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

CLAUDIA SELLI: Thank you very much, everybody, for participating in today's call. And as usual, you have the agenda. Oh! There's some music going on. Okay. Right. So, as you can see from the agenda, we will start, as usual, with the policy discussion. I don't know what's happening. Is it me?

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Hi, Claudia. Is that better?

CLAUDIA SELLI: I have music in ... I can hear music. I don't know if it's coming from me or where it is coming from.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: I can't hear music.

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.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Does everybody else hear the music?

STEVE DELBIANCO: No. We don't hear it, Claudia.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Okay. Perfect. So, I can continue anyway. Then, we will continue with the Council update, CSG report. And I will give a short update and then conclude with the Finance and Operations report. If anyone has, in any case, any other business, you can raise it at the end of the call. With that, I will leave the floor to Steve. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Claudia. And I appreciate shuffling the agenda a little bit today because at precisely 30 minutes after, I have to lead a session at the IGF-USA. The first thing I want to mention is in the last two weeks, we've filed two comments to the ICANN public comment process. One was a comment we filed on the 14th of July, on ICANN's Strategic Plan for Latin America. I want to thank Mark Datysgeld, Gaby Szlak, and Andrew Mack for drafting an excellent comment. Appreciate that.

And also, on the 10th of July, we filed a comment on the Country Codes Name Supporting Organization's PDP on how to retire old ccTLDs. Jimson Olufuye and Lawrence Olawale-Roberts did some great drafting on that one and we really appreciate that.

Let's scroll down to the open public comments. The first one is the Accountability and Transparency Review Team. And this is a Bylaws-

required, AoC-originated review by community members of ICANN's accountability and transparency. This is the uber review of all the specific reviews because it has the power ... In the Bylaws, as well as the AoC, it has the power to modify, to sunset, or to start new specific reviews. And this team exercised that power in ways that maybe some BC members and the BC in general is concerned about.

Tola Sogbesan represented the CSG on that ATRT3. And as you probably know, we submitted a joint CSG minority statement, objecting to certain processes' substantive issues. So, I want to thank Mason Cole and Susan Kawaguchi, who drafted a BC comment. And it's the second attachment on today's ... I'm going to share that, as well. It's the second attachment. And let me bring it up.

Okay. Look at your screen. It's the second attachment. And it's on ATRT3. I have it up on the screen right now. This might not be a bad time for Mason, Susan, if you want to bring up any particular items of interest in here, since we will be filing this by the 31st of July. I know that gives us plenty of time but we won't be having another BC call between then and now. So, I would say, Mason, Susan, anything you'd like to add to your colleagues about what you've got in this first draft?

MASON COLE: Steve, do you hear me?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Please. Yes. Go ahead.

MASON COLE:

Hi. Good morning, everyone. The basis of the comment is ... First of all, it's based off some of the minority statement that was filed in the final report. So, we're repeating some of the important points that were brought across in the minority statement. But the rest of the comment is focused mainly on the fact that now is not a good time to cut back on accountability mechanisms inside of ICANN. In fact, now is a good time to make sure that accountability mechanisms are solidly in place for the community to hold ICANN Org accountable. So, that's the thrust of the comment.

There are some procedural concerns in there, as you can see. I see Steve scrolling through the comment. And then, there are some substantive concerns, as well, brought up before we get into the individual comments on the ATRT3 recommendations. And you can see that those are housed in a table that runs until the end of the document.

So, as Steve mentioned, we have until the 31st to file this comment. I'd be very happy to have BC input on this, if there is any to be had. And there's plenty of time for that so we can get it filed on time. So, Susan I see that you're on. Do you want to add anything? No? Okay. Well, back to you, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Mason, thank you very much. You and I have had this discussion before. But under the substantive concerns, I appreciate the way you've couched the Holistic Review. It may be a good idea. And we don't have to say so here. But the Holistic Review might be the only way that we

could fix the broken structure of GNSO because a GNSO Organizational Review are never able to look at structural issues within the GNSO.

So, it might be that a Holistic Review that looks to give more Board seats to the GNSO—for instance, two to the Contracted Party and two to the Non-Contracted Party—would be a huge benefit to us. And none of the reviews alone are going to get us there. So, a Holistic Review, as an additive element, could be good for the BC.

We don't think however—and I agree with you that we don't think—that should be a substitute for any outside experts to do reviews of each respective AC and SO. So, I think that the way it's written ... Because we asked this question during the webinar that was held last week. And the way that the ATRT3 is framing it, the GNSO could still ask ICANN to hire an outside expert to do a review of the effectiveness and structure of the GNSO. They could still do that. They're not saying that this would eliminate that.

And then, this notion of an ongoing improvement process within each AC and SO, to adhere to best practices of accountability, transparency, and diversity, is something that BC supported as part of Work Stream 2. And in section eight, I know we added that as well. So, the continuous improvement is a good idea. The Holistic Review is helpful. But we don't want to blow up the chance to get outside experts to come in and do reviews of particular ACs and SOs. So, I appreciate that. Are there any other questions or comments from BC members? Okay. We'll go back to the policy calendar, then. Thank you, Mason and Susan. Appreciate that.

The next one up is a project from the previous ICANN Board chair, was to enhance the effectiveness of ICANN multistakeholder model. And they are into the next steps, at this point. This was a project that ICANN hired Brian Cote to do a few sessions on. And as you know, we're now in the implementation stage. These comments close on the 2nd of August. And I want to thank Mark Datysgeld, John Berard, Andy Abrams, Arinola, and Jay Chapman for drafting a BC comment.

It's the third attachment to today's policy calendar. I have it up on the screen. No. I didn't it again. I picked the wrong one. Sorry about that. So, I have it up on the screen now. And this would be an opportunity for any of the authors and other BC members who want to make particular observations or suggestions. So, Mark, Jay, Arinola, John, Andy, any of you would like to say anything on where you have this right now?

It's about a five-page comment. It's got a number of excerpts that pull from prior BC comments, which is a great way to do these things. And thanks to the good writing of the people on this team, there's a lot of powerful rhetoric in here, on holding ICANN to a higher standard when it comes to operating this multistakeholder model. Any other comments or questions for the authors. Again, thanks to all of you who drafted that. We'll go back to the policy calendar. And remember, we'll need comments from you all before that is due on the 2nd of August.

I now wanted to jump down to the question of a study on WHOIS, namely on how much contact data is available versus how much is redacted and then the distinctions between registrants who are natural persons versus legal entities. And this is a study that the BC decided to

allocate \$20,000 for our 2021 outreach budget in order to help support the \$200,000 that was requested for Interisle to do the study.

So, I went back Interisle. They responded last night. They still do not have the full \$200,000 raised. So, the delivery date is pushing later and later into 2020 but they still think they'll get it done this year. And if they don't raise the full amount of funds, then they may adjust the scope of the project, to which I replied on your behalf that the BC would want to review any changes in the scope of the report. And if we aren't in agreement with the change in scope, we would withdraw the \$20,000 pledge because we pledged the \$20,000 based on the scope of the original study. So, they accepted that and are determined to stick to the original scope. Are there any questions on that?

All right. I had to bounce over to this call from yet another three-hour call on the EPDP Phase 2. What do I say every time we talk about Phase 2 of the EPDP? We say it's not going very well. And we are in the final stages of articulating why we will not support most of the recommendations and we will not support the entire report. And at this point, we'll be joined in that by the Intellectual Property Constituency. We will be joined by the ALAC. We know that SSAC and GAC have significant concerns with many recommendations. But we do not know right now whether SSAC and GAC will join the other three of us in objecting to the full Phase 2 report.

That throws things into a mess because if the report fails to gather consensus, there are unclear rules as to whether GNSO Council would still receive the report, whether the GNSO Council would send it back. Would it decide to implement certain recommendations that had

consensus? Or would the entire thing just die and we're left with Phase 1 of the EPDP and the Temp Spec?

I have on the screen in front of you and in the policy calendar an excerpt from our current draft of the minority report, which will be a joint minority report between the BC and the IPC. And we're dissenting, claiming that that EPDP has failed to design a system that meets the goals of protecting interests. That doesn't mean that the multistakeholder process has failed. It means this multistakeholder process failed to deliver a result that we're satisfied with. So, there are some who might use the rhetoric that ICANN's process is broken. But in this case, the process itself did not generate a consensus to change from the status quo.

Mark, and Margie, and Alex are all over on the EPDP call right now, which is where I'll go when we're finished. But are there any questions or suggestions for the colleagues you have on that side? Go ahead, Mason.

MASON COLE:

Thanks, Steve. I just wanted to underline my support for what you just said. It's not a failure of the process itself but a failure to produce a policy that's satisfactory to the needs of the BC, and IPC, and others. This is really ... It's a very poor final report. It's disappointing to see. And I just wanted to underline my support for the direction that the BC's going.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Mason. I appreciate that. Anyone else? As you know, we have had multiple calls to discuss where the BC is going on this. And I believe, as your policy chair, that you have given full support to the representatives on the EPDP to take a hard line like this. This would be golden opportunity for any BC members who don't agree with that hard line to say so now. Marie, you're next. Go ahead, Marie. I saw your hand up. Okay. All right. We're going to have a discussion with Council—

MARIE PATTULLO: Can you hear me now?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yes, we do. Go ahead, please.

MARIE PATTULLO: I'm very sorry. I had a muting issue at my end. First off, obviously, major thanks and major kudos to the guys who are putting in all these hours. My concern isn't about the substance of the minority statement. My concern is that we're going to have to get ready for a lot of pushback in Council because if we do choose to vote against, put in this minority statement, however that's going to be played out, we all know it will be used as leverage against us in other areas. So, we are going to have to be prepared for that and think about how we're going to play that one. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Marie, you're so right because you're trying to work on small group in Council that's mapping out the next steps on things like the accuracy of registrant information and the distinctions between legal and natural persons. But when GNSO Council meets, at least half of Council will be upset for us having torpedoed the EPDP. And they're not going to be cooperative at trying to set up new scoping, new PDPs, and efforts to extend what the EPDP has to get done.

So, you're exactly right. We are making your job extremely difficult by failing to adopt the report. And yet, I think the BC membership—and you, in particular—share the concern that this PDP doesn't produce a worthwhile outcome.

I have to drop in about 10 minutes so what I think I will do is skip ahead and then turn it back to ... Go ahead, please.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI:

Sorry. Finally, Chantelle unmuted me. One of the comments I wanted to make about the ATRT report was that they're recommending the small team concept that's representative of the community to prioritize recommendations, which is duplicative of the existing process for our RT reports and recommendations. And if they implement that prior to this final report ... I don't know how quickly they could do this but it just puts another level of an opportunity in place to reprioritize recommendations one-by-one from a review team.

Now, this is a PDP but if they put a similar thing in place for the EPDP recommendations, then we could also have another group that we're not—the BC or the CSG in general—is underrepresented on, that is

making a decision after the fact—after the group, the EPDP has made all their final decisions. It's a long shot but it's not a good process to put in place for the RTs, the review teams. And definitely, I would hate to see it followed for PDPs.

So, I think back to the ATRT comment. But it also pertains to anything moving forward, that if another small group can then have influence with the Board and ICANN Org outside of the whole community of voice, I think we're in trouble.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Susan, do you believe that the draft you and Mason pulled together makes that same argument as powerfully as you just did now?

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Probably not. I'll go back and review that because the more I think about it, the more dangerous it is.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yeah. And the way you articulated it just now, I think, would be even stronger than what we have in the draft.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Okay.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thank you. Since I will have to leave you, I'm going to allow Chantelle to take over the sharing of the policy calendar but not before I jump to a part that we want to cover when Barbara talks about the CSG channel. The notion here is that the Nominating Committee has come up with recommendations in its review—Nominating Review Committee. And their recommendations could completely change the way NomCom reps are appointed.

Today, the GNSO Business Constituency are allowed to nominate two reps, a small business and a large business rep. So, we had asked Zahid, who's on the call today, Jay Sadowski, Paul Mitchell, Lawrence, Tola, Scott, and the Arinola to help to come up with arguments that the BC could use to suggest that we ought to retain what the Bylaws have had for 20 years and allow the BC to continue to have a small and a large business seat.

I want to thank Lawrence Olawale-Roberts for drafting attachment five on the policy calendar, which is a few pages of some great arguments about why small and large business reps should be kept in the Bylaws. And of course, the natural body that would nominate them would be the BC. Claudia, I know that you were on a call with CSG and CPH leadership on this yesterday. So, I hope that when we get to Barbara's section of the policy calendar, you'll be able to comment on that. I just wanted to call it out in advance and thank Lawrence for the draft. And I'm glad that Zahid's on the call to help with that.

So, with that, I will turn it back over to Chantelle. Would you please manage the policy calendar and go to channel two so that our councilors can lead us through that? Thank you.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Hi, everyone. Channel two should be on your screen. And Marie, over to you.

MARIE PATTULLO: Thanks so much, Chantelle. And apologies for the muting issue earlier. We have a Council meeting tomorrow. We've got one vote, which is to adopt the Auction Proceeds Report. Unless you have any questions, I don't think I have anything to say on that. But before I go any further, Susan, I see your hand's still up. Do you need to come in before we go further? Nope. Okay. Old hand. If you do change your mind, obviously, just jump in, clearly.

The part I would like to talk about, Chantelle, if you can scroll slightly down so we can see ... Yep. That's it. No, no. Up again. Up again. A wee bit up again, [inaudible] a little bit. Thank you. That's perfect. We have another track going about the EPDP as Steve mentioned briefly. It's not about the current part, which is the so-called SSAD report—the report about the model. It is what do we do with the Phase 2 priority two issues that got left over, that got left behind, got kicked into the long grass, that got ignored—whatever you want to believe.

Now, Rafik, who is both the liaison from the Council to the team and also is currently acting as the chair to the team came up with a proposal for what we could do next. A bunch of us in a small team got together. And I have to say that they have made a lot of changes to it that I'm very pleased to see, compared to its original format.

And what we have at the minute is the idea that two things will happen, one that the current EPDP Team stays together as much as possible—there's going to have to be some changes, work changes or whatever—and tries to get to a resolution, some kind of agreement on legal versus natural and on anonymized email addresses. Now, I'm not saying either of those are possible. And bizarrely, I'm asking you to put aside what Steve just mentioned because if we do not vote in favor of the report, I have no idea what will happen to this. In theory, it can still happen because in theory it's still part of the EPDP itself. But this is new ground. We've never had an EPDP before. A lot of this has been discussed.

One of the open questions about who would be chairing that group is that Rafik put himself forward. I don't think that would be the best solution. Apart from anything else, the GNSO rules say that the liaison should not also be a chair, as Susan will remember all too well. And we have been trying to suggest other people but where we are at the moment is that we're going to bringing something, hopefully, to Council tomorrow that should hopefully get these people back around the table to discuss these issues on 1 September.

And if you scroll a wee bit further down, Chantelle, you'll see that secondly and separately, there will also be a scoping effort on accuracy. Now, my concern here is what my concern has always been. "Yeah, yeah, accuracy. Let's talk about it sometime but not now, thank you." Or, "Yeah, yeah, accuracy. Nobody knows what accuracy means. We don't need to talk about it at all." And as you well know, I think both of the above are insane. And we need to be looking at accuracy, not just for this EPDP process but for data registrant accuracy in general. It's a mess and it shouldn't be.

My concern there is they're, again, trying to kick it into the long grass. So, I am, again, trying to make them be a little bit more dynamic in moving forward. I'm also suggesting bluntly and repetitively that we bring in other members of the non-GNSO community, in particular SSAC, ALAC, GAC because we know, of course, that they support us on this, too.

So, this is where we are in that at the moment. There are other issues on the agenda. If you want to run through them, I'm happy to but I don't really think we need to. We did have an extraordinary meeting last Thursday, which was all about work prioritization. Scott, I don't know if you want to say anything about that or anything else.

SCOTT MCCORMICK: Sorry. I was on mute.

MARIE PATTULLO: Sorry. Go on.

SCOTT MCCORMICK: I'm good.

MARIE PATTULLO: Okay. So, thanks, Chantelle. That's it from me. Back over to you.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Sorry. Marie?

MARIE PATTULLO: Yeah?

JIMSON OLUFUYE: I would like to ask a question.

MARIE PATTULLO: Please go ahead.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: In your preliminary engagements with Rafik, do you have any inclination that we can get what we want?

MARIE PATTULLO: I'm sorry, Jimson. In my preliminary engagements with whom? With Rafik?

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Yes, Rafik.

MARIE PATTULLO: Well, you have to remember, at this stage, that I am not talking about the actual report itself—EPDP Phase 2 itself. What I'm talking about is the remaining items. So, in this case, that means legal versus natural, it means anonymized email addresses, and it means accuracy.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Yes. That's what I mean.

MARIE PATTULLO: Well, I think if you look at the latest version of his proposal, it has moved a lot from the last one. I think it is a lot better. We've got some dates in there, like we need to start on for September. He's accepted that there has to be—or at least we should base this upon the current EPDP Team, keep the continuity, keep the expertise, keep the structure. All of that, I think, is really good, Jimson.

But the other thing we need to remember is Rafik will no longer be on Council after the end of this year. He's term-limited. So, if there is support for him to actually be chair of this, unless anybody who knows more on the call contradicts me, I believe he still could be chair of this new bit of the EPDP. And I am not sure that's the best idea.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Well, why I raised the question is because if we have an inclination that we can get what we want with regard to those prime topics, then we may possibly overlook the issue of, maybe, liaison not being fit to chair because I think the accuracy issue and other issues are quite important to us. Thank you.

MARIE PATTULLO: Yeah. Thanks. I see what you're saying but I think that's ... The liaison being chair is something that we formalized, again, in the PDP 3.0. And

that was only published this year. And I really think it's going to look pretty bad for Council, from a reputation basis, if we agree something and send it up to the community only this year, and then completely go against what we said.

And on a theoretical level, the chair is not supposed to interfere. It's not supposed to have anything to do with the substance. But I do note and underline that the NCSG is against any discussion about accuracy at all and fundamentally against any form of legal versus natural discussion, too. So, we do have to be careful. I think somebody neutral might be better for all. But that's a personal view.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Yeah. I get it. Thank you.

MARIE PATTULLO: Thank you. Any other questions? Thank you. Back to you, Chantelle.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Thank you, Marie. Barbara, if you can come on and talk to us about the Commercial Stakeholder Group, please.

BARBARA WANNER: Thank you, Chantelle. Steve's teed this up for everyone. The priority—because there really is not anything new to report from last week, other than the urgency of getting some very thoughtful comments concerning

the NomCom’s proposed revision of the Bylaws that would decrease our participation.

So, if there are any members of the NomCom on the call now, I invite you to offer some comments as to your thoughts on the proposed changes. Personally, I don’t think it bodes well for us but I would welcome your perspective. Anyone? Great. I guess Jimson and Zahid’s hands are raised. How about Zahid?

ZAHID JAMIL: Jimson can go first. I’ll go after him. Thank you.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: No, no, no. That was an old hand. So, Zahid, please go ahead.

ZAHID JAMIL: Oh. Okay. That’s fine. Thank you. Hi, everybody. I know I’ve been a bit away from BC issues but this was something that was, in my view at least, very strategically important. So, I don’t want to waste too much time talking about—preambling this. But I like the document that’s been put together. I think that’s a very good document, the attachment five. That has very good arguments in it. I do think that other members need to look at it—this is very important—and add any other points that they might have.

But here’s what I’d go with. In my memory, the reason why the NomCom had two members from the BC, large and small, was because when the GNSO was being restructured, this was a quid pro quo that,

“Fine. We’ll see. We’ll agree to the two-house system because we believe that the NSCG and the NPOC will populate it in the way that we’d anticipate.” It hasn’t happened that way. And so, the nature of that house would change. It hasn’t changed at least as we had anticipated.

And the giveaway, or the quid pro quo was, “Fine. If you’re going to do that, we need to have proper representation on the NomCom.” This is my understanding, from what I recollect. I think Philip, who was part of those negotiations ... He’s not a member of BC at the moment but I know Marie’s on the call and he represented AIM when this happened. If there’s a way to get those arguments to be—going back, ask him, and get those arguments added to this, it would be helpful because effectively, what we’re doing now is piecemeal taking away parts of the composite compromise that was reached when we tried to discuss the reorganization of the GNSO previously. Thank you.

CLAUDIA SELLI:

Thank, you Zahid. Barbara, if I can just interject into the discussion. Yesterday, there was a call, also, with the CPH and CSG. So, basically everybody is more or less in-line in maintaining that the way the restructure is written will not be good anyway, regardless of the BC arguments for different reasons. And if that should be done, it should be done in a more holistic and comprehensive way and that, in any case, this wouldn’t be the way forward. So, I think that at least, of course, the IPC, the ISPCP, as well as Donna Austin were on the same page with us, in not supporting the review as it’s proposed.

At the same time, Ashley Heineman, that is the new representative, she asked about the history of why we got the two seats. I promised to go back to her with the right arguments—not right arguments but the right historical background, which I didn't have, of course, because she wanted to go back to her group to explain why the BC got two seats, historically—not that others were opposed to us having the two seats.

So, I think that precisely having the right arguments on that would be certainly helpful because I think this will, in any case, inevitably come out in the discussion or in the conversation, Zahid. I know that this evening, you and I don't know who else from NomCom is going to be in a call with the GNSO, if I'm not mistaken. So, I guess that this type of questions might be asked as well.

BARBARA WANNER:

Yes. If I could just jump in on that too, there is a call scheduled this ... Well, it's this afternoon on the East Coast. It's 21:00 UTC, involving the CSG—actually, the entire GSNO stakeholder groups and consultative groups with the NomCom RWIG. So, I am happy to forward that link to the broader BC membership, if you would like to participate in that call. I'll just do that after the call. Anybody else have any other comments on this?

JIMSON OLUFUYE:

Yeah. In view of the importance of this and the fact that we have serious time constraints, perhaps if I may request Zahid to just do us maybe one or two paragraphs on this so that we can tidy up the document. Thank you.

ZAHID JAMIL: Can I just say, absolutely. I just had one request. Maybe I could take this offline. If somehow we could speak to Philip ... And Marie, I don't know if you're able to assist with that. If we could speak to Philip, it would give us the best information possible. I don't even know if that's possible. Would it be possible?

MARIE PATTULLO: I haven't spoken to him since yesterday because it was his birthday, Zahid.

ZAHID JAMIL: Oh. So then, you haven't spoken for a long time, Marie.

MARIE PATTULLO: No. We're not in touch at all—my former colleague and one of my best friends. We have nothing in common. In all seriousness, I do have access on the AIM network—on the AIM server—to his ICANN files. I can dig through those and see if I can find anything. But I'll be honest with you. It can't be this evening. I've got a prior engagement and another meeting. But I will try and look for this tomorrow morning. I'm noting it down. And then I will, after that, see if I can manage to speak with him.

ZAHID JAMIL: Thank you.

BARBARA WANNER: That would be wonderful. And again, I'll get that link to everyone for the call that is later today. I have gone through the other items under the CSG section so much in the past that I really don't feel like I have to review them again.

We did have our call with Becky and Matthew on the 8th of July. And the transcript is attached on the policy calendar email of today. So far, we have still not learned if the NCSG has a competitor to—if they would support Philippe Fouquart as our candidate for the GNSO chair. And we still don't know if the Contracted Party House wants to put forward their candidate. So, we have sort of a status quo situation there.

I'll just wrap it up there because I think the priority really is our attention to this NomCom review. Thank you.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Barbara, apologies. I just wanted to—because yesterday, during this call, there was also other items discussed, including the Philippe Fouquart nomination. And in fact, everyone is supporting his candidature because, also, the CPH doesn't have a nominee. So, they will be supportive of Philippe, at least. So, I think the majority has its stance.

BARBARA WANNER: Excellent. Okay. That's great news, Claudia. I appreciate the update.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Sorry. I don't know if Steve has already left or is still there.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Hey, Claudia. Steve has left. I was going to pass it over to Jimson when Barbara's done. But I just wanted to flag that the NomCom RIWG Working Group is only for leadership, who is the NomCom leadership. So, it's a smaller call.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Yeah. Thank you so much. And the other item that I also wanted to report to the membership is, in fact, the appointment of the standing panel, on which we didn't have any type of, I think, position or input so far. Of course, there was also, from the CPH and other of the CSG, interest in understanding where everyone is staying. Everyone, for the time being, was quite frustrated about the process and certainly the fact that we were including, at the very last moment, and we're a bit scrambling in the dark, in terms of a position. So, I don't know if there are comments on that. No?

Okay. With that, then, I think, Jimson, we can go ahead with your update on Finance and Pperation.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Okay. Thank you very much, Claudia. First, on the finance. At this point, we're still at about 60% compliance with regard to membership dues payment. We're still at 60%, as it was a fortnight, two weeks ago. Please check your spam folder, in case the invoice is there. So, please check it. The last call, some of our members did, and they got back, and we sorted out the issues. So, if you are yet to receive any form of reminder

on the membership dues payment, please get back to me or to the invoicing secretariat. I'd really like to thank very much all our members that expeditiously responded to this payment. Thank you very much.

With respect to operations, the next election will be the ExCom and the committee elections. As usual, our ExCom elections hold around the October and November timeline. So, immediately after the ExCom election, then we'll have the committee elections, like the Credentials Committee and also the Finance Committee.

Regard to the chair, members of the Credentials Committee or the Finance Committee, only member that would need to ... If there are more than the particular threshold—like if there are more than four people that express interest, then we have to conduct election. But the chair of the Finance Committee is statutorily the chair of Finance and Operations Committee—the vice chair of finance and operations.

Want to, this opportunity to remind as many that will be interested in those offices ... Some of us are term-limited, like the vice chair of finance and operations. So, if you want to being to ask information well in advance, please do. But immediately after the elections. All the newly-elected officers will take their seats in January 2021.

So, that is it about the brief report, with regard to Finance and Operations. Thank you. Back to you.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Sorry. I was on mute. Thank you very much, Jimson. Is there any question for Jimson? I see Barbara has her hand up. Is an old hand, Barbara?

BARBARA WANNER: No. Just to follow up to Jimson's point about the election for a new ExCom, several of us are term-limited. I'm one of them, for the CSG representative. And I'm happy to ... It's just an excellent way to get your head around all matters of the BC. And I would encourage anyone in the BC to step up and assume this responsibility. Just let me know and I would be happy to nominate you. Thank you.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Thank you, Barbara. Anyone else has anything to raise or questions? Marie.

MARIE PATTULLO: Thanks. It's an AOB, Claudia. It's not about the elections. Is that appropriate now?

CLAUDIA SELLI: Sure. Of course.

MARIE PATTULLO: Okay. Very briefly, I've just been on a webinar that Chantelle kindly organized on the Information Transparency Initiative, which is a posh title for a new website. ICANN is developing a new website which, from

what they showed us today, looks like it's going to be a lot better, a lot easier to understand, a lot more straightforward for people coming in from the outside.

Unless Chantelle corrects me, the website to go and have a look at this, bearing in mind it's a draft, is preview.icann.org. So, you can go in there. You can have a play. You can have a look. They are actively asking for feedback. They are also, interestingly, planning to have it in the six main languages—not all of the content because that's impossible but a lot of the content.

The one thing that did strike me on that—and it's a shame that Steve isn't here because I know it's an issue he's raised—is they are, as you know, rolling out this new tool for when we put in public comments, that it's no longer a question of us sending it whatever we want to send in in our format. We have to send it in in ICANN Org's chosen format. But it was confirmed on the call that even if there is a structured, "Click on this link if you want to give feedback," and so on, it will still be possible to send in attachments—for example, a PDF—with our own comments.

But again, unless ... Chantelle knows far more about this than I do. But I think it's preview.icann.org. Go and have a look. It's worth seeing. Thanks.

CLAUDIA SELLI:

Yeah. Maybe, can you send around the link to the members, Chantelle? Would that be possible? Or Marie, whoever has it?

MARIE PATTULLO: Chantelle's just already put the link in the chat because she's great, and she knows everything, and I'm just typing in this small link that's worth looking at. Thanks.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Thank you so much. Any other point? No? Okay. With that, we can close the meeting and the recording. And we will be, in any case, speaking on the 5th of August when it's our next BC meeting. Thank you, everybody, for participating.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]