

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the BC Members Call on Wednesday, February 26, 2020. In the interest of time, attendance will be taken via the Zoom room. I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and to keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid background noise. With this, I'd like to turn it over to our Chair, Claudia Selli, to begin. Claudia, please go ahead.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Thank you very much, everybody, for participating in today's call. So in... I will directly, maybe we can go directly to the policy calendar that is up in the Zoom room for the people who are seeing it and we'll start with the first channel which is BC participation in an ICANN public comment process. So on 12<sup>th</sup> of February, ICANN Chair, Maarten Botterman, gave a reply to the letter that we sent regarding DNS abuse and Steve is proposing also to discuss some follow-up questions to the letter. Is there anyone that would like to comment or maybe go into possible questions that could be a follow-up?

MASON COLE: Claudia...

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Claudia, I know –

---

*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.*

---

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Mason's hand is raised.

MASON COLE: Claudia, good morning.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Good morning.

MASON COLE: Good morning. I just wanted to follow up a bit on the letter since I was involved in some of the drafting. So I'll just kick off the discussion here.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Yeah. Thank you, Mason.

MASON COLE: Now as we remember, there were multiple sessions that were held in Montreal on this topic which really led to no resolution, so what we heard in Montreal was that ICANN Compliance didn't have the tools that they thought were necessary to address DNS abuse on any meaningful scale. So the BC took the lead in the discussion at that point by providing an interpretation to the Board about contracts and policies that would allow ICANN to take some kind of action on DNS abuse.

ICANN's reply to that BC letter was disappointing in my view. I personally found it to be nonconstructive and in the weeds, and in some

cases, even combative which is not helpful from an organization that says that they're dedicated to abuse mitigation.

So in terms of follow-up, what I'd personally like to see, and I'm interested in the BC's feedback on this, is how we can persuade ICANN to show some leadership by requiring contracts to be reinforced at every opportunity, such as contract amendments that may be necessary, issuing advisories that interpret current language, things of this nature. I think there's an opportunity as well to enlist others in this effort because the BC has been sort of the sole voice on DNS abuse since the Montreal meeting. I think the GAC and the SSAC in particular could be helpful in being enlisted to help persuade ICANN to actually take some kind of decent stance on abuse.

I think that if ICANN, the organization, were truly interested in doing something about abuse, they wouldn't offer excuses, they would actually offer pathways for the community to follow that would help mitigate DNS abuse. So what I'd like to see in terms of next steps is seeing if we can enlist others so that the voice against DNS abuse is stronger and we can reply to Maarten's letter with some constructive suggestions. I'm willing to help lead that effort, but I'm interested in the BC's input on this as well.

CLAUDIA SELLI:

This is [William]. The question is Claudia here. It's more a question. Sorry if it's redundant or not useful, but would ICANN have the remit to enforce the contracts?

---

---

MASON COLE: I'm sorry, Claudia. I didn't catch your question.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Yeah, I was saying ICANN does have the remit – right? – to enforce contracts.

MASON COLE: They do, but their claim is that their contracts are not sufficient in order to compel some kind of action on the parts of contracted parties on DNS abuse. So if the reply from ICANN is "We don't have the tools," then we need to find a way to encourage ICANN to find the tools and put them in place. And that's where I'd like to take the conversation next.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Anyone that wants to jump in? Barbara?

BARBARA WANNER: Yeah, hi. Mason, I just wanted to let you know that we put that on our list of questions to the Board that we want to address with them in our virtual meeting that will take place whenever for ICANN 67, and we specifically mentioned issuing advisories and so forth, and so on. So I don't know if that would help kind of open the door to what you're suggesting. But I just wanted to let you know about that. Thanks.

MASON COLE: Thank you, Barbara. I do think that's a helpful step. I'm concerned that ICANN will continue to... the ICANN Organization will continue to say

---

“We simply don’t have the tools” and “Look at all these great things that Compliance is actually doing” when in reality, as I mentioned, they’re sort of down in the weeds. They’re dealing with complaint tickets and [certain] liner issues where there’s really an opportunity to address DNS abuse on a much bigger scale. I do think that we should have that constructive dialogue with the Board but I’m concerned it won’t be productive and I’d like to enlist others to help pressure the Board to actually encourage the community to take constructive action.

FRED FELMAN:

I wonder if it’s worth reaching out to SSAC and seeing if they could underscore this in their meetings with the Board during the virtual meetings as well.

MASON COLE:

Good idea, Fred. Claudia, if I may, I’m happy to continue contributing to this in some kind of constructive manner. So if the BC would like for me and others to reach out to the GAC and the SSAC to see if they can be enlisted in the effort, then I’m happy to do that.

FRED FELMAN:

I think it’s an outstanding idea, Mason.

CLAUDIA MARTINUZZI:

Mason, this is Claudia Martinuzzi from LVMH. Can you hear me?

---

MASON COLE:

Yes, ma'am.

CLAUDIA MARTINUZZI:

Oh, great. So I just want to say I've been speaking about this to our French GAC members quite a bit. I've been sharing the BC letters and I haven't shared the response yet but I have a good channel of communication with them and they apparently raised the issue of DNS abuse during a closed meeting that European GAC members have together. From what I heard, from what they told me, the reaction from other European GAC members was kind of lukewarm like they didn't, not many other members saw the interest in raising this issue with ICANN directly, ICANN Org. But so far, I feel like I'm on the way to onboarding French GAC members with this issue, so I can definitely keep you updated on that and they seem quite willing to sort of raise the profile of this issue because they've been quite adamant about it. So that could be a way forward as well.

MASON COLE:

Well, thank you, Claudia. I think that would be very helpful. I know there are GAC members who are particularly interested in this because... And this isn't altruistic. It's a matter of operational security for the DNS and unless ICANN Org actually steps in to help do something about the problem, it's going to continue to grow and it's going to be a problem for our members. So I would like to enlist others in the GAC because as I mentioned, the BC has been sort of a lone voice on this since Montreal. And I don't want to keep getting blown off by ICANN letters. I'd prefer to see if we can constructively engage and actually get something done.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Okay, so what I take from this discussion is you will lead the effort to reach out to SSAC and GAC. We will have as well, also the DNS abuse questions to the Board during our meeting, virtual meeting. And we will take it from there on the business of also what SSAC and GAC responses will be. So you're assigned to that effort, Mason, and of course, Claudia will also help on the European side. Right, Claudia? Can I put you? Would you be willing to do that?

CLAUDIA MARTINUZZI: Yes, definitely. Yeah. You can keep me in.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Okay, great. Great, that's good. And I think that if we can reach any type of constructive engagement, I think that's the best way to go about it.

MASON COLE: Okay. Thank you, Claudia.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Any other questions? Otherwise, I'll continue with the next item which is that on 14<sup>th</sup> of February, we commented on the proposed final report on the new gTLD auction proceeds, Cross-Community Working Group, and Jimson and David, thank you for the drafting. I don't know if there is anything that Jimson or David, I'm not sure if you were there, but if there is anything that you want to say on that, please.

---

---

I don't hear anything, so on 14<sup>th</sup> of February also, we commented on Proposed Amendment 3 to the .com registry agreement and the active members were [Andy Abra], Zak Muscovitch, Alex Deacon, Mason Cole, and Barbara Wanner. [Jay Sudowski] and Steve DelBianco, thank you for the drafting. Anything that you would like to highlight, Mason, Barbara, and Jay, I don't know if you are on the call? Sorry, I'm not seeing everyone. Okay.

MASON COLE: Not right now, Claudia, thank you.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Okay, good. And then you can see that on 31<sup>st</sup> of January also we commented on the draft report for accountability and 29<sup>th</sup> of January, also on the proposed future Root Zone KSK Rollovers. So now the open opportunity that we have to comment is the draft financial '21-2015 operation and financial plan and draft Financial Year '21 operating plan and budget. The comments are closing on the 25<sup>th</sup>. Well, they just closed actually. So sorry. It's 25<sup>th</sup> of February so it's yesterday. And Jimson, I understand that you also worked on that.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Yeah.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Together with [Paula] and Mark Datysgeld.



JIMSON OLUFUYE:                    Yeah.

CLAUDIA SELLI:                    And we created attachment. Yeah, Jimson, please if you want to say anything.

JIMSON OLUFUYE:                    Well, not [inaudible] to say, but just to thank my colleagues that worked on these together. Thank you.

CLAUDIA SELLI:                    Okay, great. And then the second one is the Security, Stability and Resiliency Review Team draft report. The comments are closing on the 4<sup>th</sup> of March and Denise Michel's [inaudible] are on the Review Team and maybe you can say something on how things are going.

MARK DATYSGELD:                    Can I very briefly?

CLAUDIA SELLI:                    Of course. Of course.

MARK DATYSGELD:                    Thank you. What I want to highlight is on the budget draft, the result of the whole Brian Cote process and the MSM consultation that we carried

---

out during 2019 was kind of [inaudible] in there and we have drafted a response, sort of a final response. It's the way forward, so to say, of this particular process.

So I would invite anybody who is not particularly interested in the financials but who followed this process to have a [look over that] just to see if everything is up to par. A lot of it was based on the input that we had given before, but just to make sure. So thank you.

CLAUDIA SELLI:

Thanks, Mark. So going back to the Security, Stability and Resiliency, the draft report, it's in Attachment 2 for members to review. Remember that the comments are closing on the 4<sup>th</sup> of March so if you should handle your comments as soon as possible.

Anyone that wants to come in? And thank you to Susan, Roger, Ben, and [inaudible] for drafting the BC comments.

So then we have the initial report of the EPDP on the Temporary Specification for gTLD registration data, the Phase 2. The comments will close on 23 of March and Mark and Margie, of course, always do a great job of representing us in the EPDP. And for the comments, [inaudible], thank you, Drew also has volunteered to draft the comments with the guidance also of Mark and Margie and Alex. So thanks for that.

I don't know if the first draft has already been circulated, Mason, or Drew.

---

MASON COLE: No, it hasn't.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Okay.

MASON COLE: We're in the process of organizing that now.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Yeah, and I don't think that either Mark or Margie are on the call, if I'm not mistaken. No, I just wanted to get an update, if at all, in the discussions that are ongoing. If anyone else wants to jump in.

BARBARA WANNER: Hi, Claudia. I just wanted to mention that we will also have a few minutes in tomorrow's CSG closed meeting to share our thoughts on the EPDP to draft and, gosh, maybe learn more about where the different constituencies stand on certain elements of it. So that could help with our drafting process as well. Thanks.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Thank you so much, Barbara. So the other comments that is upcoming is the draft proposal for the Next Gen ICANN program improvements. The comments will close on the 31<sup>st</sup> of March and in September, we also already responded to the Next Gen consultation with Mark leading for us. We need volunteers here to respond to the proposal. Can anyone help?

MARK DATYSGELD: I will be happy to lead it again. I am very happy to have anybody else join.

CLAUDIA SELLI: That's great. Thank you so much, Mark. Anyone else? Okay. If at all, you can always reach out to Steve and let him know that you are happy to help Mark in the comments.

Then we have also the Name Collision Analysis Project, Study 1. The comments close on 31<sup>st</sup> of March and there was an outside study that includes a primer on collision and summarizes prior work. The BC has been actively concerned about name collisions in 2012 round and provided its comments also in April 2018 that were drafted by Stephanie. Any volunteer here to draft comments?

Okay, not for now. Please reach out to Steve if you are interested in leading that comments.

And then we have also the Middle East and adjoining countries, Strategy 2021-2025 where the comments close on the 3<sup>rd</sup> of April and we commented in 2016 with Lawrence Olawale-Roberts and Andrew Mack. Any volunteer here to draft these comments? I don't think that either Lawrence or Andrew are on the call but maybe we could see if they would be still interested. I don't see hands up. Okay.

Then the last one is the Revised Committee Travel Support Guidelines where the comments close on 13<sup>th</sup> of April. For you to know and in case, if ever anyone is interested, to draft comments, of course, is welcome.

---

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Yeah, Claudia. I could take a look at that.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Great. Thank you. Was that Jimson, right?

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Yeah.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Okay, good. Okay. Chantelle, if you can scroll down, please. Or... Okay, great. So we have all the WHOIS policy to comply with the GDPR. You have the update here. There has been also a latest blog by Göran, I think, following this meeting with the Belgian VPA on 14<sup>th</sup> of February. We also understand that he has been meeting and presenting the case before the Council. So certainly, there was an interest there and [last] by not least, we are trying to gather more that the political momentum around it and create some actions, such as questions from the Parliament and however we can help. I'm sure you have seen that. We don't have anyone from the EPDP on the call but if anyone else has updates, please jump in. No, everyone is silent. Okay. Chantelle, if you can continue. Keep scrolling down a little bit. Thank you.

Yeah. Then I would move if we don't have any further... Well, we have certainly the link also in the policy update on initial report and then certainly, well, maybe next time Mark and Margie can update ourselves on the challenges.

---

I would move then to Channel 2 for the GNSO Council. I think Marie has joined. Right, Marie?

MARIE PATTULLO: I'm joined, Claudia.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Can you please give us an update on your site? Thank you.

MARIE PATTULLO: Certainly. My apologies for being late to the call. I was unfortunately detained elsewhere. And also my apologies because I was not at last week's Council meeting. Scott was. I was not available. But I can give you some headlines of what happened there. It was only one vote, which was the approval of the work on PDP 3.0.

So that will now be taken forward every time that we charter an EPDP or have to deal with any PDP issues going forward. They will be under these new 3.0 principles. Of course, if anybody is involved in any working groups and finds that these new principles don't work, do work, should be changed again, of course, do let us know.

There were two project change requests. Translation, there were two requests for delays, one for the RPM Working Group results and one for the SubPro, Subsequent Procedures, both of which were pretty much adopted. There was quite a lot of discussion around them.

---

You will remember that I sent out, after our last BC call, a GNSO work prioritization list, different issues that are likely to come up to the Council within the next year or so. If you have any thoughts or feedback on that, please let me know or Scott or both of us so that we can return to the Council leadership and give them an idea of where the BC is aligned or would like to see some things move up the priority list.

Now as for the meeting that is kind of happening but not happening, naturally, there was a lot of discussion about that. The ICANN policy webinar that was held last week, if you couldn't make it, it's available to listen to. Again, if you have any questions, let me know. The ICANN policy reports, the GNSO policy updates, both of us have also been published. We will be looking shortly to scope a draft of a charter for a new PDP on the IDN scoping team. Anyone have any interest in that, please let me know.

And Keith is also, Keith Drazek, the Chair of the Council, has also recirculated the letter you all saw that we received as Council for Göran back in December concerning data accuracy. And Keith's comment is "We need to determine our next steps." So Claudia, I think probably the best thing for me to do is to send that again to the list and again request any input from anybody on how they would like us to push that forward.

I'm sorry this is brief. But as I said, I wasn't at the meeting. However, I'm happy to try to answer any questions I can. Thank you.

---

CLAUDIA SELLI: Thank you, Marie. Any questions for Marie? I don't see hands up. Okay, then thank you, Marie, for sending again the link to the list and also, I will move to our CSG update. Barbara, over to you.

BARBARA WANNER: Thanks, Claudia. Why don't I just jump right in to changes for ICANN 67? It's on page four of Steve's policy calendar. I guess the most important thing I wanted to bring to your attention is that we will have a CSG closed meeting tomorrow, the 27<sup>th</sup> of February at 18:00 UTC. It will be 90 minutes. It will be a longer closed meeting because we felt we had a lot of things to address in confidence and more appropriate for a closed meeting than an open meeting and in view of that, we have cancelled the CSG open meeting. Quite honestly, we weren't really getting suggestions or expressions of interest from CSG members as to who they wanted to speak to and what they wanted to address, so we felt it would be just better in the spirit of streamlining all of the remote participation in ICANN 67 to cancel that meeting.

Similarly, our meeting with the GAC has been canceled, quite frankly, at their request in the spirit of streamlining. We will go ahead with requests for a meeting with the ICANN Board as I mentioned earlier. We still have to determine the date and time. And Chantelle, I encourage you to jump in here. My understanding is we could keep the Cancun time that appears on the schedule or request to have that teleconference rescheduled for another date and time, perhaps that is more favorable to more people.



The CSG meeting with GNSO appointed Board members also has been canceled in the near term but will schedule a separate teleconference with Becky, Matthew, and whoever else we want to consider, we want to include on that call later in March. Similarly, our meeting with the contracted party [has] been canceled at their request.

Finally, we will try and convene with the non-contracted – or, excuse me – the non-commercial stakeholders group to discuss planning for the intercessional, and most importantly, Board seat 14 at some point in time as yet to be determined.

So that's kind of where things are from the CSG point of view. We really took the sentiment of members to streamline things so we aren't burdening staff with managing all of these teleconferences seriously.

You have before you, too, the agenda for our CSG closed meeting tomorrow, as I mentioned. We will talk about our preparations for our teleconference with the Board. I would encourage people to raise DNS abuse as we discussed earlier in the call. I would also encourage people to raise EPDP2 and how, perhaps, what elements of it the BC would like to address in this dialogue with the Board. Let's see.

Again, Board seat 14 and our thoughts on upcoming elections for GNSO Council Chair and the Vice-Chair. Particularly with respect to Board Seat 14, I would really encourage people to share their thoughts as to Matthew's performance, if you will, in our call with him last week. On our CSG ExComm call, members from both the IPC and the ISPCP thought that he did rather well, thought he presented himself in a commanding, if you will, manner, grasped the issues and was able to

---

---

share effectively kind of what he learned during his tenure on the Board thus far and what he wants to take forward.

There was also discussion about other possible candidates for Board Seat 14. I mentioned the candidate that was floated in our last BC call. It appears though, since that person is from North America, he may not be eligible. This continues to be confusing to me, but there has been a lot of back and forth with appropriate officials in ICANN that have expertise in this matter who have sent us the bylaws and relevant excerpts from the bylaws and interpreted them for us. So I don't know, Chantelle. Is that your understanding as well, concerning the North American representation on the Board?

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Hi, Barbara. Yes it is, and [inaudible] slide something on the CSG ExComm. I missed it if you mentioned this. My apologies.

BARBARA WANNER: That's okay.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: That a few members, I'll pull it up but I can post it in the chat, but basically, the two GNSO Board members cannot be from the same region. So Becky Burr is from North America meaning that if she... I can't remember off the top of my head if she's term-limited but assuming that she's not and she's reelected, the second Board member which is Matthew Shears, so it would have to be from a different geographic

---

region. I'll find that language now but just so that helps your explanation. Thanks.

BARBARA WANNER:

Okay. All right. Nevertheless, I would strongly encourage members of the BC to contribute to that item of the agenda in tomorrow's call. I think that's it for the moment. The specific dates and times of the other meetings that we mentioned, or "I'm meeting with the NCSG" still have to be determined. But the one certain development is tomorrow's CSG closed meeting. So I think that wraps up my report. I'm happy to take any questions. Thanks.

CLAUDIA SELLI:

Any questions for Barbara? Maybe just going into the ICANN 67 [inaudible] Organization, I think one thing that [inaudible]. Anyone wanted to raise something? I heard... Maybe if everyone can mute themselves.

I was just saying that to ICANN 67, we need to decide, first of all, if we want to maintain our BC open and closed meeting or whether we would propose to cancel them and reschedule with a normal BC call. That is something that we need to determine.

And the second thing is that we are going to have also kind of the CO and AC leaders call to plan the program. So if there are other comments in terms of time zone interpretation or anything that you want to raise, please let me know so that we can put the score right. But certainly, we

---

need to think about the BC and what we want to do with those two meetings. Anyone has comment?

I would imagine that our closed meeting can probably be replaced by a normal BC call, but I want to verify with everyone.

FRED FELMAN: That's the action that the registrars took. They opted to go for a longer call to discuss those issues in more depth.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Right.

FRED FELMAN: And it allows us to choose the time so I think it's actually a good idea for us.

BARBARA WANNER: I just put in the chat, Claudia, that if our regular time that we usually hold our calls works for most people, I would suggest that we go with that, yeah, instead of the Cancun time. And it looks like, let's see, Mark and Mason and Ben also like that and so does Marie. Thank you.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Yeah, I would support that as well. If we need to make it longer, we can certainly add maybe half an hour or something like that, or sometime more if we need to discuss more in-depth issues. And then also,

---

Chantelle is asking whether for the BC open, we will keep the 3:15, 8:30 slot which is Cancun time, so we need to bear that in mind. We would need also to decide that or whether, I don't know, we want to organize another call separately.

So there is, there are different threads in the chat. So Barbara is saying, "Do we really need an open meeting? I was saying that probably we would [inaudible] attend." And Jimson is asking, "Why not?" Barbara, you want to say something? Or I can certainly say that, I mean, it's just [trouble]. It's also [bargaining] stuff. Barbara, please go ahead.

BARBARA WANNER:

Thank you. I was just typing something for the chat. Yeah, I was just conscious of burdening staff. But just noticing that we had agreed to meet our GNSO Board members separately in a separate teleconference as well as meeting with the Board. I guess if there are any other people that the BC members want to meet or would want to do something that would be appropriate or suitable for an open meeting, then fine. But again, I kind of got the sense that we were scrambling as to what we wanted to cover in a BC open meeting. But if members have other suggestions, I'm open. I defer to others. I defer to the consensus on that. Thanks.

JIMSON OLUFUYE:

Yeah. Well, actually, I am also looking at, hey, that there is nothing wrong if we use the opportunity to welcome new people to our midst. As it is with a physical meeting, it's open, new people coming and I believe being the first [virtual] meeting, we should also keep that slot

---

open for people to be able to see our way also great. And I believe we can, it won't guess on what are updates. I think I will give some follow-up brief on that. But I think we should still replicate. I should be at the face-to-face setting where we can have new people joining virtually. Thank you.

CLAUDIA SELLI:

Jimson, in the virtual meeting, I don't know whether new members would really join because, certainly, it's a bit difficult also for them already to grasp ICANN and I imagine that in a virtual meeting, it is going to be even more difficult to find the schedule that's [inaudible] to [inaudible] and stuff like that. I'm not sure it's the best way to welcome them, but I don't have problems in having it. It's just an observation.

Anyone else that has comments, questions or wants to give his point of view?

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN:

Hi, Claudia. I can't raise my hand, but can I jump in for a moment?

CLAUDIA SELLI:

Yeah, of course.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN:

Thank you. So I note Chris's note in the chat. "The BC has a closed meeting from 9 to 10:15 in the morning and then also the open meeting from 3:15 to 6:30. The closed slot, or closed sessions, are not going to

---

be counted in the official ICANN 67 meeting schedule and if the BC decides to hold it as any other group, they'll be considered part of the regular monthly call and the public schedule will have the open meeting, and so it's the BC wishes to hold an open meeting. I think the question then is do we want to keep it to the two blocks, which is 180 minutes? Or do we want to reduce it to one block, which is 90 minutes? Thank you.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Thank you, Chantelle. Okay.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: I think if we can reduce it, it is better than canceling it all the way. So maybe we can just have... Maybe we have the second half, but we should not cancel it completely. That's what I think.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Okay, Thank you, Jimson.

Okay, so it seems as though there is an agreement about the 90 minutes. Let's take it then from there. I see that the majority would prefer to have that. Okay, great. We have a decision. That's good. So I don't have anything more from my end. But Jimson, I will get now over to you for the update on your hand.

---

JIMSON OLUFUYE:

Okay. Thank you very much, Claudia. Where [inaudible] I don't have much on my [slate], but just to give everyone an update, at the last meeting, which is [I did just] send out the call on behalf of the ExComm for busy [inaudible] development travel support funding for a member, for any member that qualifies and we have two members that have expressed interest. But as it is, due to the conversion of the ICANN 67 to virtual meeting. So the use of that funding will no longer be necessary or required.

I got notification that one of the applicants got a Visa but were just [inaudible] then that the face to face meeting was canceled. But perhaps, as we look at ICANN 68, maybe that's what needs to be available for ICANN to [stay] along with this, to stay in the [constant] state of, well, funding program.

But that is provided if ICANN's estate will still hold. We're told we are [inaudible]. I think health is more important. Safety is very imperative, and from our perspective, I think the decision to convert it to workshop meeting is a very laudable one.

And then secondly, you know we've been working on the special anniversary video that is being engineered by Mark Datysgeld, so thank you very much, Mark, for what you are doing. I think we should still wrap this up. I know you gave us today as deadline to send in our clips. So maybe Mark, you might want to extend it. But I think we should still continue to [inaudible] conclusion on that project.

Mark, do you want to consider extending the deadline?



---

MARK DATYSGELD:

Thank you, Jimson. On the anniversary PROJECT, LET ME GIVE EVERYBODY A BROADER THING first. So something that I work together with Jimson and Chantelle and John was the chronological BC timeline sort of, when the companies joined. That is done. It's looking pretty interesting from a historic perspective. So I don't know how we'll circulate that yet. It was going to be a video but maybe we will just archive it for now so that everybody can have access to it.

And as far as the video is concerned, I was engaged with some people and since everybody is a little bit not as energetic about this project now that the meeting will be virtual, I don't want to force anybody to do anything that's supposed to be fun. So what I would suggest is that we look forward to ICANN 68 and maybe get this aimed towards there because not a lot of videos are ready right now. People are still working on them. So maybe we will reschedule that so that everybody feels up to it, and from my perspective, that would be best. Thank you.

JIMSON OLUFUYE:

Okay. So if we are looking at ICANN's estate then, then maybe we each could say that we can give maybe a two-month extension because that's something that you think might be possible, at least with sufficient timing.

MARK DATYSGELD:

Yeah, for sure. Anybody could submit their videos at any point. We can compile them over the year. IT's perfectly fine. So let's keep this an open-ended project. Maybe we can talk a little bit more about it, but it's going to happen. So at some point. Thank you.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Okay. Thank you very much. And then, and lastly as we normally do, we've produced a newsletter. It's ready to go and we want to thank Chantelle and ExComm members for their articles. And then it will be published and communicated to members as [part in] the regular period. So once the meeting starts to be published, we can always see what we have done.

So on this note, I want to say thank you and back to you, Claudia.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Thank you very much, Jimson. Are there any questions from members? I don't see any hands up so I assume that there are no questions. The only question that I put into the chat is whether we actually want to invite anyone for the open meeting so in case you have any suggestions, let us know. If not, we will simply use it to welcome members and do our update with that.

Okay, so if there are no other points, I will close the call and yeah, we will see probably each other soon virtually. And we can stop the recording. Thank you everybody.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Thank you, Claudia.

BARBARA WANNER: Thank you.

---

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]