
BRENDA BREWER: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Welcome to the Business Constituency membership call on the 3rd of June, 2021 at 15:00 UTC. Today's call is recorded. Kindly have your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking. Attendance is taken from Zoom participation. And with that, I will turn the call over to Mason Cole. Thank you.

MASON COLE: Thank you, Brenda. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening everyone. Mason Cole here, chair of the BC. Good to have you with us today for what is going to be, as usual, a busy meeting. So, welcome to the call on 3rd of June, 2021 and we're going to get started right away. We have a little bit of a hybrid meeting today, in that we have an office-holder coming up for reelection. And rather than have a full-on candidates call as we sometimes do, we're going to include some back and forth with Marie Pattullo on her candidacy for GNSO councilor. We're going to move into the policy discussion from there and then through the rest of our regular agenda.

So, before we get started, any additions or requests as it regards to the agenda this morning? Okay. Very good. All right. So, moving to item number two, then, GNSO councilor candidate interaction with Marie Pattullo. I'm going to turn this part of the agenda over to Lawrence to run so, Lawrence, the floor is yours. Thank you.

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.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Thank you, Mason. And good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone on today's call. Right about now, we will be having a candidates call for the BCs councilor seats. This happens to be Marie's seat and she is up for re-election. After the nomination period started, we had Barbara nominate Marie for this position and was seconded by Tola Sogbesan. And so, the nomination of Marie is valid. It also happens that this is the only nomination that came in for this position, which for me is an affirmation of the great work that Marie has been doing as the BC councilor in this position.

And in fulfilling the dictates of the BC charter, for the next couple of minutes, we will allow her to reintroduce herself and now take questions from the BC membership, if there is any. In the course of reintroducing herself, Marie will also talk about what she has done and what she looks forward to in continuing in this position as councilor. Right after that, I will yield the floor back to the chair. So, at this point, I would like to welcome Marie to take the floor.

MARIE PATTULLO: Thank you. I'm conscious that we have very long agenda, as always, and I really don't want to take up any more time than I need to. Briefly, I hope you all know me by now. I'm based in Brussels, in Belgium. I am with AIM, the European brands association. AIM has been a member of the BC since it was founded, so right since the beginning. That wasn't me. That was my colleague and predecessor and friend, Philip Sheppard. I took over from him.

I have been working as your councilor for some time already. As you know, and as I always say, our role in Council is to represent you. It's to represent your views. We are directed ... Not everyone in Council is but the BC tells us what to do. And Mark's role my role is to try to do that. You all know what the key subjects are. They're not changing. They're not going away. You all know that we suffer a lot of frustration at the political level, at the Council level, because we don't have the votes to get things through. But we do make alliances. We do make friends. We do always stick to our same position, no matter where we are. And I do firmly believe that if we're not involved, we're definitely not going to get anything we want.

Lawrence, I really don't want to go any further than that but of course I am more than happy to answer any questions anyone may have, either now or at any time. Thank you.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Thank you, Marie, for that. Now, we'll leave the floor to BC members that have any questions for Marie. If you do, please raise your hands and you will be recognized and given the floor. Or if you want to type it in the chat, there's an opportunity to do so. While we're waiting for questions, I would just want to intimate the membership that right after today's meeting, the process will be that you would expect ballot tallies in email to you if you are the contact person and financially up-to-date. And once that happens, between the time it's stipulated on the ballot, you have an opportunity to cast your vote. We would like that everybody does this. And at the close of the election, we will be announcing the results for the election. That's how it will be.

Not seeing any hands and not seeing anything in the chat. Marie, we want to thank you for stepping forward to volunteer your time and we are confident that when you to make it back into this role, that BC will continue to enjoy from your wealth of experience and expertise. Thank you for all you do for us as the Business Constituency. BC chair, Mason, I give the floor back to you. Thank you.

MASON COLE:

Thank you very much, Lawrence. Thank you, Marie, for that intervention. I'm sure Marie is happy to answer any questions going forward. So, if you'd like to contact her independently, as she mentioned, she's available to anyone who has a question. So, thank you, Marie, for standing for office again and for all your service to the BC.

All right, before we move to item number three, I have two things I want to cover briefly just on issues coming up. One is, our next BC meeting is going to be during ICANN71 and it'll be on the 16th of June. And I wanted to alert members that we've extended an invitation to M3AAWG, the anti-abuse working group that works to combat abuse in the DNS in various forms. We extended an invitation to M3AAWG to present to us results of their survey, which BC members were invited to participate in and I hope you did participate.

They'll have those survey results published very soon and are going to be our guests during the open session during ICANN71. And they'll give a presentation and take questions from BC members about how we can collaborate going forward on DNS Abuse. So, I encourage you, if you haven't made time yet in your schedule, to make the BC call on the 16th

of June. I do hope you will do so because it's going to be an interesting and productive meeting.

The other thing I wanted to cover briefly is, in the last meeting, we discussed BC priorities as they related to what we want to accomplish over the next 6 to 12 months. And we also advanced those priorities within the Commercial Stakeholder Group, the CSG, which is the group on the non-contracted side to which the BC belongs. And I just wanted to report that we've had very positive feedback on those priorities. And I think it's helped us to orient our discussions with the ICANN board, with other constituencies, and with others about where the BC wants to accomplish some objectives over the near term. So, again, those are fluid and I'm happy to reshare those with BC members if you'd find that useful but that's just a note.

I want to give particular thanks to Steve DelBianco for representing those priorities in a meeting last week that I couldn't make with the CSG and our appointed board members. We got good feedback on those priorities from board members as well. So, those weren't on the agenda but I wanted to get to them before we got too far. And I believe that concludes where we are on item number two. So, let's go to item three which is our usual policy discussion. Steve, may I give the floor to you, please?

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thanks, Mason. Do you see the policy calendar in the screen?

MASON COLE:

We do.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Okay, great. I sent this around yesterday so all of you should have it in your inboxes. I'll start at the top, is that we had two comments posted since our last BC member call. The first was June the 2nd. We posted to our public website the revised BC position on the NIS2 Directive in Europe. You all approved this two weeks ago but we felt that it would be better to withhold it from the public website until after we had had a series of meetings with European parliament members and they had conducted their meetings, which we'll summarize a little bit later in the policy calendar section. So, it was Ben Wallace's advice that we simply delay by two weeks to make it public because the BC wants to honor our commitments to being transparent and accountable but, in this case, we did a two-week delay between approval and public publication.

And then on the 1st of June, we did a comment, thanks to the efforts of Andy Abrams and Tim Smith. They did a fabulous job digging through our prior comments on the subsequent procedures or SubPro final outputs. And we're able to emphasize the BC's most influential points for consideration by the board. It ended up being a bit longer than I had originally conceived because we went through all of our prior comments and grabbed the narratives that were essential to maybe move opinions on the board. And it turned out there were an awful lot of open positions that needed some input. So, that was submitted and the board will take that up, I think, at the board meeting, that's on their next agenda. Thanks again to Tim and Andy.

All right. We have one open public comment right now that deserves your attention and has to do with the North American engagement plan. As you know, ICANN org does these engagement plans for different regions around the world and they use it to increase the appreciation and visibility of ICANN and to try to get more people to participate.

So, North America, as you might well imagine, U.S. and Canada, probably doesn't need a lot more engagement than we already have with ICANN. And nonetheless, it's one of the five regions that gets some attention. This is a great opportunity for a relatively new BC member with North American, say, roots or North American residents to weigh in with the BC on what's in this plan. These are very simple engagement plans. It's the same thing. All of you in your business lives see when somebody comes up with a high-level marketing and strategic relationship plan. It's only seven pages long.

And so I'm looking at the BC participant list to see if I can get a volunteer to help analyze that plan—somebody who hasn't volunteered before. It would be a great opportunity. It's a light lift and our comment itself might only be a page long. Any new members that'd like to volunteer and help with that?

TIM SMITH:

Hi, Steve. I guess I'm not exactly a new member but happy to look it over and help with it.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Well, Tim, I appreciate that. And as I mentioned your name earlier, you and Andy did the work on the SubPro, so thank you. Thank you for that. Who's going to pitch in to help Tim so that he doesn't continue to have to carry the load? Can we have one more volunteer with a North American perspective? And John Berard will help, too—an expert communicator, the best I know. So, John and Tim, you make a great team on that. Thank you. Thank you.

All right. Next up. I mentioned earlier that the BC had two weeks ago approved an updated position on NIS2. And several BC members worked with Ben, Claudia included, and Mason and they met with one of the members of the European parliament to walk through what we had done in the amendments with respect to Article 23. And that meeting went well. We're probably not going to get into the details of the members and staff that were on.

But then last week, both the committees of the European parliament, the ITRE committee and IMCO committee, they held meetings. And at this point, we're waiting for NEPs on the committee to suggest their own amendments to NIS2. So, by middle of this month, we should have a better idea of the amendments and their level of interest and objections to Article 23. And then it will take till the fall—until October—for the Parliament's lead committee to vote on those amendments.

Now, at the same time, in parallel, the Council of ministers is moving a little more slowly and they have a working party that's been discussing NIS2. And they're going to present at a meeting that is supposed to occur, I guess it was yesterday and today. So, we are looking forward to getting a status report from them. If any BC members are aware what

was published at the Council Minister meeting, you can share it now but otherwise we won't know until next week. Was anybody tuned into the Council Ministers meeting yesterday? All right. Don't see anybody.

All right. I now wanted to turn to a quick update on the EPDP for Phase 2 and for that Mark Svancarek and Margie lead our representation. And we have Margie on the call. I don't see Mark but at least Margie is on the call. And Margie, why don't you update our colleagues on the current status of the report? I have a link to the report there. And the fact that we're not having a meeting today is indicative of significant move by leadership and staff. Margie?

MARGIE MILAM:

Sure. Hi everyone. And I was out last week so Steve probably has a lot more detail as to how we got to the final report—not final report but the version that we drafted and published yesterday. Essentially, the report got rushed through to publication because it was pretty clear there was no consensus on anything significant. And so, what you'll see in the public comment forum is a series of questions to try to inform the work of the EPDP, once the public comment period is closed. And there's very little in terms of substantive policy recommendations.

The main policy recommendation which we'll be soliciting public comment on is basically a statement that says that there's no proposed updates to the Recommendation One, regarding whether or not to differentiate between the legal persons' and natural persons' data. And that's really the main thrust of this phase. So, I think from the BC perspective, I think we'll have to think about how to respond to some of

the questions that would help inform that question. And Steve, perhaps you could chime in on what led to that kind of shift in the actual text of the initial report.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thanks, Margie. It's been a real battle to try to move even things like non-binding guidance into a report. And whenever we are unable to get a consensus because it's blocked by the Contracted Parties, staff and leadership seem inclined to say that there is no recommendation and that's not exactly what happens. We're endeavoring to get the report to reflect that there's a difference of opinion and that the fact that there's no recommendation is due to the fact that there was no consensus on having a recommendation, which I think as Margie just indicated, opens the door for us in the five questions for public comment to be able to weigh in during the period that it's open.

Margie, leadership said yesterday that the final report would of course reflect the public comments that come in but we all know how that works. If public comments come in on either extreme on a given question, they sort of cancel each other out and we don't end up seeing a significantly revised final report. So, our plan is and has been to try to keep alive our alliances with the GAC, the ALAC, the IPC, and the SSAC so that those comments can come in and advice can go to the board from those advisory committees.

On the call that was held last week, there were 26 pages of items that various members of the EPDP said we cannot live with in the final report. So, the call last week was one that focused on, what are we even

doing here, if we have a final report we think represents consensus and there's more "can't live with" objections than the length of the report itself? And so we weighed in and said that the Contracted Parties and the NCSG are getting their way. There's no guidance or standards being proposed. They're getting their way. They're going to preserve the Temp Spec for WHOIS. So they ought to be a little more magnanimous, I said, instead of dismissing out of hand and even belittling the concerns of the GAC, ALAC, BC and IPC have raised.

And I think that cooler heads are going to have to prevail in the Contracted Party House. If they proceed with insulting members of the GAC, by dismissing their concerns, it's going to come back to bite them, especially if NIS2 is approved by the European parliament and transposed by a few nations.

So, Margie, I think that in the next week, we will probably open that public comment period. Perhaps it will wait until it gets through Council, so after ICANN71. And then we're going to need to generate an awful lot of public comments that have a consistent theme to respond to the open questions. Is there anything else you want to add to that or any questions from the members?

MARGIE MILAM:

The only thing I'd add is, we tried really hard to see if we could elevate the recommendations from guidance to something that would be a little more meaningful. We even suggested best practices earlier and that was just completely shot down. And one of the things I wanted to share that Steve mentioned was this belittling of positions.

It actually is surprising how disrespectful they are when members of the EPDP, from the GAC in particular, from the European commission raise concerns or objections and they're just dismissed out of hand. And it's real striking that they would do that when they're potentially facing more significant regulation in the NIS2. And there's certainly a shift, at least in what we're seeing in the strength of the recommendations and NIS2. So, it is a bit surprising that they would be so bold with the European Commission members. And actually, Mark is on the call. I think he probably wants to weigh in as well.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Please do, Mark.

MARK SVANCAREK:

Thanks. To be honest, I'm not actually surprised at the disrespectfulness. I felt like I was being gaslighted for the last two years, being told that the data is not important, that everything we need is already there, etc. But what was really interesting during this phase was the degree to which the GAC was being very deliberately and overtly attacked and disrespected. I thought that was amazing.

And then when we got into this final report, it was very amazing how the last round of feedback that was given by both registries and registrars was, as Steve and Margie said, very, very dismissive saying things like, "No evidence has been shown, etc." So that did result in us being very aggressive in our "cannot live with" remarks because a lot of those last-minute comments made it into the draft of the report and had to be rebutted.

So, again, not entirely surprised by the treatment we received. It's just the intensity of it was a lot more than in previous phases and it was pretty frustrating. And as a result of this whole process, what you see in the report will be a collection of questions for the community to respond to but nothing of any real substance. And I wouldn't expect that any policy would come out of it, just very loosely phrased guidance, not even best practices, for what it's worth.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

At this point really the best we can hope for is to set the table for when NIS2 comes through and requires disclosure, accuracy, publication, when it requires differentiation, that ICANN will understand the need for registries and registrars to comply with that law, even if they don't change the policy to require it. The current stance taken by ICANN and the Contracted Parties is that the policy that was adopted in the EPDP would allow registrars to comply with the NIS2 if it's approved. We keep saying that ICANN require compliance with the NIS2 when it comes in, on a global basis, as opposed to simply allowing registrars and registries to pick and choose whether they'll comply with it. But that's a battle we're not going to be able to have unless and until NIS2 is approved by the European Parliament in the next six months.

MARK SVANCAREK:

So, let me give an example of something that was very astonishing and frustrating for the GAC. The Contracted Parties, as you say, asserted that the existing policy is perfectly sufficient for everyone to comply with the new directive. What they're not acknowledging though is that, based on

the policy that's in place, even the guidance that's being generated right now, we can't guarantee any sort of standardization. So, on how you distinguish natural persons from legal persons, this will again be unstandardized, implemented completely differently by every contracted party and the way that they communicate that status to each other and to requesters will again not be standardized.

So, if you think about the way that the old WHOIS system was set up, how everybody had their own implementation and it was on the client side, then you had to try to parse it together and figure out what was going on, you can anticipate that the SSAD will have similar concerns because of lack of standardization, because of lack of policy—nothing that ICANN can really can really enforce, based on past history. So, that is the concern that I have based on where we are today in this phase. That's it for me.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Mark, thank you. Thanks Margie, as well. Any questions from members of the BC delegation? Okay. Don't see any hands up. Thanks again. So, now we're going to turn to Council, channel two. Marie is on the line and can talk about Council. Marie, just tell me how to scroll and I'll lead us through it. Thank you.

MARIE PATTULLO:

Thanks, Steve. First up, how Mark and Margie are still sane, I do not know. Thank you, guys, so much for all the work you've done. It's been extraordinary. At the last Council you know we got a report from Keith Drazek, who's the chair of EPDP 2A, who told us that you all agreed,

more or less, that voluntary guidance is worthwhile and achievable. Well, there's not much else I can say to that.

The last Council was two weeks ago. The next one is going to be two weeks from now. We don't have the agenda for the next one. But as you will see from what Steve's put in into the policy calendar, we do know some of the issues that will come up.

One, if I can go back to what happened at the last Council, we agreed to initiate another EPDP, this time about internationalized domain names, IDNs. Mark Datysgeld, my co-councilor, he was on the drafting team that's got us this far and now we're actually looking for volunteers. So call for volunteers has officially come out today. We'll be sending it through to you as soon as. This is something that ties in, not just to the use of internationalized domain names but also to abuse, which was something else that was also discussed at the last Council and will be discussed at the next. So, Steve, if it's okay with you, I'd actually like Brian King to jump in here because he has a specific point about IDNs and abuse. Is that okay?

BRIAN KING:

Hi, Marie. Sure. And I'm glad you called on me now because I need to drop in a couple minutes. But yes. I didn't want our BC colleagues to overlook the opportunity to leverage the IDN EPDP to address homoglyph domain attacks. I sent a note on BC private just before this call started. Most likely, no one else has volunteered. From the IPC, we've got the [head of] IPC in this EPDP. And there is an opportunity to

make some progress on an important aspect of DNS abuse, which I think is potentially not considered strongly enough or not well known.

So, the homoglyph lookalike domain names can be very powerful in phishing attacks and in lookalike domain names that look very similar to brands and can be used in very effective phishing attacks. So, that's not the entirety of this IDN EPDP. There will be some things about labeled generation, and what TLDs look like in the root, and the differences between a TLD that's in simplified Chinese characters versus traditional Chinese characters and how that should be treated. But just flagging that there is a very real opportunity for us to make some policy changes that should have a positive impact or negative impact, I guess, on DNS Abuse, depending on how you look at it. Thanks.

MARIE PATTULLO:

Couldn't find my unmute button. Thank you so much for that, Brian. It's a really good point to make. And please, if any members can spare the time, we would be very grateful if you could sign up for this. We were going to have this for one year. At the moment, we're going to let the EPDP decide what they think it should be but it's not going to be, we hope, a multiannual process. Much of this has been scoped already.

Another thing that came up at Council was the SSAC—now, that's the technical people. They have done a really interesting document on abuse that looks at not just what ICANN does or can do but if we can get to some kind of interoperability of procedures, solutions that could be scaled outside the ICANN community. So, that is a really very interesting

text to read and their presentation was great. It really was. If you can listen to the Council recording, please do.

Finally, my old favorite, my dear friend, accuracy. You've heard me banging on about this for the last few meetings because we're supposed to be having a scoping group which is what it says on the tin. We're going to get together a bunch of experts, including the superb Susan Kawaguchi, to scope out what we mean when we talk about data accuracy and what we need to do. And I thought this was going to be agreed at the last Council and the Council before. And then I thought it was going to be agreed at the Council coming up. But, oh no, because ...

Anyway, all of that say in the attachment that Steve put into the policy calendar that went yesterday, you've got a new version of this instruction text, for want of a better word, that we're going to give to the scoping team when it is formed. It's a lot better than the last version. This is actually drafted by corporates. There are still a couple of issues I've got—small questions I've got. We're going to have another Council small team conversation about this next week. And Pam Little, the vice chair, has asked that we get back to her by the end of this week on this document that you've all got, that Steve is now scrolling through. If you do have anything, let me know.

As you know, what we are saying is, let's set up a group of experts called a scoping team who can scope. And that means they look at the resources we already have. They look at the studies we already have and then they decide if we need a new study and the way forward. I would have liked to have had better news for you on that, but I don't. Back to you Steve, unless you have any questions.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Are you being opposed by any particular contingent in Council, Marie?

MARIE PATTULLO: I'm sorry?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Is the accuracy scoping project being blocked or opposed by any contingent in Council?

MARIE PATTULLO: Well, everybody claims that it's terribly important. Obviously, the NCSG don't because it would be terribly expensive and not fair, apparently, because all of us in business know that maintaining non-accurate databases is a jolly good use of your time and resources. On the registry/registrar side, as I said, Kurt actually drafted this document, which I do think is much better than the last. But you have to remember, historically, there was a lot of hyperbole, "Oh no. If we have to have accurate data, that means that all domain names will be deleted from the root," which is total twaddle, twaddle being a technical term that means total twaddle.

Going forward, when you've got a new registrant, you ask them for accurate data. There are steps, as you know, Steve, at NIS2 and also, for those of you that aren't following it, the drafted Digital Services Act, the DSA, where we talk about know your business customer, including the verification of this data. So, you do that going forward and/or you do it

on renewal. If you're asking me to say, what are they saying in public? Does that correlate to what they say behind closed doors? I don't know. But I do know that I'm not letting this go. Just imagine a little terrier with a bone. This is my terrier impersonation.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

There is no mention of NIS requirement for accuracy in this scoping report. So by the time October rolls around, the European Parliament could well approve a mandate for accuracy. And it's different than the GDPR where a registrant or a data subject could demand that their data be updated. This is different. This is an obligation for the controller to have accurate data.

MARIE PATTULLO:

The reason that you don't see NIS2 mentioned there—although you're right. I will actually put it back in. That's a good catch—is that the document that was supposed to go forward talked about accuracy only in relation to GDPR and maybe NIS2. And we disagreed because accuracy is not limited to that tiny little proportion of ICANN's work. It should go much, much further than that.

Now NIS2, as you know, we're not going to get it in October. It's not going to be that fast. Both the Parliament and the Council they both need to discuss and then go forward but it is coming. It is coming. And some of the current ... There are lots of different parts of the European parliament who are dealing with the DSA as well. And some of the current amendments on the table there go further with the so-called know your business customer and go further into verification. So, there

is going to be precedent for this at European level. Yeah. I'll stop talking.
Thanks, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Marie. Appreciate it. Are there any questions for Marie on Council? All right. I don't see any, so I'm going to turn it over to Waudou as our CSG liaison, Waudou please.

TOBA OBANIYI: I'm so sorry. Is it still possible for me to speak?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Of course.

TOBA OBANIYI: Hi everyone. I'm calling from Nigeria. I'm literally very new to BC so a lot of things are very, very strange or new to me so forgive me. Sorry if I seem to be unaware of certain things. But my understanding, from what has been said so far regarding abuse, is that we're trying to get a situation where registrants provide accurate details or there's some kind of loyal customer going on when a customer or a registrant is registering or, in future, renew their domains.

Now, my question is, how do we get this to work across several regions that will have, obviously, several systems in place? Again, forgive me if I'm out of scope but my understanding is we're hoping for a situation where all registrars and their resellers do some form of verification for

the names that are registered. And please correct me if I'm wrong. So, I'm just curious to know how that will happen, especially in regions where there aren't very, very clear documentations or it's not as easy to do that verification process. Thank you very much.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Toba, I wanted to give you one distinction. If the NIS2 is adopted by certain European governments, it would only be binding on registrars whose users or registrants are members of those countries and subject to it. So, it would definitely be a patchwork and it would not necessarily apply to registrars, registrants in other parts of the world. That is why the BC, in what Margie discussed earlier, or Marie discussed, the BC is pushing for ICANN to have mandatory policies, either through consensus policies or contract obligations, to address the DNS Abuse through accuracy.

We are a long way from that since it is opposed by the Contracted Parties and the Non-Commercial Stakeholders Group. So, it's a delicate dance between having governments adopt requirements so that some registrars have to comply with that law, regardless of what ICANN policies are. And then we try to leverage that into a global standard through ICANN's contracts. Does that help?

TOBA OBANIYI:

Yes, that does. And honestly, I actually think that that should be the future because we have a situation where just anybody can just hop on, register a domain, defraud people and get away with it, right? So, I do absolutely agree and that's one of the reasons why I joined the abuse

committee, DNS abuse, to hopefully also contribute to that. And I think it should be global also, as well, in scope because these issues affect the entire—everyone everywhere, right?

But I'm just also thinking about the practicality. And I'm sure that has been thought about. Maybe it hasn't been discussed. And what I was just trying to understand is that for the European countries, it's very straightforward, I'm sure. But when you start going to beyond well-developed countries and you start going to more developing countries where there aren't very, very easy electronic means of verification, I'm just thinking about what exactly are the plans of the scope to ensure that this is practicable? Or is this something that we see that maybe will come into effect in a couple of years and also considering what's available in those regions? That's what I'm just trying to get. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Yeah. You should assume that about a year from now, those subject to European law will have to comply but it may be years until ICANN has contractual obligations. And so, Toba, I would encourage you to join the accuracy scoping team once the draft charter comes together and is approved by Council. I hope you will.

TOBA OBANIYI:

Well, I hope I'll be available to but thank you very much.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Okay. Waudu, over to you.

WAUDO SIGANGA:

Thank you, Steve. I think first of all I need to thank you for making a very nice eloquent presentation at the GNSO appointed and affiliated board members meeting on the BC and CSG topics that are of high consequence. And also thank Mason for making the same presentation at the CSG members meeting. I'd also like to thank you for really making a good summary, which will make my reporting here very short and precise. You have put a very good summary in the notification that you have sent out today.

So, as I've mentioned, the CSG is working on a framework of priorities which have been reached at with consensus. And Steve has given us a summary of those consensus priorities. I'll just go through them very fast so that at least we have some idea of what they are. The most important topic for the BC at the moment, actually, is DNS abuse. And our proposals are to try to see how we can decrease incidents of DNS abuse.

So, the BC is making, through the CSG, specific proposals. These include cooperating with the DNS Abuse Institute, as well as the Contracted Party House. And so far, in fact, the BC has held a meeting with the Contracted Party House and is planning more meetings with the Contracted Party House, discussing issues of how to mitigate DNS abuse. The BC is also advocating for new ICANN contractual tools in the registry and registrar accreditation agreements, as well as advocating for the issue of DNS abuse to be sufficiently addressed and mitigated before the next round.

Of course, as Steve has indicated, the IPC disagrees with this so we are also in talks with the IPC to see how we can reach a common ground on the issue, pending the next round before the DNS abuse issue has been adequately addressed.

Another priority issue is to do with the legitimate access to registration data. The BC is advocating, through the CSG, that ICANN needs to be a controller as defined by the GDPR with NIS2 obligations. We're also advocating for accurate registration data and specifically the reactivation of the accuracy reporting system.

Then, some other issues also relating to ICANN compliance include having a standard DNS reporting system that the BC is advocating to be implemented. There are also other issues to do with holistic review, which are also priority issues. And we have some members of the CSG, specifically Wolf-Ulrich and Tony Holmes who are following up on those ones. And Steve from the BC is also discussing with ALAC on the same. So, Steve, thank you very much for this summary.

And then looking ahead, the CSG has two more meetings related to ICANN71. On the 9th of June, just after the BC outreach event, the CSG will have a meeting with the GAC Public Safety Working Group that will be at 16:00 to 17:00 UTC. So, you're all invited to that one. And then on the 21st of June, the CSG will also have a meeting with ICANN full board at 18:00 to 19:30 UTC so you're also invited to that one. Thank you, Steve. That's all from me.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Waudu. Do we have any questions for CSG? As Waudu and I try to remind you all, please register for ICANN71. There's a link right here to register so that you can set up your calendar. And I attached the full schedule, which includes this week, which was Prep Week. Seeing no questions, Mason, I'll turn it back over to you. Thank you.

MASON COLE: Thank you very much, Steve, for a comprehensive review as always. Any questions for Steve or anyone else who shared policy discussions before we move on in the agenda? Okay. Very good. We have 15 minutes left in the call. Lawrence over to you please for the operations and finance report.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Thank you, chair. I want to start the finance and operations report, as usual, with the open ICANN announcements. And a number of these announcements have already been touched on by Steve and a very important one, also, by Marie. The ICANN71 Prep Week is going to be ending today. The meeting proper, very close to us so please let's register. And I look forward to seeing each and every one of us at the open BC meeting.

There is an open call for the 2022 NomCom chair and chair-elect. The BC has done very well in this regard. The current associate chair also happens to be an active BC member, Jay Sadowski. [Also, it's] having the large and small business representatives. So, hopefully, we would love to see members put in an application in this regard. I know that we would also be looking forward to a report from NomCom reps. I know that you

might be drawing closer towards trimming down towards the finals, maybe at the next BC meeting, which will be sometime in July. We might take an update around that.

There is also the call that was open today for the ... There's one for the chair of the EPDP on IDNs. Members could please take a look at the ICANN website and see if this is something that you want to step into. And aside from scouting for a chair, there's also a hunt for members and observers. I believe that the BC has very qualified members who would step into this role. The IDNs definitely will be an interesting aspect of the next round. And for new members to the BC, joining any of this might give you some more information around what the IDNs are about and how things work around it.

So, to the elections, like we announced during the candidate statement, shortly after today's meeting, we will receive ballots. Please, let's attend to them as soon as we receive them so that we can tick that off our to-do list. The opportunity to attend to your ballots will expire on the 9th of June. And by the 10th we will definitely be making an announcement on the BC private lists on the results of the ballot.

Members, we want to thank you for—thank members who have actively responded to the invoices that have been sent out. A number of you have reached us back about one or two things to be dealt with. And please know that we are attending to every of those issues. If it appears that your request has been lost, please do well to send us a reminder. But we are definitely reviewing every inquiry and we'll attend to them. Thank you for those who have responded, like I said, and please keep us in mind. Keep the fact that we need to deal with these invoices on the

front burner, for the rest of us who are still working in on it. If you require at any point ... If you feel you require another invoice to be sent, please send a mail to invoice@icannbc.org and we'll be happy to attend to this again.

I want to also bring to the attention of members that in the coming week, hopefully by next week, the ICANN71 newsletter will be out. It definitely is going to be a very interesting addition and I want to thank everyone who has made one contribution or the other towards the production of that newsletter. At this point I would want to pause for questions before moving on to the next item on the agenda. Any questions please? Okay, not seeing any, chair, may I continue with the next item on the agenda, the BC Outreach event?

MASON COLE: Please do. Thank you, Lawrence.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Thank you. So, the BC will be having an outreach event. As we all know, ICANN71 is happening in the European Union, in the EU region, and we had identified a credible partner to run an outreach with. We have had series of meetings and the ECP appeared to be actively excited and working towards this particular outreach. We will be having, as a BC representative, Marie, speaking for us. There is also going to be Arie van Bellen, the Director of ECP, which is the platform for Information Society. And Mark Esseboom from IBM. Also on the panel for the BC Outreach will be Maarten Botterman, the ICANN Chair. Let's not forget he's from this region.

It's going to be a one-hour event, which is going to hold from 15:00 UTC to 16:00 UTC. Listed in the chat, a link for members of the BC to register for this particular event. We want to emphasize that we will be trying as much as possible to keep it to an hour because right after this event, we have another engagement as the CSG with the Public Safety Working Group of the GAC.

But we want to encourage especially members of the BC from the European Union to help broadcast this outreach event using the registration link and information that we will share with members on the private list. So, kindly broadcast this event amongst your network, especially network of businesses, however large or however small startups, and associations. And hopefully the BC will be opening our doors to more members from the EU after this particular outreach event. Please [book] the date, 9th of June by 15:00 UTC.

Like I said, right after the one-hour event, for about 30 minutes thereabout, a few of us we'll be staying back to chat and answer questions that might be posed by the ECP group. I would also want to encourage members from the EU, one or two members from the EU, to kindly stay back for that segment so that we can localize discussions and might help with context that will be appreciated by those who might be in attendance from the EU.

We will also be sharing in an email, a customized backdrop for the BC, for BC members. We would like that you kindly use that for your screen, as a background for your screen, while the event is ongoing. We would want to easily identify BC members with that. We would also want to encourage members to kindly have their cameras on through the course

of the outreach event. This is to help those who are going to be participating identify with the BC—get them to see the lovely, the beautiful and handsome faces that make up the BC and how they feel that they are going to be joining a community that will be of great value to their business.

So, please book down the dates. Help mobilize participation, especially from businesses that you, as BC members, feel need to be sitting with us at the table. Set aside the one hour. Please make sure you register. Don't wait for the last minute. You can click on the chat link right now to get that done or use the material that will be sent to the private list. And for those of you within the EU, please. We can help. You can reach out to us at the end, as a back channel, to find if everything is covered or if there's anything that you can use your network to do to make the event a success.

At this point, I would want to pause for any questions that we may have before yielding the floor back to—or I'll yield the floor back to the chair to take us through the rest of the meeting. Mason, over to you.

MASON COLE:

Thank you, Lawrence. All right. Very comprehensive update as always, Lawrence. Thank you so much. And thank you in particular for all your hard work on coordinating the BC Outreach event. It looks like a very good event. I'd like to advocate for everyone on this call to make time for that event. This outreach in regions where we have ICANN meetings has been a longstanding tradition for the BC. It's an opportunity for us to showcase what we do inside of ICANN and outside of the ICANN sphere

and it's an opportunity for us to even attract new members. So, to the extent you can attend and you can make time, particularly if you live in the EU, that would be extraordinarily helpful for the BC session with its outreach effort.

And then as Lawrence pointed out, there's a discussion immediately following with the PSWG from the GAC and that is an opportunity for us to take up some of our priorities with the PSWG and advance those even further. So, if you're available for that call as well, that'd be tremendous.

So, we have two minutes to go until the hour. Any other final questions for Lawrence before we move on? Okay. All right. Any other issues for discussion or other business that anyone would like to raise this morning? All right. I see no hands. Therefore, I will respectfully return two minutes to you. I want to say thank you to Brenda for her support. She's always great and again is today so thank you, Brenda, for all your help. And thanks everyone. Our next meeting will be 16th of June during ICANN71. Look forward to speaking with you then if not sooner. BC is adjourned. Thanks everyone.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]