
BRENDA BREWER: Thank you, everyone. This is Brenda speaking. Welcome to the Business Constituency Membership call on December 2, 2020 at 16:00 UTC. This meeting is recorded. Kindly state your name when speaking for the record, and also have your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking. Attendance will be taken via Zoom. I am happy to turn the call over to Claudia Selli. Thank you.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Thank you very much, Brenda, and thank you, everybody, for attending the call. As you will see on the agenda, we have our usual items for update. The policy discussion, council, the CSG report, and operation and finance. You see there as well that there is, under any other business—

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Claudia, you're quite feint.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Can you hear me?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: That's better now. That's better.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Okay, I'll try to speak more loud. But in any case, if you have any other business to raise at the end of the call, please raise that then. With that, I will leave the floor to Steve for the usual update on the policy discussion.

BRENDA BREWER: Steve, we're not able to hear you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: How about now? Is that better?

BRENDA BREWER: That is perfect. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Gosh. Okay. Thank you. Sorry about that, everyone. I wanted to mention at the top of the policy calendar, which you have on the screen in front of you, I sent it around yesterday. I wanted to report that we commented on November the 30th on the operating plan and budgets for PTI and IANA. Thanks to Jimson for drafting, Tim Smith and Lawrence for providing some edits. Arinola, I know you had volunteered. If you also provided edits, then let me know and I'll put you onto the acknowledgement as well.

The second thing we did was the 23rd of November the comment period closed for the policy that ICANN's CTO came up with to recommend an early warning mechanism for the root zone scaling. So that as new

gTLDs are added—or even ccTLDs are added—to the root, if they're added at a rapid pace, there could be a situation where certain technical functions and maybe even compliance and consumer protection functions would be impaired. And that was an open invitation for us to pile on about the raised concern the anti-abuse community and law enforcement could have trouble dealing with a greatly increased number of new gTLDs.

And I believe that we have a good case to make there because each gTLD, each registry, has to be requested for registrant information in the new post-WHOIS world. There isn't any centralized disclosure request and disclosure fulfillment system. So you've got to go chase down every registrar and registry individually with their own policies and their own unwillingness to disclose.

So, we supported the recommendations. There was a lot of drafting that Mark SV put together. Waudo weighed in. But Mason gave us a couple of just pure clean paragraphs. I made some edits and submitted those for the BC. Thank you Mason, Mark, and Waudo.

ALAC also picked up on the DNS abuse. I put the comment in there from them. And interestingly, our two opponents on these topics, the NCSG and the registries, they commented but they never argued against this DNS abuse concern. So, either they didn't pick it up—well, they will now since we raised it in ALAC. But at least we're on record for that. Thank you, Mason, and everyone else.

Let me scroll down to the open public comments. We have two open public comments and one other one I wanted to mention. So, the IANA

naming function review comment period closes today and we circulated on the 30th of November a short draft BC comment from Jimson. Thank you, Jimson, for that. I'll bring that comment up right now and ask if Jimson wants to discuss in any way or if there are any BC members who want to ask questions. This is due today. Again, this comment is on a review that is already being conducted and it was an IANA naming functions review. We call it the IFR, IANA Functions Review, and that review is namely from the customers of IANA which is the registry operators are the primary customers, the country codes. They try to evaluate whether they think that the IANA naming functions contract is being fulfilled adequately by the ICANN entities that are charged to fulfill it.

Jimson, anything you want to add with respect to the draft you prepared?

JIMSON OLUFUYE:

Yeah, Steve, and greetings, everyone. The evolution of the IANA operation was really [inaudible] to be going very well and that is pleasing to know. In fact, in their detailed submission, you will see that customer satisfaction [inaudible] around 94%, 95%. Though it would be good to know why the other 4% or 6% is there [inaudible] dissatisfaction. But 94-95% is good.

The only area of concern is the accountability aspect, really, where some of the reports were not provided and that was what the review team noted. That's [inaudible] do with operational, per se, but

accountability. [inaudible] champion the need for accountability at that time.

So now we want to know why that is so and we would be interested to know why. Maybe [inaudible] or whoever has been given that as a possibility or was there an oversight that we don't have such report published [inaudible]? I think that's just it. Otherwise, the operational flow of IANA function is going very well.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thank you, Jimson. We are all astounded at the degree of detail you're able to muster on a really arcane report on a function that I know you don't work with every day. So, we so much appreciate your ability to dive into something like this and come up with genuine inconsistencies, and in some cases, places where prior BC priorities are not being followed. So, thank you very much.

All right, the second one. So, I'll be filing that today. Is there any other comments from BC about that draft? Great.

The other one that's open closes next week, the 8th of December, and this is a set of recommendations on the root name service. Again, we're back to that root server for the third time on today's call. They have a strategy and implementation and their recommendations include two goals I noted for you, that they want to put instances of the root server in more diverse locations around the world. There are already the A through L root servers in several locations around the world, but the idea is to increase that diversity and thereby it doesn't really affect performance very much but I think it's really more about risk mitigation.

The second thing they want to do is protect the confidentiality and the availability of the root server system during an attack on all or one of the root servers.

So, we have three volunteers. Mark Datysgeld, Vivek, and Jimson who volunteered to draft a BC comment. I've indicated our prior two comments on root zone, governance, and KSK rollovers. So we look forward to getting that circulated to members because we really ought to have it in your hands today to give you adequate time to review before the 8th next week.

Vivek, Mark, and Jimson have volunteered. Is there anyone else that wants to assist them? Okay. So, Vivek, Jimson, and Mark, I would look for a draft from you as soon as we can. Even if you just send me some points, I'll fashion it into something that our members can review.

And then the third element up here, Mark Datysgeld—and I'll call on Mark to discuss it in a moment. Mark sent an email around the other day because the Mozilla Foundation has opened a public consult. But they want to talk about DNS over HTTPS which is abbreviated as DoH, which is really just using HTTPS, the secure channel, instead of HTTP for the recursive back and forth on the domain name system, domain name services and resolution.

Their paper is linked on that line, and what Mark has done is draft a letter which specifically goes after BC interests. Mark, I've highlighted what I felt were the key elements in there, but I wanted to bring up your document, give you a chance to speak to your colleagues about your request here. Go ahead, Mark.

MARK DATYSGELD:

Thank you very much, Steve. So, the fact that Mozilla is even seeking consultation on this aspect is quite refreshing. In general, we haven't seen this consultation. There has just been a wholesale implementation of DoH, sometimes as default, and what this does is, on the long term—I'm sure most of you have thought about this—it takes away the control over DNS policies from the ICANN community. At the end of the day, that's what it is. It's not necessarily going to happen but it could.

So, with this consultation, they seek to improve what they consider to be the good actors among the providers of DoH. Those already include some requirements that are interesting, such as if you look a little towards the bottom of the documents, they already include some interesting policies against the blocking of the domains. So, that's good.

But something that's missing, in my opinion, is that they say nothing about adding domains. So, somebody who is considered a trusted DoH provider could start adding their own TLDs to their resolver and that would still be okay as per the rules.

So, I think it's important that we start to position ourselves and make sure that people understand the notion that the ICANN community is the one entrusted with making DNS policy.

If there is approval by the BC community, I would like to send this letter in the name of everyone in the BC community's name. If there isn't, then perhaps we can work out some sort of compromise. I see Jimson has a hand up. I would like to give him the opportunity to speak.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Mark, what is the deadline for the public consultation from Mozilla?

MARK DATYSGELD: It's January. We do have the month of December to work on it.

STEVE DELBIANCO: That's great. Jimson, over to you.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Yeah. Thank you, Mark and Steve. Well, Mark, your initiative is commendable. Watching out for our interests is really commendable [in coming up] with that draft.

I took a look at it and what was worked on. And also, Mozilla has done pretty well, especially in terms of public interest, because the issue of DNS abuse—[inaudible] of DNS abuse actually, in a way. I think that's something we need to [inaudible] and comment, because in the process of looking down or looking up through recursive server, the possibility is there for the communication to be hijacked. And what Mozilla has done is to ensure that end-to-end encryption [inaudible] lookup DNS. DoH, they call it "dough" anyway.

So, it is a good thing. But [inaudible] advice. I think that's where we need to look at, all of us, seriously. They are looking at advice. We've got to ... For example, [inaudible] something is secure end-to-end. Maybe the law enforcement in each jurisdiction, how will they react to

the recursive service providers? Should they just readily open up their system so they can see [inaudible] investigating? It's already [operational] in U.S. from what they said. But the one before it is implemented around the world, that people around the world, and since we have businesses around the world, we could also [inaudible] to say, okay, maybe this policy ... Like, for example, retention of individual data is the same 24 hours.

So, the reason we say that, if [inaudible] retained for maybe 30 days. Some people, they don't want to retain information more than maybe six hours just for their operational activities and other issues.

So, I think we need to really look at it and help them, because [inaudible] is DNS abuse, and they are, in a way, trying to tackle it.

Well, it's a pity that they are not operating within the multi-stakeholder approach of the BC, of the ICANN. But I believe somehow they are working also in ICANN interest, I mean in our own interest. So that should be a major, major concern, to reduce DNS abuse and DoH really helps in that. [inaudible] nudge ICANN, too, maybe internally, to have a say about it. We should nudge ICANN, too, to have a say about it. I think Mason should also look at it.

So, it might not necessarily be criticism, but as we emphasize the need to build on the multi-stakeholder approach within ICANN, we should also provide information [we actually] need. They need information to [inaudible] around the world. And I think Brazil is a major example. You have a solid law in place. And at the same time, there is a social media law that is coming up which [inaudible] also in Nigeria and in other

places in Africa. So we need to look at this. It's a very, very important thing [inaudible] and we should provide some useful information to Mozilla as a [inaudible] point. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thank you, Jimson. At the end of the day, though, I think you're supporting the effort but suggesting we add some rhetoric on DNS abuse. So, I know Mark is inviting people to mark up the attached Word doc and to submit edits to him, since we do have the time for that as well. So, we have Alex Deacon and then Jay Sudowski, and Mark you can respond after they've gone, okay? Thanks. Alex?

ALEX DEACON:

Thanks, Steve. So, I have some personal thoughts on this. I think, from a BC point of view, the focus should be on ensuring businesses can control and protect their internal or their enterprise networks as they see fit. This includes ensuring functionality that most large enterprises use today, such as filtering and data loss prevention and others. In the enterprise environment, I think DoH and things like DoT and others that are being developed should be opt-in and not opt-out. So, I may put together some of these slots and contribute them to the doc if people think it makes sense.

And finally, I think another concern is the slow march to more centralized DNS system versus what should be a very highly distributed system is also a concern. So that may be something we want to mention.

So, I'll suggest some of these concepts to Mark and see how it fits into the overall document.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thanks, Alex. And while we might complain about more centralization, remember we want a centralized disclosure system for registrant data. So, sometimes we like centralization, so be careful of that. Jay Sudowski?

JAY SUDOWSKI:

Yeah. Thanks, Steve. I think I largely echo what Alex said. I think I was going to raise both of those points in particular. And it's not even ... I think the centralization issue is an interesting one and I think it's a nuanced one, given that we do want centralized access to WHOIS data and registrant data.

But I think there's a reliability aspect that happens when you basically have one or two entities handling all of DoH requested it. One is Cloudflare and one is, it looks like, Comcast. And then there's a third one that couldn't handle the load.

So, I think it's an issue—a centralization issue from the reliability perspective of the Internet, right? You put in a lot of birds in one airplane. But if either of those folks have an outage, then there's potentially, I don't know, hundreds of millions of people that really can't access the DNS without some sort of [inaudible] regular DNS resolvers.

The other thing that I was just going to add is, Mark, I'm not sure the bit about adding domains, how that's super relevant to the Mozilla DoH

conversation, because the resolvers that DoH providers are providing still ultimately have to interface with the global root. So, any additions or deletions of TLDs in the root I think would be reflected by those resolvers automatically, although I think maybe we just want to tune the point up a little bit to make sure that Mozilla is committed to a single unified DNS root and that, as part of their policies, they'll require DoH providers to commit to going back to the root.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

And don't forget that one aspect of a recursive DNS resolution is going to the authoritative server. And if that is also encrypted under HTTPS, does that interfere with security functions that an authoritative registry is providing? I don't know the answer to that but I've heard it raised by some registry operators. Mark SV is in the queue and then we'll let Mark Datysgeld give a final thought, but you have to be gratified, Mark, that your colleagues are tuned into this. We're going to probably allow a couple of weeks for BC members to suggest edits. There's no need for you to recirculate it, Mark, because I had already attached it to the policy calendar. Go ahead, Mark Svancarek.

MARK SVANCAREK:

Thanks. This is Mark. Can you hear me?

STEVE DELBIANCO:

We do.

MARK SVANCAREK:

Okay. As you can imagine, Microsoft has some complicated thinking about DoH. On the one hand, we support the privacy aspects of it. On the other hand, we are concerned about the centralization for a bunch of reasons. One being the reliability and the other one being just now you've got a different set of people who have information about DNS.

And there are a bunch of other standards work that's going on. There's a thing called Oblivious DoH which would obscure from the DoH resolver who is even asking, so that would be more privacy and it would diminish some of the information that could be monetized at the other end. There's another thing called [Deer] which is a way for locating additional resolvers and Microsoft is contributing to that.

I think it was Jay and Alex who mentioned the concern for corporations. That's why Microsoft supports doing this at the operating system level as opposed to the application level. You could imagine that if there's multiple applications on a desktop and they all use different DoH resolvers, that would be an administrative nightmare. So, Windows 10 has actually added support to this. We also added it to our Chromium browser but that just duplicates the Mozilla thing. So we've added it to Windows as well.

So, I have a number of things to contribute and I'll work with Alex and everybody else to get them in. Thanks.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Great. Mark Datysgeld, why don't you close this discussion?

MARK DATYSGELD:

Thank you very much, everyone. It's good to hear everybody's thoughts. My initial intention was just making a blank slate, something that I think we can all agree on, that the ICANN community should be the one leading the charge in terms of DNS policy, and from there, we can evolve it because, since there is [inaudible] points of view, I wouldn't want to [inaudible] very specific things without consulting everyone.

So, about the addition of DoDs, here's my concern. And I answered to Jay directly. The same way we see DoDs dropping ... So, if your website doesn't work very well within the purview of a certain registry, you go off to another one that allows what you're trying to put out there. In the same way, I worry me and some other members of the governance community were that there could be DoH [shopping].

So, for example, if the issue of INGO/IGO limitations doesn't get solved in ICANN, a provider could be approached and go, "Hey, we need this to be done in this way." And if, say, 90% of the Internet is using that particular DoH resolver, which might be the case if a browser is a monopolist, then to most people—to common people—it is the same as if it was changed in the root zone because, if there is a monopolist player there, then any [change] that's made there might as well be made on the root zone. So that's the concern when I raised the point of adding DoDs not only involved blocking them. So, some food for thought. Happy to be refuted. But at the same time, I don't see why that wouldn't happen. So, thank you very much, everyone. Glad to be able to discuss this with you all.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Mark, for drafting. So, it will take a couple of weeks—two weeks from today which will give us plenty of time to submit it prior to the Mozilla deadline.

Let's move on now to channel two here which is the GNSO Council. There's quite a bit on the agenda since our last meeting. It was the 19th of November. A lot of us listened in. Pretty interesting discussions on rec 7 and some other items. So, I want to turn it over to our councilors, Marie Pattullo and then Mark Datysgeld. And I have on the screen the policy calendar that you helped me develop yesterday. So, start with your 19th of November and segue into the next meeting.

MARIE PATTULLO: Thanks, Steve. This is Marie. Can you hear me okay?

STEVE DELBIANCO: We do. Thanks, Marie.

MARIE PATTULLO: Great. Starting with the EPDP, I'm going to start back with some on the part that you kindly put into the calendar. Margie and Mark, thank heavens, have agreed to keep going on the EPDP Phase 2A. You remember that's the leftover bits. And Steve, thanks to you for agreeing to still be involved there also. You noted—and I also know that Alex mentioned earlier—that Keith Drazek has apparently volunteered to chair this. I didn't know that. That's news to me. So, it certainly hasn't made the council list, but if anyone knows something more about that, please jump in and let me know. You also know that—

STEVE DELBIANCO: Marie?

MARIE PATTULLO: Yeah?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Keith Drazek had told me that he volunteered [at] leadership but he hadn't received a reply yet. He knew that no one else had stepped up, so he said somebody has got to do this. This is just for 2A, Phase 2A.

MARIE PATTULLO: Yeah. Yeah. Interesting. Thank you. On the [inaudible] scoping team, massive thanks to Alex and Susan. You know how important that is to all of us in the BC. Well, the call for volunteers is I was going to say the end of this month. It's not. It was the end of last month. So, hopefully we can see some traction on that in the relatively short term.

Now back to the first bit. You remember that in the vote in council, one of the things that we voted to agree on was that we would ask the Board for a discussion. Now, the Board responded to the council, to Felipe, who is the chair of the council just yesterday. We got it this morning. Mark and I received it my morning, so his very early morning. And it says a couple of things. It says that the Board intends to open—well, initiate—an operational design phase. Now, you remember this is the new part they're pushing in between kind of parallel to and

between the policy development process and the result actually getting to the Board.

So, what it says is the Board plans to initiate an operational design phase directing ICANN Org to assess the operational impact, which is interesting. It then says that it welcomes the council's suggestion for an initial dialogue and will "support such a conversation prior to these steps". So I expect there to be a meeting developed at some point about that.

And the next thing of interest is on the last paragraph of this letter where it says—and here I'll just quote it—"As suggested in your letter, the priority two recommendations [19-22] which were related to work associated with the EPDP Phase 1 will be considered on a separate timeline. The Board plans to open a public comment proceeding on those four recommendations to allow the EPDP Phase 1 IRT to consider them as part of its work as soon as possible."

So, I don't know if Mark wants to comment on that or Margie, but there's going to be some more happening there clearly. And Steve, I know you'll pick up that public comment as soon as we see it. I'll pause there just in case there's anything on that before I go on. No? Good. Great.

There's a lot of stuff that you can read for yourself. You don't need to be bored with me reading out to you. We have agreed that the GNSO review should be paused until after the ATRT review is actually implemented—or let's say hopefully taken forward a bit. But I don't expect there to be anything controversial on that from your side.

On rec 7—recommendation 7—which you know is the potential or alleged conflict with WHOIS. It’s going to be taken into a new PDP. That much is pretty clear. There will be a draft motion that will actually be voted on at our next council which is in December. The last meeting of the circle small team of councilors looking at this is now planned for tomorrow but I’d like to ask Alex Deacon to jump in here, if he knows what’s happening, because I haven’t seen much since John McElwaine from the IPC and Pam Little started to try to develop an agreement. Alex, do you want to take over?

ALEX DEACON:

Thanks, Marie. Unfortunately, I don’t have any further update. Last I remember, John was going to continue to update the draft motion based on the conversation that happened in the council but I’m not in the loop on any other conversations that may have happened. So let me synch with John and see if we could find out what’s going on.

MARIE PATTULLO:

Thanks, Alex. That’s really kind. Then, if you could just scroll a little bit longer, please. Thank you so much. The RPM Phase 1 report is out at last—at last! I can hear Zak Muskovitch cheering in the background after four and a half years of pain. Go forward and read it. There’s going to be some updates we expect at the next council.

But one thing I would like to mention here, and if it’s okay I’ll then segue into my co-councilor [mark]. There was a discussion that SubPro will deliver before the end of the year, SubPro being the subsequent

procedures. So, a silly word for what's going to happen in the new round when we have new gTLDs.

Now, there was a question of a potential dependency that was raised by ICANN Org and the Board to do with IDNs—so international domain name variance. And there was quite an interesting discussion in council where it seemed that some of the contracted parties were, “No, there is no dependency. We must have all the gTLDs.” And a number of us were raising—including Pam who is obviously a contracted party—that actually they really could be because it's an extremely important thing. It was supposed to be one of the goals in the last round.

So, Mark, do you want to take over on that please?

MARK DATYSGELD:

Thank you very much, Marie. I was a little bit surprised to see that some councilors are not considering this to be a particularly stopping issue. It is. There are unresolved matters. That is what is at the core of the matter here. There are things that are unresolved, and if we move on without absolutely understanding what we are doing with the subject of IDN variance—I don't want to bore you too much with this and Mark SV could explain this better. But if we don't put a lid on that issue, we'll just be kicking the can forward towards some indefinite future and I don't think that's exactly what we want to do. I'll be raising further points about this in the upcoming months and let's see how it goes. But I was surprised to see some resistance from some of the council members. Thank you.

MARIE PATTULLO:

Thanks, Mark. And then we have just come to the end of a very long, drawn-out strategic planning session. That's where we normally get together and meet, but of course we couldn't in this instance. Steve has very kindly attached the slides. If you want any details, Mark and I stand ready. Steve, you've typed at me in the chat. During the last council, John McElwaine said that a thick WHOIS PDP would be fast and fatal.

Do I agree? Jay, wow. I'll come back to you. Yes, please. Yes, please. But on the PDP, I think we all have to recognize that thick WHOIS is on life support. As Alex very clearly and very carefully pointed out, it is to do with how we frame the charter or the scoping, if you like, for that PDP. Will it be fast and fatal? No idea. It will be potentially fatal, yes. I'm sorry if that sound cynical but it's also true.

Jay, you've mentioned the IGO track. Thank you so much. For those of you that may not know about this, it's in essence about the curative rights for international governmental organizations whose names are used in domain names, which got very messy and very tied up for some years because of international law jurisdiction issues to do with these IGOs.

So it's not really to do with the rights protection mechanism itself. It's much more to do with international law and understanding some very arcane and quite bizarre [treaties].

This issue has held up a number of other things that are concerned with the IGOs at Board level, if I remember, locked up there waiting for something else to happen.

So, there is a new track being launched within the umbrella of the RPM Working Group, although as I said, it's not really RPMs, but [inaudible], go forth and register please. The more people we actually know what they're talking about involved in that would be really helpful. Thank you. Steve, back to you.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Mark and Marie, thank you very much. And thanks, Jay, for volunteering. Appreciate that. Are there any questions for our councilors? We'll have an agenda for the upcoming council meeting soon.

I would say that Mark and Marie and Alex, as you gain any information on progress for the rec 7 resolution that comes up at the next council meeting, let's circulate that to BC Private in advance in case people have ideas and suggestions.

So, next up is channel three, which is the Commercial Stakeholders Group and Barbara Wanner is our CSG liaison through the end of this year and then Waudo Siganga will assume the role. So, Barbara, over to you to walk us through channel three.

BARBARA WANNER:

Okay. Thank you, Steve. The first item sort of repeats, if you will, what Marie just walked us through concerning the BC joining in the CSG letter to Martin requesting that the GNSO review be paused until ICANN can conduct a holistic review. This is all tied up and inter-related to our concerns about how the NomCom RIWG was endeavoring to

[rebalance] representation of the GNSO. So, we're kind of in wait-and-see mode. We have to see how the Board reacts to our letter.

At the most recent CSG ExCom call—and I will invite Waudo to chime in when appropriate—I had a conflict, another professional matter I had to deal with. But evidently, the CSG [would like] ahead of ICANN70 which is a departure from the way we've operated in the past. The CSG would like to have a call with Becky and Matthew and I think, going forward—and Heather Forest has talked about this in her capacity as chair of the IPC—that I think we are trying to develop an approach to our meetings not only with Becky and Matthew but also with the ICANN Board that creates more accountability. So, it's not just sort of a talk session, that there are some items that we will want and expect and ask for the Board and our appointed board members to deliver on.

So, Heather, I believe, will follow-up on that at the next CSG prep call as to the next item concerning ICANN planning. But I think this approach is worth developed because I don't know that any of us have really felt a huge sense of satisfaction, quite honestly, with how some of those discussions proceed at ICANN meetings.

We ask you, too, to put on your thinking caps and again think creatively of what items that you want to engage the ICANN Board and our appointed board members on at the ICANN70 meeting. That's what the CSG prep [kit] is for. You can open it up. I believe it's a Google Doc so you can just add in what you feel would be worthwhile and useful for us in terms of moving forward our policy agenda and our priorities.

Let's see. In terms of ... Okay. We have this meeting on the 17th with Becky and Matthew where, among other things, Alex talked a little bit about all the work he did to illustrate how Salesforce software that is already licensed by ICANN could be used to implement interim ticketing system that would not be an SSAD as such but it would serve as a start. I don't believe we heard anything back from ICANN Org about that.

The next, under the whole NomCom Review. This provides you with background for your further consideration as to the developments that led up to our letter and formed the substance of our letter to Maarten asking him to pause the GNSO Review until we can have a holistic consideration of representation of all of the ICANN stakeholder groups and support advisory groups.

Then, finally—again, I'll ask for Waudo if he has anything to add but also Mason who has been working with Dean Marks on taking forward improvements to ICANN's approach to addressing compliance issues and DNS abuse. That's kind of an ongoing informal process that Mason and Dean Marks have taken on and I commend them for it. So, Waudo and Mason, do you have anything to add?

WAUDO SIGANGA: Yes, Barbara. Can you hear me?

BARBARA WANNER: Yeah, great. Thank you.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Thanks for that report. It's quite good. I just wanted to add one or two things from what I picked up in the meeting. The first one is that the meeting that you mentioned that would be the CSG with the GNSO appointed board members, the one that would be before ICANN70, it [inaudible] not be instead of the normal one that is after the ICANN meeting but it will be an additional meeting. It was decided that we have an additional meeting, so we shall have one before and the normal one that is after.

Then, maybe the other thing I can add is just a few things that we are requiring from BC as input to some of the things that were discussed at that meeting.

The first one is that we require input for the meetings that will be there with the OEC. That is the Organizational Committee that looks at—what do you call it, that E?

BARBARA WANNER: I believe it considers governance question.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Yeah. Okay. We have requested for a meeting with the OEC sometime in December and we will require input from the BC for that.

The other area we require input is issues discussing with the GNSO board members at the next meeting. That's the next ICANN meeting. Then, also, we require session topics and questions for the Board meeting, with a meeting with the Board at ICANN70. So those are the three things.

First of all, meeting with the OEC will require input for that. Then issues for discussion with the GNSO board at ICANN70. And then session topics and questions for the meeting with the Board at ICANN70 as well. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: I'll note that the OEC is the Board committee focused on things like reviews, so really important for us.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Yeah. Thank you, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Barbara and Waudu, anything further? And any BC members have questions for our CSG liaisons? Okay, back to you, Claudia, to pick up the rest of the agenda.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Thank you so much, Steve, and Jimson, you can go with your report on finance and operation. Thank you.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Okay. Thank you, Claudia. Where we got to our finance—we are still where we were two weeks ago, only [to 7%] [inaudible] compliance. That means we have a few of our members are yet to pay their dues, so really appealing to members to check your account payable department or who else to verify if these dues have been paid.

And I want to thank members that have checked. As a result, they are paid now, so thank you very much. Please check and see if you are in good standing. And if you need any help, please contact [inaudible] or myself. Or the incoming vice chair, Lawrence Roberts. We've been working together in this respect.

Well, on operations, the handover process is ongoing. And yesterday we had extensive meets with the incoming vice chair where we tackle a number of issues raised based on the [inaudible] report, [inaudible] note giving to him as [parts of our] process. The process is still ongoing and no issue whatsoever. And once I'm done now, perhaps maybe Lawrence would like to chime in. Maybe there are some other things you may want to note. Maybe you will begin to hear his voice going forward.

And still on operations, as we have always planned, we conduct the officer elections and it has been successful, so next is the election of committee members which is ongoing. I would like to thank all those that volunteered to serve. Really appreciate it. So, those who are yet to volunteer, and want to be part of what's going on, please just dive into it and add value. There is something that you can add.

So, the process is still on to December 7th, so you can express your interest. Please come forward. Once again, thanks to all those who have volunteered. Lawrence, you want to say anything? Okay, unfortunately, he's not on this call. But perhaps maybe there is any question, any clarification required?

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Hi, Jimson. This is Chantelle. Lawrence is here. We're just trying to get him back online. But he is here.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Okay. It's all right. I recommend we continue with the program and any time he comes in, if he has something to chime in, why not?

CLAUDIA SELLI: Thank you, Jimson.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Claudia, yes. I would like to say this, to appreciate Claudia, the outgoing chair and also the incoming chair, [inaudible]. Since 2012, we've had to collaborate with [inaudible] and this year, doing [our summit], Claudia was there and made a very beautiful keynote speech along with some [inaudible] in Africa. I think that was good. So, thank you, Claudia, for doing that.

And also to [inaudible] was with us for an extensive period, sharing in his wealth of experience and it was really good and enriching. Thanks again, Claudia and [inaudible]. And thanks to the BC generally for all your spirit of collaboration. Thank you.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Thanks, Jimson. I just wanted to check also with everybody whether there are other issues or any other item that people would like to raise.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Yes, Claudia.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Please.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: There is one thing that I missed out when I made my presentation. In the meeting that will be there at the ICANN70—the CSG open meeting. It was decided or it was discussed that we should try to pep it up. So we are looking for some interesting speakers that can speak in that open meeting so that we can attract more attention and more participation. So, if any person in the BC can come up with suggestions for that, we can be able to take them back to the CSG. Thank you.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Thanks, Waudo, and I'm sure that members will contribute. I don't know if anyone else has other points. If not, I can give you back eight minutes of your time and we will continue staying in touch until the next meeting on 16th of December.

Thank you very much, everybody, for participating. And I think, with that, we can close the recording and adjourn the meeting. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]