
MARYAM BAKOSHI: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Welcome to the BC Members Group Call on Wednesday, 23rd of October, 2019. In the interest of time, attendance will be taken via Zoom. I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking, for transcription purposes, and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. With that, I'll hand over to the chair, Claudia, to begin. Claudia, please go ahead.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Yes, hi. Thank you very much, everybody, for participating to today's call. In the interest of time, I will leave the floor to Steve for the policy calendar. Steve, the floor is yours.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Claudia. Hey, everyone. I sent the policy calendar around two days ago. I'm going to display it now on the screen.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Steve, I have it here, if it's easier for me to do that.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Please do. Zoom is not allowing me to do it right now.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Okay, I'll do that now.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you. I'd like to quickly point out that we have filed three comments since the last BC call two weeks ago. On October the 21st, we commented on the bylaws-required review team work. This is the Competition, Consumer Trust, and Consumer Choice Review. That review team evaluated the last round of expansion of gTLDs, and came up with many recommendations, six of which the Board decided to proceed with. On those six, they're inviting comments on their implementation plan.

I want to thank Mason Cole, Tim Smith, Margie, Ben Wallis, and Mark Wilson for your great work on a very substantive comment, where we hit back at the Board on the general idea of only implementing six of the recommendations. But in particular, the Recommendation 21 on DNS abuse, we added quite a bit more context and substance for what they should do to implement it. I'm not sure we're going to see too many other comments filed on this, so ours should get plenty of attention from staff. Thanks again to the volunteers who made that happen.

Second one is on October the 18th, we commented on the public consultation for defining and operationalizing the global public interest. This was a well-hidden public comment opportunity, since it wasn't on the general public comment page, but buried within a proposed framework for global public interest. But we discovered it and filed a couple of pages on that.

I want to thank Mark Datysgeld and Denise Michel for assisting in that. We're going to probably have an opportunity to discuss this with the Board in Montreal, because we are proposing that a framework alone isn't sufficient, but that ICANN needs a real definition for global public interest—one that has some teeth to it.

And then, on the 14th of October, we commented on ICANN's general initiative—a strategic initiative to improve the effectiveness of the multistakeholder model. This is one of Cherine Chalaby, our retiring Board Chair's, key initiatives. Mark Datysgeld, John Berard, and Andy Abrams did a fabulous job drafting a BC comment that really took ICANN to task in many areas where they have not really paid attention to what it takes to make the multistakeholder model work—so, three excellent comments by the colleagues in BC. Thank you very much for participating.

Scroll down, if you don't mind, Maryam, to the section on opportunities for new public comments. Keep going. Thank you. There's only ... Thank you very much. The first is the RDS, or Registration Directory Service. We used to call it WHOIS. The bylaws require, every five years, a review team, drawn from the community, to evaluate the extent to which the effectiveness of the current RDS system and its implementation meets the legitimate needs of law enforcement, promotes consumer trust, and safeguards registrant data. I included that in there, because that is in the bylaws. That is what the review says they have to do, and the BC was instrumental in bringing that review into the bylaws.

Right now, we have Susan Kawaguchi, who represents the BC, on that review team. In fact, Susan, you're the Vice-Chair of that. I wanted to

note that we commented about a year ago on the draft recommendations in this team, which is a reminder to all of you that Susan's been working on this for over a year. Back in November of 2018, Denise Michel, Jimson, Marie, and Tim Chen assisted on that comment.

Now that we have a final report, we need some volunteers to put that together. I know Susan will help to steer us towards elements of the report that she believes we should comment on. Susan, I'd like to open it to you, to give some guidance on the scope of that task. While people think about who's going to volunteer. Susan?

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Yes, Steve. Can you hear me?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Perfectly. Thank you.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Okay. I never know if I'm completely off mute. Yeah, I will volunteer to do the initial draft. And I think we have lots of opportunities here to push on accuracy. The team was very focused on maintaining the current standards of accuracy, and reviewing for accuracy, and all the studies—the ARF. I know ICANN's pushing back and saying they can't do that now.

The other important part is the PPSAI—Proxy, Privacy ... As you know, ICANN Org just completely stopped any IRT work on that. We need to demand that that moves forward. One of the recommendations—the

only recommendation for PPSAI—was ... And it seems so ... I didn't think we would need it at the point we wrote the recommendation—was if by any chance it was not implemented by December of 2019, which we're two months away, then we should look at adding a contractual element while it is being implemented.

So, I have some talking points on all of this for the meeting, but I will start the draft and send that out probably after the meeting, or maybe during the meeting. And then, whoever would like to join in ... Obviously, it would be great to have others' perspectives besides me, because I was deep in the middle of it.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thank you Susan. As Vice-Chair of the review team itself, it's essential that we have a few other BC on the drafting team for our comment, too. So, this is a great opportunity for a couple of BC members to volunteer to help. You have the registration data expert involved in the initial draft, so that will make this a very—I think an accessible and easy way to jump on board to help with a BC comment, where you'll be able to contribute to the outline, filling in some meat on the bones of what Susan's going to provide. The BC has a really rich history of comments already on WHOIS that we can draw upon.

So, this is a perfect opportunity for BC member who hasn't contributed ever, or in a long time, to pitch in on this, especially if we think that privacy and proxy services really need to be accredited, since this will be our opportunity to raise that issue. Can I have a few volunteers? I'm looking in the chat now. This comment is not due until the 25th of

November, so it's well after our meeting in Montreal, so there'll be plenty of time. Do we have any volunteers who will join? We cannot count on Susan to do everything. Fred Felman, thank you very much for helping out.

Okay. I'm going to move to the next one. Maryam, can you scroll up a little bit, please, to number two? Thank you. It's that time of year again. It's the time to comment on proposed operating plan and budgets. In this case, it's for two entities—the PTI, which is called Public Technical Identifiers Entity with ICANN, and the IANI Authority inside ICANN. These are two functions that we created as part of that IANA Transition in 2016.

A year ago, we commented on the current fiscal year budgets, thanks to work by Jimson, who always leads us in that area. Jimson almost always steps up to volunteer, but just like we did for Susan, we need a volunteer who can assist Jimson on these two comments. Our comments are usually very brief. Jimson will suggest a few things that we should point out, that need to be further clarified and defined. Under Jimson's leadership, you will not find this to be that difficult. Ben Milam, thank you for agreeing to help on that, too. Who's agreeing to help Jimson?

JIMSON OLUFUYE:

Yes, Steve, as usual, the Finance Committee will also be joining me.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Jimson. Any others that can help, in addition to the Finance Committee? Jimson, who's on the Finance Committee? Let's give some recognition to those folks that are helping you.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Yeah, we have Tim Smith, we have Chris Chaplow, and we also have Arinola.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Fantastic. Thank you. Alright, now the third element on here is not a publicly-noticed public comment. It's not even a solicited comment from ICANN. It's an unsolicited but important attempt from the BC to put a sharper definition and a sharper focus on the idea of what is DNS abuse. You know that we had a webinar on it last week. There'll be an entire high-interest topic session in Montreal on DNS abuse.

And Mason Cole, one of our members, took the initiative, back on October the 8th, to draft a page a half, drawing on previous BC work, as well as previous PDP—that's 10 years ago—back when Barry Cobb, and Martin Sutton, and many other BC members worked on a definition of DNS abuse that was adopted through a consensus. Mason circulated that, and then I circulated a new draft, which reflected edits by Fred Felman and Ben Wallis. Tola and Statton also reviewed it. That was circulated with the policy calendar two days ago.

That statement reflects much of what we just submitted about DNS abuse in the CCTRT comments I discussed earlier in the call. So, this is an opportunity for us to have quotable, citation-worthy statements on DNS

abuse that we'll make from the floor, from the microphone, or in other means, because it's going to be a hot topic in Montreal and thereafter.

Maryam, if you please, could you load the attachment to my policy calendar? This is the second attachment, which was the draft statement on DNS abuse. That's the first one. It's the second statement. Perfect. Thank you very much. Scroll a little bit further down. I want to bring up the definition of abuse. You can stop right there. Oops, too far, too far. Bring it down right there.

So, took a look right there, because the PDP done 10 years ago defined abuse by saying it "causes actual and substantial harm, is a material predicate of such harm, and is illegal or illegitimate, otherwise considered contrary to the intention and design of a stated legitimate purpose, if a purpose is disclosed."

So, after that work that was done 10 years ago, ICANN conducted a webinar. Claudia Martinuzzi and a number of you were on there. I was as well. For some reason, ICANN's decided they'd like a new definition. So, I'm going to paste it into the chat, and then I'll read it out. This is the new definition that was disclosed in that PowerPoint slide. They said DNS abuse and misuse ... "DNS abuse refers to anything that attacks or abuses the DNS infrastructure, or DNS misuse refers to exploiting the DNS protocol or domain name registrations processes for malicious purposes."

Never mind that a definite of abuse uses the word "abuse" and "abuses" in it, so it's self-referential. And never mind that it deviates from where the definition we adopted in a consensus. There may be

things that some people find attractive about the breadth of that new definition. So, Claudia, I'd like to turn to you first to describe why you might propose that we go with ICANN's new definition, as opposed to the PDP definition. And then, Mason, I'll turn it you afterwards to talk about the current status of this document, and how you feel about that definition. Claudia?

CLAUDIA MARTINUZZI Hi. Can you hear me?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Perfectly. Thank you.

CLAUDIA MARTINUZZI: Just to clarify, Steve, that definition that was shared by ICANN staff wasn't during the webinar on DNS abuse—not to my knowledge, because I didn't participate in that webinar—that pre-ICANN policy webinar. But this is language that was presented by someone from ICANN staff during a meeting in Brussels, at the high-level group on internet governance, on October 10th. So, it might have also been presented during the webinar, but I'm not sure.

Also, to clarify, I don't necessarily support the language that ICANN is presenting. I just wanted to flag it to the BC, so that we might decide to take a position on it prior to Montreal, or include it in our statement, or just see between us how we stand by it. But I don't necessarily think splitting or dividing the notion of abuse into abuse and misuse is necessarily a good idea. I guess I leave that up to discussion.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Claudia. Mason, what are your thoughts on that definition, versus the one we have in there, and any other items you want to bring to our attention? I would like to close the BC member review period on this statement today.

MASON COLE: Thanks, Steve. Do you hear me?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Perfectly. Thanks.

MASON COLE: Thanks. I appreciate Claudia's intervention on this. Just by way of context, this idea originated from the fact that the GAC and the Registries put out preliminary statements on their definitions of abuse, and the need to either narrow or broaden those definitions accordingly, according to whatever their position was on abuse definition. Predictably, the Contracted Parties have taken a narrow approach to an abuse definition. They want it focused strictly on security threats. The GAC wants a slightly larger view of what abuse is.

The impetus on the BC statement was to more or less back up the GAC, and present our requests to the ICANN community, including discouraging a definition of abuse that's over-restrictive, building on a previous consensus definition of abuse that admittedly goes back to 2010, but still is useful building blocks, and otherwise try to keep the

definition of abuse not overly narrow, so that the community is too focused on DNS-level abuse.

So, that's what drove the comment, and I wanted to get it on record in advance of Montreal, before the abuse session, because, as you correctly point out, there's a high-interest topic. I think Marie's intervention is helpful, that I don't necessarily agree that the staff's direction on a definition of abuse is helpful to our position. I'd like to keep our intervention on the subject of abuse as broad as possible.

I also want to point out that John Berard presented to the list recently an idea of an entirely new nomenclature around the discussion of abuse, because so many of the definitions and the previous work done on abuse are fairly old. I agree with John that we probably need to change the language around DNS abuse. I'm concerned a bit that we don't have quite enough time before Montreal to rework the entire language. I agree with you. I want to close this out as soon as we can. So, I'm interested in BC members' responses to where we stand on this current document, so that we can get it out.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Mason, just to be clear for our members, getting it out really just means posting it on the BC website. We're not even going to email it to the ICANN Board. We're going to have it at our elbow when we are in Montreal, but it isn't really going to be distributed or specifically sent to anyone. Any BC member would be free to relay the document, if and when the BC membership approves it, which I hope we can do today.

To John Berard's point, if we want to do further work, I'd prefer to do the work after we approve this, and do that work on a continued refinement on this. Part of the value of this document is to do what we need to do to remind the ICANN community that DNS abuse has always been within ICANN's remit and purview, and that ICANN has spent time defining it. We burned a year on a PDP that included defining DNS abuse in the document on the screen in front you, in the PDP.

So, I'll stop and take a queue. Who believes we ... Yeah, Fred. I'd like you to clarify. When you say "this definition," are you speaking of the staff definition or the PDP definition. And then, Marie, I would like you to clarify as well. Go ahead.

FRED FELMAN: The definition that you posted in the chat.

STEVE DELBIANCO: And you believe that ... Which would you prefer? The one on the screen in front of you, or the one in the chat?

FRED FELMAN: The one on the screen in front of me.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Fred. That's the PDP definition. Marie? Okay, Denise, please.

DENISE MICHEL: Hi. Thanks, Steve, and thanks, Mason and others for pulling this document together. I would just note, in the fourth bullet, regarding ICANN should clarify the purpose of abuse-related data collection before further work is done to define DNS abuse ... I think that language need to be tightened up to make sure people don't interpret this as not moving forward with DAAR, for some reason, until DNS abuse definitions are recreated. I think that gives a false impression.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Strike everything after the final comma—so, instead of ... Take out the words “before further work is done to define?”

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. I'll send a little redline to the list. I'm not changing the substance, just clarifying that [inadible] ...

STEVE DELBIANCO: Right. The words “before further work is done ...” tends to give an excuse for some to say, “It looks like we're going to do new work to define DNS abuse,” and we not really saying that.

DENISE MICHEL: Right. I think part of the overarching concern here is that, as this document points out, we've had longstanding and well-vetted definitions of DNS abuse that impact a lot of activities throughout ICANN—everything from DAAR collecting data, to contractual obligations, to security staff activities. And then, all of a sudden, the

Board views this idea that we needed to redefine abuse as an excuse not to adopt some very important recommendations coming out of the CCT Review.

As a member serving on the Security Review, we're also concerned about early board efforts to intervene and require us to tabula rasa reinvent the definition of abuse. I'm concerned that this definitional issue will be and is being used to forestall ICANN and Contracted Parties carrying out their obligations. So, I just wanted to put a finer point on that.

To that end, Steve, I think, particularly given that the registries and the GAC have sent statements in to the Board that have been posted in the correspondence page, I'm wondering why we don't do the same with this. Since we've gone through the trouble of creating it and approving it through the BC, I think it would be useful to drop a cover note on it, send it to the Board as part of the ongoing—the BC's perspective on this conversation in Montreal. I think that would give it broader access, and I think it's an important contribution to the Montreal discussion. Thanks.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Okay, Denise. Thank you. So, we're looking for a minor edit that you're going to propose. If you can propose it on this call, it makes it easier for us to get an approval from our membership. If it's something you're going to send around later, it'll take us another day or two.

DENISE MICHEL:

I'll send it now.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Okay, and then Mason in the queue. React as well to Denise's suggestion that we have Claudia send this to the Board, so it shows up in the ICANN Correspondence page.

MASON COLE: Thank you, Steve, and thank you, Denise. I think, actually, I agree with Denise. I think a broader distribution would be more impactful. I also wanted to make the further point that I agree with you, Steve, that this serves as a good set of talking points that BC members can have at the ready, not only at the high-interest topic abuse discussion in Montreal, but when abuse discussions take place with Contracted Party colleagues or others who need to hear from us on an alternate view of abuse. I don't want to limit this to strictly the formal abuse discussion in Montreal. This is a good set of talking points to use for the entire week.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you. Anyone else in the queue? As Claudia pointed out, the DNS abuse webinar—the 15 slides presented by the GAC and by Contract Parties—actually didn't repeat either the existing definition or a new one. Instead, it just said that the DAAR—the Domain Abuse Activity Reporting tool—identified categories of abuse, such phishing, malware, botnet-commanded control, and spam—so, literally four things that happen to show up in the DAAR report get listed on slide number five of the big webinar as a very limited view of four things that constitute abuse. We certainly don't want to allow that to happen.

So, we either return to the PDP definition that Mason has in the document or propose something new that would have to be approved. I think the consensus ... I could read that the consensus on this call is that we should take the definition from the PDP and put it right back in ICANN's face—remind them all that this was a consensus, and therefore, it is considered a consensus policy definition, and it's the definition ICANN should be using.

Staff should not be presenting, as they did in Brussels, an alternative definition. It might just be that that staff didn't know. This was done 10 years ago. Right, Claudia? We could bring it up in that regard. So, if there's anyone else in the queue, and then I will ask if there are any thoughts, positive or negative, about sending this to the Board, once we get a final set of edits approved by the membership.

Okay, Claudia, Mason, Tola, Statton, Fred, and Ben, thank you for the work you've done on this. And Denise, after we see your edit to the entire BC private, we ought to have a day for our membership to come on board on that. And Claudia, I'll work with you on a cover letter, so that we can send this to the Board itself and the Correspondence page. Thank you. I do hope it'll bring this up when we have Board interaction and at the microphone in Montreal.

Maryam, could you please put the policy calendar back up? That was the third attachment—the PDF. Thank you very much. Under modifying WHOIS policies ... Again, we are so lucky to have Margie Milam and Mark Svancarek representing us on the Expedited PDP, or the EPDP Phase Two. They're also carrying a lot of water on the implementation of Phase One, along with several other BC members. So, Mark and

Margie, would you please give a quick update to the BC members on the current status of the EPDP Phase Two?

MARGIE MILAM: Sure. You want me to jump in?

MARK SVANCAREK: Yes, please.

MARGIE MILAM: Can you hear me? Okay, thank you. Basically, as we're moving into Montreal, we are still working on building blocks, which are different areas of the accreditation policy. We learned this week that we actually will not be sharing our building blocks in any of the sessions at Montreal. So, I think for several people on the BC side, you may be a little bit discouraged, in that you won't get a good view as to what we're talking about, since there will be no document or no real substantive discussion of what we've been working on.

Our team has been working on a much more frequent schedule, looking at things like accreditation policy, query policies. We still have not had a substantive discussion about the purposes for accessing the data. That's something that I think is teed up for prior to Montreal. So, at this point, we cannot report to the BC, for example, that there is an acknowledgement that the policy will specify trademark infringement or cybersecurity purposes as reasons for accessing the data. I think we'll get there, but we don't have that agreement yet in place.

So, basically, Montreal for us is going to be a very active working session. I think the community will just hear an overview. If you listened to the pre-Montreal meeting policy discussion, where Janis just gave an overview of how we're working, I think that's what our session's going to be all about, which I think may disappoint some members of the BC. With that, I'll pause and let Mark fill in the details.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Mark, please.

MARK SVANCAREK:

Hi. Yes, I was also going to hit on the point that the building blocks were not going to be presented, and that it might be useful to people to review those offline, if you're really, really interested. Some of the areas that I've been interested in have been definitions about abuse of the system.

This is something that's being led by James Bladel of GoDaddy, although I've sort of interjected myself into that. And so, I think you can imagine that James from GoDaddy is very interested in having a pretty broad list of abuse types, and some of them are very backwards-looking, like using multiple IP addresses, which, of course, doesn't apply in an RDAP system, and also doesn't apply if everybody's using VPNs, I suppose, and including definitions like harvesting, and mining, and things like that, which are undefined terms in this context that I'm alarmed at, because they go to someone's intent, as opposed to someone's activity.

So, there's been some pushback on that. I would say that since LA, we are seeing some forward movement on these topics of accreditation. I think that's a positive note. We keep saying things like, "It's only about authentication," but in actual practice, the whole thing is actually being ... The whole broad scope of accreditation is actually being discussed, so it doesn't really matter when people use that talking point, I think.

Right now, something we're really hung up on is automated decision making. There are types of automated decision making that are defined in GDPR that are not allowed ... Sorry. It's not that they're not allowed. Anything is allowed under certain circumstances. That's sort of a misunderstanding of the law. Constraining what the rights of a data subject would be, and what they can object to, relative to so-called automated processing. This is something that we're debating at great length right now.

I think that that will be the most interesting topic for me in the next few weeks, because we are envisaging a system that has substantial automation. There are some parts that are non-controversial, like if I send a request, I should get an acknowledgment. That should be automated. However, if the ultimate decision to disclose or not disclose is completely algorithmic, we'll have to have some safeguards built into the system in order to be defensibly lawful. So, those are the things that I'm most interested in. Margie, did I miss anything?

MARGIE MILAM:

I think the other thing we want to share is that the group sent a letter to the Board, asking the Board if ICANN would be willing to serve as the

centralized discloser of this system. The answer to that question actually matters, because if the answer is no, then I think we're almost at square one, where we may not end up with a policy that will really work.

We're hoping that ICANN will say yes, and that will dictate how the system gets designed, and how the policy gets designed. But we don't know the timeline for the Board response, and we're hoping that ICANN will give us the answer quickly, so that we can continue our work, and assume that ICANN will be the centralized gateway for these decisions.

MARK SVANCAREK:

Thanks, Margie. Yeah, that was on my list of things to mention. I'm sorry I skipped it. We don't know when the Board will respond, and part of that, I think, is because we don't know what the progress of the so-called Strawberry Team is.

There is a team that has been put together under Elena Plexida that should be working with the folks in Brussels to determine if you have an electronic infrastructure similar to what the TSG produced, and if ICANN is playing a particular role within that infrastructure, can decisions be made in a lawful fashion? This will influence the discussion on automated processing as well, I suspect, but that's not necessarily what they need to do.

So, we don't have any transparency into what's happening on the Strawberry front. We don't know what their schedule is. We don't know what their planned next steps are, and we certainly don't know what sort of advice or guidance, if any, that they've received so far.

I think that the status and success of the Strawberry Team is going to influence the Board response to that letter, and if there is no progress from them, I'm not sure what the Board can actually commit to right now. So, there's really the possibility that they will give an ambiguous or noncommittal response, which will just randomize everything within the EPDP. Thanks.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Mark and Margie. Appreciate that. Maryam could you scroll ... I have it on channel two. This is the discussion of Council. The last Council meeting was way back in September the 19th. The next Council meeting is tomorrow, and so let me turn to Marie to talk about what do they have on the Council agenda. Go ahead, Marie.

MARIE PATTULLO: Thanks, Steve. Checking that you can all hear me okay.

STEVE DELBIANCO: We do.

MARIE PATTULLO: Thank you. I'm conscious of time. I will try to be quick. Council is tomorrow. We have a grand total of one vote. It's only to approve the proposed selection process for Board seat number 14, into which Barbara's put so much work with the CSG. So, that will happen. We can leave that aside. You can read the rest of the agenda I sent through to you on the 15th.

The only thing that I would raise to you is the implementation, again, of EPDP Phase One, again. You'll remember that there's been back and forth between the Board and the Council on this. I think, very interestingly, the Council received a response from Cherine just last week—so, the Chair of the Board, just last week. My reading of it is he actually calls out the Contracted Parties, although I'm willing to be told I'm wrong. Again, I sent it through to you—this letter from Cherine. You remember that Rec 12, which the Board had questions about, goes to the deletion of the organization field.

The Contracted Parties have told us that they've got problems with keeping the organization field for a number of reasons, so it should just be redacted. The Board has come back and said, "Well, we're not that sure that you're right. It overlooks a lot of issues." I'm quoting here, "The deletion of registrant organization field data might have security and stability implications, and could cause concrete harms."

It then goes on to put a question to the Council. Again, I'm going to quote, "The Board observes that in the case of an administrative contact, the Council recommended a safeguard to avoid unintended consequences—" this is Rec 29—"recognizing that in the case of some existing registrations, there may be an administrative contact, but no or incomplete registered name holder contact information, the EPDP team recommends that prior to eliminating the administrative contact field, all registrars must ensure that each registration contains registered name holder contact information. The Board would be interested to learn why it was decided that such a safeguard was not necessary in relation to the deletion of the organization field."

So, I think that's a really interesting point of that letter. If anyone has any comments, let me know. We have the meeting tomorrow at 12:00 UTC, which is 14:00 if you're in Brussels. I'm sorry. I don't know what time it is for all of you. Then, we're going to talk about lots of other things as well. Obviously, any of your comments are always welcome, and anybody who wants to listen in to the call, the audio stream is in the agenda I sent to you. You're always more than welcome to back email me stuff, if I've forgotten anything. Back over to you, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thank you. The highlights from that agenda are in the policy calendar, along with hyperlinks to the agenda itself. And the agenda does include a link to the video stream as well. Any questions for Marie, regarding Council?

Denise Michel, I see in the chat a suggested edit. It isn't the same one we discussed earlier, and so given that some BC members will need to see it in email, I guess we will have to have a circulation of a redline. Mason, please send Denise the very latest Word copy that you have. I think you made a few edits yesterday. Send the very latest Word copy to Denise so she can do a redline to all of BC private.

With that, I'll turn it over to Barbara Wanner for channel three, and at that point. I am going to leave the call. So, Barbara, our backup—the CGS liaison—and you can put it back to Claudia. Thank you.

BARBARA WANNER:

Okay. Thank you, Steve. I'm not going to take up everybody's time with going over the scheduling details. The schedule is posted on the Montreal webpage, and I invite you to check that out. Rather, I wanted to just briefly mention that I know it's very annoying, but we have been asked repeatedly to clarify what sort of questions we want to delve into in our meetings with the Board, in our meetings with our GNSO representatives on the Board, and certain individuals that we've invited to speak to the CSG and BC meetings.

What I have done, really, is just drawn upon the comments that we have provided, that members devoted a lot of time to, and are very thoughtful—in particular, the comments that we filed concerning global public interest, the comments we filed on the effectiveness of the multistakeholder model, focusing on, in my view—yes, Marie, questions that they will address in our meetings with them—focusing, perhaps, on some of the frustrations that we experience concerning philosophical and organizational differences with the NCSG, in terms of how the Non-Contracted Party House is organized. And then, finally, ICANN Org's planning [assumptions] for the next round of gTLDs.

As I said, I've used those as a basis for submitting questions, but understanding full well that the questions that we ultimately address with these individuals will depend on developments during the week and developments between now and then. But just wanted to keep you aware that I've gone back to what we've submitted and is on the record. Thank you. That's it for me.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Okay, I guess I'll just roll to my section.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Jimson?

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Yes. May we have the agenda back up? Okay, thank you. First and foremost, I would like to appreciate all members for the confidence [inaudible] us, the ExCom [inaudible] the mandate that you've given us. [One at a time]. Thank you very much.

The officers' election has been concluded, and next is the committee elections. That should be coming to our notice very soon. But it's going to be within the committees, and principally in both [inaudible] the Credentials Committee. The Credentials Committee is responsible for accreditation of new members, checking that they meet the charter requirements to become a member of the BC. So, that is a standing committee of the BC—the Credentials Committee. There will be election for Chair, and also for members—for those that their term has exceeded three years, the max. You'll be informed about this need for expression of interest to serve in the Credentials Committee.

The Finance Committee's another standing committee, but it's [started to relieve] the Vice-Chair. Finance and Operation is the Chair of the Finance Committee. Also, members can rotate. They have the maximum of three years to serve in that capacity. That will also be communicated, if there is need for expression of interest. The election will not exceed December, basically.

The other committee, which is ad hoc, in the Outreach Committee. The Outreach Committee, based on ExCom new consideration, is going to be focused on regional interest. We have ICANN 66, so we're looking at ... Members that are in North America will most likely be concerned that there should be outreach, and so they will be involved in the outreach planning for ICANN 66. And then, for Cancun, ICANN 67, members of that region as well will also have to express interest to be part of that.

Next is on the membership dues. I still have in notes there were some of our members have yet to conclude the payment process. So, I'd like to appeal to members concerned to please check their internal processes, to really find out where things are. But of course, we'll also get in touch with them. So, that's on the membership dues.

On the BC 20th Anniversary Committee, and expression of interest was sent out to members who showed their interest in participating in organizing, [befitting] the 20th anniversary get-together celebration for the BC. The ExCom is grateful to members that have expressed interest in serving. I would like to use the opportunity to appreciate, again, Mark Datysgeld, Lawrence Olawale-Roberts, [Aru Joba], and John Berard for putting their names forward. So, you'll be joining the ExCom in organizing this event. Once again, thank you very much.

Lastly will be on outreach. We have some outreach information. With regard to ICANN 66, the INTA Plenary Session on Innovation in Domain Name Safety ... So, we actually expected to be part of it. For Sunday, that is 9:00 to 11:30 on Sunday. That is November 12th at Le Westin Hotel Montreal. If you are interested in participating in that workshop—

the outreach workshop—please send your RSVP by Friday, 1st of November. Chantelle will send the link and the pages to the list shortly.

Once again, there is an outreach planned by INTA, and we also are to be involved in it, so those that are interested, please take note. Once the RSV link comes those can express their interest. It's on Sunday, 3rd of November, 9:00 to 11:30 a.m. That's for ICANN 66 outreach.

Also, in ICANN 66, there is a plan for the BC itself to have an inreach. For the first time, we plan to have an inreach—get to know one another. Also, you're free to invite your colleagues to be part of it. The inreach is happening on Wednesday of ICANN meeting at 6:30 p.m. I don't know if Tim Smith ... Is Tim Smith online. I can't see him online. Tim Smith, thank you for organizing that, as our interest member on ground, to see that we get together in Montreal. Chantelle will be sending out an RSVP on that, so that we can take a count of those that will be attending.

Lastly, still on outreach ... Of course you know that we need to continue to do outreach—to reach out to business world, and we need to get new people to be part of what we are doing. So, yesterday, a member, Alaa, [inaudible] was in Accra, Ghana to do an outreach at an international conference on geospatial data and internet. Alaa was there, and he spoke for BC. So, Alaa if you are on ... I can see Alaa on the call, so Alaa, can you tell it how it went? Alaa?

ALAA ABOU EL SEOUD:

People was really interested to talk about the BC, and role of the BC, as the internet is a business enabler, and also to know that ICANN—that there will be new languages for the domain names, so it would a lot of

African languages. And also, I talked about the IoT challenges, and blockchain, and that we have this DNSSEC and IPv6—so, what is supporting those new technologies. In fact, people here are very welcoming, in order to participate in the BC. Let's hope that they will engage us with that. Thank you.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Thank you very much, Alaa for that. I believe factsheets were also printed and distributed for the audience to take away and learn more about the BC. Thank you very much. On this note, I will take it back to you, Claudia. Claudia, back to you. Thank you.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Can you hear me?

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Yes, please.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Can you hear me? Yes. Okay. So, a couple of things that I wanted to share. First of all, before there was a discussion on the Strawberry [inaudible] and the progress that we would or would not [inaudible]. So, I just wanted to report back that yesterday, in the [inaudible], we talked about the Strawberry Project. Basically, it was shared that they have been closely working with the European Commission to prepare the paper that will be sent out to the EPDP, as well as to the DPAs very soon, before Montreal.

Basically, the paper is about the Unified Access Model and how it should work. The aim of the paper is basically to present that to DPAs and figure an answer from them. Of course, we haven't seen much to now, but we will see soon, and then, of course also, they will be working to try and get the DPA answering.

Then, the other thing that I wanted to share and ask to the group is first of all, is that we invited at the BC open meeting in Montreal, Jamie Hedlund. He would like to receive questions that you would like to ask him during our BC open meeting by the end of the week. So, if anyone is on the call who would kindly send to ExCom, by Friday, the questions that you would be interested in asking, we would be glad for that. We can transfer those to Jamie prior to Montreal.

The third thing that I wanted to share, also concerning the speakers for ICANN 66, is that basically, [Finance] will not be speaking at SG level. But also, we haven't invited them yet at the BC level. So, the question for you is whether you would like to have [Finance] there. For now, we have already three speakers, those being Jamie, [Jon Schultz], who's going to present his idea on legitimacy for ICANN, and then the third one is Cyrus Namazi. So, if you wish that we also invite [Finance], please let us know and we will do that.

With that, I don't have anything else to add. If there is any other question that members would like to highlight or to share with the group, please do so now. I don't hear anything, and I don't have a view on the queue, whether there's anyone writing. But if there is nothing else, I would close the call now. In any case, we will see each other in Montreal. Thank you very much for participating to today's call, and

have a nice rest of the day. Thank you. We can stop the recording,
Maryam.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]