CHANTELLE DOERKSEN:	Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the BC Members Call on Wednesday, August 19th, 2020. In the interest of time, attendance will be taken via Zoom. I'd like to remind all participants to please state your name when speaking for the transcript and to keep your phones on mute when not speaking to avoid background noise. With this, I'd like to turn it over to Steve to begin. Steve, please go ahead.
STEVE DELBIANCO:	Thanks, Chantelle. Welcome, everyone. I'll get right into the policy calendar now. Sent it around yesterday. And we haven't had any new comments filed since our last meeting two weeks ago. There are no open public comments at ICANN right now.
	But I did want to point out that we expect, before the end of August, an open public comment on the Subsequent Procedures for subsequent rounds of gTLD expansion. And the current timeline that that group is discussing shows applications for new gTLDs in 2023—2023 at the earliest.
	We're going to have a lot of work to do on those comments—things like the method of allocation when there's contention between two different applicants for the same string. That's a big deal. Some of the RPMs, public interest commitments, and one of the BC's favorite topics, which is on closed generics.

That would be a generic word for a top-level domain, like .tools, for instance. And if the company applying for it sells tools, then they're able to close it so that tools is only available to that company. That would be an example of a closed generic. The BC had concerns about that, if it was misleading to consumers to believe that a single closed generic would imply that it was open. But the idea is to be transparent.

So, I think that the new Subsequent Procedures report is going to offer us choices in areas like auction and closed generic. I don't really believe they've reached enough of a conclusion, that the report will actually indicate the recommendation. That's my sense of it. Does anybody have any other updates on Subsequent Procedures? I'll open the chat, too, so I can keep an eye on that.

Okay. As far as WHOIS policies and GDPR, I have a couple of brief updates for you. Right in here in the middle of the policy calendar, I told you that Interisle Consulting had a proposal in to do a new study on the accuracy of WHOIS data. Last night, I checked back in with Interisle and they do now. They have enough pledges to begin the work. They're going to confirm today. But they've picked up two extra funders so that work should be able to get started within a week or two. And I will confirm as soon as they tell me that they're ready to go. The BC, as you recall, allocated $20,000 from our 2021 outreach budget as a pledge, provided that Interisle raise the full $200,000.

I did discuss on our last call that the BC and the IPC are working on a joint minority statement, which is due the 24th of August, on the Phase 2 EPDP report. And Alex Deacon, you just go into the call. And Alex, you can help me confirm that the current minority statement still contains

the line, "As a result, there's a need for clear regulatory guidance to the GDPR and to pursue alternative legal and regulatory approaches." So, Alex, just confirm that's still in there, if I have the right document up.

ALEX DEACON: Yeah. Hi, Steve. Hope you can hear me. That's right. That language is still in the minority report. It made it into the report that—sorry, into our statement that was copied into the report. And I believe it hasn't been changed since. So, I don't believe there's a plan to. But yeah. That's the state, currently.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yeah. You, Margie, Mark, and I were all comfortable with that line. But there were some in the IPC that felt like it undermined the multistakeholder model. And we believed it was better to declare the idea that maybe the answer to GDPR is other legislation that goes in the opposite direction because GDPR created this problem. So, it was never, at the beginning, a multistakeholder problem to begin with.

Are you aware of any further efforts, then, to modify that? Or do we think that the minority statement, as linked to here, is going to be the one that's submitted on the 24th?

ALEX DEACON: I haven't been involved in any further discussion on that so I don't think there will be any changes. I could double check but I think we're good.

STEVE DELBIANCO:	Good. I also wanted to mention that Council meets tomorrow. And when we get to the Council section, Marie, Scott, and Mark can talk about a late breaking memo from Council leadership as to how they want to consider the basket of recommendations.

But before I jump into that, I wanted to let you know that the GAC, Government Advisory Committee, had drafted a minority statement of its own. It was quite strong. And there were echoes of the BC/IPC minority statement in there as well. However, the GAC has to run its own tracks, with the government representatives. And it's unusual for the GAC to issue a strong statement in the ICANN context. They typically advise the Board and don't do a lot of written work for working groups.

So, the draft that I saw, we're not going to share it yet. It's not by any means approved yet by the GAC. And if the GAC gets it in by August the 24th, we will share it on the BC list. And if it's as strong as the draft that we saw, your representatives on the EPDP will endorse and support the GAC's statement. But we won't do that until I circulate that.

Mark and Margie, we're about to get into a discussion of what's in front of Council. And it has to do with the way in which it will be organized. So, I think I'll bring that up in the chat right now. It's a brand new email that just came in from Council leadership.

Preparation for the Phase 2 Final Report because as I mentioned in the policy calendar, at the Council meeting tomorrow, they're not going to vote on the EPDP Phase 2 report. Instead, they will discuss how they're going to be voting on it and talk a little bit about next steps and the Implementation Review Team, IRT.

So, in preparation for the meeting—this was just circulated—they're going to consider all of the SSAD-related recommendations, which are recommendations one through 18, as a package. So, you can imagine that there would be a motion at the September meeting—a motion to approve recommendations one through 18 as a package. That's of some use because it's different than picking them off, all 22 recommendations as individuals. And then, they're going to take the priority two recommendations, which is recommendations 19 through 22, as a separate package. And they're going to discuss that tomorrow.

So, Marie and Scott don't have to vote on the packages. They just have to comment on whether this way of deciding it makes sense. And so, the BC, as I reported in the policy calendar, did not support recommendation five, six, eight, nine, number 10, number 14, and number 18.

So, we did not support several of the recommendations in the package of one through 18. The ones we didn't support are the response requirements from the SSAD, priority levels, the authorization of Contracted Parties, automation of processing, mostly because it really had no way of doing any evolution.

And so, the BC was not happy with the SSAD. So, the SSAD-related package, recommendations one through 18, I would imagine that the BC would be in a position to vote no on all of those as a package. And I wanted to get a discussion going on that. So, I'll take the queue from the Councilors, Mark, Margie, and Alex and those that are really familiar with the EPDP on this. Mark and Margie, do you think it makes sense? I see Margie's hand up. Go ahead, Margie.

MARGIE MILAM: Hi. Given that we did not dissent to those recommendations, 19 through 22, I don't see any harm in splitting the vote. In particular, the one that I think is probably most important is the ICANN purpose two. And it closes out, from Phase 1, the discussion on what the purpose two should state. So, the rest of the recommendations are … They're not earth-shattering. So, I don't see any problem with splitting it up.

STEVE DELBIANCO: But Margie, with respect to purpose two, which recommendation affirms purpose two? Isn't that on 19 through 22?

MARGIE MILAM: Yeah. Hold on. Let me find it.

STEVE DELBIANCO: So, you don't see a problem in splitting it between SSAD and everything else?

MARGIE MILAM: Right. Because I think the purpose two just basically says that ICANN has a purpose, consistent with its Bylaws, to preserve the security of the internet. And so, that's why I don't … Here it goes, recommendation 22. There would be a new purpose, "contribute to the maintenance of the security, stability, and resiliency of the domain name system in accordance with ICANN's mission." So, I don't see any harm in that

being approved. It's apart from the SSAD recommendations and, in fact, closes out the issue that was open, when the Board did not accept the purpose two from Phase 1.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Great. Mark Svancarek?

MARK SVANCAREK: Thanks. Yeah. I agree with Margie. I think it would be easy for the Council to just reject this second package because it's mostly things that are of interest to us. I think it's recommendation 21 that perhaps would force them to keep it—the data retention one, number 21. So, I think it makes sense for it to be voted for separately.

Whether it's a risk or not, I think it's recommendation 21 that causes it to be passed because I could easily see 19, display of information of affiliated privacy/proxy providers, the city field—that's recommendation 20—and purpose two, since there are some concerns or objections to those, either in certain Contracted Parties or NCSG, I could see those—actually, them just voting "no" on those, in spite of the existing consensus.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yeah because, Mark, 19, 20, 21, and 22 are designated as having either full or regular consensus.

EN

MARK SVANCAREK: Right.

STEVE DELBIANCO: And you still think there's a risk that NCSG and Contracted Parties could vote no at Council?

MARK SVANCAREK: Well, in their minority statement, the only thing that the NCSG objected to was 22, if I recall.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Got it.

MARK SVANCAREK: So, I think it makes sense, procedurally. I think it's only a medium risk to us. I recognize there's some risk. But I think that 21 slightly mitigates that risk. So, that's my opinion.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Mark.

MARK SVANCAREK: So, I'm okay with it.

STEVE DELBIANCO: So, Marie and Scott, it sounds as if our experts on that team would recommend that it's fine to follow Council leadership's recommendation of splitting into two buckets and that it's not probably any secret that the BC would be "no" on the first package, the SSAD package, and that we would be "yes" on the priority two recommendations.

And if there is an effort to undermine or pick apart the second package, I think we want to resist that. The priority two recommendations, as a package, 19 through 22, do have consensus, both either full or regular consensus. And they should be a package in the same sense that the SSAD itself … There will be some discussion of the fact that if the SSAD-related package, one through 18, goes down at Council that there won't be an SSAD.

And I know there are still folks in the ICANN community that are incredulous that the BC and the IPC wouldn't support the SSAD, considering we had been demanding one for over two years. And our answer needs to be an emphatic that this is nowhere near—this SSAD recommendation is nowhere near adequate to the tasks necessary to protect registrants and internet users. So, we'd rather not have this and pursue other means than to vote for this and pretend as if it's going to allow us to protect our registrants and customers.

So, Marie and Scott, do you feel like you have enough to go on for that discussion tomorrow?

MARIE PATTULLO: Hi, Steve. Can you hear me okay?

STEVE DELBIANCO: We do.

MARIE PATTULLO: Great. I feel like I need to thank Council leadership for having the decency to send this mail just before we had this call. Mark and Margie, that was really, really useful. I've been scribbling notes, as you can imagine. Yeah. I think I do have enough for what we need for tomorrow. I will have to read it through again, get my head around it properly, and really do hope that as ever, our experts can join that part of Council so they can prompt us if need be. But thank you very much for bringing that up, Steve. It was very useful. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: All right, Marie. And you won't be voting on the motions? You'll just be discussing the way in which the motions will be presented for the September meeting?

MARIE PATTULLO: Yep.

STEVE DELBIANCO: And there may also be a discussion of whether anybody is going to ask for a deferral at the September meeting. And it would be my view that we should not. And if somebody prompted us to promise not to ask for deferral, I would try to get something for that. But I think it would be

bad form to request a deferral on something we've been demanding progress on for over two years and we pretty much know how we're going to vote. So, as long as they don't change things too dramatically from where we have it right now, let's not seek a deferral at the September meeting. Is that okay?

MARIE PATTULLO: To me, that makes complete sense because we did have issues with the deferral in the past, of course, with Phase 1. And it creates acrimony. And it also opens the door for them to make us look like the bad guys. And we need to play clean here, as we always have. So, yeah. I fully agree. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: I agree with you, too. Any other comments on that. And Marie, since everybody has seen the minority statement, it includes the phrase that we will pursue alternative legal and regulatory approaches, as well as seeking more regulatory guidance for the GDPR.

That could come from the DPA, the Data Protection Board. It could come from courts in Europe. And the notion of alternative legal and regulatory approaches could be new European regulatory rulings and laws or it could be laws in other countries. And that does create an unfortunate conflict of law, if some other country enacts legislation that requires the disclosure of registrant information for consumer protection purposes. And the GDPR started this problem. And it might be that another country could go in the opposite direction. I know it

puts a squeeze on Contracted Parties and it puts ICANN in a tough spot. But it will mean turning the engines back on for an EPDP.

MARIE PATTULLO: Sure. But to be blunt, Steve, conflict of the laws and the internet exist at every single point of the internet. The internet is not regulated by one law anywhere in the world. This isn't that new.

STEVE DELBIANCO: That's right. ICANN didn't create this problem, nor did the BC and the IPC.

MARIE PATTULLO: [Et voila]. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Okay. The rest of Council, I have displayed on the screen, Marie. And I pulled from the Council agenda all of the items that look to be relevant. So, why don't you lead us through the rest of the Council agenda that's on the screen.

MARIE PATTULLO: Sure. Briefly, we've got some consent agenda items, as you know, which … This is where my computer decides to freeze, of course. Okay. The consent agenda is as expected. Unless you guys tell me differently, we don't have an issue there. We are going forward with getting the operational track of the new IDN procedures started, if that makes

sense to everybody. If you look in the agenda itself, there's a link that takes you to a new tool called the Action Decision Radar, which sounds really complicated but it's actually really great because you can see what Council needs to do in short-, medium-, long-term.

So, what we intend to vote on tomorrow in the consent agenda is part of the Phase 1 EPDP but it's the terminology bit—so, the bits where current ICANN policies have words that now need to be replaced with new words. That's all it is. So that, again, makes sense. If you look in the agenda, you'll see a link that explains all of that in great detail. And also, staff need a bit longer to work up their issue report on the transfer policy. No problems with that at all. So, that's the consent agenda out of the way.

Steve has just run through what I think is going to be the meat of the meeting. I'm expecting, as per usual, the BC to be on the Council's naughty step. All the things Steve just said—we wanted this and now we're voting against, yadda, yadda. But Scott and I can deal with that. We have big shoulders and it's not really going to worry us.

What I find more interesting, on a personal level, is the next part of the agenda, which is looking at the leftover bits from the EPDP. As you know, a lot of people do not want to touch them with a barge pole and are trying to not just kick them into the long grass but the bit of the field beyond the grass, over the bridge—in particular, accuracy—data accuracy, being registrant data accuracy.

Again, if you look at the links that are in the agenda, you'll see that a small team of Councilors has been working on this. I have been quite

EN

happily raising my hand repeatedly, saying, "No. Not next year. Not the year after that. Now, now! Let's do it now." And if you look at the current text that will be discussed by Council tomorrow, we will be looking at timelines. And I am pushing for this to happen as soon as is feasible. I'm not talking about tomorrow. But I do want a timeline in there. Otherwise, I can see it disappearing over the horizon.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Marie?

MARIE PATTULLO: Yeah?

STEVE DELBIANCO: The actual Zoom screen shows the summary of your Council agenda. And I have item five listed in detail. And it shows your recommendation to reconvene after the 24th of September Council Meeting. That's what—

MARIE PATTULLO: Yep. Again, Steve, because I want to … What I'm trying to do, as you know, is to not let them tie up their so-called leftover items, remaining items, which from EPDP Phase 2—so, anonymized user mail and that sort of stuff—with data accuracy because they keep telling us that data accuracy is huge, and standalone, and affects everything in the whole ICANN world. So, I don't see why we need to tie any discussion of data accuracy, in general, to the voting or nonvoting of this EPDP report. I'm

basing it on what they've said. So, I don't think we should allow them to backtrack on that. But we'll see what happens tomorrow.

There's also a minor discussion going on over chair. Rafik wants to chair the next steps. I pointed out to him that this is actually against the Bylaws—not the Bylaws, the Operating Procedures of the GNSO Council. What he didn't seem to realize, when he accepted one of my amendments to his document, is that I quoted the correct bit of the Bylaws. It's not that I don't like Rafik. He's a nice guy. But the rules say if you are the liaison between the Council and a working group, you cannot also be the chair. They're pretty clear. Anyway, we'll see what happens there.

After that, we're going to have a discussion about the independent review process, standing panel. Steve, unless you want to discuss this further, I'm just going to let this one go today because we haven't really had any bite on that. And unless you need anything else or, Scott, if you have anything to had, then that's me.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Anything, Scott?

SCOTT MCCORMICK: Nope. Nothing from me.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Okay. Barbara, why don't we turn to channel three on CSG matters? It's up on the screen.

BARBARA WANNER: Okay. All righty. Okay. This whole NomCom review has become a mess. On the 13th, as Steve notes, I emailed Council leadership, indicating our support for a position actually developed, originally, by the IPC, which would maintain the status quo while a holistic review of the NomCom is undertaken, as called for in recommendation 10 of the NomCom implementation recommendations, to examine constituency overlaps.

For example, from what I understand, there are some NCUC-type members who belong to ALAC and vice versa. So, the IPC's point, which I feel is well-taken, is that before you start talking about revising the Bylaws and giving the GNSO authority to restructure its representation on the NomCom, let's undertake this holistic review.

I forwarded my intervention, which provided historical background as to why the BC originally was allocated a seat representing small and large business constituencies and the importance of retaining that, especially now, the way the digital economy and the internet economy has developed. Small business representation is all the more critical, given the startups and so forth that we've begun to see in this space.

Helpfully, the Registry group also came out in opposition to the Bylaw amendment and in support of the position that was presented by the IPC. We still don't know where the ISPCP will come down on this or the NCSG. So, I don't know if this is going to be resolved by the 21st of August. We'd hoped to secure a GNSO-wide consensus on this by the 21st of August, in anticipation of the next meeting, I believe, of the Implementation Review Team.

So, the last thing we want is for this to be thrown into the … Well, the last thing that a good portion of the participants in these past calls of the GNSO leadership want to see happen is for this to get thrown into the empowered community process because it will be long, drawn out, and bluntly speaking, will enable constituents who do not participate on the GNSO to have a say in how our NomCom representation is allocated.

So, I don't know what's going to happen, guys—whether they'll just— the deadline will be extended until after the US Labor Day, which would be the 7th of September or what. That's all I know about that right now. Can you scroll—

STEVE DELBIANCO: Barbara, before you leave that topic, I wanted to pay particular compliments to how you've made some lemonade out of these lemons here because the NomCom restructuring and implementation could only hurt the BC. So, achieving this maintenance of status quo with a holistic review, and getting support not only from IPC and ISPs but from Registries, is a major win. I know it's not done yet and still could come undone if NCSG and the Registrars go a different direction. But this would be very helpful so please keep after it. And thanks for all you've done so far.

BARBARA WANNER: Well, my pleasure. And I guess I just ask that Chantelle continue to loop in both you and Claudia on all emails—Chantelle and Brenda— concerning this NomCom issue because I unfortunately, will be off the

grid for about the next 10 days. So, I don't want this … If there's an important decision made, I would hope that a BC member could be there to weigh in and reiterate our position.

Let's see. Okay. In terms of the ICANN 69 block schedule, we are also … There was a leadership—excuse me, a planning call, I guess—earlier this week or late last week, concerning how to handle the plenary sessions. Right now, the block schedule has three plenary sessions allocated, if you will. However, there are six proposals for plenary sessions. And I don't … Again, it's unclear to me now how ICANN Org will handle this. They may send us an email, asking us to vote on our top three preferences. And obviously, the two BC proposals will rank high for us. And then, I would need, perhaps, consumer protection based on an email—a helpful email that we received from Fred.

And also, too—and, Chantelle, please jump in—I believe there was some discussion of why are we wedded to these three slots? Could we do without one of the other forums—public forums or something— which aren't quite so effective in a virtual setting, for a fourth plenary session? So, it's a little bit of a fluid situation. And it's unclear whether there will be another call—another planning call to hash this out—or whether they'll simply ask us to rank them through an email vote. So, that's where we are on that. Can you scroll down a bit more, Steve?

STEVE DELBIANCO: That's the bottom.

EN

BARBARA WANNER: Oh! That's the bottom. Okay. So, that's where we are right now. Right now, it looks like we are going to … In terms of our actual meetings, it looks like we are trying to get a CSG closed call scheduled during the week. Oh, goodness. It's, I think, that first full week in October—yeah, sometime during the week of October 5th—to give us plenty of time to get our ducks in a row for our subsequent meetings with the Board, which will be on Thursday the 15th.

And then, our CSG open meeting, which will be on the 21st, I believe. When would that be? What block would that be, Chantelle? I can't remember. It might conflict with the drafting of the GAC communique. But we felt that a slot on the 21st for the CSG open meeting, there were less conflicts and more opportunities for participation by the community at large.

So, I would welcome people's suggestions as to topics that you want to raise with our meeting—with the Board in particular. We do not … In the past, we have allocated 45 minutes to a joint CSG dialog with the Board on EPDP issues. But we do not have a CSG-wide consensus on this, correct? ISPCP taking a slightly different view?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yes.

BARBARA WANNER: Okay. So, how do people want to address our concerns about the EPDP? We certainly could do that as part of the 15 minutes that the BC would be allocated for our own dialog with the Board. I would then welcome

EN

suggestions as to what we might address jointly, with the other two constituencies, with the Board.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Maybe Phase—not Phase 2 itself but the next batch of priority two items, that there's a chance that we will have common ground with the ISPCP. So, it's not so much focusing on the SSAD, that by this time, will be probably defeated, but rather—

BARBARA WANNER: Okay. So, that would be the recommendations 19 through 22 that Margie just walked us through—Margie and Mark?

STEVE DELBIANCO: That's what I'm thinking, Barbara. Yeah.

BARBARA WANNER: Yeah? Okay. All right. Well, I'll raise that. We'll have a CSG ExCom planning call that week—hopefully during the week of September 7th. And I will raise that as the BC's proposal. And then, just welcome any thoughts people have as to when you want to meet Becky and Matthew. Before, during, after ICANN week? Let me know. Oh. And then, on the 28th of August …

STEVE DELBIANCO: I have it on the screen.

BARBARA WANNER: Yeah.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Has this date been firmed up?

BARBARA WANNER: Yeah. Has that been firmed up, Chantelle? Do you know—that meeting—that informal dialog with Göran and Board members concerning our letter, our April letter?

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Hi, Barbara. Yes. Let me bring it up right now. I think the invitation went to the CSG ExCom for … Yep, the 31st of August.

BARBARA WANNER: Okay, 31st. Great. Okay. I know it's on my calendar because I can remember accepting that. So, I know this is technically a meeting for CSG ExCom. And I insisted on invited policy experts. So, if we … I do not think the CSG would object if, for example, Steve, Margie, and Mark joined the call. Just throwing that out.

STEVE DELBIANCO: And Alex? Alex Deacon as well.

BARBARA WANNER:	Right. Alex Deacon and let's see. And even if we talk about enforcement, Mason.
STEVE DELBIANCO:	That's right. Let's see if we can get them all on there, Chantelle. Make that request—Alex, Mark and Margie as our EPDP reps, and Mason Cole.
BARBARA WANNER:	Got it. Okay. I think that's it.
STEVE DELBIANCO:	Thanks, Barbara.
BARBARA WANNER:	Nothing else new to report.
STEVE DELBIANCO:	Great work on that. Any other questions for your policy calendar? I don't see any hands up so I'll stop sharing this and let Chantelle put the agenda back up on your screen. Thanks, Chantelle. And let's move to the Operations and Finance report. Jimson, the floor is yours.
JIMSON OLUFUYE:	Okay. Thank you very much, Steve. And greetings, everyone. Let me begin with the finance. As usual, with regard to membership dues, I think we are now at the 76% milestone. So, thanks to members that

continue to take the financial health of the BC seriously, and as such, pay their dues expeditiously. All the same, if anyone still has not seen this invoice, please reach me or Joseph, the invoicing secretariat as soon as possible. As you know, election is coming. So, it is only members that are fully in good standing that will be able to participate in the elections.

Secondly, the process of onboarding the new general counsel, Marylenny of I&O Law has been concluded. She and the accountant are now be responsible for managing our accounts with Wells Fargo. And their action, as usual, is in line with our charter and is subject to the direction of the vice-chair of finance and operation and the ExCom, of course. The ExCom authorizes every transaction or every action. And the vice-chair of finance and operation directs for implementation. But for me, or the vice-chair, to keep a tab on the activity on the accounts, I have the viewing access only to the accounts. So, I can see what's going on. I also get alerted if there's anything going on.

Thirdly, you could recall that we normally put in additional budget requests into ICANN annual budget. Every year, we put in for leadership development that will encourage new leadership from developing countries. Unfortunately, this year, in the ICANN FY21 budget, that request was not approved. Well, at the same time, the ICANN CROP—the CROP application—was approved. That is for three slots. So, for leadership was declined. But we have one leadership development slot in our own FY21 budget.

So, we will be talking more about it going forward. So, members that might want to express interest in using the opportunity, both for leadership development from the BC budget and that of the CROP from

the ICANN Budget … CROP is Community Regional Outreach Program. It is a program we actually started way back, to encourage outreach across regions of ICANN, to bring in new members or new membership.

Well, you might wonder why was it declined? Well, ICANN is saying at least broadening the effectiveness of the fellowship program. On the basis of that, more people will be able to come in. But anyway, let's see how that goes, also with the CROP—the use of CROP. And now, we're still in the pandemic. So, we don't know how it's going to be. So, we're not going to have the opportunity to use any of these until maybe next year—January next year perhaps.

Also approved is the additional budget request for printing of newsletters. But that funding has been coalesced into the communication budget head, about $30,000 that serves all the SOs and ACs for printing and communication requests—so, sort of like being streamlined.

On the operations, I will use this opportunity to welcome three new members. Two of them were recognized the last meeting. But I will just repeat them again Hypernames Ltd. of UK, represented by Nikul Sanghvi. Nikul was on this call but he had to leave for a business meeting—urgent business meeting. Also welcomed is Buckley Media of the US, represented by Kate Buckley. So, Kate, you are welcome. And we also have a new member, DomainAgents Platform Inc., Canada, represented by Ryan McKegney.

Secondly on the operations, plans for the BC officers' election is still on course, as usual, around October/November timeline. So, expect formal

notification by early September. Offices open for elections, those were the chair of the BC, the vice-chair of policy coordination, and vice-chair of finance and operation, which I occupy it. And this is my last year—my last term, so to speak. And also, the office for the Commercial Stakeholder Group, CSG, representative. For your information, the current CSG rep is Barbara Wanner. Vice-chair of policy coordination, as you know, Steve DelBianco, and the chair, Claudia Selli.

Immediately after the election for the officers, that of the statutory committees will take place. And the committees concerned are the Credentials Committee. The Credentials Committee have been working very well, very hard and efficiently. So, we thank them for their work. And also, the Finance Committee. [That of] the Finance Committee, the status really is the vice-chair of finance and operation that chairs that committee. But of course, the members who also need to rotate after three terms of being in that position. So, for the Credentials, we will need to have election for the chair of the Credentials Committee and also members of the committee.

We have another committee called the Outreach Committee, by the [decision] of ExCom. The vice-chair of finance and operation coordinates that. And it normally works based on the specific ICANN meeting region—stakeholders that may show interest in the [conduct] of outreach to business in that region. So, it is a regional focus. So, members that are based in a particular region that ICANN meeting will be taking place, [inaudible] expressed interest in organizing business outreach—the vice-chairs who coordinate that. That's how that works.

And finally, I would like to welcome Brenda Brewer, who used to be with us in the secretariat, way back in 2014, before Chantelle resumed. She has been assigned by Org to support us. So, Brenda, you are most welcome. Brenda has worked in many areas in ICANN and she's got a tremendous experience. She's very, very efficient, just like Chantelle. Welcome. So, that's it from me.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Any questions for Jimson? Any other business? As Jimson mentioned and Barbara put into the chat—term-limited. Barbara and I are term-limited in our positions on the BC officer. And it's important for other BC members to step up to these positions. We can give you a detailed briefing on how we do the job, how many hours it takes, some of the challenges and rewards that come with it. We've done it for a long time. And would be happy to brief any of you. You can reach out to Barbara and I, Claudia, or Jimson privately and we'll do a briefing. But at this point, we're unaware of anybody who's indicated an interest. So, please think about it, everyone.

All right. That's it. If there's no other business, we will meet again at this time on Wednesday, the 2nd of September. Good luck tomorrow in the Council, Scott and Marie. We'll be watching. Chantelle, you can end the call and everyone can have another 15 minutes back.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Okay. Thank you, Steve. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]