CHANTELLE DOERKSEN:	Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Welcome to the BC Members Call on Wednesday, June 3, 2020. 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 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 it over to the BC Chair, Claudia Selli, to begin. Claudia, please go ahead.
CLAUDIA SELLI:	Thank you, Chantelle, and thank you very much, everybody, for participating into the BC call today. You have the agenda in front of you. So as usual, we're going to start with the policy discussion. Steve, the floor is yours.
STEVE DELBIANCO:	Thanks, Claudia. Let me display the policy calendar for you. I sent it around yesterday, you should all have it by now. Let me bring that up. All right, I hope that's visible now. Thank you. Sorry for the delay.

What we'd like to do is to have Barbara Wanner, our CSG Liaison, go first because Barbara's got another critical appointment in the next 30 minutes. So, Barbara, you're up first and on the screen I have displayed your channel for the policy calendar. |

EN

BARBARA WANNER:	Thanks very much, Steve. Let me see if I'm – yes, I'm not on mute. Thanks very much, Steve. If everybody wouldn't mind scrolling down the channel a bit, you'll see that we need your input on some Doodle polls to determine when sub-meetings will take place. I will just say that at this point, it appears likely that we will have a CSG closed meeting probably on the 10th of June. We're still awaiting input from other CSG ExCom members. But this will be an important meeting because it will allow us to prepare for our June 15 meeting with Goran, [Maarten], and ICANN org to follow up our letter and issues and matters of concern that we had that we didn't sufficiently sorted out during ICANN67. So I just encourage you to do the Doodle poll and continue to watch your e-mail for that CSG closed meeting. We also need your input, would welcome your input on the Doodle poll for everybody to have a conversation with Becky and Matthew and perhaps others if people find other members of the Board on that call. I think that is it, basically.

Again, if you could scroll down a little bit more, we will have a CSG ExCom call on the 8th, I believe, to talk about the agenda for our meeting with the Board. If you have any further topics that you want to raise during that meeting, please let me know, similarly for our meeting with Beck and Matthew. What I have down there is what I'm proposing just based on what we've been talking about in our calls. So I think that's it, Steve.

We reported last time that Philippe Fouquart has emerged as the consensus candidate for GNSO Chair. The CSG still do not know where the NSCG stand on that, so our conversation with them still has to proceed. I guess that's it for the moment. Thanks.

EN

STEVE DELBIANCO: Hey, Barbara, thanks a lot. Who's responsible for doing outreach to NCSG on this Council Chair and Vice Chair, and who's in charge over there at NCSG?

BARBARA WANNER: I believe Dean has been – and Debra too – engaged with Stephanie Perrin. He has a good relationship with her. It's probably a case where they're having trouble getting their schedules aligned because of COVID complications or whatever. But Dean has made an effort to reach out to Stephanie to talk to her about our nominee and then how the NCSG would like to proceed in terms of the Vice Chair candidate if indeed they join us in supporting Philippe.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Barbara. Do we have any word back from the Contracted Party House, the Registries and Registrars, about whether they'd be acceptable for Philippe?

BARBARA WANNER: I believe they're supportive. I believe they're supportive but I think I will [inaudible].

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Barbara. In the chat, I put the link to the Doodle poll that all BC members should complete today so that Barbara can proceed with

setting up that particular CSG interaction call. So the Doodle poll link is in the policy calendar but it's also in the chat. At this point, let's take any questions for Barbara on matters in the CSG, the Commercial Stakeholder Group. Okay, I don't see any hands. Barbara, thank you very much.

BARBARA WANNER: Okay. Thank you. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Now I'll scroll to the top of the policy calendar. I have two updates on comments filed since we had our last call. Earlier this week, we posted comments on two – one was on the draft Strategic Plan for the Public Technical Identifiers. That's a corporation formed when IANA was brought into ICANN. This is for a four-year strategic plan. Jimson, Tim Smith, and Arinola, thank you very much for drafting that BC comment. They put that in. The second was for an ICANN Regional Plan for Africa for 2021-25. Jimson, Roger Baah, and Arinola, thank you for drafting. We put that plan in as well.

There are only three open public comments that I noted for BC members to pay attention to. The first is this Name Collision Analysis Project. This particular one looks back at the prior round of new gTLDs, looks ahead of the subsequent rounds of new gTLDs to try to come up with a policy to avoid having collisions between a new gTLD and internal API calls to corporate resources on intranets and Internet resources, things like .printer, .mail, .office.

EN

Mark Švančárek and I prepared a very brief BC comment on the last one. This is the final report. I think the vendor responded to our suggestions. Is there anyone who's really keen and interested in the collisions topic that can help Mark and I analyze and comment on the final report? Looking for hands or chat. Mark, it looks like it's going to be you and I on that one. It shouldn't be too difficult.

MARK ŠVANČÁREK: That is no surprise.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Okay. Thank you. The second one up, thankfully, we have volunteers. Jimson and Lawrence volunteered to take a look at the Country Code Names Supporting Organization (ccNSO) and they've got an initial proposal on a process. They do their own PDPs over there in the ccNSO and they're very much like the GNSO PDPs. They have invited public comment from outside the ccNSO on a process they would use to retire old ccTLDs that are no longer in use and should not be supported anymore – .su for Soviet Union is a great example of that.

So they have an interim policy paper. We're not commenting on which ones to take down. We're commenting on the process they'll use. So Jimson and Lawrence, that closes July 10. You have plenty of time so sometime in the next three weeks, read that over and give us your recommendation for a BC comment.

Then finally, we do need volunteers for a comment on ICANN's Regional Strategic Plan for Latin America and the Caribbean Region. We didn't

comment on that four years ago. Thanks to Isabel Rutherfurd of Amazon and Andrew Mack, they did a superb job on that. I need some volunteers that would step up and help us do this analysis. So this is for those of you who have a keen interest and experience in Latin America and Caribbean Region. Looking for a hand raised or you can volunteer in the chat. This won't be due until the 14th of July – that's over four weeks away, almost five weeks away. You can take a look at that plan. Again, these are ICANN's regional plans. ICANN, at one point, fancied itself doing economic development for regions of the world but now it's throttled back a bit to where we're just interested in the DNS industry and making sure that we support in each region a robust industry of registrars, registries, making sure that registrants, particularly in our case, the business community, have a robust set of choices for people to go to, to register, maintain domain names, register and maintain websites. So I don't have a volunteer yet, unfortunately. So I'll come back to you on that.

The next section is a summary of what's been happening since May of 2018 as ICANN has butchered the WHOIS system to accommodate GDPR, and it really does feel like butchery sometimes. I would conclude – at the bottom of that list – with two updates. I'm going to turn to Margie Milam and Mark Švančárek to talk to you about the current state of affairs in the EPDP. But I did promise the folks who talked to us two weeks ago – that was Greg Aaron and Lyman Chapin – if you recall they're from Interisle, they had done a domain name registration data report that the BC was pretty keen to. They had concluded in that report there was a failure overall to do the domain name registration disclosures predictably, reliably, and even in compliance with the

EN

obligations under the temporary spec and the EPDP policy that was approved in Phase 1. That's unfortunate. So what they came to us for was a proposal to do another study and their proposal was discussed on our last call. They would try to do a deep dive on how much data is redacted to provide the data that's necessary. I guess for us to put pressure on parties both within and outside of ICANN on the fact that too many domain names, it is nearly impossible to discover who the registrant is when you really have a legitimate reason to reach out and contact them. It could be a Denial of Service attack, it could be fraud, it could be a trademark infringement or counterfeit goods, things that constitute a DNS abuse but we are unable to learn who the registrant is. So they pitched it to us and you all asked a handful of questions on last week's call. What is the level of interest in the BC at providing opportunities to fund this study? They tell me that they did line up some study, some funding from SSAC and IPC members. I don't know exactly how much they raised of the $200,000 they're looking for. And I'm not asking for firm commitments right now, but what's the level of interest in the BC? And I'll take a queue on that. Margie, please go ahead.

MARGIE MILAM: Hi. Yeah, I do think their work is important and they do a tremendous amount of looking at issues that I think others typically don't look at and ICANN certainly doesn't see. So I think it's interesting to continue the studies and I think it's a good idea to try to see whether there is funding available for them.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Margie. I hadn't broached the subject with the rest of the ExCom yet but the BC has money on reserve and we are spending that reserve down under the budget that Jimson and the Finance Committee had proposed. And in that budget, there's as much as $30,000 to go to outreach. So there really isn't remaining funds in our budget for the BC to support this study if we also wanted to continue to do the outreach to build BC membership, and I do think that's really important. So that would mean that companies on this call, members of the BC, we feel this is important and probably we've got to try to scrape some budget money together in order to get this funding. So they have lined up some commitments. They don't have it all yet and they can't proceed without firm commitments.

So at this point, I could simply give you the opportunity to reach out directly to Lyman and Greg or you could ask right back to me privately and I'll connect you with them. Because at this point, if we don't sort of generate additional funding, we're not going to be able to get the study done and it will take several weeks to a couple of months to complete. Margie, is that an old hand? All right, so I will pass the word that the BC is interested but doesn't have its own budget and that individual BC members it'll be essential to help to fund this. I'm not going to be very encouraging to Greg and Interisle because we don't have any high levels of indications of interest there other than Facebook.

All right, turning to the next item up, Margie and Mark, why don't you update your colleagues on the current state of affairs in the EPDP?

EN

MARGIE MILAM: Sure. Essentially, it's the same update that we've had over the last couple of weeks. We're getting closer to the final report for the EPDP. We will lose Janis at the end of June. But essentially, where we stand today, the current policy recommendations for the SSAD are just not in a place that I think would be useful to most BC members. In our view, it's not a centralized system that was recommended by the GAC and the European Commission but a decentralized one where I think you'll see the same type of results that we see today, which is very little legitimate request actually resulting in disclosure. It does fall short I think of our needs for a robust system that protects people against cybersecurity threats, fraud, and intellectual property infringement.

The thing about it is that this view is held a number of stakeholders. It's not just the BC, the IPC has the same position. The GAC, the ALAC, and SSAC does as well. So we're moving to a place now where we're going to probably have to decide whether to join the consensus or pose a minority position for the final report because there are so many gaps in the policy from what we need. As I've described and as Steve has described in the past, it's essentially a glorified ticketing system. So if you want an intake system for the requests, that's what the system would build. But there's no centralized decision-making at the moment. The issue that we're fighting the most about – and we spent a fair amount of time on the last call – is how we move from this decentralized system to areas where some issues could be automated. And there's this thing called the evolutionary mechanism where the concept was that if the laws were to develop in a way that would make it easier for automated responses, like for example, if it's a phishing attack involving a domain name and that there was legal clarity that

that could be automated, that there would be some sort of lightweight mechanism that's less than a PDP to be able to simply change the way the system addresses those issues and to allow automation when the law evolves to support it. That's the issue we're fighting the most about because the contracted parties, I believe, that that mechanism cannot change policy in any way and they are looking for something that basically mimics another PDP. If that's the case then the system will never evolve in our view to a system that would be robust and allow for automation and allow for more of centralized system. So that's, I think, the fundamental disagreement that we have and that we've been spending a fair amount of time about, and we're hoping to break some ground and to see whether the different parties would accept something less than a PDP and perhaps come up with some other new structure that would mimic the membership that we see in the EPDP today. So the concern that we've raised, and the GAC and the ALAC and the SSAC has raised, is that the classic PDP doesn't include the perspectives in the voting of the Advisory Committees that have such an important stake in this. So the GAC, the SSAC, the ALAC don't really have seats at the table in a PDP in the same way that they do in this particular expedited one. And so, we're trying to get to a place where the composition of this evolutionary model would include those important perspectives. Then whatever comes out of that consensus – so if that group says, "We should automate for phishing events," or "We should automate for trademark infringement," then it would be updated and the model would evolve without having to have a GNSO vote on it.

That's the real discussion that we're having and I just don't know if we're going to get to a place that will make that a satisfactory answer for us. Because otherwise, if it ends up that the GNSO Council is the one that's going to decide this, then you lose the perspective of these Advisory Committees. So that's the main issue here.

STEVE DELBIANCO: You lose their votes as well, Margie. If [count] decides we already know we're non-commercial and contracted parties are likely not to want to expand the requirements for automated disclosure to other than governments, they barely made that position quite clear. They're not interested in publishing, for instance, the legal person's data or disclosing legal person's data on request. So if it's in Council, we're not just worried about Council adding a lot of time to the process if it has to do with policy. It's very likely that Council would not approve expansions of the disclosure, which is why I think we ought to support what Margie and Mark are doing at taking a hard line on this, even if it means voting no on the Phase 2 report. That could be spun against us in the sense but some may claim that the BC has declined to take advantage of an automated ticketing system. But we need your guidance on how to handle this since we're staring in the face of SSAD that really will not serve our interest and has very little opportunity to evolve in a way to conserve us. So, Mark, why don't we take you next and then we'll go to Barbara.

MARK ŠVANČÁREK:	Thanks. Where we're at right now is basically where I told my management we would be way back in January, so not much has really changed. At that time, I was somewhat more optimistic about the ticketing system or the Clearinghouse as I called it because there was another element of it that we don't always think about which is the ability to generate objective transparency. So being able to track how many requests were actually made, how long was the response time, who is being slow, who is being fast, who says no all the time, etc., which gets us out of the constant debate we have whenever one side generates statistics and everyone else says, "Yeah, that's bogus because you disregarded a bunch of things," or "Your methodology is flawed."

So that's really what we're talking about right now is a ticketing system/Clearinghouse that generates objective statistics that are visible to everybody and which can be audited. If that's what you're okay with then you can vote yes on this. If that's not enough then you should vote no. I'm even less optimistic than Margie on the mechanism for evolution based on the call that we had yesterday on Tuesday. It was very clear that NCSG sees us as a threat to their voting structure and it's very clear that – at least some people in the Contracted Party House are just going to oppose it just on principle, really. I had said EPDP is a new thing. We pioneered new processes during the EPDP and this is a time for us to consider some new mechanisms, writing a policy that is explicitly designed to allow for a more expansive implementation process going on over a year and iterating. And I was told in no uncertain terms that this would be too unpredictable for the contracted parties to base their business practice in them. I think that was it. I think that was a moment

of candor which really indicates that we're not going to get any progress on that either.

So when you decide to vote yes or no on this thing, what we're getting is a ticketing system in the Clearinghouse which eliminates a lot of the bad requests that the contracted parties get, and hopefully depending on the final language, we get transparency and statistics. If that's not enough, vote no. Thanks.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Mark, keep in mind, voting no means we get nothing. It would not implement any SSAD with any mechanism for evolution. So a vote of no has consequences and it also has symbolic value – I get that – but we need to hear from BC colleagues about how hard of a line you want us to take.

MARK ŠVANČÁREK: Yes. And that was really my point in mentioning that, that second aspect, the statistics and the transparency, because that is something you would be giving up if you voted no. It's not just that there's a ticketing system on the front end, that there is objective statistics and transparency on the back end, you would be giving that up too. So those are the two things you would be giving up if you vote no. If those are worth fighting for, vote yes. If you're willing to give them up, you can vote no. Thanks.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Mark. We'll take Barbara and then Alex.

BARBARA WANNER: Partially a question. I've been going through the schedule for ICANN68 and I didn't really see any opportunity for us to talk further about this issue. Do you think that some of our concerns could be raised within a context of the plenary session on domain name abuse? Or is that mixing up to very controversial issues and we should just approach them sort of cleanly on separate tracks? Thanks.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Mark and Margie?

MARK ŠVANČÁREK: I'm sorry, Barbara. I was blowing my nose. Could you repeat the question?

BARBARA WANNER: That's okay. Margie thinks there are two different issues. I just noticed that in ICANN68 schedule, there's no real opportunity for us to raise this again. I know that GAC will hold a session on WHOIS and privacy policies, but there also seemed to be a plenary session that will focus on DNS abuse during COVID and I don't know whether there might be some opportunity to raise these issues within the context of that. But Margie suggested there are two different issues and maybe raising EPDP type concerns in that would muddy the waters and weaken the very important message that we want to convey with respect to DNS abuse.

MARK ŠVANČÁREK: Yeah, I also think that those are separate issues. Thanks.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Later we will turn to Marie and Scott on Council. Marie has quite a bit to say about the fate of the EPDP Phase 2, so we'll cover some of that a little bit later, Barbara as well. Alex Deacon?

ALEX DEACON: Thanks, Steve. Hello, everyone. I agree with Mark and Margie. As someone who's still closely following and invested in the work of the EPDP, it is disappointing, to say the least. The way I think about where we may end up is from the point of the requestor – BC, IPC folks – that will eventually be using this system. Given that those requestors are going to be bearing the cost of the system, at least the operational cost of the system, and paying for accreditation to use the system, my analysis on whether it's worth it, I think people should consider that. Is it worth paying for accreditation to use the system that will return accurate data? Is it worth paying to use the system that doesn't distinguish between legal and natural persons? Is it worth using a system where disclosure may result and actually privacy proxy information? Is it worth using a system that has zero ability to handle request at scale? Is it worth using a system that really has no ability to evolve over time? Is it worth using a system where accredited users could actually view rate limited and refuse access to data? The list goes on and on. I find it very difficult to envision based on the policy as it exist now to envision an answer to those questions that would say,

"Yes, it is worth it." It's clear to me that paying accreditation to use the system just doesn't make any sense. The value is just not there. Thanks.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Alex. I did want to remind colleagues that it's possible that if the IPC and the BC voted no, and even the ALAC voted no, if the rest of the EPDP members said they wanted to proceed, they would have a majority on the EPDP and they would proceed. So it's possible that our no votes would not block this ticketing system of limited value but would preserve the register of discontent and dissatisfaction with it.

Are there any other questions for Mark and Margie? Suggestions? This is a chance for BC members to register their view on this. Otherwise, those of us who are working closely with this PDP are going to continue to suggest that the current proposal is inadequate for the needs of Business Constituency members. At the last minute, you'll never know how the voting would go depending on whether it's on a certain recommendation or an up and down on the report. You're going to have to trust us and give us the flexibility of voting in the situation. But are there any BC members who feel as if the BC should embrace the limited ticketing system as opposed to resisting? Chris, your hand is up. Please go ahead.

CHRIS WILSON: Thanks, Steve. This is not exactly directly answering that question but I think I just was hoping for consideration when we do have these discussions about voting no or yes. I take Alex's point to heart, and Margie and Mark Sv's point to heart. I think their hard work on this is to

be commended. I always come from this, the broader sort of holistic notion of the efficacy of ICANN and the efficacy of the multistakeholder model and recognizing that this may be a best quarter of a loaf, if you will. What the ramifications may be for a no vote in terms of the symbolic nature of that and how it gets portrayed and seen going forward in the broader Internet governance landscape and ICANN and where it fits and all that. So I really have some a little bit of concern about it because I do want ICANN to be seen as successful and I want the multistakeholder model to continue to be upheld as the lodestar, if you will, but recognize that obviously this is falling short, this particular policy process is falling short for many of us. But I just want to throw that out there for consideration, further discuss this because I do think it's worth keeping that sort of 30,000-foot view in mind if possible.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Chris. I think Mark has got his hand up to reply.

MARK ŠVANČÁREK: Thank you. Chris, great comment. I share some of your concerns. I guess my replies would be if you actually look at the list of things that – you heard Alex reciting, he's written quite a manifesto on this, the bulleted list of things that are unhelpful, broken, and wrong within this policy is about two pages long, just single lines. If you have this, is it worth it? If you have this, is it worth it? It's a really long list, and so in a sort of neutral court of public opinion, our lack of acceptance for this policy, it's very, very defensible. If that's the concern, how this is received outside of this weird little incestuous community that we live in.

The second thing is, Microsoft is a big supporter of multistakeholderism and multistakeholder models of which there is more than one, but we are not a fan of just supporting something because it calls itself multistakeholderism. We do not have to support all instances and all models that claim to be multistakeholder. And so if it is our conclusion that this is simply not working to purpose, it's okay to say this is not working, it needs to be changed or revised or improved in some way without that being a blanket rejection of multistakeholderism, and I do think that that is a distinction that we will want to make when we give our feedback on this policy if we should choose to vote no. So I hope that's helpful. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Mark. Susan?

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Thank you, Steve. I really agree with Mark Sv. I think the honesty of saying, "Look at what we've been saying for the last … since BC has begun and this does not work. There's too many issues with this policy and we cannot vote for it." What we're also about ready to lose – what we've basically lost is previous multistakeholder decisions, policies created in the system and this is going to turn it upside down or has already in Thick WHOIS and PPSAI. So we're not just losing on the EPDP, we have lost Thick WHOIS and PPSAI. Now there's still a little bit of hope but I think sort of drawing a line in the sand and saying, "This is absolutely not acceptable. We do not agree." I don't see another

possibility here. I don't think it's going to really impact the NCSG or the CPH and all the rest. With good conscience, I could not vote for this.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Susan. We're going to move on now to cover Council. But Susan's point about a line in the sand is worth remembering, is that the wind and the waves quickly erase the line and you will remember that we took a hard line. If no policy at all gets implemented for the SSAC, we'll have to find other ways of restoring some usefulness of registrar information disclosure. It may not be through ICANN.

Let's go to channel two on Council. Scott and Marie are councilors. While their last meeting was the 21st of May, there were no resolutions adopted. However, the word active debates and we expect them to be taken up at the next Council meeting on the 24th of June. So what Marie and Scott would like to go through are two items that I have in the policy calendar – Thick WHOIS and the EPDP. So, Marie, over to you.

MARIE PATULLO: Thanks, Steve. I trust you can hear me okay?

STEVE DELBIANCO: We do.

MARIE PATULLO: Great. Thank you. Very quickly, just to a few other wrap-up points. Matthew Shears has been reappointed to Board seat 14, that went

through by consent as expected. Considering from here on in, inviting Matthew as the Non-Contracted Party House's Board member and Becky Burr being the Contracted Party House's Board member to attend alternative meetings, so one each on a one month cycle, to be considered but seems like a good idea.

Pulling out something that Susan just refer to, Keith told us to expect some mail shortly on RDS-related issues. He's looking at two recommendations specifically passed by the Board coming out of the RDS Review Team, and on the WHOIS Procedure Implementation and Advisory Group. So when that turns up, you will all see it.

A quick shout out that if you want to attend the prep week for ICANN68, it's actually over two weeks, webinars between Monday the 8th and Thursday the 18th. If you want to do that, please remember to register by this Friday. So that's 5th.

Another issue that we haven't got in the calendar but for your info, we had a very quick debate about DNS to abuse. The reason for that being that SubPro were, as you will remember, asked to look at that by the Board as part of this Competition and Consumer Trust Review results where the Board did not adopt all of that review's recommendations. The SubPro Leadership has decided that if we're looking at DNS abuse, it should not just be for any new forthcoming gTLDs, it should be for all of them, which to be fair, I think is right. So they've punted that back to the Council, who had a very circular discussion about, "Do we need the PDP? Do we need the CCWG?" And then we had, of course, over everybody makes things up about data accuracy and will give us these nasty hyperbolic headlines. I'm quoting. And you don't give us any

figures and stats and we shouldn't have any content regulation and blah, blah, blah. Anyway, so that one's still live. Don't know where it's going to go.

Now, onto the two that we have gotten the calendar, one we can wrap up very quickly unless Alex thinks differently. You remember we discussed at our last meeting the concerns we had around Thick WHOIS. In essence, shorting this as much as possible, we were worried that there was an assumption that we would automatically agree to launching a new PDP to deal with any potential issues between what the EPDP says, what the GDPR says, and what the Thick WHOIS history says. Fortunately, and this is very much down to John McElwaine at the IPC, he managed to get it through to the two Vice Chairs, Pam and Rafik, that this is a procedural issue. The Board has asked us to look at it. Our answer is, "No, the IRT should look at it. Because this is adopted policy, it should be dealt with by the IRT." So as you will see in the annexes to the policy calendar, you have the current draft of the letter, it's still the red line, but as far as I know, it's been about to be sent imminently. So you can pretty much count this as final.

Then on to the wonderful EPDP, circling back to the beginning. We tried in Council to point out that they themselves said, even in the Council agenda, that they had not had time to fully consider all the comments received to the chief public consultations for Phase 2 on the Addendum. But they're still closing at the end of June and it's all because the Chair Janis has to go and because there's so much fatigue and everyone's sick of it and we were told that consensus is not getting everything you want and, and, and. Anyway, interestingly, what did come out just yesterday – and Steve has again kindly put it on to the Annexes of the policy

calendar – is Rafik. Now he's the Vice Chair but also he's the Liaison to the EPDP.

In the Council meeting itself, Keith recognized our two headlines of the issues that are left over. So that is legal and natural. Accuracy are very important and do need to be dealt with but we probably don't have time to deal with them and a few other issues by the end of June. So Rafik has put together this documents laying out what he says are the issues we face and giving three options as to how we can go forward, which break down roughly into, "Just get rid of the EPDP at the end and there you go. Reset the EPDP." So that goes through everything, finding a new Chair, getting a new membership or combining it into those topics that can be closed out by the end of June should be, but those that could deserve further consideration, further discussion could be pulled out and looked at, maybe in around three months with a scoping team to see if we can get anywhere on them. And that includes, in particular, for us, accuracy and legal and natural.

Now, I've sent that document to Steve, he's kindly sent it unto you. Please have a read, because I really think we need to respond to this. Please remember, this is not the same as the discussion you just heard about the EPDP itself. This is about those issues that we were promised would be looked at in Phase 2 and have not been, and I don't think that we should let this one go, I think we should stay on it. That's me. Scott, anything that you want to add in here?

SCOTT MCCORMICK: Nope. All good here.

MARIE PATULLO: Cool. Okay, Steve, back to you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Marie. I will note that the Contracted Parties and the Non-Commercial Stakeholders Group, they will differ. They won't admit that we didn't look at legal and natural inaccuracy. They just simply believe that they have the votes to say that nothing should be done. So we're back to the same problem of not having enough support from the GAC, ALAC, and SSAC to overwhelm the other side on these policies. I don't how it goes better for us by creating a new process if we're still up against the same minority problem. So we'll have to pursue that.

All right, anything else on Council? Probably not. Any questions for Marie and Scott? Looking in the queue. Okay, great. There's only a couple of other projects that are going on in GNSO. I did want to point out that the Accountability and Transparency Review Team or ATRT3, where Tola represents BC and the CSG, just earlier this week submitted their final report to the ICANN Board, plus transmittal of middle letter. Tola led us through the effort of amending that final report and to the extent that those amendments weren't accepted, we lodged our concerns in a minority statement from the Commercial Stakeholder Group. I have a link to it in the policy calendar as well.

Finally, on the new gTLD auction proceeds, Anne Aikman-Scalese shared with us in Attachment 3 a timeline where ICANN will proceed at creating the group at the department, if you will, to try to figure out a process for awarding several hundred million dollars in proceeds from

the last round of new gTLDs. That's it for the policy calendar. Unless anyone has any questions, I'm happy to turn it back over to you, Claudia.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Thank you very much, Steve. I'm not seeing any raised hand. We can probably continue with Jimson for Operation and Finance.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Thank you very much, Claudia and Steve as well. Greetings, everyone. I trust we are still keeping well and safe. If I may, I will just say that I'm quite certain that we couldn't really make much progress as recorded in EPDP and it's really a big concern for me when legitimate concerns are not factoring and we don't have the [inaudible] to be able to push this through. I think this caused for us to really extend our collaboration with other groups, maybe like the SSAC or ALAC and all those people. We need to find a way to really getting to those kind of partnership more, especially on crucial issues such as this.

Well, I would say that regard to Finance and Operations, I think the key things we have now is with respect to the election, the election is still ongoing and voting ends tomorrow, I believe we've all received those that could vote. We received the ballots. Please vote so that your vote can count. And by June 5th, the announcement will be made on the outcome. This is just what I needed to pass across unless there is any question with regard to the budget being proposed.

Well, as Steve mentioned, yes, we have about $30,000 which we kind of budgets every year for outreach activity, we actually use more than $10,000 of it. So that's what is there which could be applied on to the study that Aaron and Lyman proposed. It is quite important as well. As Steve mentioned, we need to get partners to work with us on this. So that's about that. Unless there's any questions, I think I do not have anything to provide for us for that. Thank you.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Thank you, Jimson. There's a question from Claudia in the chat for Mark and Margie. I don't know if you, Margie and Mark, as anyone can respond to other question on when is the vote on the SSAD likely to happen?

MARGIE MILAM: It's Margie. If I could answer. Thank you, Claudia, for asking the question. It's before we publish the final report, because the final report will include minority statements. We're right now in the beginning of June and we're at a point where we're looking at the recommendations and deciding what we can live with and what we can't live with. And then we're trying to negotiate changes in the areas where we can't live with. Then we'll get to a place where we look at the entire package before publication and say, "Will we support this or will we not?" So it's still in an early stage in the sense that there's nothing that's final for us to look at but I would suspect probably the third week of June, so we're talking two weeks from now, we'll be getting closer to the time when

we'll have to make that decision, so it'll probably coincide with the actual ICANN meeting.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Okay. Thank you.

MARK ŠVANČÁREK: That assumption is that end of the month is likely. I mean, none of the dates are very predictable at this point, but my assumption was maybe a week later than Margie thinks, but in that same time zone.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Thank you very much for that. So just as a reminder, the next BC closed meeting, as you can see on the agenda, will be on the 17th of June in the context of the ICANN. And the BC open meeting is going to be the Tuesday, 23rd of June at 4:30. If there are no other questions, we can stop the recording and adjourn the meeting. Thanks.

CHRIS WILSON: Hold on.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Sorry, someone was asking?

CHRIS WILSON: Claudia, I don't know if the meeting is – is it over now? I don't know. But if not –

EN

CLAUDIA SELLI: It's not yet.

CHRIS WILSON: I just wanted to quickly note for folks, as of last night, the .amazon top-level domain was delegated to us. I just wanted to thank everybody. I know the BC has been a big supporter of us on that issue. It's been a long road. It's been eight years since this began. But we're excited that it's now been delegated. We have a [net] page set up. We now will begin our promised outreach to ACTO and its member countries to work on implementing our public interest commitment. I want to share a moment hopefully for ICANN, for businesses, etc. with this delegation. But I want to make sure everybody knew while we're on the call. Thanks.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Thank you, Chris. With that, I think we can adjourn the meeting.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]