CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the BC Members Call on Wednesday, August 5th, 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 any background noise.

With this, I'd like to turn it over to our Vice Chair for Policy Coordination, Steve DelBianco, to begin. Steve, please go ahead.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Chantelle. Hi everyone, I know that attendance is a little bit light today because in the Northern Hemisphere, it's summer break. I understand all that. So, I think that this call could go more quickly than usual.

I have the policy calendar on the screen in front of you. And since our last call, we've actually filed three things. We filed a joint minority statement on phase two of the EPDP back on the 27th of July. This was a tremendous effort by Alex Deacon, Margie Milam, and Mark Svancarek. And we're going to talk about it in more detail a little bit later.

On the 31st of July, we filed comment on the final report that came out of the ATRT 3. Mason Cole, Susan Kawaguchi, did a fabulous job on this comment, and it picked up on some things we'd said in earlier comments on ATRT 3.

I think that Susan and Mason and I attended a couple of webinars that were put on by the team, and the ATRT 3 team is very casual about the recommendations they have. They don't believe that they're radical. They believe they've conformed with what the bylaws allow. They don't believe that there's been a process glitch in getting to where they are right now. And I don't get the sense that Becky Burr and Matthew Shears feel the same way. They believe there may have been some policy shortcuts or process shortcuts taken. So, we'll have to see how the Board reacts to that final report. But I appreciate Susan and Mason's great work on that. Thank you.

And then just Sunday, this weekend, we commented on enhancing the effectiveness of ICANN's Multi-Stakeholder Model, next steps recommended by ICANN Org. We had a big drafting team on this that had picked up on comments we made on the earlier MSM report. That was Mark Datysgeld, Andy Abrams, John Berard, Jay Chapman, and Arinola Akinyemi.

I wanted to turn it over to Mark for a minute. I'll display the comment, and Mark wanted to make a few comments about what we put in. Mark, over to you.

MARK DATYSGELD: Thank you very much, Steve. So, some very interesting things about this comment. But, first of all, I would like to acknowledge the massive effort put in by the drafters. This was a very intensive draft, a lot of good ideas circulating. So, really great work, everyone. I think we managed to pull something really good.

And, first of all, there is a fundamental problem with this Public Comment, and it's something that we have been outlining in terms of when ICANN says the priorities come from the community, what do they mean? And I think we really picked up on this thread in which they, before this opportunity, asked us and gave us a list of priorities and asked, "What is the easiest to tackle?"

Okay. So, when they came back to this comment, when my first draft the first thing I noticed is that they said, "So, here's the things the community wants the most." That is a drastic change of language that not only us picked up on, but ALAC has also aligned with us on their Public Comment noting the very same thing, the difference of priority versus low hanging fruit.

And I would really like for us to call out on this and follow up on them because this is the exact kind of thing what we're complaining about, that we come up with certain solutions and somehow it gets mutated in the process. So, this is something to look into.

And we also outlined the ever remaining question of them not addressing the structural concerns, which keep on being ignored. And this is something that, in turn, the IPC focused their comments on.

So, I think that a lot of the things we're bringing up have alignment within the community and could be pushed further. We could be trying to look into these matters in a more systemic manner. We do have allies to tackle this on.

So, as this project develops, let's see if we can bring back attention to these matters. And I would like to say that our emphasis where it should

be taken into consideration is that the roles and responsibilities task that was left out of this comment is actually the most important. Supposing people understand—this would be, of course, a very difficult process to get to, it would take a lot of blood and sweat and tears. But once we actually understood what everybody is supposed to do, who is supposed to make the calls, who calls for consensus, what's going on, that would alleviate all of the other issues.

And this was picked by them as the least important issue. I mean, not by them, by us. We picked this as the least important issue, according to them. So, I would like to also bring this back up within the process.

And if anybody's interested, at the bottom of the document for the interest of time, I won't stress too much the directed comments we made on their identified priorities, but we did make some suggestions in the sense that if they get new methods out there to convey policy ideas and to actually work with the community, they would need to make sure that this actually reaches their intended audience, that they actually get implemented in a way that makes sense for the community. I'm especially thinking of the BC members who did not have that much representation, who did not have that much time, but are still very interested in everything that's going on, they get left out of this big picture thing. So, what will ICANN do if they make significant changes to actually include these players, for example?

So, just a quick overlook. Again, congrats to the team. And we will keep up with this. I think there's a path here towards something, it's just not very clear how we're going to work with the policy team in a way that's actually productive. Thank you, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you Mark. Any other members of the drafting team want to add any points, just raise your hand. And Mark, there's two items for follow up. The first is to look at the ATRT 3 recommendations where they talk about a brand-new review called a holistic review, which does look at the structure of ICANN from a top down way. It might be the first time we've had a structural examination, and it's long overdue. So, there might be a way to say that the MSM recommendations dovetail with one of the ATRT 3 recommendations.

And we didn't object. Mason and Susan in their draft appreciated the holistic review, but we don't think it should be instead of the organization reviews that need to occur.

And then another element is to determine where does this go next? Again, this came out of a top down strategic initiative by Cherine Chalaby, and then they hired Brian Cute as a consultant. But Brian's gone, so is Cherine, so it would be great to understand where does this go next? And Mark, or members of this drafting team, do you know the next steps for the MSM project?

MARK DATYSGELD: Very quickly, so what they intend to do, as far as I understand from having talks with them, is to start parceling out this work and handing it over to certain parts of the community. But they have not been very specific in how they will do that. And it would be certainly interesting to follow up with them on how they intend to do this process. And as far as ATRT is concerned, I think that's good insight, Steve. We should really

be looking into that as a compliment to this, rather than as a separate process. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: All right, Mark, thank you and all the rest of the drafters. It's a very well written comment. I don't see any other hands up, so I'm going to go back to the policy calendar.

There's one other item I wanted to bring up in terms of the comments filed. Back in early July, Jimson and Lawrence drafted our comment on the Country Code Name Supporting Organizations PDP on the retirement or deselecting old ccTLDs. And the ccNSO is now seeking volunteers. The expressions of interest are due this Friday, the 7th of August. That would be if you would want to be on that PDP because ccNSO is willing to consider folks outside of the ccTLD world.

Anybody have interest in that right now? Because then we can bring that up, Chantelle can help to follow up with details. So, any BC member that is interested, let Chantelle or I know and we'll get you the information.

With respect to the upcoming Public Comments, here's a switch. There's nothing in the current open calendar that I would deem as really particularly relevant to the BC. I did look ahead a little bit, though, and I see that in August, we do expect to Public Comment on a big chunk of the new gTLD subsequent procedures. These are a set of really detailed plans for things that would have to be done for subsequent rounds of new gTLD expansion. This will be on their draft final recommendation. So, we'll watch for that.

EN

Next, I wanted to return to our ongoing saga of trying to modify ICANN's WHOIS policies to comply with GDPR. We are well over two years into this and the process reached the conclusion of phase two just this month. So, I'll scroll down to the key section here, is that the BC and the IPC filed a joint minority statement on the 27th of July. Now, that can be modified somewhat between now and late August if we decide to tweak a few key paragraphs. And it includes our notion that the phase two report fails. It fails to strike the balance between individual rights of privacy and legitimate interests to know who the registrant is behind a domain name. And we said the failure is a detriment to be able to protect the rights of people from fraud and abuse that occurs in the use of the DNS.

There's currently a discussion amongst BC and IPC members that follow the EPDP on what to do with a final conclusionary statement. And I was responsible for drafting this line here that says, "As a result, there's a need for clear regulatory guidance for the GDPR and to pursue alternative legal and regulatory approaches."

So, that last phrase "alternative legal and regulatory approaches" is something I threw in there to highlight the fact that legitimate requesters for WHOIS are probably going to pursue other means. Such as, let's say, a conflicting law passed by, say, the United States that would require the disclosure of registrant information for those serving American consumers or registrants for the purpose of consumer protection. It would be pretty much the mirror image of the way in which GDPR has been interpreted by ICANN.

EN

So, Europe has a law, GDPR, the US could end up with a different law, some other regime could have a different law. So, there are some in the IBC and BC that believe that that is provocative. It's mainly the IPC folks, and they would prefer to take that out, what I've highlighted on the screen. And they'll go back and forth on that.

But I'd be grateful to know whether BC members think it was too provocative to conclude that we might pursue alternative legal and regulatory approaches. I'll take a queue on that, please. Go ahead, Mark.

MARK SVANCAREK: It may seem provocative, but it's really just honesty. I think there's a lot of denial in the community based on some of the feedback that was given, particularly by registrars, after our minority statement was published. They seem to think that we're an inch apart, as opposed to a mile apart. It's a very puzzling situation. But denial, I mean it could just be gaslighting, but I think a lot of it is true denial.

And I think it is good to be honest, to say, "Oh, by the way, we're going to have to pursue alternate approaches, and these will include legal approaches and regulatory approaches."

And certainly, if I were to have a one on one with a registrar, I could explain my reasoning on this, namely that we cannot proceed until there is legal certainty. We can't get legal certainty unless governments are engaged, and we can't keep governments engaged unless we object clearly and strenuously.

EN

So, provocative or not, I think it's a statement of honesty. Whether that's a value or not is up to this community.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you Mark. And it's no secret that members of the BC and IPC support the Coalition for Secure and Transparent Internet. I'm not involved in that from Netchoice's perspective, but there are other BC members and IPC members who do. And they are pursuing legislation that would require the disclosure of registrant information for consumer protection purposes. So, that's not a secret. As you say, it's better to be honest about it than to try to hide that ball and then be accused of being dishonest later on.

I appreciate that. I don't see our hands up, so I'll scroll to the next piece. On the 31st of July, that was last Friday, the phase two final report was delivered to Council. And again, this is a PDP, the work of the PDP delivers to Council. It's a big one. It's 270 pages and the consensus designations on page 107 lay out the fact that of the 22 recommendations, eight of them had no consensus. And all but one of those, the BC was among those who did not support it.

So, this is a Swiss cheese report when it comes to consensus. There are holes in this report, and Council will undoubtedly look at it recommendation by recommendation, but if they adopt some but not all, that's where the Swiss cheese comes in. I have a hard time believing that SSAD will hold together if not all the recommendations are implemented.

EN

So, Council is going to be considering this and will not vote at their August meeting, but they presumably will vote at their September meeting. But my personal assessment is that the contract parties, the NCSG, and the ISPs will support it, and that gives Council the supermajority to do whatever they want despite our lack of support for certain recommendations.

Despite all that, I wanted to turn it over to Margie, and Mark and give you guys the opportunity to add some color to this. But I also wanted to thank Alex Deacon, who's been an indispensable help to getting through these last two years. Margie, Alex, Mark, anybody?

MARGIE MILAM: Sure, Steve, I'll jump in. Good morning, everyone. I think what is important to understand from the process is that the minority statement that was published with the IPC raised a lot of issues that were echoed across many stakeholders. So, the At-Large folks, the SSAC, the GAC, joined in various combinations of objecting to these issues. But if you read what they've said, and some of them are still in the process of finalizing their statement to be included in the report, it echoed all the things that we talked about; the lack of accuracy, the lack of firm commitments that could be enforced by ICANN, the lack of responsiveness with SLAs where a phishing attack could take as long as five to ten business days to receive the information.

And so, they really backed up a lot of the statements that we made in our minority statement. And so, it really poses a question now to the ICANN community and to the Board—Becky Burr responded fairly

quickly after she realized that we had so many disagreements as to, well, what is the next step? Where do we go from here? Because, as Steve indicated, you've got roughly a dozen recommendations where there really is no consensus, or very weak support, and what does that mean for the entire system? Do you even consider going forward with it? Or, do we go back to the drawing board and support the UAM or something else?

And so, it's a wakeup call for the ICANN Board and for the community. I think the contracted parties in a sense seemed surprised on some of these issues, but Mark and I and the IPC folks were very clear that we needed certain things before we could support this recommendation. And, unfortunately, we were just unable to get there.

And I think the issue that probably resonated strongly with the ALAC and the GAC in particular was the inability to evolve this model to become a centralized decision-making system, which is really what we had gone into the negotiations and in the policy process seeking. And the model that's proposed is not one that could ever be a true UAM where ICANN is making the centralized decision-making and it's a process that's automated and able to process these requests very quickly.

So, I just wanted to kind of give you guys the big picture that this group of recommendations just became so weak that it really touched a number of stakeholders of the ICANN community.

STEVE DELBIANCO:	You know, Margie, Becky Burr had quickly Skyped me when she saw our minority report. She said, "I'm just so surprised. You're saying it's not worth pursuing?"
	And I said, "Becky, I'm surprised you're surprised. We've made it very clear that there isn't any value to the business community in what is being implemented without the ability to evolve it. It's just not worth the trouble."
	And she said, "Okay, I don't know how the Board is going to deal with that." Well, part of what the Board will do is, only after Council in September approves this as consensus policy with super majority, it goes to the Board. Now, the Board is also going to get advice from three other groups: the GAC, the SSAC, and the ALAC; because they don't vote on Council, but they do advise the Board. So, if they're strong in their advice to the Board, that could have some effect on what the Board does in terms of accepting or rejecting or modifying the recommendations that come from Council. And all that would happen in the September/October timeframe.
	Mark, anything to add?
MARK SCANCAREK:	Nothing special. I mean, just really the level of denial is very bizarre to me. I don't know if anything like this has happened before in a PDP. It felt as we went along the process that we were being told, "Look, shut up. You're not going to get anything better than this. Just take your medicine and shut up and leave us alone." And then they were surprised at the end when we didn't do that.

So, I don't know, I think there are some people who are very tone deaf or arrogant and very accustomed to getting their way and they seem to think that, as Michele always says, consensus doesn't mean you get everything you want. And, of course, my retort would be, "Lack of consensus doesn't mean there's no consequences."

So, I guess it's a wakeup call for them.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Mark and Margie, thanks again for the last two years. Sort of suffering withdrawal not having three-hour calls two days a week and two more hours of prep time, but I think you'll get through it. Thank you for all you've done. I'm sure we're going to have to tap into you again for picking up on threads that are going to emerge, helping our Councilors walk through the voting that will occur in September and October. Anything else?

Okay, I'll move down to Council. Marie is not with us today, but Scott is, and Mark Datysgeld is our incoming Councilor. The last meeting was the 24th of July. I've recapped for you their agenda, their documents, and there was only one motion approved So, Scott, I'll turn it over you to talk about the Council.

SCOTT MCCORMICK: Thanks, Steve. Good evening, good afternoon, morning, everyone. So, obviously, yes Council [inaudible] was just last week, or [inaudible] last week now. We are still discussing also Keith and Rafik's term limitations.

EN

Philippe is still expected to step in for Chair. And then, let's see here. There we go. [Went past there].

We have five new members coming in on the Council, Mark is one of them. We have two on the registry and three on NCSG, as noted in the minutes there. And then, other than that, there's not much else to report on.

STEVE DELBIANCO: So, Scott, back up in the Council section, if you're looking at the screen. Marie gave me these items that are listed that are topics under discussion at Council. Any comments or color you want to add to these?

SCOTT MCCORMICK: I think most of them speak for themselves. Yeah, it speaks for itself on that.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Okay, any questions for Scott as our Councilor? So, Scott, please keep an eye on the list in Council and the discussions about the EPDP report that was received by Council on Friday because you're not supposed to have it on your agenda, but there are issues of accuracy, legal versus private, and anonymized addresses. Those are presumably still being discussed by Council and may even generate an issues report, what we call the next steps.

SCOTT MCCORMICK: Correct. It's obviously been an ongoing issue that we've been dealing with.

STEVE DELBIANCO: So, you and Marie, when you identify a juncture where it's time for the BC to weigh in, maybe not with a formal vote, but having you and Marie weigh in on the Council list, surface it for your colleagues in the BC, give us an appropriate amount of context, and invite BC members to support you so that you and Marie can say something that's relevant on that list. Okay?

SCOTT MCCORMICK: Sounds good.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Any other questions for Councilors?

Okay, I'll scroll down to the next section, which is CSG or Commercial Stakeholders Group. Our elected liaison is Barbara Wanner, a member the ExCom. Barbara is absent from today's call, and helped to prepare the policy calendar I circulated yesterday.

One of the key elements on here is the Nominating Committee review, or the NomCom review. It's going to be implemented, and if it is implemented in a certain way, the BC will likely lose the ability to name two people to the NomCom, a small business and a large business seat.

Because the recommendation is to simply delegate a handful of NomCom seats to the GNSO and every other AC and SO, and then the GNSO would work out who gets people on the NomCom. When that happens, that's a change to the ICANN bylaws. And the GNSO would presumably have internal procedures of its own to determine how that's going to be done.

This is not good. And the BC itself is trying to push back, we're getting some help from the IPC, but as of yet, we don't have any other allies. It feels like EPDP all over again. So, at this point, all we can do is make a good case, and I did want to thank Lawrence, who's on the call. Lawrence drafted a bit of a case, but to tell you the truth, we need help. We need help from Lawrence, Jay Sudowski, Paul Mitchell, Tola, Scott, and Arinola to help us craft our best argument.

To feed into that, we got Philip Sheppard, who's a former GNSO Councilor, an officer of the BC from many years ago, used to run AIM where Marie is today. And he did some background, too, on where it is that the BC got two seats and it goes way back, it's almost 20 years ago. And it was done as part of the transformation from the old Names Council to the Generic Name Supporting Organization.

And what Philip argues is that there was explicit recognition of the need for the business community to have a role in helping to select people for the NomCom, and both [large and small business] were necessary for ICANN to have legitimacy. And there was also a whole episode of ICANN trying to use individual At-Large voting for Board members, and that was a disaster.

So, there came this idea that let's turn to our representative groups, like the BC, and have them give us Nominating Committee members to represent large and small. So, there was initially some misconception that we got the two seats as a result of the structuring in 2009, but I think I put that to rest. This predates that, this is almost 20 years old, and we're going to need some allies because we could be dead right about this and still lose. Because if it's only us and the IPC standing for this position, we aren't going to prevail, not likely to prevail.

So, I'd like to take a queue on that. Chantelle, you have some additional information you put in the chat. Why don't you put your mic on and brief us on that?

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Hi Steve, thank you. So, there's going to be a follow up call for the GNSO Stakeholder Group and Constituency Leaders on August 6th. So, Barbara and Claudia have both been invited to that call. And I think if the BC can organize any thoughts or proposals that they wish to share on the call, that would be incredibly helpful.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Well, that's tomorrow. So, what we have is Philip Sheppard's history, Lawrence's rationale, and then Barbara's work to try to sort of clean up Philip's history so that it doesn't contain any politically sensitive points that would cost us allies we need. But there isn't much time for additional drafting.

So, I'm looking on the BC list right now to members who are on this call that have been part of the Nominating Committee before, this is your time and we need your help.

Chantelle, would you circulate to former members of the BC NomCom, I have all their names right there in the list—Paul Mitchell, Jay, Zahid, Lawrence, Tola, Scott, and Arinola—to see whether any of them can join the call as well. I can't believe that they would turn us down if we had some other NomCom members joining the call as well.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN   I'll do that. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Any other NomCom members have anything to add?

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Steve?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Please, go ahead.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: I want to find out what is ISPCP's position on this?

EN

STEVE DELBIANCO: I've told you that they're still considering their position. They haven't taken one yet. That was as of Friday from an email from Wolf-Ulrich.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Okay, thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Mark Datysgeld, go ahead.

MARK DATYSGELD: Thank you, Steve. Just to put something out there, do you think it would be useful for SMEs involved in the BC to make a supplementary statement? I would be certainly willing to draft that from that position explaining how important it is to us to feel this kind of representation. Is that something that would be useful?

STEVE DELBIANCO: It would be and that was what Lawrence undertook to do when he came up with a statement, he's got a few things in there. This is the second attachment to this policy calendar to talk about the need for small business. But two paragraphs, to be honest, would be helpful, Mark, if you could help to draft two paragraphs on SME representation in ICANN and in the NomCom and the essential nature of that, that would be helpful.

But that meeting is tomorrow. So, it has to be drafted and circulated under BC private, BC members can weigh in. Andrew Mack has said he

would help Lawrence with that, but it needs to start today. And I think only a couple of paragraphs is all you need. You're supplying rhetoric that Barbara and Claudia would use on their call with our other colleagues in the SGC leaders. But, again, every other group in the GNSO would love the idea of being able to allocate these seats, not just the two that BC has, but all the seats. And that would end up being controlled I think by … Maybe it gets split by house? I hope it wouldn't be simply controlled by majority.

But you know that we are desperately outnumbered in GNSO, so any rights that we have now to get subject to the voting of the whole GNSO are going to are going to diminish our power.

MARK DATYSGELD: I'll get into it right now and talk to Andy after the call about this. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Since there are so many members on the call and we have so little time, I would ask you, Mark, that when you work up a draft with Andy of a few paragraphs, circulate it to the entire BC private, you can include the section on my policy calendar as context so BC members would know what it is we're trying to do. And we are attempting to give arguments and rhetoric to Claudia and Barbara for the call they're having tomorrow. Thank you, Mark.

MARK DATYSGELD: Understood.

STEVE DELBIANCO: All right, so I'm scrolling down in the other items in Barbara's section of the report here. We expect that between the end of August and the first week of September, we'll have our long-promised call with Göran Marby and a handful of Board members where we talk about DNS abuse, EPDP 2, enforcement issues, things that we wrote about back in April. We are long overdue having the BC meeting with Göran Marby and multiple Board members. So, Chantelle, are we firmly committed to get that meeting sometime between August 28th and September 2nd?

CHANTELLE DOERKSON: I believe a Doodle poll went out to the CSG Ex Com leadership with some dates. I will look for that.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Okay. And that's about all I have for the policy calendar, all three channels, and I would turn it over to Claudia, but Claudia is not with us today. So, Chantelle, let's put up the main agenda. Thank you, and turn things over to Jimson for Operations and Finance Report.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Thank you, Steve, for your consistent hard work on our diverse policy issues, and greetings to everyone. First, with regard to our financial outlook, when as of this moment, we are above 70% milestone with members' dues payment. I really want to thank our members. Each time we have a meeting like this, many of our members, they do get back to me and we sort this out.

So, that's why, at least this year, responsiveness rate is higher. So, I would like to remind those that are yet to receive any notification, please check your spam boxes. And if you check and do not see any invoicing notifications, please contact the secretariat or myself.

Well, over the period, we have two new members, one from the UK, that is Hypernames Limited, and another from the US, Buckley Media. They are not on this call. Now, perhaps the next meeting they will be on the call. And I want to really, on behalf of all of us, thank the Credentials Committee for your consistent work on reviewing credentials of new members. Thank you.

And lastly, our ExCom election is coming up, as we were notified two weeks ago, still coming up. Normally, we have a policy that should take place between October, November [axis] so that new officers were able to interact with the outgoing officers throughout December, or thereabouts, then the new officers can take their seats in January.

So, notification for the election will be out next month, just to prepare our minds. The ExCom offices open include that of the Chair of the BC, the Vice Chair of Finance and Operations, Vice Chair of Policy and Coordination, and CSG Reps.

So, at least for me, I've been in this position since 2014. It's been quite a great opportunity to serve the BC, I [loved] everyone, so I'll be bowing out this year, so I want to encourage as many that want to pick up the baton to please prepare. It's really good to serve the BC. So, on this note, I want to say thank you.

Okay, so back to the next agenda.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Jimson. I'll add that the current officers, those of us that are subject to the term limits, as always are standing by to brief you privately if you want to know more about what it takes to do the job. Jimson, for instance, would gladly walk through the process of managing our banking and administration, finance, and budget. I would be happy to walk you through how I construct and manage the policy work of the BC. Claudia can talk to you about being President, and Barbara about being our liaison to the CSG.

So, we're happy to do that privately to give you an idea for how much time it might take, and the way in which you can be supported in that. But we passed a charter several years ago that included term limits. So, those term limits take place, unless nobody else will run for a spot. But what we should do is try to get some new blood in here, too. Any questions on that now?

Our next call is set for the 19th of August, and you'll get a policy calendar and agenda in advance of that. Any other business? I don't see any hands.

Okay, timeout. Chantelle, would you please speak up on that one? It wasn't in the agenda. Go ahead.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Thank you, Steve. And I'm unable to raise my hand because I'm a host for this meeting. So, one thing I want to [flag up] to the BC is for ICANN 69 planning, the plenary topics need to be submitted by the 13th of

August, which is next week. And once those plenary topics are submitted, that Thursday there's also going to be another production call where the planners will meet to look at the session topics and any community feedback.

And so, if anyone's interested, please contact ExCom for more information. And any topics that you think should be submitted for a plenary session, please get those to us as soon as possible. Thank you, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Are there any topics that BC members want to throw out now so that we can put them into the mix for ICANN 69? There'll be usually a push for DNS abuse, particularly if it's come up. There ought to be a topic on what are the next steps for this EPDP. I have to believe we would feature that at the top. Mark Datysgeld mentions Multi-Stakeholder Model reform.

Chantelle, maybe a note over to Barbara just indicating at least three ideas were discussed on the call: MSM reform, next steps EPDP, and an update on DNS abuse. Any others?

All right, we'll give you 20 minutes of your day back. Thanks, everyone, and we'll talk to you in two weeks.

Chantelle, you can end the call.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Thank you, Steve. Bye everyone.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Thank you, everyone, this call's been adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]