MARYAM BAKOSHI:	Thank you very much, Mason. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the BC Membership call on 20th of May 2020 at 15:00 UTC. This meeting is being recorded. Please kindly state your name while speaking for the record and have your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking. Attendance will be taken from Zoom participation. With that, I will turn the call over to Mason Cole. Thank you.
MASON COLE:	Thank you very much, Maryam. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. Mason Cole here, chair of the BC. Welcome to the call on 20th of May, 2021. The agenda is in front of you on the screen. We have, as usual, quite a bit to cover today, so we're going to dive right in. Does anyone have any additions or changes to the agenda before we start? Okay, I see no hands. All right.
	So, we've changed up the order of the agenda today a bit because we're going to have ... During the policy discussion, we wanted to give Ben Wallis a bit of time to get onto the call. He has a conflict early in the call for a discussion on the NIS2 consultation. So, what we're going to do is we're going to take what usually comes last in the meeting, the issues for discussion, and we're moving that up to the front, and then we'll go to the policy discussion and Lawrence's report.
	So, onto issue number two. Maryam, if I can have the slides, please? All right. Thank you very much. So, colleagues, what we have talked about here in various forms and over e-mail is a discussion of our priorities as a

BC. This was kicked off by a discussion that Waudo and I had with the CSG ExCom not very long ago where we were reviewing meetings that were coming up either before, or during, or immediately after ICANN71.

And instead of approaching those meetings from the ground up and saying, "Well, we have meetings with the board, and with contracted parties, and with the NCSG, and whoever else," what is it that we should talk about?

What we decided to do instead was draft out some priorities for the BC over the next six to 12 months and then align those with the discussions that we have with the broader community and the cooperation that we extend to the broader community so that discussions that we do have, meetings that we take, issues that we explore, etc., support those objectives.

So, what I want to do, if you ... There was an e-mail that I sent out, I don't know, a couple of weeks ago, probably, outlined a draft set of priorities, and I wanted to review those with you today and get some feedback, if there is some, because this is a work in progress and I want everyone to be aligned on what our priorities are. So, I'm going to review those quickly. All right.

First, why the need to establish priorities? Well, the BC needs these priorities to guide our actions and the strategy forward instead of the tactics backward, as I mentioned. So, when we know those priorities, it will help us with decisions on where we want to engage, with whom, and how, both within and outside ICANN. So, it's sort of a guiding light in that regard.

And then, priorities help focus our work on the issues where we need the most impact, and then de-emphasize those issues of lesser importance so that we don't waste our time. Next slide. Thank you, Maryam. So, priority number one: improve legitimate access to domain name registration data. This has obviously been a driving force for the BC now for the past several years as the ePDP work has progressed.

But what we want to do here is seize on community support for data accuracy, continue our good-faith participation in ePDP work with an eye toward potential suspension in favor of governmental developments, and then continue to engage with GAC and governments as influencers over data policy. So, as you see with our progress on the NIS2 directive, this has been a fruitful direction for us recently, although we're still frustrated a bit by what has happened with the ePDP.

Next slide, please, Maryam. Priority number two: decrease the incidences of DNS abuse. And to do this, what we want to do is maintain a flexible and suitably broad definition of DNS abuse, dissuade the opening of new gTLD rounds until the abuse is productively addressed, help ICANN secure contractual tools necessary to combat DNS abuse in a meaningful way, participate in cooperative industry efforts to address abuse, and then, in the end, as a result of all that, positively impact the levels of DNS abuse as measured by ICANN and non-ICANN sources.

So, we know that ICANN puts out some ... I'm sorry, back one more, Maryam. We know that ICANN puts out some data. We know others in the industry put out some data. That data is sort of disjointed, and it doesn't harmonize very well, and what we need is a clearer picture of what's really happening with DNS abuse. So, as a result of our efforts,

we want to see those trend lines go down, both in terms of how ICANN reports it and how others in the industry report it. Okay, Maryam.

Okay, third: improve the ICANN Compliance function. So, again, we want to get better contractual tools in place, make sure that ICANN Compliance is adequately staffed, improve transparency in public reporting on compliance activity, reinstate the accuracy reporting system, and then help ICANN define a standard abuse reporting and response mechanism, including timelines for all parties.

So, we know that if we're going to meaningfully address DNS abuse and other problems, what we need to do is encourage the development of tools that ICANN Compliance can use to enforce against offending registrars and offending end-users. And this is something we have talked with Compliance about for quite some time. We have been a bit frustrated on lack of progress here but I wanted to identify this as another priority. Okay, Maryam? Okay.

Bringing ICANN up to date on its overdue obligations to the community is our fourth priority. So, we want a complete work on recommendations from the CCT RT. We want to see work completed on recommendations from SSR2. Complete work on the privacy proxy accreditation issue and then align ICANN review activity with community input. Now, these are all things that have languished in the ICANN sphere now for a while, depending on what the issue is.

On bullet number two, I did see, actually, just a few minutes before this call, that, on the SSR2 issue, there is going to be an ODP, start of the operational design phase, that, apparently, Janis Karklins is going to

chair as a way to get that kicked off. So, that's a piece of potentially good news on that front. But these are things that we as a BC want to see completed because they sort of align with our desired outcomes for the community. Okay.

Next slide, Maryam. Oh, that's it? Okay, very good. All right. So, again, these are in draft form. I think the ExCom is wide open to input and thoughts on what might be added to, refined, taken out of these priorities. So if I may, let me just open up the floor for some feedback. Steve, go ahead.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Mason. Yeah, I think it's an excellent setup to be proactive like this. And I noticed on the first slide you did mention "work closely with GAC and governments on alignment for data policy." And what that prompted is the need for us to nurture relationships with allies in the ICANN community and outside, but particularly in the community if we want to prevail on working groups, at council, and influencing the board's decisions.

So, I think that we should add to nurture and build relationships and alliances on issues where we have common interests at the GAC, ALAC, SSAC, and other members of GNSO. And it almost goes without saying but, ultimately, it's so frustrating for us to have a really excellent recommendation but not the votes and the allies to get it done. So, politics matters a lot at ICANN and is a good complement to the substance that you're trying to lead us on. Thanks, Mason.

MASON COLE:	Thank you, Steve. Excellent piece of input, there. I've taken a note there to add that to the list. So, very helpful. Anyone else? I don't see any hands on this, so I will take that as a ... Oh, Mark Datysgeld. Go ahead, please.
MARK DATYSGELD:	Very briefly, I do think that the online era took a bit of a toll on our membership. I would say that the coming year, or a year-plus, we do need to look into how to re-strengthen our ranks a bit, how to get in touch with [core existing base] and how to do more effective outreach so that we can have a little bit of more hands around. So, that would be something that I would be looking into. Thanks.
MASON COLE:	Okay. Thanks very much, Mark. That's another good piece of input. I agree with you. I think that would be a good priority for the BC, so thanks for raising that. All right. So, we have two pieces of input. Anyone else like to chime in on this? All right. If not today, that's fine. But again, you can look for an e-mail from me from about a week or two ago about these priorities. I know that I and the ExCom would welcome your additional feedback.

So, if you have thoughts that you'd prefer not to share today but over e-mail, then please do make a point of sharing that with the ExCom. That would be extraordinarily helpful. So, if there is nothing else on agenda item number two—and I see no hands—we're now at 12 past the hour. Steve, let me turn the floor over to you for the policy discussion, please.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Okay. I'm going to share the policy calendar that was circulated yesterday and go straight to the second chunk, which is the notion of upcoming public comments since we haven't filed anything new since our last call two weeks ago. So, I have three that I wanted to bring up right now.

The first is we have a review on all rights protection mechanisms, which I always call RPMs, in all the gTLDs. And this is a long PDP, which is finally into the Phase 1 final recommendations. Those comments close tomorrow. And thanks to the great work of Andy Abrams, we've got a draft comment on this. Now, Mason contributed. So, did Zak. So did David Snead.

So, altogether, the edits in the draft comment, which is a link right here on the screen, the link to the Google Doc, were approved by all of you a few weeks ago but they extended the comment period. That's why it's still in here. And I'll be filing that tomorrow morning. Again, thanks to Andy, Mason, Zak, and David.

Are there any questions with respect to that? Great. Second item up is the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures. This is really meant to be procedures for subsequent rounds of new gTLD expansion. I try to articulate for some of the BC's newcomers who can't figure out what it means to have a subsequent procedure. It's a [inaudible].

So, what we would like to do here is continue to emphasize the priority that Mason brought up, which is that subsequent procedures for subsequent rounds should take on board reviews that have not had

implemented improvements yet. We should take a look at solving problems that we have before we create additional problems with the new round of TLDs.

This creates leverage. Leverage: since many in the community are anxious for a new round of TLDs, we want to suggest that let's finish some work that ICANN needs to finish before opening the new round. So, what they have done with this very long report is come up with a set of outputs. And it's part of annex C in the final report. And all it requires is consensus recommendations and then guidance of implementation for those consensus recommendations. So, what has been left out are recommendations that didn't have a level of consensus.

So, the council itself, back in February, proved that. And so, now the board has it for final consideration. This is sort of our last chance to raise for the board before they vote on accepting the GNSO super-majority/ raise for the board lingering concerns. That just allows us to keep our message and priorities in front of the board so that, when they approve this—and they very are likely to—maybe the board indicates in its approval that they, too, share some of the BC's concerns about implementation of review recommendations prior to opening the next round. So, it has been a great opportunity for us to weigh-in.

I wanted to thank Tim Smith and Andy Abrams, Andy again, for volunteering to draft a very brief BC comment where we take a look at the last things that we said in September of 2020 just six months ago and then pull a very short comment to the board. We write these more like a memo or letter to the board. It doesn't have to have a lot of detail in it.

So, I'll work with Tim and Andy this week to get that circulated for all of you to review at least seven days before it's due, and that's due on the 1st of June. Are there any other volunteers that would like to get engaged on that particular item? I'll look for hands or chat. Okay. Thank you.

Next item up: do we have Ben on the call yet? No. We were expecting him at half-past the hour. So, we're going to return, I think, when Ben joins the call to the item on discussing the NIS2 conversations with [members of parliament], as well as the BC's latest updated position on that.

So, I'll skip that for now and go, before I turn it over to Marie and Mark, I wanted to ask whether Alex Deacon, Margie, or Mark Svancarek, do you want to give any update on where we stand on the ePDP process? Okay. Not seeing any additional insights there. So, with that, I'd like to turn it over to Marie and Mark as our councilors. So, on the screen, I have that channel, here. So, Marie and Mark, over to you.

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

STEVE DELBIANCO: Perfectly, thank you.

MARIE PATTULLO: Great, thank you. I don't think any of our ePDP experts are on the call yet, so, with any luck, we can come back to that later. First up, I have an

invitation for you all because Mark and I have the council meeting this evening and we'd love for you to listen in. So, if you're free at 19:00 UTC, please do sign into council. Mark and I are always happy to take anything by Skype, by WhatsApp, by carrier pigeon. Any comments you have, please do let us know during that meeting.

As you see, thanks to Steve who has put all of this in front of you, we're going to have a vote about our response to the GAC communiqué. There is nothing controversial in that so we won't go into that. However, there is another vote which I assume we're voting in favor, unless you tell us differently, which is to set up a brand new and shiny ePDP.

But this one is about Internationalized Domain Names, so IDNs. Back in 2019, there were recommendations on how they should be allocated and this led to a scoping team within the GNSO that suggested two tracks, and that's what's happening. One is the policy track that you see in front of you, and, at the same time, there will be an operational track.

Now, assuming that this does get voted in today, there is also going to be a discussion. You'll be seeing an invitation shortly to join that working group. If you're interested in this subject, and I know that we have a number of members—looking at you, Vivek, maybe, and some others—who are very interested in this subject, we will be allowed to have up to three members from the BC. The timeline is for 12 months, for one year.

So, hopefully that is something that you feel you might be able to get involved with. You then see that we have got a couple of discussions. The one on curative rights and RPMs. This has been going on for years

but, as you know, it's about whether international organizations can have certain rights protection mechanisms. I won't go into Phase 2A, Steve, because, absent the others, perhaps [inaudible]. I'm turning that to you.

But I am going to go to item nine, which is Marie's favorite, as you know: accuracy. Mason also mentioned that as one of the BC's priorities. As you do know, we have been fighting for a long time to look at the fact that so much registration data is inaccurate, which the contracted parties seem to believe is okay and we don't.

We have now managed to push it to the stage that they are supposed to be setting up a scoping team. We have been pushing and pushing for this to happen, as opposed to it being talked about. The messages over the last couple of weeks, including the last few days, have been, "Oh, but we need another report yet to decide on this," and our responses have been, "No, we don't. That's kind of the point of having a scoping team. You ask them to scope. So, they have a look and see what's already here. And if we need anything else, including another report, another study, that can happen."

So, a repeat call, please. We have the fantastic Susan Kawaguchi, who has already come forward to be involved in this, but we will be allowed one other member. You've seen, as mentioned, it is a BC priority, not just a Marie hobbyhorse. So, we would be incredibly grateful if any other expert members might consider joining Susan on that. Now, there is another discussion at council tomorrow that I jumped over, you will have seen, which is all about abuse. So, at this point, I hand over to my abuse colleague, my fabulous colleague Mark. Thanks.

MARK DATYSGELD: Thank you, Marie. Let's keep that [abuse going if that's] … So, I would like to start, first of all, with a new small group that I'm a part of now in the GNSO Council. Specifically, it aims to reply to the SAC114. It's one that we have discussed here in the past where the SSAC basically wants to force their hand on ICANN policies, a little bit. Let's call it that.

It does tie in with the DNS abuse subject but, first of all, let me give you an overview of where that small team is. They are under the impression that the whole procedure, in relation to the new round of domains is being kind of hijacked by the SSAC.

I guess that's the general idea of what they're going for. Because this report in particular is asking a few questions and I will read one of them for you, which is, for example, should ICANN support to continue the evolution of the Internet's unique identifier systems with a new round of gTLDs? That is just possibly funded, managed with, and so on.

And they're basically asking if it is ICANN's job to add new TLDs to the root zone, which is … I don't know. I guess this has consensus that it is but they're kind of using this to ask if a new round is even something that ICANN has any right to do. It's an interesting read but the main thing that you will notice if you have a look at this document is that the executive summary is kind of divergent with the actual content of the document. So, they don't really go that deeply into these questions.

So, they are trying to frame, from a technical perspective, what looks like to be their personal opinions on the future of ICANN. But on the other hand, they do come up with some strong suggestions in relation

to DNS abuse which I do see as a positive. They are looking to this as something that goes kind of along with what we're saying, which is there should not be any round until DNS abuse is handled better.

So, I'm latching onto that particular interpretation that they are giving. But the small team has a lot of pressure from Jeff Neuman and he doesn't seem to be very happy with the way that ICANN is handling SubPro. I'm trying to push back against that a little bit so that we can take the good out of this. But if anybody wants to follow this more closely, please drop me a note. It's interesting in an ICANN way, I guess.

And on the subject of DNS abuse itself, some members of the council have been trying to discuss the merit of the GNSO Council actually being involved, and this is by and large as a reaction to the Contracted Parties House's own take on this, which is the DNS Abuse Working Group, which is that the GNSO doesn't have anything to do in this sense, and I guess that's very convenient for them but not really my take on it. So, I'll see what the temperature in the room looks like today and maybe try to push this a little bit more. Let's see if that's feasible. So, that's it for today. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks Mark and Marie. Any questions for our councilors right now? And please recall that about four months ago, when Mason organized a discussion on DNS abuse, I introduced the ten-year-old definition of what DNS abuse was from a working group. It wasn't an official PDP approved by council but it was a working group that developed the

definition, and it is a far broader definition than the one the Contract Parties want to use and the DNS Abuse Institute want to use.

And those of you who attended that call know that I received quite a bit of pushback on the expanded definition because it would include trying to make sure that DNS abuse encompasses situations where consumers are defrauded and, in many cases, they're defrauded by deceptive marketing and deceptive domain names. So, that strikes us as being an element of DNS abuse, too.

So, we're going to have to decide whether to work that battle a little bit harder. Mark, if you don't have that definition that I shared earlier, I'll dig up the e-mail and send it over. Just let me ... Oh, so Waudo is asking me for it, so I will send it to the entire BC after this call. Thanks, Waudo. Okay. So, with that, why don't we turn to channel three, Waudo's section, which handles the Commercial Stakeholders Group? Waudo, it's all you. Waudo, we're not hearing you.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Thank you. I just wanted to unmute. First of all, just a bit of an apology that I was not on the call the last time. I couldn't make it due to unavoidable circumstances. So, I hope that you [inaudible] that. Now, the CSG right now is involved in organizing meetings for and around ICANN71.

We last held a planning meeting two weeks ago during which the BC proposed the adoption of a SMART-based working mechanism whereby we can design our work based on the results we are working to accomplish. This involves formulating medium-term priorities, and I

think Mason sent out an e-mail to the BC list regarding this after that meeting.

The [inaudible] from the BC is a big improvement from the way the CSG has worked in the past, whereby meetings were first scheduled and then what followed was an exercise to fill those meetings with topics and speakers.

So, in this new paradigm that has been proposed by the BC, it has been proposed and accepted by the CSG, we first formulated priorities and then organized meetings that worked toward achieving those priorities that we identified.

So far, the BC identified some priorities and I think, in an earlier e-mail, also, Mason sent out those priorities that the BC had so far suggested. Just to recap, the main four groups were, first of all, improving the situation on DNS abuse.

Secondly, improving ICANN Compliance function. Third was bring ICANN Organization up to date on overdue applications to the community. And the fourth major grouping was the overall improving legitimate access to registration data. So, we floated this to the BC membership asking for your contributions and your comments. I would like to thank the BC members who have endorsed the [new remark] as well as who have commented or contributed to the list of our priorities.

From the contributions, it appears that two main priorities are improving the situation on DNS abuse and also improving legitimate access to registration data. We shall keep those two at the top of the mind in case we don't have enough time within the CSG to have all the

other suggested ones. So, those will be the top ones that we'll be discussing as the BC within the CSG.

Tonight, we have another CSG planning, ICANN71 planning session, and Mason and myself will advance those priorities that we have identified. We hope that will help to frame [inaudible] content of the meetings during and around ICANN71. Our expectation is that the meetings will advance steps in resolving the priorities in a [designable] and measurable way.

Okay. Maybe a quick one on the ICANN meetings that are planned so far, the ones we are thinking of. On Monday the 24th, I think this will be before the ICANN meeting, we have planned to have a CSG meeting, and I'll be sharing with you topics and we progress and hope that those topics will fit into our identified priorities.

Then, on Wednesday the 26th May, we have planned a CSG meeting with GNSO-appointed board members. I think we did this one some time back, so some of you are familiar with this one. We'll have it on the 6th of May. Then, on June 9th, we have a CSG meeting with the GAC Public Safety Working Group. I think, over e-mail, I'll share the agenda for that meeting so that those of you who would like to participate may do so. Then on Monday the 14th of June we have planned for the CSG a closed meeting.

Finally, we have suggested a date of 24th of June after the ICANN71 for CSG members session with the [full Board.] We're also thinking of some smaller meetings, maybe CSG, with the NCSG, and also maybe the CSG with the CPH—CSG and CPH.

And also, perhaps a meeting with the Board-appointed appointee. That's Matthew. We had such a meeting with him also some time in the past, so we may want to have another one with him, particularly after we have had one with the appointed Board members. There is a [grid showing] the status of the meetings for the CSG during and around ICANN71. I think Steve has shared the link to that [grid] in the notification for this meeting. So, I think that's that for now. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Waudo, it's Steve. One quick question. Which of the Commercial Stakeholders Group constituencies is the lead organizer for CSG at ICANN71?

WAUDO SIGANGA: It is the IPC.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Got it, thank you.

WAUDO SIGANGA: The Intellectual Property Constituency. That's Wolf and Jen.

MASON COLE: No, it's actually the ISPCP.

WAUDO SIGANGA:	[inaudible]. Sorry. Mix up. Thank you. Thank you, Mason, for the correction.
STEVE DELBIANCO:	Thanks again, Waudo. Any questions for Waudo on CSG matters? Waudo, this is Steve, and I did want to remind all the BC members that the ISPCP in particular was anxious to try to find a common cause with the ALAC on discussing what should be done in the holistic review that was recommended in the ATRT.

And so, we had a preliminary discussion with Tony Holmes, and Wolf-Ulrich, Heather Forrest, and then I did a follow-up with the ALAC and tried to get them interested in opportunities there, and they are very interested in pursuing it. So, all it is is a conversation at this stage. But in case the ISP leadership brings it up with you, they had asked me to follow up with ALAC because I had good context there, so we did that. So, it's just a matter of conversation on holistic reviews. So, thank you.

And Ben Wallis has joined the call. Thank you, Ben. And we had saved this for your arrival, which is the notion that NIS2 presents an outstanding opportunity to try to update the policy on disclosing or publishing WHOIS information in expectation of what we hope the European Parliament will approve sometime in the next year.

And then, in the year that follows, we had looked for several European governments to transpose that into their own law. It is a very popular topic in the ePDP, and that's not where Ben is working. Ben is working in the European Parliament arena to try to influence what they come up

with on NIS2. We continue to use the NIS2 amendments all the time in the ePDP.

So, Ben, I have it on the screen, now. I wanted to turn it over to you to lead through the work that has been done in the past couple of weeks which culminated in BC's approval of an updated statement on NIS2. I can display the statement if you wish, just let me know. Thank you, Ben.

BEN WALLIS: Thank you, Steve, and apologies for joining the meeting late. I appreciate the accommodation for having me update you later in the meeting. Yes. So, I talked before at BC meetings to explain the legislative process in the EU and it's a long road. But we did reach, or the parliament reached, a key milestone in the last couple of weeks when the MEP, who is leading the process for the European Parliament, published what he would like to see as amendments to the European Commission's draft law.

Now, his report, his draft report, gets picked over by MEPs in his committee, and discussed, and further amended. There is no telling exactly how it will come out. But this is the MEP with the pen who will also be leading negotiations with the other half of the legislator, which is the national governments and the council. So, this is really a key player.

And the fact is that his starting position is a pretty close response to a lot of the concerns we had with the commission's text. The commission's text was already a welcome addition to European law as a counterweight to the GDPR, but we had concerns about gaps, and loopholes, and areas which weren't clear enough.

So, yep. Whether ... Who knows? If there has been a loud chorus of ... We're not the only ones who have raised these concerns and many people have been working, but a lot of the concerns we have raised and we've shared with the rapporteur have been responded to in his report.

So, the statement that I developed and made a few amendments responding to comments from the drafting team and which were shared yesterday by Steve is a response to that report. Now, there are different approaches. Perfect can be the enemy of the good. To what extent do we push for the precise wording of everything we would like to see?

I took the approach of it's easier to throw your weight behind this really powerful MEP and his position where we think it has pretty much responded to our concerns, rather than try and muddy the water by saying, "Well, he's done a pretty good job but we'd like another word here and another word there."

So, the statement that the BC adopted this week ... I mean, there's nothing new in terms of what we're asking for, which is why there was a shorter comment period. But it's just restating what we want in terms of these new positions from the key rapporteur. So, it's a really positive development, I think, and the idea now is to share our views and our support for these very specific amendments. So, we call them all out to other key MEPs in the process who will be leading the efforts from the other political groups to provide their own comments on the legislation.

And so, what we're saying is WHOIS data is important for all these reasons, and these amendments are really important, and you should support them, too. So, don't go changing them. That's the gist of our

statement and there are two areas where we decided to stick to our guns and suggest additional amendments we would like to see.

But otherwise, we're in a very good position at this point in the process of being able to support amendments that are out there by the lead MEP rather than asking for other MEPs to introduce amendments. They're already there. So now, it's kind of a matter of defending and fighting for them. And a last word on the parliament process.

Just a thanks to Claudia Selli and to [Jamie and Patel]. Claudia, [inaudible] colleague from LMVH, for their support. They're going to help Mason and I with the outreach, which we'll do tomorrow, to these MEPs. Just going to draft some e-mails, and gather everything together, and share them with Claudia, and Jamie, and Mason today so that they could be sent out tomorrow morning ahead of one of the meetings that will take place next week.

So, that's all I'll say about the parliament's half of the process. The council goes at a kind of different pace, at a less dramatic, more gradual pace, and I'm conscious that we need … Once … In the next few weeks, we need to start thinking a bit more about reaching out again to the council and getting a sense of how far they've gotten with their work.

The work of the council is chaired by whichever country is the president of the EU or holds the presidency for that six months. That is currently Portugal, and their term comes to an end at the end of June, and then it hands over to Slovenia. And so, what the country in charge of the presidency does is they issue reports on all of the dossiers that they've been following.

So, what we will see in the next few weeks is, among other things, there will be a report on how far they've gotten with the NIS2 directive. And I understand that's just going to be a report that we have been considering it, and we've had an initial round of discussions between member states and with the European Commission.

They hadn't yet gotten to the point which the parliament is at of starting to discuss specific amendments. But we do want to get back to the council process, as well, and make sure we're doing our best to influence those discussions, as well. So, I will pause there, see if there are any questions, and not take too much more of your time.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Ben. No, not at all. The BC members that have been helping on the drafting were very active, but the rest of the BC, this is a great opportunity to seek any clarifications to the document that we shared with all of you, and the final of which was pushed up last night.

Ben, I will note this, that the 72-hour proposed amendment was something that definitely got contracted parties' attention. So, that kind of specificity in the amendment indicated they would have to make changes in the way they do business, and they're very resistant to that at this point.

Any questions for Ben or the other drafters on our NIS2 comments? Ben, I did want to let you know that, with our principles on transparency and accountability, the BC will be posting the comment itself on the BC website, the same place we put the prior one up. There isn't any discussion there of who you are meeting with and conversations that

we've had. So, I just wanted to confirm with you that there's nothing confidential in this document that shouldn't be shared on the BC website.

BEN WALLIS: I don't think there is anything confidential. It would only be a question of … It's a tactical question, I guess. The contracted parties will see the arguments we're making. It will equip them to counter our arguments, and know what they're up against, and give them more time to do so.

STEVE DELBIANCO: If you wish, I could wait until you've sent it to MEPs and then post it. Would that be helpful?

BEN WALLIS: Yes. I mean, I think it would be … I wonder how quickly you need to publish it. If we let the process in the parliament run for a few more weeks, it gives the contracted parties less time to gather their horses and … That's probably not the right term, but organize themselves and argue against our specific points. But I—

STEVE DELBIANCO: I'll wait two weeks for that then, okay? We'll wait two weeks.

BEN WALLIS: Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: All right, that would be perfect. Any questions for Ben? Ben, thanks again for your great work on that. Mark Svancarek has just joined as the ePDP Phase 2A call finished up. Mark, can you give us a brief report on what's going on in ePDP Phase 2A this week?

MARK SVANCAREK: Sure, I'd be happy to do that. We have a draft of the first report out. Here, I will put it in the chat for your viewing pleasure. I think you will find it, perhaps, frustrating and disappointing. What we are working on now in Phase 2A is related to pseudonymous or anonymous e-mail contacts, or pseudonymous and anonymous consistent registrant identifiers.

We are also looking at natural and legal distinction, whether or not flags should be created and whether or not those flags should be part of the public RDS, or whether they should be transmitted through the SSAD, or whether they should exist at all.

And what we have been developing is optional guidance, optional unenforceable guidance, and even the guidance is very high level and non-specific, such that an IRT team would probably have a hard time even turning it into a real recommendation or a practice. We are cruising toward conclusion. It's being rushed forward by the chair and by the contracted parties who are very eager to see the end of it.

We are hoping that we can get some additional comments into the report related to the lack of consensus. Most groups do not agree with

the lack of policy recommendations and the focus on simple guidance. We would like to have some language in there regarding why we would like the special e-mail addresses and contacts, which are related to the ineffectiveness of the Phase 1 webform recommendation.

We would like to specify a few other things. It doesn't look like we'll get any of those comments into the report itself, although I anticipate that everyone will provide them as part of the public comments. The public comments ... I can't remember exactly what date it's supposed to be submitted on. I'm looking at the website and it's not clear to me. Hang on.

STEVE DELBIANCO: We'll have some time for that, though.

MARK SVANCAREK: Yeah, yeah. Oh, we have some time for that. I think that is supposed to be submitted on the 1st, and then it would be closed on the 15th of ... I'm sorry, on the 1st of June, and then it would be closed on the 15th of July. I'm not 100% sure that those are the dates but, the work plan that I'm looking at, those are the dates. So, anticipate that the draft that I just put into the chat will be finalized around the 1st. Thanks.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Okay. And I'll be your co-pilot on the ePDP next week since Margie is out. And I guess we want to, by the end of that week, start figuring out the things that we and our allies are going to want to change in that report. But thanks for the leadership on this, Mark, and for your update.

MARK SVANCAREK: Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Mason, that's all I have for the policy calendar but I see Marie has got her hand up. So, Marie, why don't you speak?

MARIE PATTULLO: I've got a quick question for Mark, if that's okay?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Of course.

MARIE PATTULLO: Mark, we have Council later and we've got ten whole minutes where we're going to be updated on your work by Philippe and by Keith. Are there any [watch-outs] and anything you think it's worth us saying? Thanks. You're on mute, Mark.

MARK SVANCAREK: Sorry. I think you should look out for a few things. I think you should look out for any claims that inadequacies of Phase 1 recommendations such as web forms, either that they should be sent to Compliance ... Which is, of course, silly because Compliance would never enforce something that was never defined in the first place. Look out for claims that things were out of scope.

In Phase 2, the scope of Phase 2A was defined by parties other than us, which has left us in a situation now where we raise issues or mention extenuating circumstances and then are told that either that's out of scope or we don't have time to address it, things that were constrained in a previous phase, which is literally true but not at all practical or helpful. So, those are the sorts of things that I would keep an eye out for.

MARIE PATTULLO: Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Are you able ...? It's 19:00 UTC today for the call, the GNSO Council call. If it's possible to be in Skype and listening, I know that it would be great for Marie and Mark to have specific support from you during the call.

MARK SVANCAREK: All right, yeah, let me take a look.

MARIE PATTULLO: You don't need to be there for the whole thing. I'll send you through ... You don't need to be there for the whole thing. I know that you have a life. I'll send you through the agenda. Well, yeah, but seriously. I'll send you through the agenda so you can see the part that is relevant to you.

MARK SVANCAREK: Okay.

MARIE PATTULLO: Thanks, Mark. Thank you.

MARK SVANCAREK: Thanks.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Okay, Mason, back to you.

MASON COLE: Thanks very much, Steve, and thanks, everybody, for the comprehensive updates. We have approximately ten minutes left in the call. We may go over just a few moments. Before we go to Lawrence and his update, allow me to take a bit of chair's privilege and wish Crystal Ondo a happy birthday. She's on the call today. So, everybody join me in wishing Crystal a happy birthday. Hope you enjoy your day. All right. Ladies and gentlemen, we are off to the next item, which is Lawrence's update. So, Lawrence, the floor over to you.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Thanks, Mason. Seeing that we are ten minutes from the top of the hour, I will try to keep to time as much as possible. So, I will start with the ICANN community announcements. The policy week is going to be on the 1st to the 3rd. Members are kindly encouraged to sign up and register for this event. Once you are able to log into the ICANN71 website, that will give you some access to the virtual meeting space.

There is going to be an ICANN webinar for Work Stream 2 implementation. This is with regard to Work Stream 2, the implementation processes and all. This is for the 25th of May. 15:00 UTC is the time.

Please, you can visit the ICANN website on the announcement page to get the link to register for this webinar. Just before joining the meeting, I was also on the call on the African Engagement Forum, which is a new pilot program that ICANN has floated. It was quite packed. The program was packed, basically, and I'm sure newcomers will have found the contents very informative.

One thing that ... Because of its focus on Africa, one thing that ... I would say my takeaway from this event was that it also brought to the fore for me and for business some issues that we have, especially on the continent, with regard to contractual compliance. This is in the area of accuracy of data.

I personally found out that a good number of new gTLD registrations within the region were not captured, so they are a lot of new gTLDs that have zero registration for Africa. I personally know that that's not possible because some of these new gTLDs we have registered in my own company to defend our brand.

And so, I was hoping that this is also one example that the BC will help elaborate on. I don't know if anyone has any questions in this regard before I continue. Otherwise, I'll just move on.

So, we have our outreach, the BC outreach, for ICANN71 planned for Wednesday the 9th of June. This is billed for 15:00 UTC. We will have the

honor of having Marie, our BC councilor representing business and the BC at this high-level event.

There will be some other business leaders from [EECP], which is the organization we are partnering with, and it's also most likely that the ICANN Board chair, Maarten, will also be seated on this panel. We are still fleshing out the details and ExCom is billed to have several calls in terms of arrangements for the outreach with the Global Stakeholder Engagement team.

So, when we have some more and firm information, we will definitely pass this out to members. In terms of our membership, we are still at 63 members, and we are encouraging more direct membership outreach. I had reported in the last meeting that we will be unveiling our BC logo today. This won't be possible because we are still interfacing with the ICANN's comm team.

And whenever it is that we have the whole work finalized, we will definitely present this to membership. So, we will be taking this off our radar until it's properly concluded. The BC newsletter deadline for submission of articles is for tomorrow, and if you happen to have been working on any article, please note that we will love to have this turned in tomorrow so that we can continue the process in time for unveiling in the next two weeks.

We have healthy and growing balance. We have a little over $64,000 right now in the BC account. This is because we have warehoused $60,000. And we want to thank members that have been paying up their dues. We want to encourage that if you have any challenge whatsoever,

kindly send a mail to invoice@icannbc.org. If you have sent an e-mail to invoice@bizconst.org, we have also got that mail and you will have seen that we have also acted on it.

Well, please feel free to reach out with any challenge whatsoever that you have. We will be very, very happy to help. If you also need to have another invoice issued out to you, please just send a mail to invoice@icannbc.org and we would attend to that request as soon as we can.

We all know we have the new BC committees set up. We are waiting to finalize a process for chairs to be elected and waiting for some consensus, hopefully. If that is not reached by Monday, in the coming week we will start a formal process for an election amongst the members of the committees.

The BC/GNSO Council election is already in progress. Nominations have been received and the call for nominations is still open until Monday the 24th. It's going to be closing by 23:59 UTC, thereabouts. After the close of the nomination period on Monday, on the 3rd of June, we will most likely have a candidates' call and voting will start same-day until the 9th.

And so, by the 10th of June, we should have an announcement on the new BC councilor for the ICANN72 AGM—to be seated at ICANN72 AGM. Sorry about that. I would stop at that point and wait for any questions. If we don't have any questions, I will then yield the floor back to the chair. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO:	Thank you very much, Lawrence. Any questions or comments for Lawrence, please? Okay. I don't see any hands. All right. Lawrence, thank you very much for that update. Very comprehensive, as always. All right, ladies and gentlemen.
	Any other business to cover before we adjourn today? All right. In that case, we are ending directly on time at the top of the hour. So, thanks, everybody, for attending today. We'll meet again in two weeks. Be on the lookout for that meeting notice. The BC is adjourned. Thanks, everybody.
MARYAM BAKOSHI:	Thanks very much. Thanks, everyone. Bye-bye.
STEVE DELBIANCO:	Thanks, Maryam.
UNIDENTIFIED MALE:	Thanks, everyone. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]