrify or even worse from the San Juan event. It is hard to organize people in an outreach setting. I've spoken now at what two, three different conferences in Brazil remotely but it's hard to get people together. It's hard to do the kinds of things that you need to do in terms of sensitizing the audience, getting them to understand the ecosystem and then doing all of the follow-up.

It's hard to do and it's hard to do alone. And we recognized, one of the things that we recognized through the study was just the fact that there were different pockets of ICANN working in different places. So there's some real economies of scale if we can pull our work together with ICANN's work and with the work of some of our members. The second thing, our existing model of participation is demanding. And it is even more demanding for most Latin American businesses. I think most people in the room, especially most people in the room who are native English speakers don't realize just how much of a list it is, I mean think about how long it took you to learn ICANN-ese. And then think about how hard it might be to try to do it in another language, right and the demands of trying to find people with in a company who has that level of skill and can devote the time to ICANN. So it's a pretty heavy lift.

And then what that leads us to is a third realization is that is that we need to be more creative, perhaps more creative to reach Latin American businesses on their own terms. There should be an S there, sorry about that. Next slide. So by the way if you'd like to jump in Gabi if you'd like to jump in at any point please stop me. I know we have 25. I'm trying to get the crux of it in before our audience is, you know, like our next meeting comes.

So four major challenges that we thought. We did a series of interviews from all over the region. We worked with eight different countries primarily, but we also and with business leaders some of whom had experience with ICANN, some of whom were less experienced with ICANN, some of whom had much - little or no experience but were interested in the idea or would be on our list, the people, kind of people that we think we should be seeing at these meetings.

Four major constraints to membership and to participation came up. And I mentioned both membership and participation because membership is good but ultimately if we're going to really represent the global business community we want participation too. So one of the things that we've seen with - and complements to our friends from Nigeria right? We've had a real not just that people are on the list but that they are on the list doing things and that's really what we're looking for.

So first constraint is logistics time, money and language. Time because this takes a lot of time to do as you all know, money because it's expensive and especially expensive. As part of our study what we saw is that the vast number of people who might be able to say yes to joining the BC are people who are my age, Nivaldo's age many of whom, most of whom in Latin America don't speak English. So the kind of people that we would need to get not only does it take time but they're expensive and there aren't very many of them. The logistics is number one.

Agenda is number two. We went back and we looked at the last 36 plus months of BC agendas and had a hard time finding a lot of Latin America related things. Now recognizing that about half of what we do on an everyday basis may be in some way or another related to making the BC run or making ICANN run wasn't - we still found that there wasn't a lot there that if I am a Latin America member I can take back to my people, okay?

Third thing was business culture. And this is interesting because this is something that I didn't know. I - we learned from the course of our meetings and our conversations but business culture's a little bit different in the sense that most firms really aren't directly involved in policymaking outside of an ad hoc come together around specific issues. Partly that's as a result we found from the fact that there are a lot of more day-to-day issues than you might find in the United States and Europe just in making your, you know, business environment kinds of issues. But it is partly a cultural thing the businesses just aren't - they don't have the experience of it in the same way. Please?

Mark Datysgeld: Just to briefly add it going back to your interviews the most, what struck to me the most is literally the question am I allowed to do that? So it's very different from saying am I able to do that, am I allowed to do that in the sense that it - is this not something that the government does? Can I as a business or an association do this? So it's more core issue in the sense that they wouldn't believe even that they could actually be a part of the process. That's how distanced it is from their reality to think okay I can go there, I can influence, I can talk on the table so this is kind of where we're trying to get at with this so please continue Andrew.

Andrew Mack: Thank you and Gabi can you hear us? Not sure okay. Well if she's on the line please and if not we'll grab any comments that she has from the chat okay? Yes, okay. So and the last one I mentioned earlier the fact is the participation is hard. It's many issues advance nomenclature. What we found at least as importantly is it's very hard to show results and to translate out to value to management. I mean I know that this is something that even the company, the largest companies in the room sometimes have a challenge with is how do you take what we do here and what we learned here and the amount of time and effort it takes to get really good at it, translate it out. Imagine now that you've got a region where ICANN is much less well known and where there are language barriers and nomenclature barriers it becomes pretty substantial.

Next slide please. Okay so what - one of the things that we decided that we wanted to do. We got - the feedback that we got from an awful lot of the interviewees and from the conversations that we've had over the course of the last I don't know 18 months around this topic was is that the participation model that we have here may just not be practical for a lot of people in the Latin America region.

Okay I found this one. Okay. And it got us to thinking what are our options? If people cannot spend the time they don't have the resources, they don't have the language skills or maybe even that many of the issues that they're facing that we are talking about are not front and center for them. Are there ways that we could organize participation or allow them to participate that might be more appropriate, that might be worth trying for them and for us? And we came up with for potentials based on the Latin America experience. You want to talk about the fourth? I've asked okay.

So the four models are a team to membership model, an association model, a bundled central representation model and a model of local ambassadors. So the team membership model might be something along these lines. A lot of companies, especially small and medium-size companies might not have the wherewithal. They might not have the bandwidth to pick up an entire membership. They might not be able to attend all the meetings. They might not be able to attend all the calls.

One of the things that a number of our interviewees suggested is to try to create the kind of a team, a group of smaller companies especially in some of the smaller markets so that they could work together to cover if you will or to represent the private sector and their company and in their country to keep people up to speed creating critical mass okay? So think about it like a team.

The second one is an association model. What we found is that to the extent that companies in Latin America really were working on policy issues whether domestically or internationally but especially domestically they usually did it

through associations. And so one of the things that we thought we would recommend for Latin America and potentially more broadly for other emerging markets is that we use our focus on outreach and we use our focus in terms of trying to build long term relationships with the associations themselves.

So there's - there is a great example for that or a great precedent for that. It addresses a bunch of issues that we want not least of which is the language issue right? So association comes in, they've got somebody they can do this, they're up to speed. Then they then can do a report out. And probably the most successful example that we can think of that is actually the country in which we are right now Japan, where the Japanese ICANN community has if you will a few regular representatives that oftentimes come to the meetings around the world and then a really strong readout that happens after each meeting where people who aren't as fluent in English and don't have the ability to go as deep into the acronym as others, they have the ability to keep up to speed and to participate. And that seems to work very nicely.

Mark Datysgeld: And one interesting thing is that the deeper part of this is that there is an actual value for the associations because what we found is that what they want the most, almost all of the associations mention they want to add value to being a member of their associations. And this being a part of an international fora were other associations don't is a huge differentiator so they can sell this back to their clients and say here I am representing you in international forum. So this is not a position that is empty. It's not like that reach out for associations because it's nice. It's we can sell it as okay, you aggregate this value to your services and you can sell this back home at the same time that you increase the ranks and you increase what we're doing here. So there's we think a robust model behind this proposition.

Andrew Mack: So the third model so one of the things that we did as part of our research was to just look at who is using the Internet in Latin America? Who has – what are some of the biggest sites, what are some of the most important

groups that are not here okay? And what we found is that there were a number of people whether they be in finance, whether they be in media who have interests who have analogues in the global north who do show up at ICANN right?

And the third potential new participation model would be a kind of a bundle sectoral representation. And the thought is basically that we get people for example big media companies in the Andean region, sit them down and say this is what ICANN is. We like you to be represented in some way. How can we help you do this go after them as a sector and try to get them to work together, send somebody from their sector okay?

And it wouldn't be from all of Latin America obviously but you could – that – the important thing about that is is that they have a common perspective based on the sector that they are involved in, wouldn't be necessarily like an association because they might not even be associated in that way. But the aim out of sector specifically that we think is underrepresented and could be important for business and reaches a lot of consumers, reaches a lot of our potential market. Talk about the last model.

Mark Datysgeld: Just to complement briefly what you said this is based on experience. What our main idea behind this is what has been done by the GSC from Brazil, (Daniel Think) with the .brand from Brazil. They were completely inactive with their .brands for the longest time until he decided to sit them down together and get them to get started on the conversation about what they were doing about what that meant for them. To them there was no value in that. It was simply something that their lawyers did long ago to protect their brands.

But once they sat down and started talking about ideas and started galvanizing something immediately we saw an increase in their interest and they're actually conversing with us. We have a line of dialogue directly with them now so this is something that while very new has already been proven

to have some success in some way in the ICANN model. I don't see why we couldn't at least give it a shot in this sense.

And the thought about is, we thought about is the local ambassador. And this kind of brings back to a lot of the things that we see in all of our communities here which that one very driven person usually can generate the kind of change that we are looking for in the region as long as they have some support, as long as they have the constituency behind them trying to get things to happen. So well what this would be would be something along the lines of maybe getting the right person that we think could generate some change in a region. And this is not - this is - can happen in parallel to the other model. This is not exclusive but getting one person in a key market we are looking at and seeing this has potential because we don't have anybody there and actually bringing them to the community and trying to really engage with them in a more direct matter in what sense bring them into the PDP process and kind of provide some sort of help assistant in their language so that long term they could act back home and create that sort of structure there.

There are many examples of this happening in other communities but in the BC I can't exactly think of a model where that – or where the quotas would be. What Nivaldo did, he was the one who kind of got us into this idea. He started talking about ICANN and started coming to the meetings, people onboarded him. Jimson was very helpful, Steve and us, they brought him into the process then he managed to bring me into the fold, bring the Brazilian Software Association bring the Association of the Federation of banks of Brazil who are very close to becoming members so one member in a target region who the community engaged very closely yielded five companies from Brazil. So this is where we're coming from on this particular model.

Andrew Mack: Thanks. Next slide please. So if one of our big takeaways is we should be creative and look at new models of participation right, that more fit Latin America and the realities of day to day Latin American business the other

thing is to try to figure out what can we do now, especially what can we do that's going to be that's going to have little to no cost and we can put into place as quickly as possible. And here we came up with two sets of recommendations which we very much hope that the BC will adopt.

The first is around our relationship with ICANN. We did a really deep dive, and I mean a really deep dive and all of the data that was available from ICANN sources and we found out two things. Number one is it's really hard to get and number two is there's not very much of it okay? There's not very much data about where ICANN is speaking, who they've met with, what if any follow-up there is? We also looked at data from things like fellowship but it's hard to know how many business candidates were in the pool but didn't get accepted.

And I am a mentor for the Marrakesh meetings and beyond and one of the things that I went through today with the person who was assigning mentees and there were very few business candidates. And so somewhere between – there's an opportunity in there. I'm not to say that anybody, you know, that we have not gotten our fair share but it is clear that of the number of people that have been potential that have been mentees in the Fellowship program I think we looked at it and like 2% were businesses from Latin America. That's probably too low a number. So more data, more accountability through that data, the more fellowship opportunities for businesses.

The second thing we know that they've just put together, I mean the reason they just put together a Latin America strategy not a lot of business inputs in it. We want to create a back and forth with ICANN regional leadership so that business voices are involved in their strategizing, strategy process to a much greater extent. And the last thing is around coordinated BC ICANN outreach. I mentioned at the very beginning just that it is hard to do outreach in Latin America. But ICANN's do it and we're doing it and we should be doing it together. We should know where they're going to be. We'd like them to be telling us in advance and we've already had conversations with the regional

vice president and others in ICANN regional staff and they're completely on board and we're going to have a follow on meeting with them unless anyone from the BC objects to try to really go deeper into this to try to coordinate much more effectively and to see who do we have in whatever region wherever there's going to be an event so that we can get there with them or when they have - when we have events to make sure that they have resources that they can push into those and that we know as much in advance so that we get the absolute maximum amount of it. So three things that we can do to make more of our relationship with ICANN.

And on our side two things that we think we can do as a BC to make ourselves more Latin America friendly and maybe a little bit less oriented just towards the global North. The first is to address language constraints directly. And here none of us are talking about providing simultaneous translation. We don't have enough members who are not native English speakers or who are Spanish and Portuguese speakers at this point. But we could relatively easily translate all of our materials into Spanish and Portuguese. We could translate our Web site into Spanish and Portuguese and I think we should.

And the second thing and probably the most important thing is we need to build opportunities to learn about the global sound. We need to build opportunities for members from outside Europe and the United States to really shine. It's important for them facing their own management and it's important for us in terms of our ability to learn from those regions. So we have a proposal for having a segment called here are the BC and here's how it would work. Every other meeting on a rotating basis we would take a representative from one of the regions, Africa, Latin America, Asia to spend ten minutes, ten minutes of every other call talking about a region, five minutes to inform the BC about what's going on in their region, what issues are important to them anything that we should know as a business grouping and then five minutes for discussion. And we think we should try it because if we're not talking about Latin America then there's no incentive for Latin Americans to really engage with us. And it's very, very difficult for them to

show the people who pay for their salaries and their travel that they're really having an impact. So these are humbly submitted a bunch of – a few recommendations that we have all of which we think can pay for themselves and be relatively simple to implement.

Last slide please. The way we would like to go, what's our vision new models and new participants. True integration of new markets into the BC and I and in the end for us as a group a smarter group that is smarter internally and stronger and externally better representing, truly better representing global business. So thanks.

Mark Datysgeld: So briefly for anybody who would like to take a deeper look into the suggestions we actually have a more extensive list. We just condensed some key suggestions for your appreciation but we do have quite an extensive list of possible paths we could take so please refer to the documents that have been circulated on the list if you want to have a deeper look.

Claudia Selli: Yes, our guests are around here Jonathan, Andrew but we can try to take a few questions and then when they come in we might interrupt and continue later. Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: Thank you Claudia. My – I have a question and a comment. We do have a later. It will come later and Jimson will just use my slides discussion about outreach more generally. So perhaps we could, when we could have that presentation which Jimson will need to make because I probably have to leave before we then go into more detail. But I do have a question. And that is did you encounter and work with the (Ecom LAC) staff because the largest companies actively meet there once a year at a C level, a C suite level? And just if you didn't we can talk later. I can introduce you to the executive staff there because you might want to factor that into other ideas for outreach in the region.

Andrew Mack: Sure we tried to reach out to as many people who had a connection in one way or another to the kind of whole e-commerce world because that's big and growing but still not super well-organized. So we talked to one of the people who was our – one of our interviewees was I think the number one and number two at Mercado Libre which is, you know, the largest space in Latin America. But obviously we'd love to meet with more people and we love to get those kinds of people. They have a lot of the issues that we would, you know, that would fit in the BC. And so we'd love to meet more of them and we'd love to do that on a more ongoing basis. Part of this was less about outreach which we are - which we think is going well and more about trying to drive into the value proposition why people would join and how to keep them in right, and how to keep them active and what we can learn from their activity. Please.

Claudia Selli: Yes please.

Vivek Goyal: (Unintelligible) here. Thank you very much for that report. I'm from India so as you were going through that report I was saying oh that happens to us that happens to us. So everything you have said applies to India and maybe regions around it except for language. Because of the past we are quite comfortable with English to work but all the other challenges does apply.

Most businesses in India don't know about ICANN including those that did apply for GT brand gTLDs and have now lost and forgotten them and are still paying for them. So whatever you say can also be expanded to other regions of the world including India and maybe even neighboring regions. And this could be an opportunity to take a look at all of these areas to increase participation in BC and active participation, not just being on the list but actively being part of it. So thank you very much.

Mark Datysgeld: Thank you so much for the comments. We had a secret hope deep within us that this would be more of a panorama on how to get started on engagement with the global source but we didn't want to be pretentious about it. We

focused very much on the (life) but with the hope that we're getting a bit of a panorama on how we can start addressing the global self more effectively. So if that came across than it's more than we could have expected because we really to dip down but we didn't want to try to sound pretentious.

Andrew Mack: And I might just add that the idea of new participation models and if you think about it we have a member from Afghanistan right? I mean how many calls – that's a hard time zone challenge and India is similar right? And so thinking more creatively perhaps about the way that people can participate being full BC members but to do it in a slightly different way I think that that's smart for us. And it allows people in diverse geographies in - with diverse language backgrounds to participate. It's worth our time to think more deeply about it than try and develop these over the course of time.

Claudia Selli: Jimson?

Jimson Olufuye: Yes thank you Andrew and team for a job done. Now have a number of the questions as much as possible just to throw more light to the whole idea. And as part of your recommendation you talked about there would be need for a chat pod update or for us to trigger the basic charter. So what area of the charter could be affected in this respect? And then two like (Vivik) had just spoken about the relevance to Asia okay and of course Africa as well and also of course Latin America being the business. So the point is is it - what do you think about the idea of having an observatory, maybe a committee whereby we can have representation from each region of the global staff so that they can have a discussion among themselves and then when we have a BC meeting as we recommended we have a slot so that they can bring it (unintelligible) they will at first disclose this theme and prioritize and then presenting our normal call. Is there - because if you give Latin America several minutes so you need to give Africa into - give Asia as well. So it might be a good idea to have an observatory committee to look at all those issues in the region and then present them and will sign them to the list.

Andrew Mack: So let me two things okay. First of all the charter look that Jimson was referring to is a very simple thing. When we were exploring the idea of a team to membership, the way that we currently do membership is on a company by company basis. So yes or an association. And so the reason we mentioned it at all was because we didn't know if it was – it may be necessary to have a slight adjustment to the charter to allow people to join as a pair for example okay? So that was - that's all that is.

In terms of the idea of here the BC the thought was to have a rotating basis. So for example we might have – it might be the turn in the same way that ICANN moves its meetings regionally on a circular basis right? It might be the turn of Africa to talk about Africa, African issues and the African perspective in one meeting. Two meetings later it might be the turn of Asia.

The point of it is to make sure that we are constantly educating ourselves on the rest of our world so that we're relevant to them and so that they are - they have the chance to shine. But it wouldn't be too - I don't think we need to if we want to create a global self-ad hoc kind a committee that would be great but I know that people are already time stretched. But it's just the idea of having a slot here that is devoted to hearing from companies that are - they represent the relatively underserved markets and that the thought was to make it simple and, you know, one day it might be a person from Nigeria, the next time it might be a person from Argentina the next time it might be a person from the Middle East and then the next time around it might be someone from Kenya instead of Nigeria. This is just the idea so that we are educating ourselves on an ongoing basis. Make sense?

Mark Datysgeld: The idea would be for example there's a new framework being discussed in Kenya that says this and this. It repeats all around we hear about that and a few months later so about this framework what happened was this and this. In this way we would get to understand the individual context without oversaturating without stretching for time without anything while still getting to

understand what's going on with different members around the globe even for our own benefit even for the global south benefit.

Jimson Olufuye: Actually the idea of that just for coordination, more effective coordination, the contents and or to make the presentation.

Andrew Mack: I'm never against the idea of getting global South voices together and learning more and sharing best practice and all this kind of thing. Our hope was -- and I hope this makes sense to everyone in the BC -- our hope was -- and we feel very strongly -- if this is a side effort we're not going to get the pickup that we want. We want to try to make this a small discrete ask within our -- yes within our normal, you know, every other meeting. It's not a big lift. It's something that the person who represents the region for that meeting will prepare. And we were talking about five minutes, just a quick update and that'll get us talking about them and then we'll move on. It's not going to destroy our policy calendar or make our meetings extra long or importantly it's -- we're not asking anyone to have another extra meeting unless they want to.

Claudia Selli: Thank you. Thank you very much Andrew and Mark. I think it's a very good report and certainly we had to pull up to see also how we can implement those suggestions because I think they are meaningful precisely also because they are coming from people on, you know, in a precise region and are not actively participating. We can certainly continue this discussion when we go into the outreach as well in case there are other questions. We have now Jonathan and Drew that are here.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks Claudia. We are now going to move to the segment we discussed this morning which is to increase awareness and targeted specific engagement on advancing the recommendations that came out of the consumer trust competition and choice to review, the CCTRT which we call it. So we are having three guests, the Chair, Jonathan Zuck, Laureen Kapin from Network Team also part of the GAC US government and Drew Bagley.

So we're going to welcome them to the front table to update and engage with us. Thank you.

Jonathan Zuck: Hey folks thanks for having us here. My name's Jonathan Zuck and I am part of the At-Large but I served as the chair of the CCT Review Team that for which we've recently received our response from the board. And I want to begin by I think some of this was motivated by my statement to the board in the public forum about the need for some kind of a gathering of the board and the review teams that are in place or will be soon because of a change from having accepted all recommendations and just having trouble implementing them to now kind of having a much more sort of wishy-washy response to the recommendations.

And so there is some complexity associated with our and some nuance associated with the recommendations in that some were designated to actors other than the board and were therefore passed on. So we have a kind of a nuanced view on that that we would have love some endorsement associated with that passing on to the Subsequent Procedures Working Group to contract compliance, et cetera, and so that's a language problem.

But some of those things like for example we've been in discussions with subsequent procedures as we're going along and they have incorporated some of these things. We left those recommendations in so we could declare victory right, because some of those things were already being considered. Similarly contract compliance has begun to try and act on some of the things that we requested of them.

There are some core problems though and some things that I think are giving the board some pause. One of them is things that require changes to contracts. And ironically when there's a new contract negotiation it feels like the contracted parties come to the negotiation with a list of things they want and the staff very rarely comes with their own list. And there have been multiple times you've made suggestions to them for things on their list, and

that's what we did as well on the board treated that like the third rail. You know, we can't dictate what the outcome of a contract would be which empirically is true but at the same time given that so many of the contracted parties are interested in a subsequent round there are opportunities for leverage let's say about contract negotiations.

And so, you know, I think that the opportunity to be creative was missed on the part of the board. They also felt like they needed to not impinge on the community which felt like a selective time to do that given some recent events as well. And so I - but at some level I think they've created a real PR mess for themselves associated with it because it's a real change in the way they've dealt with reviews that in many respects is justified but they just sort of threw it out there instead of really preparing the waters and coming up with a process in advance.

And so we'll be talking more with them. We'll be ingesting more of this. I have a meeting with Cherine tonight to go through and clarify some of these things. The last bit of this though is the kind of late homework assignment nature of their response. We've got a lot of reassurance that they spent a lot of time talking about it. And I believe that but I'm not sure they spent a lot of time reading it beforehand, right? And so they asked, they've pushed things to staff like go find a definition of DNS abuse when in fact there's an explicit one in the document that Drew will mention and other areas like that where they simply got the facts wrong.

They accepted Recommendation 1 but completely misinterpreted. And so I think there will be, you know, Recommendation 1 is about the organization taking data collection more seriously generally. And that's something the BC has supported all along, the GAC has supported all long, the entire CSG and even the NCSG that they mentioned, you know, came around onto that so. You know, again it comes back to we don't want to step on the toes of the Registry Stakeholder Group and I think that's something that we need to push

back on as a group that, you know, if we're going to make real evaluations of about things like competition we're going to need data to do it or it's a farce.

And the reason it's important is that with each of these programs is this cost benefit analysis right? In other words if we're not able to quantify any kind of upside associated with the expansion of the DNS then everything on the downside is ways against nothing if you will right? And so the value of really figuring out if competition has been increased for example becomes really important. And so I think our fear is that things that they're calling pending and things like that will be lost in the processes with the staff, people will come back and say things are too expensive, et cetera. And so I think that's where we're going to have to do some work.

And the other issue is that - was about prioritization. And I think that that's - they talk to you, the CSG when you were together about this issue of prioritization. And so what we did was a categorization. What we said is we think this is something that should happen before the next CCT review or this is something we think should happen in the next year or this is a prerequisite to any further rounds. And those privatizations got ignored and I think I again that's something that is a point of leverage for the board that they are refusing to take up.

Now as far as privatizations across recommendations, we didn't do that. We didn't say, hey if you've only got money to do half of these do these and not those. We didn't feel like we were in a position to do that. And certainly we couldn't prioritize our recommendations vis-à-vis the recommendations of other review teams right?

And so that may be a community exercise going forward but unfortunately they're trying to completely change the way we handle an accountability mechanism without coming to the community first. And I think they really botched the launch of it and there's going to be some work to bring them back on board. But I would like to turn it over to Drew to talk about some

specific mistakes they made that may be worth revisiting with them and getting them to revise their response to the recommendations based on those mistakes.

Andrew Mack: Jonathan before Drew picks up I wanted to let the BC members know that in the Adobe chat I placed an excerpt from the board's resolution and specifically the part where the board parked 17 of the 35 recommendations in the pending space. And you'll see the five generic reasons given. And as you read on because you can scroll in Adobe, you'll see the rationale used for the site concerns from NCSG or the registries. But as Jonathan went through it a lot of the concerns he surfaced are in writing up there so we have a better idea about what they've covered. Okay Drew.

Jonathan Zuck: And all the issues that the NCSG has raised so then they're actually very happy with our recommendations at this point. So there - it turns out there will only be one group, the one that would in fact be burdened with some of these recommendations so it's a little complicated from the perspective.

Drew Bagley: Thank you. For those of you who don't know me, my name is Drew Bagley. I'm with CrowdStrike in the Secure Domain Foundation. And I served on the leadership on the CCT Review along with Jonathan and Laureen.

And as Jonathan mentioned we still are doing a deep dive to fully digest what the board has done with this resolution and how they've interpreted or punted or missed opportunities perhaps with these recommendations. But I'd like to reemphasize that with all 35 of the recommendations we came up with they were full consensus recommendations that were unanimous and that the CCT Review Team was comprised of members of the whole community. So this was an exercise in really coming together to really build consensus, worked very hard on these recommendations regardless of the topic area and also of course to factor in the public comments we received including those we received several months ago after we had released our draft report so that we took that very seriously so that we were hoping not only to ensure

that we were retaining the full consensus of our own review team but so that we could ensure that we were fully accounting for all the feedback we received.

That included with regard to the recommendations we came up with for DNS abuse. And those recommendations and our focus on that stemmed directly from our mandate which was twofold with regard to abuse. So one was to look at the malicious abuse issues associated with the expansion of the DNS. And the other was to look at the safeguards that were implemented as part of the new gTLD expansion that were put in place to mitigate issues that were identified by the community prior to the launch of the new gTLD program. And so in doing so like with everything that we attempted to look at, we took a data-driven approach and we even commissioned a study. And to commission that study we had to rely upon an operational definition for DNS abuse that was discrete and measurable. And in doing that and coming up with the criteria for the study itself we relied upon work that the community had previously done going back nearly ten years to October of 2009 where we were dealing with the mitigating malicious conduct report to several communiqués since then to even a working group that was the registration abuse policy's working group from 2010 as well as work done by ICANN staff in 2016 that was specifically to inform our review team and look at specific areas of abuse for which there was both consensus as well as a community description and even areas of abuse there were already enshrined in contracts.

So there was a lot of diligence put forth by us to ensure that we were working with something that was measurable and for which there was already consensus. And so with that we created an operational definition of abuse that we called DNS security abuse which we defined as DNS abuse related to cyber security such as malware distribution, phishing, farming, (botnic) command and control and high volume spam. And so this was directly related to our mandate itself as well as ICANN's remit with regard to the security and stability of the DNS.

And so the important thing to know with that is that there really is no need whatsoever for the community to go forth and define more broadly all of the aspects of DNS abuse that the community might want to tackle from a policy perspective because instead our recommendations are very specific to our mandate into this operational definition and to work that the community has done for the past decade on this topic. And so we really do not understand why the DNS abuse recommendations were put into pending until the community at large comes up with a definition of something that as we see with other areas the community is working on now related to abuse did something that surely would take years if it was even something the community would achieve in time before there would be any sort of next round.

So this is something I think that's really, really important to emphasize and I really hope, you know, as we have further consultation with the board this is something we can continue to articulate and will continue to watch. So I just wanted to point that out that that is not a necessary exercise before acting on these recommendations. And so with that I will, you know, pass to Laureen Kapin from the FTC.

Laureen Kapin: Thanks. I just wanted to point out two concrete examples of the challenging logic that the board used to refrain from accepting these recommendations. And these dealt with the consumer trust side of the equation which was the subgroup that I headed. And one deals with asking for more data on objective behavioral measures of consumer trust. The review team was tasked with dealing with the question of whether the expansion of the new gTLD system actually had an impact on consumer trust but the data that we were looking at didn't have a lot of information on whether the public actually trusted these new gTLDs and one of the questions we asked was how do you measure that?

What objectively do you do to measure that? What behavior would consumer's exhibit the public exhibit to show, demonstrate that they trusted a new gTLD versus a legacy gTLD, i.e., for example would they give a new gTLD their credit card number? Would they provide sensitive health information? Would they engage in sensitive communications?

And this was information that was absent. And part of the justification here given for not accepting this recommendation is that there already had been surveys done in this area.

And yes that's true, but the information that we were seeking was not in those surveys. So the logic here is topsy-turvy. We identified a lack and to say well it's already been done, you know, are two ships passing in the night. If it was already done we wouldn't be asking for more information. We found it to be insufficient. That's what we identified. So that's one example.

And then the second example and these are not comprehensive, these are illustrative is Recommendation 23. And this deals with highly, new gTLDs in highly regulated sectors which I'm sure you know has been a topic of frequent GAC advice because of the higher risks these new gTLDs can pose to consumers in these sensitive areas -- banks, pharmacy, financial sectors, gambling sectors -- places where people may be at high risk to lose lots of money or provide very sensitive information.

And one of the things we suggested was the ICANN compliance use its existing audit authority to figure out whether these highly regulated gTLDs which had a safeguard that said if you're a highly regulated gTLD and you require a credential to operate in that new gTLD let's make sure that not just anyone can buy a gTLD in that area. Let's make sure they have the credential. So we suggested oh well gee, ICANN compliance has this audit authority. Let's have them audit. Let's have them see whether that's being enforced.

And the response here is well we should look at the complaint volume. Well let me ask you how would anyone ever have the visibility to know whether a gTLD is enforcing this? You would never look at complaint (unintelligible) to get at that information. It's just not something that actually gives you any information on whether that criteria is being enforced. The only way you get at that is to perform an audit.

So again you have this very absurd sort of logic for injecting a very in my view important and reasonable recommendation. And, you know, frankly it undermines the whole credibility of this decision-making. So I'm not passionate about this at all.

Jonathan Zuck: Well in fairness Laureen if there was like a plumber that performed heart surgery the, you know, the relatives of the patient would probably complain eventually that they had found that on a gTLD and...

Laureen Kapin: Yes, but sometimes those relatives don't realize that the surgeon screwed up. All they know is the patient died and the surgeon said, "Oh I'm sorry we lost him."

Jonathan Zuck: Yes.

Laureen Kapin: "We did everything we could." What you need is someone like another doctor or a nurse in the room who says, "Well did you know that they actually fell asleep in the middle of the operation and that's what happened?" I mean you do need this audit.

Claudia Selli: Yes sorry there are a few members who would like to jump in and the discussion so I have Steve, (Denise) and Margie.

Steve DelBianco: That was the most passionate, articulate and specific presentation I witnessed at a ICANN meeting and I'll note that none of you are on ICANN staff. So we get it. We get it, and we want to be and we want to be as helpful

as we can be. There's a big lift here. Yesterday in the public forum the board pretty much blew this off by saying, "Well have, oh we'll have an event in Marrakesh to talk about it." And that may be helpful but it's not going to get the job done.

There is a relatively big lift to get the board to change a resolution that is approved already, a big lift because that is effectively what I hear you saying is that some of this is just wrong, misguided, maybe but a little bit accidentally misinformed and ought to be revised. We took this on board today. We used a significant chunk of our time with the board today to make this argument. And we intend to do so at the public forum on Thursday.

So we could appreciate some guidance on very specific actions that we want to request the board to do once the echo chamber has revealed that they've made some mistakes, that they have kicked the hornet's nest and if they knew the kind of presentation you just gave I'm pretty sure that they wouldn't have taken the actions they took.

Jonathan Zuck: Do you want us to respond? Yes I mean again we have to confess they also dropped this on us while we were all on a plane right, to come here and which is why when I went before the board I asked for an event. And the event I asked for was a meeting to discuss the changing nature of reviews and conflicting costs and things like that, because I think they dropped us in a, they thought they could obsequiously drop a completely different type of resolution than they've ever done with respect to a review before. At the same time that you have ATRT3 ramping up, you have SSR2 going on and they're all wondering why am I wasting my time. If this is now how you're going to respond why not just the PDPs right? And so it's completely change the characteristic of reviews and that's what I want to have discussed at the meeting. And they did finally agree to that even though Goran was wasn't sure he could commit to it. And but anyways it was a funny thing.

So as far as like specific things that you can bring up it's a part of what you're up for right? I think there are a couple of sort of baskets of things that are of interest in one of these is about contracts right, because at the core of this it's about data and having the data necessary. And this is a perennial problem across the organization and not limited to the CCT review. And so this is something that's going to continue to come up. And I will say I will share something because I think it's particularly poignant but David Taylor who was on our review team was having a conversation with Jon Nevett while he was with Donuts and he said, "You can recommend whatever you want. We're not going to do it." So that was a one on one conversation that, but he said that explicitly and that is frighteningly reflected not only in this resolution but the rationale given for the resolution. It's almost frighteningly transparent right?

So I mean that's something that I think is worth addressing that for you to be guardians of the public interest you need to come to contract negotiations with an agenda and a willingness to use whatever leverage you have to get your (unintelligible) as a function of those contract negotiations and not just say oh well we can't see an outcome. They could have said we'll try or something like that and they didn't even go that far or we'll instruct staff to attempt to get this concession. None of that happened. They simply said we don't have power over negotiations which is...

Man: Not true.

Jonathan Zuck: ...horseshit right? And so those kinds of responses I think really undermine their credibility in a way that they approach the response to this review and reveal a systemic problem that if you're willing to bring up I think is something that can be done in fairly concise fashion and could be - and will cause a hubbub for sure right? But there's a reason that people have referred to this as the international cartel with assigned names and numbers right? So I mean I, you know, it's worth attacking that.

As far as going into specific things I don't know if that's a, you know, DNS abuse you can say well we're very concerned about DNS abuse because we represent all the people that use our product and all of our customers, et cetera. And so the idea that for example you can't mandate an audit to make sure that TLDs are actually upholding the...

Laureen Kapin: Note just for your information that the Review Team was asked twice to create new definitions of DNS abuse, once in the early days and then again after we started. We started again after we were suspended. Both times the review team looked at the same fully community vetted definitions of DNS abuse that are available on the ICANN Web site over many, many years and also have been vetted and included in the security framework that ICANN staff publishes multiple years and found those definitions to be quite appropriate for our work as well. And we decline to start from scratch and try and redefine DNS abuse.

So stepping back then I'm – also share Steve other people's concern about the implication this holds for the really only serious accountability mechanism that the community was left with post IANA transition. And I think aside from the really important issues that your review raises and the board's actions raises I think it's important for the community to also give some serious consideration to what these accountability mechanisms are currently.

I would also note just for context that prior to the IANA transition not only were all the recommendations accepted by the board but the board accepted them. And if other entities within the ICANN community were responsible for implementation at different aspects of it they would accept the recommendation directed to that particular body and ask them not only to address it but also direct staff to support the efforts to address it and to regularly come back to the board and community with progress.

If there were budgetary concerns they would ask staff to develop an implementation plan and a proposed budget and come back to the board.

The board would either move forward with that implementation finding money elsewhere or it would state that implementation would be and the budget would be included in the next budget in the next fiscal year. So there's been a significant market change in the board's reaction to and treatment of these recommendations. Thank you.

Margie Milam: Hi, this is Margie. Wow there's so much to talk about here. A couple things just historically with the first Whois Review Team I believe it was there actually was – were recommendations related to amending the contracts and it actually did when the board approved those recommendations kicked off the negotiations cycle that led to the 2013 RAA. So there is already precedent for doing that and I'd like to at least have you guys think about that.

Secondly I believe the contracts that you are referring to relate to the contracts for the next phase in any event. So, you know, the next round of new gTLDs could have its own contracts. So again this is a really odd answer to say that you can't have a contract change as part of a review team recommendation.

The other thing I think I'd point out is I'm not sure that it even complies with the bylaws. The bylaws require the board to approve, at least vote on it within six months. I don't know when your final report was but I don't believe there's an opportunity there to just have a pending recommendation. It's either a yes or no and tells them why. So I'd actually raise bylaws related issues here because I think that's problematic and I think they should at least explain why they think it's consistent with the bylaws.

So and like I said I've learned a lot here. It's quite surprising. And I guess the other thing that (Denise) mentioned is that, you know, however long it's been since you published your final report but the act of budgeting and creating the budget should have happened then. This is not something that, you know, as by the time it gets to the board the staff should have already gone to the board and said we've looked at these recommendations and come, you

know, we think it's going to cost this much but to, you know, wait six months only to say, "Oh we don't know whether we have the money for it," you know, again that's, you know, mismanagement there on whoever's managing the board process but it's really unfortunate.

Claudia Selli: Susan?

Susan Kawaguchi: So oh my goodness because the RDS Review Team finally after 2-1/2 months of stalls have finalized our report literally this weekend and it will be published in the next couple weeks. But I'm sort of wondering if I don't throw up my hands and say no I renege on this, I'm not signing off because we looked at your report a lot while we were doing our work. There was some overlapping issues and we were, you know, it was consumer trust, it was, you know, how a new gTLD handles and, you know, and manages their registries and that really the compliance functions. And we would look at your report and go they've addressed this. There's no – their recommendations will manage this issue. There's no reason to duplicate this. Let's use our ammunition where there isn't.

So this could have a cascading effect. If they're not going to implement, you know, half your recommendations that affects our report. And then obviously know we will be prepared to have the same, you know, issue with the board on our recommendations.

So, you know, I think and then SSR2 is coming in right behind us. So, you know, this is something the US government mandated for ICANN to do and they should - we fought battles about how much control ICANN or could place over our discussions. We were told on certain things. No, no, no you should look at that. And it's like now we're really going to look at that. You know, if you, you know, it's like don't go there. Well now I'm going to go there and here, here and here and here.

So, you know, I mean our report is because GDPR has changed a lot of things since we started I don't know how effective our recommendations but we tried to take that into account. So I'm really disappointed to hear that this is happened and I feel sorry for you guys because I understand. And you guys worked many more years than we did on our report. So I think we all have a duty to go back and say no we will not tolerate this.

Jonathan Zuck: Thanks (Susan). I – it's interesting because you said is one of the only accountability mechanism these reviews. That's in fact not true. And I don't know if this is worth raising because this is a little bit inflammatory. It is a layer of accountability that might be considered the soft accountability mechanisms but there are in fact harder ones.

There is an empowered community. There is the ability to escalate and to overrule the board. And so it's not a question necessarily launching that but it may be something that is worth discussing, you know, and as an incentive to come to the table and deal with this in a more direct fashion. I don't know.

Steve DelBianco: First step would seem to be highly specific and civil rebuttal to this resolution. And I have to believe with the way in which you responded verbally that you've already begun writing such a document, yes or no?

Jonathan Zuck: (Unintelligible) at the meeting...

Steve DelBianco: Got it.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Zuck: That's the problem.

Steve DelBianco: Well there's plenty of time between now and Thursday. So but if you were to commit to that we could commit to supporting it, a specific rebuttal because it's clear that we could go to the microphone Thursday and raise the general

concerns that you've heard today on accountability and bylaws. On the other hand specific item by item rebuttals would be best supported by work that you're probably prepared to do and we could point to that and generate community for four specific rebuttal to the motion. Would you consider that and if so how can we help?

Jonathan Zuck: Thanks Steve. This is Jonathan Zuck for the record. I mean the - I'm a little bit concerned about focusing in on the things they got wrong or something like that and saying, "Okay well here's where you were just dumb and we need you to revisit these pieces because of the broader implications." It almost feels like letting them off the hook by focusing in on the fact that all what we have the DNS oh yes, yes, right, right, right, okay then that's okay, right? I mean it's a, it's more of a question of what it's they're indicative of than it is fixing those five things that we might find to put in a document that seems so specific.

I love the idea of specificity but I mean I – it's – I guess I'm – I guess in context it feels like a very small thing for you guys to rally behind. We can try to go through and we've tried to go through and say these are things you sort of got wrong and do that but that has to be part of a broader communication somehow. So I mean I think we will in fact prepare some response to this not by Thursday, but we could do a bullet list of things where there were just mistakes. But the way that that's presented I feel it needs to be done in a context of a broader problem than it represents.

Man: (Unintelligible) by Thursday's probably (unintelligible) sure.

Man 3: I've got a quick question.

Claudia Selli: Yes, sure.

Man 3: Is there any way to know did the whole board vote on this? Did anybody recuse themselves? And I find it a little curious or coincidental perhaps that a lot of the board has ties to the domain name industry ...

Claudia Selli: Yes.

Man 3: ...you know, implementing some of these things might be problematic in particular, you know, related to, you know, subsequent rounds being launched. So I mean it kind of seems like this is a fox in a henhouse type situation. And I - maybe that's me being a little skeptical conspiracy theory but I mean I think it's a question to at least ask.

Jonathan Zuck: Yes I mean I think Steve's point is that without a lot of data behind it is kind inflammatory thing to bring up in a public forum.

Man: Sure.

Jonathan Zuck: And so I mean we need to do more work to have that conversation probably I guess but so I - we'll try to come up with something and but I suspect any statement made by a member of the team won't confine itself to hey fix these three things because I think like I said they're almost incidental to the broader problem that's associated with their response to things.

Steve DelBianco: Part of the fix it is to look at their elements of recommendations that are outside of org's role for example amendments to contractual agreements. To me tearing that apart not a minimal.

Jonathan Zuck: No, no, no.

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: I mean that is exactly what I want to be able to say.

Denise Michel: This is (Denise). Do we have to wait three months to talk about this? Is there a way to have conference calls, have something a little closer in particularly because of the impact this also has on other reviews yes?

Jonathan Zuck: Yes and I'm a fan of moving it up and be happy to participate in that. I mean I don't know if you recall, I offered to fly you all to a board meeting if it would help. So I mean I, you know, that's the – we can try to push this forward. And like I said Cherine reached out and I have a meeting this evening so they recognize that they've once again yes messed up.

Denise Michel: Stepped in it.

Jonathan Zuck: Yes stepped in it.

Denise Michel: So just some practical matter, we work closely with Chris Disspain who was on the team which I'm assuming you've had a board member on your team also or not? Oh okay, so we had Chris Disspain so we walked him through every recommendation. He only participated - he participated in discussions and everything but not real decision decisions. But we sat there in, you know, as we finalized each recommendation and said, "Is this worded in a way that the board is going to accept this?" So, you know, he may be a little bit on the hot seat if we receive the same type of treatment.

Jonathan Zuck: We did receive a letter from Cherine initially with comments like that. Don't be overly specific in prescribing how a problem should be solved, say that the problem should be solved for example. So we went through and kind of watered down recommendations as a result. And so a perfect example is Recommendation 1 that they accepted which was initially puts them in a place to be ahead of data for ICANN, a data scientist like Graeme Bunton is at Tucows and be there as a service to the community of working groups, review teams, et cetera, and be proactive about the collection of data and empower them to do that. And that felt really prescriptive like hire someone.

So we said, "Well this is a problem. ICANN needs to take this seriously." So they accepted it and their exception of it, their accepting of it said, Well we tasked staff to look for data elements that might be useful which had nothing to do with what we were requesting right? And so that was a result of trying to accommodate their request not to be overly prescriptive in a way that we had describe things and that was the result. So I'm glad that you had that that you had that help but...

Denise Michel: Well who knows if it is going to do anything.

Jonathan Zuck: Well yes there were certain board members that participated in the CCWG as well and then...

Denise Michel: Yes.

Jonathan Zuck: ...it was a varying of, you know, assistance.

Claudia Selli: Thank you very much for being with us and we certainly continue the conversation. So thank you.

Laureen Kapin: Thanks for letting us be here.

Claudia Selli: We have a break now so there is I think 15 minutes if I'm not mistaken. Chantelle how long do we have for the break?

Chantelle Doerksen: Well we've gone over the break was technically from 4:45...

((Crosstalk))

Chantelle Doerksen: ...to 5 o'clock and now it's 5 o'clock. So if we want to give a break we can have a short...

Claudia Selli: Yes we can take a break of 10 minutes and then we can restart in ten minutes.

Chantelle Doerksen: Thank you.

Claudia Selli: Thank you. Okay, we are restarting the meeting so if you can kindly take your seat. Can you all come to the seat. We are restarting the meeting? Okay so we are restarting the meeting and there's an echo. I don't know.

So we're starting with the policy discussion. If you can mute the PC who's, I don't know there's an echo here. Okay stop. We're starting with the policy discussion. Steve if you want to kick this off?

Steve DelBianco: Chantelle can you put up the policy calendar that I circulated yesterday? This will be very quick for a change because as you know when you're walking into an ICANN meeting they slow down the gauntlet of new public comment periods, right? So we only have one open comment that we want to pay attention to.

First thing I'll do though is thank BC members who helped to file the comments that were drafted by members. So John Berard drafted a very brief comment that we filed last week on the customer Standing Committee Effectiveness Review. Thanks to John for that. Jimson thank you for drafting our comment on the first consultation for a two year planning process. And we filed that on February 20. So that's what we filed so far. There is only one open public comment that we want to pay attention to and it's the board seeking public input before it votes on the GNSO recommendation on the EPDP phase one kickoff for phase two.

So that is closing by April 17. I'm very grateful that (Mason), (Statton), (David Ferris) and (Susan) all volunteer this morning to help draft that. I'm positive that Mark and Margie will have something to say and participate in it but there

is no need for you guys to pick up the pen. We'll find other elements of the team to pick up the pen for you. In fact I hope that that will be helpful.

And this morning's interaction with the board remember Cherine asked after – as we were politely but persistently probing about the EPDP phase two asked about the motion that didn't come up, how robust can that motion be as opposed to a rubberstamp? And he said well and maybe it was Chris Disspain, was it Chris or Cherine? Who asked? Cherine asked said can you give us some recommendations for what we might put into that motion? Well the answer is yes. And I don't think we want to wait till April 17 to submit that it a big public comment.

I believe that given that he asked us we should very quickly before drafters very quickly come up with the kinds of things we'd love to see in a bullet list, not the precise words but a bullet list of what ought to be in the resolution. If we do that I can send that to Cherine because he asked for it. And we would do that a week from now instead of waiting for a public discussion on April 17. The idea is that he would then turn to staff to say let's bake this into the motion somewhere, right? So I think that's an opportunity for us to seize. (Susan) I don't see (Statton) here right now but (Susan), (David) for sure and (Mason), you guys can help with that? (David)?

That's great. And then there's a list called the BC – EPDP, all four of you are on it. And that's the list we'll want to use. Let's just use that. Okay fantastic. The rest of the policy calendar dive into some elements that are already ongoing that we have discussed extensively. Personal opinion, I think we really use the closed meeting to great affected today by talking about confidential strategic initiatives that we then executed an hour later in our meeting with the board and with Goran.

We didn't get exactly the answer from Goran that we were pressing for we wanted him to recommit to say that org is willing to take on whatever level of legal responsibility is necessary to be able to get a UAM for accredited

access. So we got close but not quite a yes and we'll continue to press on that. But I think we're not the only ones. I believe the contract parties are running the same exercise and pressing for that.

So I don't have any other policy discussion to take you through today considering we've focused on it so much and there's only one open public comment. So before I turn it over to Marie and (Scott) to discuss the council agenda, is there anything that any of you have for the first half of the policy calendar? So Marie and (Scott) under Channel 2 I have paste it into the policy calendar. You can all scroll up if you don't mind to Channel 2. I think that Chantelle is going to do that now. And we have the items that are up for discussion in your council meeting tomorrow so why don't you take us through that?

Marie Pattullo: Thank you. This is Marie. First thing to say is please remember that our role on council is to do what you guys tell us to do. And by that I mean that there are some counselors for example, the noncommercial who are not beholden to spec constituencies. I'm not saying they make it up as they go along because that would be wrong. But we operate under a more defined process whereby you tell us what to do and we do it. So thank you very much for those of you who do tell us what to do. It is hugely appreciated.

Right, you've all got the council agenda. I sent it to you on Saturday. We're meeting tomorrow. It's also...

Steve DelBianco: It's right there in the policy calendar.

Marie Pattullo: And is also right there in policy calendar which is great. We're going to be talking about privacy proxy. Now we already discussed that this morning. I think (Scott) and I had a very clear stare on what you want us to do there. If there is anything else that you want us to do there, let us know because we are here to do what you tell us to do.

We're then going to be talking about the infamous 3.0 which is the idea of trying to make PDPs work. They're not supposed to last for three years, four years, ten years who knows how many years. They're also not supposed to be hijacked by one lunatic -- no names. One lunatic is not supposed to hijack anything even if he or she as the case may be...

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible).

Marie Pattullo: And what we are - what - we've now got a small team. We meet on Thursday within Council 2 to try to figure out okay sometimes you need everybody at the table for PDP. Sometimes you need an EPDP with people who are brilliant and wonderful enough to actually take on that kind of work. Some -- you know, there are various different methods we can use but we need a defined process so that should there be one lunatic, there's an escalation process for (unintelligible) issues, but don't derail the work of the PDP which is hugely important.

So this is ongoing. We hope that there's some implementation happening already but we simply need to be practical about that. So again those of you who have been involved in any form of ICANN PDP if you've got issues on how it did or didn't work let (Scott) and I know because we really want to come to this with practicality and try to resolve things and not have as many lunatics.

For those of you who do know the lunatic to whom I'm referring there is no more correspondence from ICANN legal going back to the lawyer of the lunatic. I'm sure she's really happy to talk to you about that. She's everywhere this week so go say hi for me. Then we're going to be talking about next steps on handling who is conflicts with privacy law.

(Boettcher): IRTP for that.

Marie Pattullo: You're right I should have put my glasses on earlier. Thank you Mr. (Boettcher). Yes we're talking about discussion on the inter-registrar transfer policy excuse me, about which yes you know the answer...

Claudia Selli: Of course we have just state the name before saying anything just for the people who are on the chat.

Susan Kawaguchi: Susan Kawaguchi for the record and I don't know the answer to this so I am asking you. So, you know, the whole saga with the 3.7. And I was wondering if there's been any modification or, you know, changes to the guidelines yet or is it in process so that it's clarified and that it can't be used to derail a PDP.

Marie Pattullo: There hasn't as yet been and a changes but there has been some discussion. I'll find and send you the update of where we are on the implementation to various parts of 3.0. He's already filed another 3.7. Yes I know. And he is claiming that it's all in good faith and he doesn't want to derail anything and he just wants to ensure. This one was about - it's just such a shame because Phil just stepped out. He was here. He could of explained this better. This current one is because he thinks that the deadlines - Phil can I call out to you in a minute?

Phil Corwin: Sure.

Marie Pattullo: Because his current one is he thinks that the deadlines for the work to be achieved in the RPM working group are too tight. So he's taken yet another 3.7 on that. But this comes down to look everyone needs to have their say. Yes everyone should be involved, yes. If you are doing it deliberately to derail a process involving thousands of people and thousands upon millions of work hours then quite frankly do one you know? And I realize we're in a public recorded form so I'm not swearing. But do you want to add anything to (unintelligible)?

((Crosstalk))

Phil Corwin: Marie do you want - Phil Corwin for the record, former BC Councilor, now a proud alumni.

Man: Alumni fund's going to hit you up man.

Phil Corwin: Is there a specific aspect of this you wanted to – me to comment on Marie? I'm intimately aware of dealing with this person. I will not use a derogatory term because he has attorneys and he seems to read everything that's muttered everywhere in any ICANN transcript.

Marie Pattullo: So how many 3.7s has e-filed do you know?

Phil Corwin: He filed one recently. He objected to the timelines proposed by the coaches proposed timelines. And we did hear concerns from some other members and we adjusted the timelines in response to those concerns to where he – the person following the three said, "Well it's – I, George Kirikos it's not." It's a fact you can't be sued for stating a fact. He filed a 3.7 in which he had like many, many separate things he demanded that we do.

He wanted to set his whole own agenda for the entire working group. He demanded the resignations of all three co-chairs. He demanded that ICANN replays one or more of the staff members who he claimed were biased or lazy or both but he didn't name them. And the base of his – it wasn't just about the timelines. There were three complaints. I forget what all three were, but the first one was that his contributions are being systematically ignored. And we've responded with a response saying basically one we adjusted the timelines, two we don't know what you're talking about because, you know, you had 14 of your individual URS right, proposals for are going to be in the initial report for comment by the communities so how were you ignored?

And his response was to (Aris) our communication was to say that that part, the consultation with the co-chairs was over and he was demanding to speak with council leadership and council leadership has never gotten back to him. And since then we just, we felt we had responded and he didn't want to – we had an offer for an informal discussion and he didn't want that. So we had done our thing and there was nothing more we were going to do.

And then he filed one – he posted one email to the working group list in which he particularly targeted me in a very taunting manner and recounted his glorious victory over me and the IGO working group which has produce recommendations that have been so warmly embraced by counsel in which the board has already indicated they will never accept and compared himself to both Russell Crowe as gladiator and Kurt Douglas as Spartacus. And to where one colleague asked me if he had been under the influence of alcohol when he wrote and posted this email. And that's the last we've heard from him.

And then of course over the weekend John Jeffrey sent a letter to Mr. Kirikos and his attorney stating that the expected standards of behavior were in fact enforceable and that legal believes he had violated in a number of cases in his exchange of correspondence with Greg Shatan which was the matter that, you know, we had tried to after Greg filed a formal complaint we had tried to act on that and that's when Mr. Kirikos declared that the expected standards of behavior are unenforceable and that and when we said we don't think they are and you still – we still would like a response by your deadline or you forfeited your opportunity to do so, he then informed us he just retained two counsel and we should speak to them and ever since then it's been legal.

And but this is a whole, you know, it's a sad tale but it has affected the working group and their timeline in the atmospheres and all of that. I mean PDP 3.0 is not about just that, but there does have to be a defined way to deal with individuals who are the subject of complaints from other members in a timely manner that doesn't turn the whole process into litigation. And there's

also the matter of at one point when we're being told by counsel that we had to act on this we said, "Well if we have to we're going to be indemnified if we were sued individually or collectively and we could never get a clear answer from legal on that."

So it's a mess. So we're trying to continue it. We are continuing our work. Goran did misstate the situation in Barcelona when he said that he understood that we hadn't been able to get anything done in seven months and in fact we had gotten things done. And but this has been a tremendous significant drain on the time and energy of the co-chairs to deal with the situation. And it's – we haven't been able to respond to a complaint of a member who thought he had been maligned on the working group email list.

So and I still don't know how it's all going to be sorted out even in the wake of John Jeffrey's communication to Mr. Kirikos and his attorneys and his separate communication to counsel about the enforceability of the ESV which the cultures will try to coordinate with council on the matter.

But, you know, and there was a response from Robin Gross. Rob Gross in her capacity is one of those two counsel. The other one's a litigation counsel based in Toronto where Mr. Kirikos lives. And that's between her and Mr. Jeffrey so we're kind of standing back and watching this now.

Susan Kawaguchi: So I mean for us as the BC I think, you know, obviously this is a prime example in that, you know, fixing 3.7 is very important and then the GNSO counsel upping the stakes on enforcing the, you know, code of conduct I think it's something that you should emphasize. So and thanks...

Phil Corwin: Yes.

Susan Kawaguchi: ...for the craziness.

Phil Corwin: And of course Susan you had your own experience as you tried to bring the IGO...

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes.

Phil Corwin: ...working group to a close.

Susan Kawaguchi: Which I totally failed at.

Phil Corwin: So you had the enjoyment of that experience.

Susan Kawaguchi: So I was hoping he would file litigation against me but he didn't do that so...

Marie Pattullo: You just said that on a recorded call. But to follow onto something you just said (Susan) the ombudsman joined us very briefly in our strategic sessions if I can get my words out, in January. And he made it clear and this is something we do need to remember that he has no power of sanction, that his only power of sanction is to deal with harassment and in all of its guises, so not for something like this.

So he in essence invited counsel to develop a process in which he can be involved but the sanction would have to be counsel developed. We can't, you know, just shove this over to the ombudsman's office. Should I continue? So we've got an update on what's happening with the inter-register transfer policy. I - from what I remember we didn't actually file comments on that I don't think Steve. But so I'm guessing that's not terribly important to the guys around the room.

Then we're talking about the procedure for handling Whois conflicts with privacy law. From what I understand I'm again looking at my resident expert Mrs. Kawaguchi that you would agree that this can be put on hold or waiting the outcome of the EPDP work?

Yes because it's...

((Crosstalk))

Marie Pattullo: ...yes. And unless anyone tells us differently again this is an update. None of these are votes so it's just discussions (unintelligible). Then we're going to have a discussion about something called the EPDP. I'm not sure what that could be. Yes so that's it.

Obviously it's an open meeting. Everyone is welcome to come and watch us. Everyone is welcome to send (Scott) and I emails, Skype's, Whatsapp whatever during the calls so we can sound intelligent as we read out what you've asked us to say. And (Scott) do you want to add anything?

Scott McCormick: No I think it's a fairly uneventful council meeting this week so yes.

Claudia Selli: And so for the rest of the agenda I mean (Barbara) is not here. That would be the CSG update. And I wanted also to again thank her for the work that she has been doing even if she's not here. For the CSG what we have left is tomorrow the meeting with the Contracted Party House which is at 10:30 so it conflicts with the EPDP.

The meeting is open to the CSG participants and members so wherever is free from the EPDP is welcome to join the meeting. In terms of topic we discussed that the CSG a closed meeting but we wanted to put on the table, you know, the EPDP status and next steps the RDAP implementation privacy and proxy and if I recall correctly also the CCRTR review. Do you guys have other comments on that or we are okay with the where we stand? I think Margie and others will be probably at the Steve included will be at the EPDP? Okay.

Steve DelBianco: With respect to the contract party interaction remember strategically they will need to be aligned with us to ever get the UAM done. So this is the time to build that relationship. The Mark Monitor post that I circulated a couple of days ago fully acknowledges there's a difference between the way some registrars and registries reply to disclosure requests.

There's good and bad actors in that mix and we want to appeal to the better angels of their nature that we fully understand that access model has liability issues and that we fully understand the need to address that liability right and that we've done at every turn have said that we need to be aligned with the contract parties. So this is a great opportunity to start building a relationship we'll need to prevail at counsel and in the PDP for the next year and a half.

Claudia Selli: Yes agreed. Any other comments on that? No. Okay for the rest of the agenda I don't have it in front of me but if I recall correctly there's the outreach part. Jimson do you want to - I know you have a presentation on the outreach.

Jimson Olufuye: Yes we can tend to?

Claudia Selli: Yes.

Jimson Olufuye: Will you kindly project? And also maybe before going into that or not that I will be in a budget meeting why the meetings agreement with the contracted parties (unintelligible) on the report. Okay this is Jimson Olufuye. This presentation that Marilyn was supposed to present but she's asked me to do that. And as you know I happen to be the ExCom liaison to the Outreach Committee and so quite positioned to deliver this.

Where we had it outreach in Tokyo that was on Friday very, very successful. And the chair was there. That is Claudia, Steve DelBianco Andrew Mack and Marilyn Cade, the Outreach Chair. I couldn't be there because I was engaged in the ICANN Academy for Leadership Academy or Leadership Program. So

that was quite successful and we will recommend that many of us to participating as an opportunity to interact with other leaders in the community.

There were two sessions on Friday at the outreach in Tokyo. And from what I got was quite very successful. And since the chair was there and Steve and Andrew maybe they could just give a very brief report on that how it went before I go further into the other part of the presentation.

Claudia Selli: Yes may be very briefly I mean and Andrew and Steve please jump in but I think two event were quite successful. In the first event we had around 15, 20 members from the one of the most known association in Japan which is (Kinidarin). The other one which is (JADA) we had about 40 members, a quite senior level that were there.

In both cases they engaged with us a lot which is not the normal, the typical type of engagement that they would have because the, apparently it's more polite to stay quiet rather than speak. And they asked very pertinent and good questions. And we had in any case also during the reception, a very good conversation with those members. So the follow-up is difficult to define. But I think it was very good and plus we didn't spend money for it – for those two events. Andrew?

Andrew Mack: Yes my complements I think it was a – I think they were both really good events especially the second one. We lost our translator about a half an hour before the second event. And imagine trying to do this meeting in Japanese. I was overwhelmed by how engaged they were, how - I mean think about how hard it would be to maintain that level of concentration to talk about what we're doing. In English if you're a native Japanese speaker and don't speak English on a regular basis.

They had really smart questions. They were – it was a really a very impressive group of people. Two things that really stood out for me, one was that they had a real recognition that they are – need to look to the future.

They came with a five year plan that they were working out that (JADA) remember the booklet was incredibly well done. And they know that they need to create an innovation culture here in a way that hasn't been in the past.

I think there's some real opportunities for us to engage them. And I'm not sure whether they will become members of the BC. But just the fact that we have each other to call on I think we created some real relational capital. Companies like NEC Panasonic were in the room so some real big companies. If we can begin those relationships and engage them I think they may be really great contacts for us whether as active members on an ongoing basis or even just people that we call to get the - to understand how the markets are working here so very, very positive.

Jimson Olufuye: Excellent. Yes (unintelligible) can you – can (unintelligible) maybe change speed on that? Okay so there is the member of the Outreach Committee by using the opportunity to again thank Andrew Mack for a good job done as the outgoing chair in the meeting chair of the Outreach Committee. Are you still a member (unintelligible) because once you are into outreach it's in your blood. So and (Gabriella Lawrence), (Oma Detala Ariola) is are members of the Outreach Committee. Can we next (Unintelligible).

Oh, okay well every just talking about the kind of funding we have, mainly outline the budget ICANN has for outreach around – more than 20,000 USD by 2016. This talking about what community-wide budget which has been reduced considerably from what we know like at a CROP by cellular by 100K but is reduced to 50. But we need to have our own funding that is busy funding to support outreach, to support some members who participate in the outreach event.

And most importantly we got support from ICANN itself, Chris Mondini. I will need to use the opportunity to appreciate Chris for all the support, consistent support. Even at the Joburg outreach South Africa then at the Panama

outreach as well and all the other outreaches we have. And so we'll continue to leverage on that partnership with Chris as Claudia mentioned.

Tomorrow - well no not tomorrow - yes tomorrow. So tomorrow 13th they plan to partner with ISPCP as you know to conduct outreach again. And this is also being sponsored by (JADA). Chris Mondini's also supporting and we - everybody's invited so if we already start and you felt maybe there is a notice that is filled up, you know, mainly saying no you cannot come in and be part of it the bus will be available. The time is about 4:00 p.m.

And then the ICANN supports also for printing a newsletter, can see we'll print a newsletter for outreach. It's part of our budget request and well done. So please feel free to pick up your electronic version as well up in your office. You can put on the desk where customers can also pick and just read through.

Next slide please. Apart from the newsletter you can pick the fact sheet as well. Okay where this is talking about groups, we talked about effective Outreach Committee. The effect of Outreach Committee has been quite significant and we can see how the next level with the LOC report we've gotten to - we expect to leverage on that to move to the next level for that diversify the BC.

Next level, next slide please. Okay yes, can we go to the next one we've spoken about this. Okay see the participants. This is a beautiful picture and we'll push to our Web site. Okay so that's picture there. There you go.

All right so 4:00 pm tomorrow, 4:00 to 8:00 pm is the outreach tomorrow. I want to encourage everyone to be part of it as I mentioned. Chris is supporting the ISPCP and the BC to make this happen. Claudia will be speaking as usual our chair. (Scott) will also be there thank you, (unintelligible) and (Mack), (Mack) so will also be speaking. And again it's open to everyone. Please feel free to be a part of it.

Okay next slide please. Well these are an example of outreaches. So all these have been documented. The one that happened in last year the (unintelligible) report this year will there's always a report for every outreach engagement and they are published. Like this one that happened in Tokyo we expect reports for mailing that will be published in the next newsletter. So that's list of all activities that's happened. This presentation will be sent to the list for your (unintelligible) still review.

Next slide please. Okay this is talking about how we do the budget. We make provision for outreach in all our ICANN meetings and other engagements. Very soon we'll be seeing our draft FY '20 budget proposal very soon, perhaps next month so we'll see what the Outreach Committee will come up with in terms of budget provision for your approval so that we can continue to sustain the momentum. And we also factor in all the recommendation from the LOC study so that we can begin to implement.

Okay next slide please. Okay they're looking like Marrakesh yes ICANN 65 and if got (unintelligible) member that is (Pagil) from Jordan and working on that so that we can have an outreach in Marrakesh bringing in the – a session from Egypt, Morocco itself and led by he said Chris Mondini has agreed to also partner with the BC to make that happen. He's also focused in Montréal ICANN 66 and then look to 2020 and so (Shelley) in Malaysia where BC has a strong relationship with the largest ICPR session to (unintelligible) so looking ahead.

Next slide please. Okay from the other committee there is a strategy I believe that's going to be expanded with the LOC recommendation. But it's recognized that we lack meaningful presence from Caribbean Islands MENA region. We need to build on Asia, New Zealand, Australia and Eastern Europe. We need members help reaching out like ICANN has CROP support and they want leadership development that we propose but they were not used, okay. We sought application from Eastern Europe to use the CROP to

use the leadership development even for ICANN 63 Barcelona, no application.

And for this ICANN 64 yes we happy that (Vivik) pick it up and which is good otherwise it will have just been that we're not using it. But if CROP was still there so the CROP was no used okay, so the CROP funding will go back to ICANN treasury.

So how can we justify all these requests if they're not used? So we need to have brought in a network so that it can be used to facilitate this idea with accelerate and there has to be justification for us to say okay let's throw back the CROP, you know, level. So need for more (unintelligible) in Europe against IGF 2019. So she's explain that we'll need, we'll be doing some engagement with regard to IGF 2019.

Next slide please. Is that the last? Oh, okay so that's the last. And as I mentioned the IGF 2019 is quite important. Business has always been there and think if we can do something an outreach to reach out 2019 or 2019 will be good. We expect eastern European participation as yes, we expand a window to handshake with delegates from Eastern European in particular.

All right so that's it with the reports from the Outreach Committee. Any question? Yes Tim?

Tim Smith: Hi. Tim Smith for the record. I don't know what you have planned for Montréal for outreach and I don't live near Montréal but I do live in Canada. So if there is some way yes, just down the street. So if there's some way that I can help, I'm happy to do that.

Jimson Olufuye: Oh great will let Marilyn know about that. Great.

Claudia Selli: Thank you. (Mark)?

Mark Datysgeld: Concerning the IGF Jimson, I'm really glad to see it put so clearly because I have been - somewhat has been waving the banner that we really should have a little more participation there. I wonder if we could really push on this and try to get a little bit of a structure then there because there's really so many of us there, and we do engage one by one with people but it would be really interesting if we could get some sort of Korean event going on. I do think there's space for that.

Last year there were so many bilaterals going on at the IGF that one could simply not go to the event and live on bilaterals which is kind of what I did besides my panel, so there really is space right now for that kind of stuff and I would really like to keep pushing that and well volunteer myself as much as I can to help you along.

Jimson Olufuye: Okay good. Well my advice okay (unintelligible) putting something to the Audit Committee. I check you're not a member so you could send a note because the Audit Committee will be based I mean with regard to the budget I believe. And IGF is coming up the last quarter, the second quarter of FY '20 correct to that's – that's coming into the budget.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Jimson Olufuye: Oh the IGF...

Claudia Selli: Twenty-five November I think, around those dates.

Jimson Olufuye: Yes, so you know FY '20 starts from July 4 to the end, so we need to put something in the budget so a note to the Audit Committee. And of course see Andrew there so always getting a budget proposal into the bigger budget plan for FY '20.

Claudia Selli: Okay, I - if there are no other question turn into the other items that you want to bring up? No, so the meeting is adjourned and we'll see each other

tomorrow for the meeting with the CH - C Contracted Party House. Thanks
everybody.

END