BRENDA BREWER:     Good day, everyone. Welcome to the BC Membership Call on the 18th of November at 16:00 UTC. Today's meeting is recorded. Kindly state your name when speaking for the record and have your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking. Attendance will be taken via the Zoom. I will turn the call over to Claudia Selli. Thank you.

CLAUDIA SELLI:     Thank you very much, everybody, for participating in today's call. As you can see from the agenda, we have the usual points. So, we're going to start with the policy discussion and continue with the Council update to move into the CSGA report, and finish with operation and finance.

And with that, Steve, I will leave the floor to you to start the meeting.

STEVE DELBIANCO:     Thanks, Claudia. In this screen should be [inaudible] policy calendar that was circulated just yesterday afternoon. And I have just a few updates to make to it.

So, let me see if I can walk through this pretty quickly. Since our last call, we've had only one comment submitted and that was on the 16th on November, Monday of this week. Zak Muscovitch did a fabulous job drafting a brief comment to support amendments to the .jobs Registry Agreement. We all discussed this about two weeks ago, and you guys were all on Board.

Thankfully, Zak took those intentions and turned them into some articulate prose. We explained, based on the BC's concerns over restricted registration TLDs, that amendments like this not be used to work around the promises that were made when the registry was awarded. And this was a sponsored TLD from the previous era.

The BC is a business group, so we welcome improvements in efficiency, [switching the way in] which the objectives are accomplished, but we did not want to [support] abandoning the registrant restrictions like .museum tried to do two years ago. And we objected strongly to that.

So, Zak, thank you again for that, and I appreciate how fast you came through.

We have several public comments that are open right now. The recommended early warning set up for the root zone scaling is due in about a week, and we have a rough draft. Thanks to Mark Svancarek for pulling it together. Waudo, Mason, and I have been helping a little bit with that, but Mark is holding the pen.

We are really leveraging, I think, the tiny bit of leverage that we have because you know that .org and the ICANN community are desperate to start a new gTLD expansion program. And this root zone scaling gives us the opportunity to suggest that they shouldn't launch that until they have addressed the concerns.

And remember, it is Org who wrote this document and it is Org who said one of the reasons we would want to limit the growth of the root zone file is because of "anti-abuse communities and law enforcement could have trouble dealing with a greatly-increased number of new gTLDs."

Because each new gTLD is a brand-new zone file, a brand new registry that you have to beg for disclosers on registrar information if you needed to track down a source of malware or [inaudible] fraud.

So, I think that we're going to hang our hat on that and try to suggest that we support this fully. Waudo's helping to try to pull in some justification from the CCT, the Competition Consumer Trust Review Team.

So, Mark, Waudo, Mason—anything you want to add to this right now? And I attached the rough draft of points to the policy calendar I circulated yesterday.

Mark?

MARK SVANCAREK: Steve's summary is a good one. If you look at the past history, the scaling of the root zone wouldn't seem like it's so very scary. The rate at which new TLDs are added is moderate. It is very prudent for us to look at this, but most of the fears that were put forward didn't come true in the last round.

However, it's another round and we need to look at it again, and there are additional uncertainties. We don't know whether the rate is going to be faster than in the past. That could change some assumptions.

Also, we've learned some things. We've learned that some of the TLDs will likely become vectors for substantial abuse. And if we don't have some sort of a system in place to allow at least the anti-abuse

community to scale up, that means that the horse will be out of the barn by the time we figure it out.

So, it's going to be important to have some sort of an early warning system in place before new names start being delegated. And that's where this draft is taking us.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Hey, Mark. I think that the narrative we may be able to tell is that in the post-WHOIS world, and without a centralized disclosure system, each new registry presents a brand-new challenge for us to try to protect our consumers. It means you have to create relationships there. You have to try to navigate the system they have for making disclosure requests. You have to deal with abuse and security problems that occur there.

So, every new gTLD does incrementally, and maybe even sometimes significantly, increase the challenges or protecting consumers from DNS abuse.

So, if we tell that story, it has an underhanded way of suggesting that a centralized disclosure system would solve some of those, and maybe relax any restrictions on the rate of growth of the zone.

MARK SVANCAREK: I think that's a good insight.

STEVE DELBIANCO:    Okay. All right. We're going to stitch that tighter, and I will circulate via e-mail in the next day a draft that's more than just the talking points, but a more fleshed out draft because we need to give BC members the time to review prior to the comment closing on the 23rd.

Are there any other suggestions or questions for BC member for Mark, the chief drafter here?

Okay. I don't see any other hands. Thanks, again, Mark.

The next one up is in Attachment 1, which we would like to be able to get some feedback on today. This is the BC comment on the proposed operating plan and budget for PTI and IANA. So, again, this is related to the services of managing the root, and it's part of what we did in the transition of IANA from the U.S. government to ICANN.

BC helped to engineer that, and every year we get an opportunity to comment on their operating plan and budget. And every year it's Jimson who leads the way with help from Tim Smith, Arinola, and others on the finance committee, like Lawrence. And this time around, we've got a draft. I put it in your hands about two weeks ago.

Let's see if we have any comments from the drafters or from BC members because we won't have another call, I think, before this goes in.

Drafters or BC members? Any comments on Attachment 1?

JIMSON OLUFUYE:    Yes, Steve. This is Jimson.

STEVE DELBIANCO:        Yes, go ahead.

JIMSON OLUFUYE:         So, over the past weeks, Lawrence and, today, Tim, they weighed in, and their inputs are okay, at least kind of putting in more clarity for readers. And then Tim talked about the issue of reduction in staff. Well, that reduction is based on optimization—the staff's role optimization they've done. And it's a very good concern, that I hope the reduction will not affect the work of IANA. And that's been well-captured, and that's what [we've always] spoken about; that you don't just have to be onboarding new staff.

Even though the work is critical, and we are quite glad they did an optimization, which is necessary. And with that, we saw that a full-time employee might not be necessary. So, on that basis, that's a reduction. It's based on a kind of optimization they've done.

And don't forget that this is really at the side of ICANN operation activity. There are some works that ICANN does for IANA, and there's a full [inaudible] operation which PTI does by itself. So, that one is sound. It remains as it is, so to speak.

So, all in all, it's okay. The budget is just about 10.3 million and is consistent. And where we needed them to make more clarity is in the summary [of each paper] to put in the final figure at the summary because a busy executive might just want to read an executive summary

and should be able to get the full substance of the proposal at the executive summary. So, that's what we talked about.

And then also the improvement they are talking about, they need to have a cap on the improvement where they want the new system to be fully in operation. So, they are silent on that.

So, we talk … [We raised it] last year and this year, and they said nothing. And this year, again, they've said nothing. So, we are still raising it again so that they can take note that we want to know when this yearly improvement, new system they are working on will be finalized. It's a project management requirement. Thank you, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO:     Thank you, Jimson. We can move on to the next one. It has to do with the transfer policy which we used to think of as the Inter-registrar Transfer Policy. This comment will not close until the 30th of November as well.

Susan Kawaguchi has the pen. And I saw, Susan, your first draft came over last night via e-mail. I didn't attach it to the actual policy calendar. It came in after I circulated it, but I would be happy to send one out after the call. You do have plenty of time on that, so I didn't feel it was necessary.

Susan, do you want to say anything about what you, Jay, and Waudo are working on so far?

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI:        So, I just started the first draft. I went through, and actually there's a lot more in that report that I'm concerned about than I thought at first glance. So, I got through about half of the issues. Some I have no experience with, and so the recommendations and the point of view in the report seem fine.

There is a big section on Rec 27 for EPDP, and I've addressed a little bit of that. PPSAI and transfers of proxy registrations have been an issue for a long time, but since ICANN shut down the PPSAI IRT, we couldn't finish the work we were tasked with concerning the transfers.

So, there's actually more to that report than I had envisioned. So, I'm hoping to get back to it maybe by Friday, but I would love it if Jay and Waudo could take a look. And if anybody has any experience of TIAC or TDRP or those two specifically, I just don't have any transparency into those processes.

But it's a good [start], I think.

STEVE DELBIANCO:        Yeah. So BC members, think about your experiences with your corporate domain portfolio departments about situations where you would need to manage transfers among registrars because those kinds of experiences are the best to bring into the BC perspective on this. Any other comments?

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI:        Not from me.

STEVE DELBIANCO:     Hey, Susan. Thank you for taking the pen on that. And I'll work with you. I'll [take care of] formatting a submission, but I'll work with you when you're ready to circulate something for BC member review. Okay? Thank you.

We have two others. The IANA Naming Function Review has an initial report that's out. And again, this is not something that the BC has to focus very much on. We may just leave this one go. This has to do with whether the [IANA] is serving its customers appropriately. IANA customers are those who run registries because they're the ones who want to make sure that any changes they make to the registry are made to the root.

Do we have any volunteers in the BC that consider this issue something they have interest and expertise on?

JIMSON OLUFUYE:     Yes, Steve. I will take a look at it.

STEVE DELBIANCO:     Jimson, thank you. You're the one who actually helped us the last time around when we did this. Thank you, Jimson. Appreciate that.

Anyone else want to help Jimson? Great. Thank you, Jimson.

And finally, we have volunteers. Mark Datysgeld, [Vivek], and Jimson— all three of you volunteered to help on a BC comment on the Root

Name Service Strategy and Implementation. And I believe that this is similar to the one that we discussed about Mark Svancarek at the beginning of today's call.

The idea is that we take advantage of ongoing processes and reviews and recommendations and try to insert the BC's perspective and requiring that ICANN and its contract parties be responsibility at mitigating DNS abuse.

And we're not talking about intellectual property abuse here. It's about the [integrity and] availability of the root server system if there's an attack. So, let's give a hard look at that. But that's not due until the 8th of December, and I'll get back to you on that.

All right. Moving to the next section which is Channel 2, which is an opportunity to discuss Council. Now, Marie, I believe, was unable to joint today's call, but Mark Datysgeld, our new BC Councilor, is on.

And Mark, at this point of the call, as you know, I turn things over to you. I've already prepared a summary of what happened at the previous Council meeting, and we have several notes in there that are highlighted in yellow on things that you and Marie felt you wanted to bring to your colleagues' attention.

So at this point, Mark, I'll turn it over to you.


MARK DATYSGELD:        Thank you very much, Steve. It's just some notes because the meeting is literally tomorrow, the next one.

STEVE DELBIANCO:    Start at the top there, though, Mark, if you don't mind. Where Marie is talking about the need for volunteers on the Accuracy Scoping Team.

MARK DATYSGELD:    Yeah. No problem. I was going to talk about that because that does tie in with something that I was going to comment; which is that we have been having a lot of strategy meetings. Stephanie as you know is now on the council, and she came in with guns blazing around what she considers the BC's ideas and interventions. And it's exactly what's highlighted there.

It's been a little confrontative for something that's [deserting the game,] but we are definitely holding our place. We're staying steady. But that's exactly why we need people to help us on this matter of accuracy.

STEVE DELBIANCO:    One person would be enough. We need one person to just join this scoping team. And how long would a scoping team work? This is not a three-year element. This is something where the scoping team comes together to draft a document the Council then uses to launch the Accuracy PDP. Right, Mark? So, it's not that long of a process.

MARK DATYSGELD:    It shouldn't be that long. And it definitely would be a lot of help so that we can really be fighting this from all fronts because if it depends on

NCSG leadership, this will be buried. That's kind of what she is implying. She's like, "This issue has run too long. It's not relevant." And there's a lot of support for that position because of their stakeholders there. We really need some help there, so it would be really good to get some.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Mark, not to interrupt, but Alex Deacon just raised his hand. Alex?

MARK DATYSGELD: Please, Alex.

ALEX DEACON: I volunteered to be part of this team, but I think it's important, given the topic, that we have folks that understand the ICANN Bylaws intimately; especially as it pertains to issues of accuracy. We need folks to be involved that understand how the GDPR has impacted important tools such as the ARS. And we need folks, I think, also that have an intimate familiarity with the GDPR and what it says and what it doesn't say.

And I think we should, as a team, kind of understand what we hope to expect from a potential PDP on accuracy to make sure that the scope that is defined by this team covers everything that we want and doesn't exclude anything.

So, it's an important topic, and I'm hoping we can get a good group of folks that cover all of those points of view to be involved. Thanks.

STEVE DELBIANCO:     Mark, in case you're not watching the chat, Susan Kawaguchi has also volunteered. It would be hard to do better than an A-team like Alex and Susan. So, I would to ask you, Mark, to use the processes within Council and make sure that Council secretariat knows that the BC has two volunteers for the Accuracy Scoping Team: Alex Deacon and Susan Kawaguchi. And then cc Alex and Susan and Marie on anything that you send over to the secretariat.

MARK DATYSGELD:     Yeah, perfect. We'll do that. Thank you, everyone, for volunteering.

STEVE DELBIANCO:     Yeah. Go ahead, Mark.

MARK DATYSGELD:     On top of that, we have also begun really trying to advance some procedures to make the GNSO work a little more transparent. I've been working on that a lot with Steve Chan.

The bottom line is, we don't really understand how budgeting for projects work in ICANN. That's becoming clearer by the day. I've been asking a lot of questions about that. Some other Councilors are also interested. And the answer is we just don't know.

It's all very opaque, and there really is a big push now to try to understand how this goes down, especially because we're anxious about what is yet to come with the EPDP and the different proposals that are being pushed forward. It might need a budget; it will probably

need a budget. It is simply unclear where this is coming from. Right? How do you access that from ICANN?

So, this is something that we are focusing on a lot in hopes of trying to advance some kind of position. But at least we understand. So, be on the watch out for that.

And I would finish by saying that …

STEVE DELBIANCO:      Mark, on the screen is the agenda for the Council meeting on the 19th of November, which is tomorrow. So, the highlighted items in yellow, please.

MARK DATYSGELD:      Yeah. The main thing, I'm still trying to catch up on most of those because the whole thing is a little convoluted. I would say that the transition of the leadership in the GNSO is not making matters super clear.

STEVE DELBIANCO:      All right. So, let's just stay focused on the items in yellow. The first is Item 7 on your agenda.

And I wanted to remind you, the BC members in our last call two weeks ago, there was no objection to us agreeing to the chairman, Botterman's, request to delay the next GNSO Structural Review, which the Bylaws require every five years. ATRT3 recommended a delay and

there was no objection in the BC to delay that. And we discussed it on the call with our Board members yesterday.

So, Mark, if that comes up, the BC currently believes that that delay is worthy to happen. Any objection to that, BC members?

Okay, Mark. Look at your Item 8. This is about the draft motion. Now, the current agenda you have for your meeting tomorrow, Mark, doesn't indicate that you're going to vote on that. Are you just going to discuss it—that motion on Rec 7?

MARK DATYSGELD:     Yeah. So, about Rec 7 in particular. There has been a lot of, I would say, movement around that. And it's still quite unclear where exactly every player stands on that issue. I know the BC's position. It's very clear from that side, but I'm very interested in seeing tomorrow what people bring to the table. There is supposed to be a lot of discussion around that topic.

STEVE DELBIANCO:     Alex, what is the status of your suggested replacement motion? Has that been conveyed by John? Has that been conveyed to Pam and to Council?

ALEX DEACON:     John was working on the draft. He made some small changes. He asked me to draft a rationale, which I did. And he said he would send it to Pam

and Rafik as a friendly amendment. I just checked the Council archives. I don't see anything public.

STEVE DELBIANCO:    I didn't either. That's why I'm thinking that is has not happened yet.

ALEX DEACON:    Yeah. So, let me ping John and see what I can find.

STEVE DELBIANCO:    After you find out, would you please convey to BC colleagues, but especially Mark and Marie? Because we need to make sure that this is coordinated.

ALEX DEACON:    Yes.

STEVE DELBIANCO:    The question for you, Mark, is whether there will be a discussion of Alex's replacement motion tomorrow. And Alex can't speak on the call. You and Marie have to, so we all get on that Skype channel, Mark, and we'll back you up on it because [I don't] whether …

MARK DATYSGELD:    Yeah, let's get that going. There will be a discussion for sure. That much has been implied. But let me …

STEVE DELBIANCO:    I mean a discussion of Alex's replacement motion. That's what [I've been saying].

MARK DATYSGELD:    Oh, of the replacement motion in particular. It doesn't seem to have been mentioned, but I will bring it up then. I will [inaudible] during the call.

STEVE DELBIANCO:    Well, you don't want to bring it up unless, in the Skype channel, we all agree that it's the time to bring out. See, it depends on the reaction we're getting when we make the request. It might be necessary to just bring up some of the rationale points that Alex has drafted. See, because if we bring up the rationale, it sets the table for you to introduce the alternative motion a little bit later.

Alex Deacon, go ahead. Your hand is up.

ALEX DEACON:    I just saw an e-mail from John. So, he has sent the Friendly Amendment to Pam and Rafik, and he has a call scheduled with Pam this evening at 6:00 pm eastern. So, he believes that if she's onboard, then it could be jointly sent to the GNSO list. If not, then he says we'll need to regroup on how to best present it.

So, I think, Mark and Marie, if you're listening after the fact, we'll have to wait until that happens to determine the best path forward. But I'll keep on top of it.

And John McElwaine from the IPC is kind of taking the lead here, so we'll make sure we get his input and we're all on the same page.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Alex, after you hear back from John McElwaine, circulate that reply to bc-private, please, so everybody is on board.

And Mark and Marie, it's entirely possible that you'll be required to, in your own words, express some of the rationale for why we are trying to change the motion. You may not have to get into the weeds of the words that Alex introduced, but you certainly have to explain why this is important. And that's really in the rationale aspect.

MARK DATYSGELD: Right. So, yeah. We'll be holding onto whatever comes out of that discussion. Please keep me in the loop so that we know exactly how to proceed tomorrow.

STEVE DELBIANCO: ODP?

MARK DATYSGELD: Yeah. So, in relation to ODP, I haven't seen any discussion about that yet. Nobody has brought it up. Hopefully, something will come up there

**EN**

in the meeting, and I will keep you posted. But so far, I don't see any movement.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Take a look at the hyperlink right here that I'm circling. I just highlighted it. So, that's [from] Kurt Pritz. He's the new Council member, and they are looking to move thing ahead on ODP. So, be prepared to discuss Kurt's attachment in tomorrow's meeting.

MARK DATYSGELD: [Okay.] Makes sense.

STEVE DELBIANCO: You bet. Alex, your hand is up. New hand? Thank you.

Any questions for Mark, our Councilor?

MARK DATYSGELD: I have a question for myself. I'm still working hard to catch up on everything. It's a lot of things going on, and the leadership change itself has been apparently a bit of a struggle. Nobody really knows exactly how this is going to work. But apparently, the new working procedure is that we'll be splitting into small teams for pretty much every task. So, that's the way that Philippe intends to move this boat ahead.

And it's still not very clear how exactly we will go about setting that up. So, still lots to be understood, and still lots to be defined. But I'll make

sure to keep everybody up to date on what's going on over there. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO:   All right. Any other questions for our Council? Thank you, Mark.

Let's move on to Channel 3, which is the Commercial Stakeholders Group. And until Waudo is installed as the new officer, Barbara is our CSG liaison. Barbara, over to you.

BARBARA WANNER:   Thank you, Steve. And I think I would like to focus today's report; a lot of what appears following the highlighted text really refers to what was discussed on yesterday's call. As many of you know, yesterday we deliberately asked to delay our call as our GNSO [inaudible] on what happened in ICANN69 in our dialogue with them. And that conversation was yesterday.

The CSG ExCom decided to streamline the agenda primarily because we only had one hour with them [inaudible] too ambitious [inaudible] just not have [inaudible] …

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:   You're not so clear, Barbara. You're not so clear.

BARBARA WANNER:   Okay. Give me a second. Let me plug in my microphone. Is that better?

STEVE DELBIANCO:        Yes.

BARBARA WANNER:        Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:        [inaudible]

BARBARA WANNER:        Okay. Speaking personally and only for myself, I was very disappointed with the first two items on the agenda. I felt like we got no forward movement on those topics at all. The status of ICANN Org's outreach to the EU for legal clarity is basically no word yet. And in Becky's words, don't hold your breath; meaning that this will take time, not necessarily that it will never happen.

I invite Alex to step up and offer his thoughts as well, but I was, again, rather disappointed with their feedback on Alex's excellent presentation to the Board on how to use Salesforce as a ticketing system in the interim. They said, basically, "Thank you very much. We're still considering it."

I thought Alex very appropriately and shrewdly added that, "Look. We are not presenting this as the end all be all. We're presenting this as a very practical, economic interim solution to enable ticketing under the EPDP and implement Phase 1 at least."

So, Alex, I turn it over to you. Do you have any more to add concerning the treatment of that?

ALEX DEACON:    No. I think we need to think about the best way to move this forward. In terms of messaging, it was clear to me that the assumption from the Board members, at least, was that we were proposing this as a Phase 2 solution, an SSAD solution, which is not the case.

We want this to be up and running now, and as I mentioned on the call, if it were to be up and running now for Phase 1 request, and also for temp spec requests, then that would absolutely be very helpful in informing any future Phase 2. And it could even form part of the data that needs to be analyzed during an ODP if one were to be spun up for the Phase 2 work.

It was suggested by Becky, I think, that we may want to present this to a wider group within ICANN. I think we should consider that.

BARBARA WANNER:    Right, yes. Thank you for reminding me.

ALEX DEACON:    I kind of have an action to figure out what concrete next steps do we want to do and what is our ultimate goal and who do we achieve that. A lot of questions there. That's kind of what I think we need to focus on now in terms of this concept.

BARBARA WANNER: Okay. And then Steve noted in the chat that Becky Burr referenced the Schrems II ruling and how that likely will cause resistance from certain of the contract parties.

STEVE DELBIANCO: I brought that up in the context of Thick WHOIS, Barbara. Since Verisign's registries are U.S.A., this could end up becoming yet another rationale used against the implementation of Thick WHOIS. Just keep an eye on that.

BARBARA WANNER: All right. I'd like to move to the third item that we addressed yesterday, and that sparked the most animated discussion. And I think Heather Forrest did a masterful job of presenting the lay of the land as we currently have it. And what she basically described is a convergent of three important matters that will be coming before the Board. One of them being ATRT3, the NomCom RIWG, and the Maarten's letter concerning the [GNSO] Review; and all of them overlapping to some degree.

We reiterated our concerns about how the NomCom RIWG was proposing a rebalancing of the GNSO's seats via Bylaws review. And we also reiterated our concerns about moving precipitously with the GNSO Review.

Heather also reminded us that the ATRT3 called for a freeze on further reviews until there was a more holistic review of representation within the ICANN community.

So, in a nutshell, where we have it now—and you received an e-mail this morning or late last night from Heather—is she reached out to the entire CSG to get behind a letter that responds to Maarten concerning a delay of the GNSO Review wherein we re-elaborate on our various concerns with all of these converging issues that the Board will have to deal with.

The bottom line being that we strongly support a more holistic review of community representation within ICANN before agreeing to any Bylaws revision concerning rebalancing of the GNSO seats.

So, the big action item for BC members now would be to take a look at that e-mail that Heather sent. Heather has stepped up to hold the pen on that. Tony Holmes will actively intervene because he was very, very active in this discussion.

And quite honestly, I feel this represents an opportunity for the three CSG constituencies to come together and truly collaborate on something wholeheartedly. The EPDP created some awkwardness with the ISPCP. On this topic, we completely are in alignment, and I think this would start the year off in a wonderful way.

The background on the whole NomCom review and our concerns with that is included underneath those three topics that Steve has highlighted, so I'll end it there.

I'll just, then, invite Mason to discuss what he and Dean have been working on in terms of taking forward improvements to address compliance issues. Both Dean and Mason briefed the CSG ExCom at our recent meeting. So, if you care to reiterate a lot of what you told the CSG ExCom, Mason, I leave it to you. Thank you.

MASON COLE:          Thanks, Barbara. Thank you very much. So, there's been a small group working on this long-time ongoing issue of DNS abuse, and what we've tried to do with colleagues in the IPC and elsewhere is see where there are opportunities to fully leverage our position on DNS abuse to bring it to the attention, again, of the ICANN Board and ICANN Org.

So, we're not finished with our work yet. We're looking at ways to build alliances within the ICANN sphere to try to drive some attention on DNS abuse within ICANN Org. The ultimate goal, obviously, would be can we either leverage existing language in contracts to do something about DNS abuse; or if not, is there a way to open the contracts and improve the language for combating DNS abuse?

We fully believe that this can't be done by the BC only or by the IPC only, or even with the BC and IPC combined together only. We've tried this now for a while, and the BC sort has of been screaming into the wind without enough movement on the part of ICANN Org.

We get communications back from them either verbally or in writing that say, "We really can't do anything about this because we don't have the tools." And they're unwilling to do anything to improve those tools, so our objective is to build alliances within ICANN and bring enough

pressure on ICANN Org to do something about the contractual language.

You can harken back to 2013 when the last time the RAA was improved and part of the reason that was a successful movement was because there was so much pressure on registrars and ICANN Org from the rest of the community, including the GAC and the SSAC and others, that it couldn't be ignored. And so, we're looking at ways to build those alliances and bring greater attention to the DNS abuse problem.

As I said, our work and our plan isn't quite complete, but that is the direction we're heading for now. So, hopefully that's helpful. Barbara, back to you.

BARBARA WANNER:          Thanks, Mason. Very helpful for me. So, that wraps it up for me, Steve. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO:          Thanks, Barbara. That's it for the policy calendar. And back to you, Claudia.

CLAUDIA SELLI:          Thank you very much, Steve. And now back to Jimson for the finance and operation update.

JIMSON OLUFUYE:     Okay. Thank you, Claudia and Steve, and everyone that has spoken. With respect to our dues compliance, I think we just crawled to about 87%. So, thanks to members that check their archived or their spam list or whatever, and then they got the invoices, and they have followed up and they have paid. But we still have some members that have yet to respond. I will continue to follow up with them. Myself and the incoming Vice-Chair in December will also follow them up again before we begin to rule in the new year.

So, other financial issues are in a good state. We've given the 50% to [inaudible] that we promised out of the $20,000 earmark in the budget, so we'll transfer $10,000 to them. And I believe [their research is] on track.

With regard to operations, thanks to [electoral] support from the secretariats Chantelle and Brenda, we've concluded the election for officers. We are now in the process for the election of those that will be in our important committees: the Credentials Committee and the Finance Committee.

Now let me congratulate again: Mason Cole our incoming chair; Lawrence Olawale-Roberts, my incoming successor; and Waudo Siganga. I want to thank you all for putting yourself forward. And also, Arinola for a willingness to serve.

I want to believe that we don't have any rancor after the election because we have a solid electoral system and process we all believe in. So, thank you so much for that.

So, with regard to the process [that's going out], I want to plead with members to please put their themselves forward to serve in the committees. The outgoing committee members have really done very well. Andrew Mack, Arinola for the Credential Committee. They have really done well.

Adetola and Lawrence—of course Lawrence, as the incoming Vice-Chair, was to be able to oversee, as the liaison of the ExCom, will still be able to oversee what goes on in all the committees, so not really be lost so to speak.

So, thanking John Berard. He is a veteran in the CC work scope. Thank you, John. Thank you, all. Tim Smith is still there in the Finance Committee. And also thanking Chris Chaplow, also being very supportive as my predecessor of the Finance chair. So, he'll also be rotating out of the Finance Committee.

So, the handing over process is ongoing. Consultation in ongoing, so members have nothing to worry about. The channel is open for the handing over. So, we have until January 1st, but the process is going on pretty well. I'm very happy about it because the weakest point in any organization is the period of transition, and if the outgoing and incoming are getting [it well], then that is great. And that tells us that the sustainability, plan, and the structure is working; and the process is working.

So, just to give you the confidence that we are right on target, right as we plan, as has been conceived. So, this operation is running, and the structure is working.

Thank you very much. Claudia, back to you.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Thank you very much, Jimson. And, indeed, congratulations to all the incoming new officers.

We have, still, a few minutes. So, just wondering if any member has any other point to raise. I see Barbara has the hand up.

BARBARA WANNER: Thank you, Claudia. I just wanted to bring to everyone's attention. I don't know if this came through your inbox yet, but the meeting survey responses were released by ICANN on proposing next steps. And I will recirculate it to everybody.

But I found it fascinating. It lists all of the survey results according to constituencies. And just looking at the GNSO responses, not surprisingly nobody is really wild about the virtual format, but there's kind of nothing we can do about that right now. And nobody is wild about the time zone decision-making.

So, I commend it to you. I think you'll find it very interesting and maybe help us all understand how we want to respond in shaping next steps for future ICANN meetings. I'm thinking at least the first two in 2021.

So, that's it. Thank you.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Thank you so much, Barbara. And I'm just looking in the chat if there is anyone else willing to bring up any other business.

Okay. If not, with that I will give you back 10 minutes of you time. Thank you very much for participating, and continue to stay safe and healthy. Thank you.

And the next meeting is on the 2nd of December as you can see.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**