
CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Welcome to the BECAUSE Members call on Wednesday, April 22nd, 2020. In the interest of time, attendance will be taken via Zoom. I would like to remind all participants to please state your name when speaking for the transcript, and to keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid background noise. With this, I'd like to turn the call over to our chair, Claudia Selli, to begin. Claudia, please go ahead.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Hi Chantelle, thank you so much and thank you very much everybody for participating to the BC Call. I hope everyone is keeping safe and happy during this very challenging period. In the interest of time, I will give the floor to Steve for the policy discussion. Steve, the floor is yours.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Claudia. I'll put up the policy calendar right now. I sent it around yesterday, I hope that all of you have it. They have one comment filed since our last BC meeting, and that was the comment that Jimson, Mark Datysgeld, and Arinola drafted on ICANN's revised Community Travel Support Guidelines. They put a very brief comment in because, for the most part, ICANN had taken our previous recommendations. Thanks again to Mark, Jimson, and Arinola.

Upcoming public comments, there are only a few, but they're big ones. The first is we have an opportunity to comment on the phase one report of a PDP that is looking at all the rights protection mechanisms in all

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.

gTLDs. And that comment period was just extended and now runs until the 4th of May, which is good.

It gives us more time because currently we're at 57 pages on our draft comment, and so a big thank you to Jay Chapman, Zak, Marie, Mason, Andy Abrams, and David Snead for working on that. We are doing it in a Google Doc and it's full of comments and back-and-forth right now.

I would say that a week before the comment deadline, so around the 27th of April, the drafters will work together and will come up with a clean comment that all the BC members can have a week to review and update. So, look for that about the 27th of April.

So, for any of the drafters that are on that team, I'll look in the chat, raise your hand if you'd like to comment on the current state of that or whether we need additional help and volunteers. Okay, didn't see any hands there so I'll move on and thanks again.

Number two is the expedited PDP on WHOIS data or gTLD registration data. We're in phase two, which is supposed to work on developing this unified access model or a centralized model. At this point, we've commented on the initial report, but now there's an addendum several pages long. An addendum that talks about unresolved and issues that resolved in ways that are not very favorable to the BC.

So, this is a critical comment for us, even though it's much briefer than the previous one we submitted. We are working on it right now. It's due on the 5th of May. Mason Cole, Alex Deacon, Jimson, Mark SV, Margie, and I are working on it. And we haven't put too much time into it yet, but it's a Google Doc and we're available to take other volunteers who

want to assist with it. This is a big opportunity for us to push for the notion that the registrant data for legal persons, for corporations, should be published in the publicly available WHOIS. It should not require an access model.

And we also want to develop a mechanism for the evolution of the centralized model, so it becomes more than just a ticket system but also guarantees we'll get disclosure of WHOIS data from qualified and accredited requesters. And we also want to work on the accuracy issue. I'll stop there, are there any additional volunteers or comments from those who are already working on it? Go ahead, Mason.

MASON COLE:

Hi Steve, thanks. Can you hear me okay?

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Perfect.

MASON COLE:

Good. So, I just wanted to update the BC a bit on where we stand on this draft. We've gotten probably three and a half pages of draft comment to add to the Google document, including some overarching comments about the status of the EPDP and where it's fallen short of its charter mandate. So, there's some points that precede the questions that ICANN is asking us to fill out.

And then of course there's that section where there's specific questions where we make the points that you elucidated just a minute ago, so I'm

pretty pleased with where we stand on the draft so far. We've got some more sharing to do among the drafting team, but I think we'll have a workable draft here before too long and certainly well before the deadline.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thanks, Mason. We want to circulate for all BC members at least seven days before that May 5th deadline. So, let's look for 27th of April, have something that's clean for everyone's review and I'll circulate it then. Okay?

MASON COLE:

Got it.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Mason, thanks again. Any other questions or comments?

I'll go on to number three. ICANN does these market-based plans, they call them regional plans, where they assess a given part of the world, cut up into the UN regions, and they come up with a notion of how to increase let's say the effectiveness and visibility of ICANN's services for registrars, registries, registrants, and end-users. And the BC has been super at focusing ICANN on serving those who register domain names and those who use the Internet, use the DNS, and make it less about economic development and promotion of registrars in a given region.

And I think that focus is gradually beginning to have an effect on the way ICANN writes them up. And I think that I shouted out to Lawrence

and Andrew for the work they did on the Middle East strategy and now it's time for the Africa regional plan. Those comments don't close until the 27th of May and it's a relatively short plan, it's only 12 pages long or so. This is an easy lift I think for BC members, especially those of you from the Africa region.

In 2017, we did a pretty extensive comment on the last one from Waudu, Andrew Mack, Lawrence, and Jimson. Who are the volunteers we can turn to prepare this Africa regional plan?

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Yes, Steve, I'll be part of it.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Jimson. All right, so I'm trying to keep an eye on the chat at the same time. I am looking at the ...

ROGER BAAH: Yeah, Steve, I will want to support Jimson on this as well.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Okay. Any others? Great, thank you. I'll now turn to the last one. It's a draft strategic plan for a part of the ICANN Organization called PTI, or the Public Technical Identifiers. It's actually a subsidiary of ICANN that we created as part of the IANA transition. When we took IANA out of the US government and put it into ICANN, we set up PTI and they have their own strategic plan and budget. The comments close the first of

June. Jimson and Tim Smith did some great work on it in 2019, so I think we'll have an opportunity to pick up on that. Can we have some volunteers to work on that strat plan?

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Yes, Steve. Tim and I, we've spoken about this. I will be looking at it, but of course new members are welcome to [join.]

TIM SMITH: Yeah, hi. I will be involved with that.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Tim, thank you very much.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Tim, you are on the call. Good.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Wonderful, thank you very much. It's hard for me to see the chat, I'm on a very small screen at this time so sorry about that. So, I'll keep an eye on the chat as well to see if others ... Right, Chantelle, and I had already noted that extension. And then Fred Felman, thanks. You should chime in then on that EPDP addendum that Mason and I were just discussing. I have a link to the Google Doc and Mason said he would be putting his introductory comments into that Google Doc. Mason, if you could do that as soon as possible, that way others can jump into the Google Doc and pick up from there.

MASON COLE: Will do.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Okay, and Arinola, I see you're going to join Jimson and Roger on the African plan. Thank you.

Okay, let me turn to GDPR and how it has affected WHOIS. As you all know, this is the focus of the EPDP, the expedited PDP. Since our last meeting we've had a couple of calls [in] the EPDP. There's a tremendous amount of work that goes into that. Mark Svancárek and Margie Milam and I spent hours of prep calls before the two hour calls we have in the PDP. It isn't going well. I don't have any good news to share on the ability for us to say that accredited requesters are going to be able to get access to the WHOIS information that's now been redacted. I'll turn to Mark and Margie right now and to see if you want to add a little something to the current process. Mark or Margie, please.

MARGIE MILAM: Hey, I guess I'll go ahead.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Hi Margie, I thought you weren't here today.

MARGIE MILAM: Yeah, I can get on for a few minutes and then I have to jump to another call.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Okay, go ahead.

MARGIE MILAM: Okay. Yeah, Steve is correct. The negotiations aren't going very well. What we're doing is spending hours going through the public comment period and seeing whether we can enhance the policy. The areas I think that are most important for the BC and that we've been pushing are trying to move the model to as much centralization as possible, but we're just getting an extreme amount of pushback on that because, as it's currently drafted, very little would be automated. Simply law enforcement requests in jurisdiction and that's it at this point. So, we're sort of struggling with understanding how useful this system might be if we're unable to improve the policy.

The area that Mark's spending a tremendous amount of work on is identifying areas where there should be additional automation. So, for example, this legal/natural person distinction that we're talking about is an area where we think the information for a legal entity shouldn't even be redacted because it's not covered by GDPR. There's no privacy concerns there. But, right now, it is redacted, so what we're pushing for is automation when the record involves a legal person. That's just an example of one of the areas where we might try to push for automated responses as opposed to manual responses. And we have had a lot of pushback on that even though we've received legal advice telling the group that it is possible to make some of these distinctions.

The other area where we're pushing on is accuracy, but obviously accuracy keeps getting pushed away from us. There is some memos that just came out that supported the positions that we made and that, unfortunately, isn't going to be addressed in the EPDP. The GNSO has taken that away from us.

But so, one of the things I think that's really important for us to focus on is the public comment that we just talked about because we will go through that process and look at each comment when it comes through after May—whenever the due date is for that addendum. And so, I think it's great that the BC's really putting a lot of effort into that.

And then the other thing I wanted to share was I did share with the BC the Interisle study that Mason had shared with the BC as well that really talked about how bad the WHOIS access is right now and gave a lot of examples of where even the public information that should be available, that isn't redacted, is simply not being made available by contracted parties. And one of the things that I thought is important for the EPDP to focus on is some of the policy recommendations that came out of that Interisle study. And so, that's an area where I think we can use to have outside surveys and studies support the factual basis for improving the policy. So, I think that's all I have. Mark?

MARK SVANCÁREK:

Sure. One of the things that we're seeing is ... I'm going to describe this as a severe lack of imagination. Really we have a couple of very strident voices saying the conservative and unscalable process that I use to review a couple hundred cases over a two-year period is the only one

that is lawful. And when you try to express to them that with accredited system, with audits and consequences and safeguards, you can build something that is trusted but also verified. And you can imagine that the NCSG would oppose this just because they have this feeling that once the auditor finds a problem that the data has already been released and that this is some sort of tragedy or something like that.

But on the contracted party side, it really seems like they just don't understand the purpose of several articles within the regulation and they can't possibly imagine that automation was envisaged by the writers of the regulation. And for a while I thought that this is just people being jerks, and to a certain degree it is, there's a lot of sanctimoniousness and you guys don't care about data-subject rights, but really now I'm starting to think it's just a lack of imagination and it's very hard to push against that. When people just simply cannot conceive of something different than what they're doing, there's no persuading them.

And this is what we're up against. If you read the existing public comment, you'll see a number of places where people are insisting on what they call meaningful, human review. And that's a term related to automation, but really they're using it in all cases.

So, that's an ongoing problem. This is leading to a certain amount of acrimony within the meetings themselves and Brian King of the IPC, he seems to be having some good luck with some backchannelling to people within both the registrar and registry group. I don't know that this is actually producing any results, but he's getting some feedback that we might be able to get some progress on trademark automation,

for instance. Now, trademark is sort of a third rail thing, as far as I can tell. So, I'm not holding my breath waiting for that, but he seems to feel like there's some confidence there.

I would portray this not only as a lack of imagination, but also a lack of leadership. I think a few voices within the contracted party house are leading them down a bad path because you know what's going to happen. If we don't get satisfaction on this, we'll be forced to take this outside of the multi-stakeholder model. And I think the consequences of that for the contracted parties is going to be unpredictable and not favorable. And, again, I think this is a lack of imagination. They are very comfortable within this multi-stakeholder model where they hold all the cards and where ICANN is not willing to even enforce their own contracts. And I think they're in denial about how bad it could be if we were take this outside of the multi-stakeholder model.

I don't want to overstate that, I mean certainly we might find that we're as stymied there as anywhere else, but it probably wouldn't be good if they have to deal with a lot of noise coming from the states, let alone governments. And if you are in the Echo group, there's a lot of people from the contracted party house who are discussing the .Org situation that's happening with the California Attorney General and they're starting to realize now that this could be a bad thing and if this were to be multiple states, not just California. The word that Michele Neylon used in an email today was "game over."

So, that's an interesting thing that is happening there. We are waiting for some additional legal feedback on automation. Brian King and I fed into the process some advice I had gotten from [inaudible] Law

regarding automation that was hanging off of previous legal feedback from Bird & Bird had provided us some hooks to hang some theories onto. And so, I had gone in and developed some of those and Brian fed them into the legal committee's system.

We were expecting that automation feedback several days ago and it's delayed. I think they're probably providing a pretty detailed opinion on this. If that's favorable, that could be a pretty good thing for us. If it's not favorable, then it's sort of game over on our side because there's not going to be any way to persuade anybody if we don't have the backing of Bird & Bird, regardless of what the law or the regulators determine at some later date.

So, as Margie says, it's a pretty dire situation. We're spending hours and hours doing homework processing the public comment and this is really keeping us from having any substantial discussions within the plenary itself. And I think we're going to have to resort to doing more on the list in order to have any substantive discussions on topics like urgent requests by non-law enforcement agencies or the entire concept of trust but verified. So, that's where we're at now.

As Steve says, please review the public comment that's out there. Please contribute to the addendum public comment. It's a lot of work and I can't give you high confidence it will make any difference but we have to do our best and this will be over soon enough and we'll know what direction we need to go in soon enough. Thanks.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thanks Mark and Margie. We may ask BC members in their individual capacities and corporate capacities to file comments on this addendum as well. So, watch for that email. It would be probably before the end of next week.

I also wanted to call out the contributions of Alex Deacon and Mason Cole, they've been huge helps to the work we do on the EPDP. Alex does our homework for us every night and that's been a big help.

Second thing is that Margie Milam mentioned the Interisle consulting report. I wanted to make sure you all knew that it is in the policy calendar on the screen in front of you where I have a link to it as well as the research conclusion that there is an overall failure to provide the domain name registration data access that ICANN is obligated to provide. That's very helpful.

And then finally, when Mark talks about going outside the ICANN process, there's probably a number of BC members that are wondering what we are talking about. So, let me try to give you just a quick explanation. The GDPR was European law that was binding upon businesses that based in the EU or serving EU residents, EU citizens.

By the same token, any other nation could enact a law that had contrary requirements like a law that would say that if you're serving registrants or end users in the United States that you have to disclose in public WHOIS the information necessary to follow-up and protect consumers. So, just picture the mirror opposite of GDPR requiring basically the same WHOIS we had before. Now that is a nightmare for registrars and registries who then have to have different legal regimes governing

everything that they do because they will serve both EU residents and citizens and registrants and users in the United States. So, this conflicting law is really the nightmare that they all want to avoid. So, the degree to which that becomes a specter might actually help us to push the contract parties to agree to what the GAC, ALAC, SSAC, IPC, and BC want to do and we can, at that point, outvote the NCSG in the EPDP.

So, when Mark talks about going outside the multi-stakeholder model, it's about countering the GDPR with something that's in the same vein but the opposite direction, from a different national government.

Mark and Margie, thanks again for everything you're doing there. Are there any questions from BC members? Thank you.

Let me move onto Council. So, I would turn to Scott and Marie, who are both with us. I have three highlighted items in yellow. Scott and Marie, over to you.

MARIE PATTULLO: Thanks, Steve. I'll kick off. Can you hear me okay?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yes.

MARIE PATTULLO: Great, thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I can't hear you.

MARIE PATTULLO: I'm sorry?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I said I can't hear you.

MARIE PATTULLO: Okay, is that better?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Perfect.

MARIE PATTULLO: Okay. As Steve kindly put into the policy calendar, we had the council meeting last week and the most important subject for us came up under two headings. One being the current workload of council and the future priorities, and the other being how all of us are trying to deal with the current situation. Within that, and also within the EPDP, we at the BC of course agree with the GAC that it's a totally artificial deadline that everything has to be finished by June.

In particular, when we are—and using Alex Deacon's words—punting, the very important subjects of data accuracy and legal versus personal data into not even the [long grass] but just into the absolute unknown future. We tried in writing, we tried vocally on a call, we will keep trying

and we lost. We're not remotely surprised by that, but we were accused of trying to use the current situation to make things seem worse than they were in terms of DNS abuse, which I find outrageous. In particular, if anyone wants to buy some counterfeit tests or masks or any of the other stuff to do with the current crisis, just go online because you're going to find plenty of counterfeits.

Anyway, there were a couple of things that were discussed in passing, but Steve has also put those into the chat, which are things that we will need to react to on the council list. One is about, as I mentioned it just now, the work plan and our prioritization of the GNSO work plan. I'd be very grateful if you can look at this, as Scott sent it out to you and asked you to do. It's not just about what work you would like to see ICANN doing, please remember this, it's about what you think should be on the council's agenda. So, any comments on that please, I just the [inaudible] ...

On the history of Thick WHOIS and where it may currently be, Alex has done an amazing job of putting together the history, which Steve has very kindly sent through to you. We were going to discuss this last week, we didn't have time, so we know it's going to come to the list, and again if anybody has any comments, please let us know. I think right now that's all I have to say, so I will hand over to Scott.

SCOTT MCCORMICK:

Thanks, Marie. Yeah, I circulated the draft 2020 work plan. We need input for that by the 1st of May. I was just searching my email to see if anybody commented on anything, but other than that the next council

meeting's obviously going to be remote and other than that, I think that's it from council.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Scott and Marie, thank you very much. Are there any other questions for our councilors?

Okay, scrolling down to other work. The council and GNSO in general, Denise Michel and Scott McCormick, who are both on the call, serve on the security, stability, and resiliency second review, which is our bylaw's required specific reviews. You guys issued your report earlier this year, we commented on it. Denise and Scott, what's the current status on that SSR review?

SCOTT MCCORMICK:

I see Denise is on, but I don't know if she's got her mic on. We are currently working through public comments and have broken those down into teams to work on individual workstreams. So, as of now, we're still marching ahead. Due to obviously not being able to have face-to-face meetings, things are obviously moving slower, so we're planning ahead as this goes on.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

All right. Thanks to you and Denise for all that work. The second one is the ATRT 3. ATRT stands for accountability and transparency review. This is another specific review required in the bylaws. Now, Tola is on the call with us, Tola Sogbesan. And Tola represents all of CSG, not just the BC. They now are working on their final report, we have commented

on it and Denise Michel led an effort where we differed with where the initial report was going on the specific reviews, and now we're turning more to what's going on in the organizational reviews. These are reviews required in the bylaws since 2003, where ICANN the board reaches out to an external consultant and pays them a couple of hundred thousand dollars to do a study on the SOs and ACs one at a time, every five years. So, they've studied the GNSO, for example, and they figure out whether it is still fit for purpose and is it effective at fulfilling its purpose.

Those reviews have not been very satisfying to those of us in the BC, we've been rarely able to get anything out of them. And the surveys that this review team did reviewed that most of the ICANN community didn't get much out of those reviews. Consequently, the ATRT 3 working team is coming up with a new set of recommendations that instead of outside organization reviews every five years for every SO and AC, they're encouraging each SO and AC to do a self-assessment on its accountability, transparency, and do it every three years.

In addition, there's an idea, and this is in Tola's report, it's an attachment to the policy calendar. Tola's done an excellent report summarizing for IPC and BC and ISP leadership exactly where they are as well as the current set of debates about the organization reviews. And I did want you to keep in mind that in addition to these self-assessments every three years, they are still recommending that every seven years that the board does get an independent review. And that might be adequate for that independent reviewer to explore structural changes in GNSO, structural changes more broadly at ICANN.

Give you an example, we sent Tola into this fight asking him to argue for two extra board seats for GNSO so the contract parties would have two and that the non-contracts would have two. Tola was rebuffed in that, but this seven-year independent review would be the opportunity to try to get that brought to bear. It might also be the only other time we can get independent consultants to recommend changes to the split-house structure in GNSO.

At this point, the IPC chair, Heather Forrest, wants to hold a call with Tola and the other leaderships in CSG to figure out where we go in the final phase of the ATRT 3. So, Tola, let me turn it over to you with that set up and we'll see if we have questions.

ADETOLA SOGBESAN:

Thank you, Steve. Greetings to everyone. You've rightly summarized [with the GNSO what] has transpired. I responded to Heather Forrest and Wolf and [they supported that the] BC wouldn't mind to hold a call. I don't know how soon we are going to do that because we are rounding off the ATRT 3 report by the middle of May, we have our next call next week. We just [held a] call today and we have agreed to cancel two calls, waiting for—in nine days' time we'll be having our final call which means anything we're going to be doing within CSG, we need to do it within the next week.

[Inaudible] have suggested we invite [Matt Shears.] By the way, who won his election, back onto the board last week and the suggestion was to invite them to come to CSG [ExCom] and we ask them questions. So, what we're requesting for now is if any member of the BC has any

questions, please pass [a call to members] so that we can present it to [Matt Shears] and any other question that will appear at the meeting.

Apart from that, [yeah, today's call,] [inaudible] Osvaldo, Osvaldo represents [ISPCP on the ATRT board.] We tried pushing the same issue today and we have every possibility of this discussion being heard at our next call. There's a problem and I'm sure they'll present it again and they may likely listen to what we've got to say. [That is all from me now], thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: It might only be possible at this point to be sure that seven-year specific review that happens ...

ADETOLA SOGBESAN: Seven years, yeah.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Push for the fact that scope of that review would include examining structural changes, both in ICANN and the GNSO and SOs and ACs. Structural changes that are necessary to the effectiveness and legitimacy of ICANN.

ADETOLA SOGBESAN: Okay, that sounds good.

STEVE DELBIANCO: [So if we can just include that.] You're not going to be able to get the changes implemented in the report but the idea is to make sure that that external review can still give us a fighting chance to get the changes we need.

ADETOLA SOGBESAN: Okay, that's okay. That's noted. Thanks a lot.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Tola. Any questions for Tola? Remember, that you can write Tola directly, we don't have to run everything through the CSG. Tola independently represents the BC, the IPC, and the ISPCP. Great, don't see any questions there.

One more of these big cross-community working groups is the one on auction proceeds. Do recall, ICANN raised several hundred million dollars by auctioning off new gTLDs where there was contention. And that money then sits in a pool of funds and ICANN created a cross-community working group to decide how to allocate the funds, what mechanism would come up with to propose uses of that money and what mechanism would approve the uses and supervise the spending. When the BC filed comments two months ago on this, we generally preferred a mechanism where an outside expert group would come up with the evaluation of criteria and grant and choose the grant recipients and then administer the grants. Since then, the majority of the momentum I think on this working group is to not go with an outside expert, but instead to make a department inside of ICANN Org that would evaluate and choose the grant recipients. And then they would

be accountable to the community the same way that anything that anything that Org does.

So, Anne Aikman-Scalese represents CSG on that working group and she's been good about keeping us informed. It's the third attachment to today's policy calendar. Read the writing in her attachment and it's pretty clear they're going to go with the internal ICANN mechanism. Are there any BC members that feel strongly against that and what would you have me tell Anne Scalese? Looking in the chat and seeing if there are any hands up. All right, not seeing any. I'll turn things over to Barbara Wanner, our liaison to the commercial stakeholders group. Barbara.

BARBARA WANNER:

Yeah, okay Steve. First of all, I have a couple of questions I want to jump in on right quickly concerning the ATRT 3. First of all, I thought Tola was going to be participating in that call. Is that not the case? I think they're looking at having a call on Friday the 24th, the CSG Ex-Com.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Tola, can you join?

ADETOLA SOGBESAN:

Yeah, I can. [Heather Forrest has] indicated that, actually, but I'm willing to join once it's announced. Thank you.

BARBARA WANNER: Okay, I will then forward the relevant call-in information to you.

ADETOLA SOGBESAN: That'd be good, thank you.

BARBARA WANNER: All right. Secondly, as Steve notes, the CSG leadership led a drafting of board questions to follow up on our virtual meeting at ICANN 67. Several of you I think contributed to that. Steve included it as an attachment. If you have any more revisions please let me know, although I think they would have to be submitted after the fact because I believe that Dean Marks has already sent them on to the board. In any case, we can review that and take another look and make any refinements I'm sure.

As Tola mentioned, there was a formal vote, if you will, and Matthew Shears was reelected concerning board seat 14. And the only other thing I'll remind people about is that we will have to select a ... I believe Scott McCormick is term limited, so we will have to select someone to fill his seat, and I believe he has the right to run again if he so chooses. But most importantly, we'll have to select a successor to Keith Drazek as chair to the GNSO Council, and with the exception of the vice chair position, Philippe Fouquart has indicated an interest. Philippe is with the ISPCP. I have heard no viable candidates step forward to succeed Keith, so I don't know where we stand on that quite honestly and I invite comments as to how people want to proceed. That's it, Steve. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Barbara. Any questions for Barbara? Thanks, everyone. Back to you, Claudia.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Apologies, I was on mute. I think we've shared also the information of a webinar that is being organized by ICANN on the 28th of April and it's a webinar that will explain the impact of coronavirus on ICANN activities. It's open to the whole community, so if anyone would like to participate, I think it would be interesting. Yeah, and then for the rest, of course, there are continuous conversation around the next ICANN 68 and start organizing it. I don't have much more to report, but I will leave the floor to Jimson for the finance report and operation.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Thank you, Claudia. Greetings, everyone. I trust we are keeping well and safe in this COVID-19 environment. Well, if you will pardon me, I would just like to say something in regard to the auction proceed options, if you don't mind.

Really, at that time, BC took a position recommending [inaudible] and I think we all agree that option B would be best to get that independent grant making organization to do the granting with ICANN oversight. And the major concern then was with regard to ... because if you have to have a department, you have to hire people and then again that is outside our remit. Our remit, of course, ensuring that DNS system works very well with regard to policy formulation, and that would be a

digression. So, if the majority are going towards A, just for us to state exactly what we had in mind when we said B should be the first choice, why A would be the second and C third.

Okay, so I will say that. Let me move on to the financial operations. Thank you, Claudia, for the reminder on the webinar. The webinar is actually to try to review the ICANN budget expectation for FY 21 in the face of the COVID-19 challenge, market issues. So, as many that could participate, please do. I'll assure you, finance team will be there.

Well, last fortnight ago when we had a meeting, I informed us that we got some feedback from ICANN with respect to our comment and then we responded with survey questions and with those questions, they are to review the document all over again [for which we were informed] and we'll check in again. [We saw] some things that needed clarification so we're sending that to them. So, we're expecting for that a response with regard to the ICANN FY 21-25 plan and operations, or comments that ICANN responded to.

Secondly, at the last meeting I said that invoices for FY 21 will be dispatched by May 1st. But that has been adjusted now to June 1st. This is because we are correctly upgrading signatory's mechanism in the bank so that [it can be in tandem] with the organizational standard. Working on that and we are hopeful that by June 1st we'll have been tidied up and should expect your invoices in your email.

Now, on operations. This credential committee new membership guidelines that I mentioned at the last meeting has now finally been updated thanks to the credential committee chair and members for

their work and to our smart working secretary Chantelle for getting the guidelines on our website. So that new members will be able to complete a number of new suggestions like they need to have a website and they need to present their application in English because there are some applicants that present the application in other languages. Even though we have language translation on our website, we do have languages on our website, but the language of communication we [prefer] to be English.

On the elections coming up, we have two election processes going in parallel. [Inaudible] all together, yes. The Council election and NomCom elections. The Council election for the seat currently being occupied by Scott McCormick. And then also for the NomCom position for the large seat rep and the small seat rep. Our large seat rep is Paul Mitchell of Microsoft, while our small business representative is currently is Lawrence Olawale-Roberts. The two of them are term limited for the NomCom, but I think Scott is not term limited.

So, the election process will begin May 4th until June 5th and Chantelle has already sent the information to our emails, so please review again and let us look at the date of commencement [May 4th] so that we can begin to nominate a candidate. And of course, as you know, members that are in good standing are [dually qualified to stand] and also to be voted for.

We have started the process of producing our newsletter for ICANN 68. You know we've always produced a very good newsletter that captures our views with regard to outreach activities and specialized articles by members. So, I'd like [to use this] opportunity to request members that

have very relevant articles, please send it to Ross. In particular, maybe like a [inaudible] article that will probably last time can be tweaked to incorporate some new updates. It'd be great to also publish that on our newsletter.

This upcoming edition will only be electronic since the meeting ICANN 68 is going to be virtual. It is very important we continue to publish our newsletter.

Lastly, we are beginning also the process of updating our outreach strategy for FY 21, so I'll be reaching out to old and new members so that we can tidy the outreach strategy document up, especially with the recommendation of [ExCom] that we should focus our outreach based on interests and on regard to members in the region. Like the ICANN 68 normally should take place in Malaysia, so the [ExCom] decision there was that members in India, in Asia, and that region could focus and drive the outreach [at our period] at those regions. So, but since it's no longer going to be physical, it's going to be virtual, so yes, members from that region will also be consulted, but there's also opportunity for outreaches in other regions, maybe post-COVID. So, maybe let's look at post-COVID because it's only when we are out of COVID issue that we can be really doing outreach as we did before, as we normally do. But there also other participation virtually that we can still do to engage. Many of us have been doing that, [we can continue to] do that and so that will be factored into our outreach strategy document.

So, old and new members, please expect an invitation to that very soon. Okay, on this note, I don't know if there are questions. Please, I await your questions. Thank you. Back to you, Claudia.

CLAUDIA SELLI:

Thank you very much, Jimson. I'm just looking at the chat to see if there is any other business from other members. No, I can't see any hands up. So, with that, we can close the meeting and we will speak in two weeks' time and we can stop the recording as well. Thank you very much, everybody.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]