BRENDA BREWER:
Good day, everyone. Welcome to the BC membership call on 14 December 2023, at 16:00 UTC. Today's call is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN expected standards of behavior.

Please state your name before speaking. Have your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking. Attendance is taken from Zoom participation. We do have apologies from Marie Pattullo, Barbara Wanner, and Nivaldo Cleto.

With that, I'll turn the meeting over to BC chair Mason Cole. Thank you.

MASON COLE:
Thank you, Brenda. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. Welcome to our call here on 14 December. Good to have you all on the call.

We have our usual agenda on the screen. Before we dive in, are there any updates or changes to the agenda or any items to raise under AOB later please? Okay, all right, no hands, so we're going to dive right in. We've got an hour today and a lot to cover.

So, Steve, I understand that you'd like to introduce somebody new to the BC this morning?

STEVE DELBIANCO:
Yeah, thanks, Mason. The NetChoice team has finally got someone that can fill in for when Caroline left us because Bartlett Cleland who's on the call right now is a former U.S. Senate staffer, 20-25 years in tech

policy, a lawyer, and an expert in a lot of what we need to deal with here at ICANN. So, Bartlett, just say hello to everybody. You're going to be the new NetChoice righthand man.

BARTLETT CLELAND: Thank you, Steve. And thank you, Mason, for the warm welcome I got already. And look forward to working with everybody.

MASON COLE: Thanks, Bartlett. It's great to have you as part of the BC, so welcome and we're looking forward to your contributions. Steve, please take the floor for Item #2 please.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Mason. So now we're going to quickly pick up on the policy calendar that was circulated yesterday. We're going to go to Tim Smith first because has to jump off the call. Tim, you'll see that I have your channel up on the screen. Go ahead.

TIM SMITH: Thanks, Steve. And welcome, Bartlett. Yeah, not much to report actually. As you know, I'm sort of transitioning to the finance and operations portfolio, so this will be I think my last report as CSG rep. We're really just sort of getting some of the outcomes I guess or action items out of our intercessional underway. So Marie will of course be taking over the CSG role.

So just a couple of things to comment on. There was talk at the intercessional that we had at ICANN78 about having another intercessional in the coming year. So that's in the process of being planned probably to be in the Kigali meeting at ICANN80. So that's in the process of being organized at the moment. So that would be an intercessional all-day event sort of adjacent to the ICANN meeting.

In addition, we also agreed that we should try to have a one- to two-hour session during each ICANN meeting, so that's something we'll be looking to put on the schedule for ICANN79 in San Juan.

And other than that, I guess the other thing that's in the process of being put together is something that we affectionately called Team 14 we were at our intercessional. And that was going to be a small group that was going to be taking a look at the selection process, the nomination process, the expectations of Board Seat 14. So that's in the process of being put together.

There was a call for interest just the other day, and actually Marie put up her hand to participate on behalf of the CSG. So we haven't confirmed that back. And actually, Mason, if you'd like me just to relay that back through CSG—okay—I will offer Marie up as one of the three to be part of that team from the CSG. So I'll offer that to the CSG group.

And really that's about it at this point of things that we're working on.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Any questions for Tim? All right, Tim, thanks very much. So I'll scroll back to the top of the policy calendar and we'll take it from there. The

first thing up is that we submitted last Friday a comment to the U.K. Parliament for a committee that's evaluating the new criminal justice bill. I want to thank Mason Cole for pulling that draft together based on things we've submitted to other bodies such as the AFNIC consultation to ICANN DNS abuse. And Tim Smith and Marie Pattullo both made some edits. It was only a few pages long, and I again appreciated an expedited review by the BC on that.

I understand that comment period is still open, and I don't really know when the committee will meet to consider the criminal justice bill. Mason, any info on when this will come to a head?

MASON COLE: I haven't seen anything, Steve, no. But we'll keep an eye peeled. Chris has his hand up as well.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Go ahead, Chris.

CHRIS LEWIS-EVANS: Yeah, thanks, Steve. And first of all, I apologize for not adding some input. I had a few days off so missed the short window.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Oh, you didn't get the memo that says when you join the BC we work on every day that ends in a Y.

CHRIS LEWIS-EVANS: Yeah, I'm not allowed to take holiday. I missed the you're not allowed to take holiday part. Yeah, so for a bit of background I actually in my previous role wrote the vast majority of the text that's been in the bill so have a little bit of background with it. There was a little bit more that I wanted in there, but there was an open consultation period or a closed consultation period as well and so there have been a few changes.

There are a few things going on in Parliament in the U.K. at the minute. They were scheduled to meet for the first time to review any evidence this week. I am unsure if that happened or not. Unfortunately, since changing roles I've lost some of the insight that I used to have. But I know that they will review all evidence.

The only thing I would maybe like to have added to the comment and just for consideration if there is some opportunity is actually push some of the ask a little bit more. I think it's really important that countries and their law enforcement agencies are able to take court approved action against abusive domains.

We're never going to get ICANN policy that will allow for all types of domains to take down. And from BC point of view I think it's really key that we enable law enforcement or civil action to take domains down where they are causing abuse. And I think from e registry and a registrar side, some of the activity is really hard for them to judge whether it's legal or not, so having law enforcement in there.

So what I'll do is I know the people reviewing it. I will reach out to them and see what I can find out from that and I'll put that back. But I may

look to put a separate comment now I'm outside of the [world] just supporting the ability to take action.

But, no, really welcome the text. I think the only thing I would have said is for these and especially for the U.K. ones suggested amendments are really well received from the Parliament because they are aware they can't reach everyone in those initial consultations. So I think we need to spell out any amendments if we did want [inaudible].

STEVE DELBIANCO: Chris, this is the BC. We are always action oriented. So I put up on the screen the committee's website, and you know this well. What are the rules? Because we are willing to submit a revised set of evidence or a supplemental set of evidence. They said they met on 12 December. So did they meet, and is it too late for us to add more?

CHRIS LEWIS-EVANS: So that was going to be the first meeting. So they will review evidence [as it] goes. Once they get to that part and have read it, they may or may not re-review that part. So there were obviously lots of other elements to that bill. It wasn't just around domain takedowns. So it depends where they have got to within that part.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Right. So what's your advice on that? Do you want to work with Mason and I at revising our evidence or submitting something in your own name? How do you want to handle it?

CHRIS LEWIS-EVANS: We will be submitting something from a CleanDNS perspective. I am quite happy to have a work with you and Mason to see if there's anything more targeted that we could ask for in there.

STEVE DELBIANCO: All right, you're the expert on this particular venue and processes. The BC is standing by. We can within a few days approve an expansion or amendment or a supplement to what we submitted if you think it's appropriate and we'll just have to circulate it. People will be looking at email, so we don't have to wait for the next two weeks. We can do it via email in the BC. Welcome your ideas.

CHRIS LEWIS-EVANS: Yeah, I'll have a look and circulate that then.

STEVE DELBIANCO: All right, back to policy calendar. We have no open public comments from ICANN right now, but we have one request for input as well as our ongoing work on this too. So the request for input comes last Thursday. The ICANN Board chair Tripti Sinha wrote to the BC, wrote to everybody the same letter I believe asking for responses to questions and a framework regarding remember the public interest commitments (PICs) and the registry voluntary commitments (RVCs). And it's all about the next round. So all this comes out of the subsequent procedures (SubPro) directive that the Board put out. And they've summarized their views in the November 21st blog. I've linked to all of this.

We have two requests for the BC. We're supposed to review the proposed framework—it's about 26 pages long, it's part of that link—and then submit written input to questions. We have not commented in a decade on the specifics of registry voluntary commitments or public interest commitments. And we have until February 23rd to complete the form. There's plenty of time on this. And there will be a webinar next week. I'll try to tune into that.

So what I would ask is to think about volunteers on the BC. I'll take names now if we have any. But in any event, anybody who's remotely interested should click on the link I put to the webinar on 18 December and listen to what their framework is.

Again, I did a debate at Hamburg with the Non-Commercial Stakeholders Group (NCSG) who looks very unkindly at things like voluntary commitments and public interest commitments. And yet when governments insist upon it to remove an objection, it ought to be enforceable by ICANN.

If you recall when we did the IANA transition in 2016, we clarified ICANN bylaws that ICANN is not supposed to address matters of content. And yet when you take a look at these public interest commitments they may not have anything to do with content. They have to do with conduct, with activity that occurs, security problems, malware distribution. And when that is happening, there could be a commitment on the part of a registrant. A registrant might also commit to the eligibility of registrants. The registry could commit to the eligibility of registrants based on a domain name that was serving a particular protected community or licensed professionals.

So we think in the BC that there's plenty of room for enforceable RVCs an PICs in the next round. So I think we're going to need to be firm on this, and I'm looking for volunteers. Do I see any names so far? Let me just check the chat.

MASON COLE: Margie's volunteering in the chat, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Margie, thank you. Appreciate that. Anyone else? Okay. I didn't mention this earlier, but Bartlett Cleland who I introduced at the top of the call is on the user council for .US. That's a ccTLD, I get it. But here in the U.S. it gets a lot of attention. And, Bartlett, what does the registry council do, and have you dealt with things like access to registrant information or validating and restricting who registrants can be in .US? Would that be relevant to this?

BARTLETT CLELAND: Yeah, it could be. We've touched on the topic a couple times. I feel like it's been at least two years ago now since we last mentioned it and maybe longer. And just to be clear, I'm part of the stakeholder council, so we do some of the stuff. There are other entities, obviously, involved. But, yeah, we've approached it before. So I can always bring it up at the next meeting.

EN

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yeah, and did your stakeholder council take note of all the comments filed on the .US disclosure regime?

BARTLETT CLELAND: Yes.

STEVE DELBIANCO: BC filed on that. Be sure you take a look at those.

BARTLETT CLELAND: Yes.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Okay, great. Any other volunteers besides Margie? All right, thank you, Margie.

And then NIS2 which is usually followed closely by Marie who is not with us on the call today. Does anyone else have any updates on how the European member states are transposing the NIS2 into their member state law and regulation?

MASON COLE: Steve, I can give a quick update on that.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Please do, Mason.

MASON COLE:

So NIS2 as everyone I think knows by now was approved by the European Parliament last year. The deadline for transposition into member state law is October 2024. So there is a great deal of lobbying going on all throughout the ICANN community from various corners to try to get member state law implemented in a way that's complimentary to various interests in the ICANN community, which I'm sure you can assume on the part of contracted parties and ICANN Org themselves as well as non-contracted parties.

There is a working group that is working diligently right now to identify resources in the 27 member states that we can use to lobby for a robust implementation of Article 28 which is the part that deals with WHOIS data. I'm chairing that group, and we meet periodically. And we have lots of work to do ahead of us. We've drawn up some implementation guidelines that we're sharing with member state authorities and the idea is that we are trying to influence those authorities to, as I say, make as robust an implementation of Article 28 as possible.

So that process is underway. It's going to be an intensive several months when we turn into the new year because after the holidays are over that's when member state governments are going to meet to consider these and other changes related to NIS2. And we need to get on the radar with all these people in order to help them understand why it's so important to have as liberal to WHOIS as is possible.

So that's where we stand right now. The BC is well represented in that working group. And as I say, we've got a lot of work ahead of us but it's underway.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Which member states would be likely to be the first out of the gate?

MASON COLE: Well, probably the ones that you would expect that have large ccTLDs themselves like Germany, the U.K., France, probably Spain. We know that the Czech Republic has already published a draft of their transposition. So it's definitely underway.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Denmark?

MASON COLE: Yes, Denmark. In fact, we have a good relationship with the GAC rep from Denmark who is chairing the coordination group that is responsible for informing member states on how to transpose the Article 28 into member state law. So, yes, Denmark as well. I'm sorry. You're right, Chris. Not the U.K. You're right. They're not part of the European Union. Excuse me.

STEVE DELBIANCO: All right, any questions on NIS2? 2024 is going to be a busy year.

MASON COLE: Indeed.

STEVE DELBIANCO: All right, next up I want to talk about Council. So do we have Mark and or Lawrence on the line? We do have Lawrence, and I do not see…yes, and Mark. We have both of them on the line, fantastic. So I'll turn it over to you. You can tell me how to scroll the highlights that I put in for you.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: All right, thank you. Also, you too, Mark. Mark, do you want to go first? Then I can follow [inaudible].

MARK DATYSGELD: Yeah. I've been a little sick so I'm a little off the grid so not very much on top of things right now so not much to say today.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: All right, so I'll just report. And do take care of yourself, Mark. So I'll just report that there is a [inaudible] planned for the 21st. And it's [inaudible] on internationalized domain names. So this is a work now being championed by Donna. And I believe that to some extent there have been some requests to have some additional time for this track of the work to keep going. I'm sure to a large that their request will be granted.

The GGP for the GNSO Guidance Process which I also have had an opportunity to participate on behalf of the [inaudible] I think about two weeks back. There was a consensus call for the recommendations that we were working around much of which we're familiar with. And the final report was sent to Council on 11 December. So at the next Council meeting it's hoped that there will be also a vote around this process.

It's not yet clear how exactly things will play out as members feel greater need to familiarize themselves with the final recommendations on this particular GGP. And so I personally foresee a possibility of any [inaudible] votes and decisions maybe starting the next Council meeting in [inaudible].

All right, so I'll be a bit louder. They will also have [inaudible] SubPro small team. There will be a report from Paul McGrady on this basically just giving the highlights [of what] the work is and a process to [inaudible] group in terms of the [small team]. [inaudible] there will be some [inaudible] on the temporary specs.

And we also will be discussing further a request for reconsideration by the IPC. So members will recall that [inaudible] we had to make some adjustments to the auction proceeds final recommendations such that they will be able to indemnify ICANN from legal issues going forward. But the problem with this is that it wasn't community driven but it was actually [inaudible]. So Council feels that there is….

Sorry, this might be due to my network.

So Council feels that there is further need to do some work on cross-community working groups outcomes and how those are [inaudible].

[inaudible] will be reviewing the IPC's reconsideration request as GNSO to know if there are [inaudible].

STEVE DELBIANCO: Lawrence, IPC is alone on that reconsideration request. I don't recall them ever asking the other members of the CSG to join and we never discussed it, but they're alone on that. And what are they asking Council to do?

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: I haven't [inaudible] the request this morning, and I'll be taking a look [at what it entails]. But I'm sure they are basically asking that the Board reconsider its actions with regards the auction proceeds and maybe reconstitute the CCWG or get some kind of process from the community to basically reverse itself. So based on what [inaudible] Council will then [inaudible].

STEVE DELBIANCO: All right, when that comes up you can refer to the 2020 comment that I linked to from Jimson and David Snead. Thank you for drafting that. So we did comment back then and we were comfortable with the plan that they had, and I'm just surprised that the IPC wants to present to Council. The Council is not going to—well, I don't know—I doubt the Council is going to jump in on it. It's certainly an IPC initiative and I'm not even sure what it's really all about.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Yeah. So basically [weren't] jumping in because it's only for one of the [inaudible]. But basically the [theme] will be to evaluate whatever the request of the IPC is. The IPC, like you say, they are acting alone and have submitted their request to the Board. And so I'm sure on the merit of whatever it is they submitted, the Board will definitely be happy to make a decision. But this will be for the other GNSO constituencies to either get behind it or leave things the way they are. There's a feedback from At-Large that they wouldn't want anything to stop the process of the auction proceeds from going forward, so it's likely that others might queue behind At-Large.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Okay. You're not taking any votes. It's just a discussion on Item 8. This is next Thursday's meeting.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Sure.

STEVE DELBIANCO: All right, does anybody have questions about the next Thursday agenda in front of Council? We won't meet before Mark and Lawrence are involved. I don't see any. Looking for hands. All right, Lawrence, help me walk through some of the other Council related activities. The first is Transfer Policy Working Group. I know Arinola joined and Zak is on. I don't think you had a written update. Is there anything more you want to tell us, or are there any questions on transfer policy?

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: Steve, I'm just going to put into chat a link to the wiki page for the transfer policy group. Everyone is welcome to check that out. And if they have nothing to do over the holidays, I encourage them to listen to the recordings. The last one is particularly interesting, so you'll get to hear the BC take on registrars about transfer policy. Nothing is being decided anytime soon. Still ongoing discussions. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks Zac and Arinola. Appreciate that. Next item up Lawrence has already covered, right? The GNSO Guidance Process.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Yes.

STEVE DELBIANCO: And I think that the good news is the final report includes nonprofit applicants. Well done, Lawrence. Thank you.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: The RDDS is me. I represent us on that small team. As you know, on November 28 the RDRS went live. I reached out to BC members who have tried using it, and I got responses from a few indicating that it works pretty well.

They were disappointed that about two-thirds of the registrars [that] were seeking [that] disclosure were participating but that meant one-third of them were not. What Tim Smith noted is that even for the domain names at registrars that don't participate he actually found it convenient that the system allows you to download a PDF of your entire request so that you can send it directly to that registrar as opposed to routing it through this ticketing system.

We did another call on this Monday and, again, there's a deadly trap here in that if we don't use the system, we will allow opponents of increased disclosure to say there's obviously no demand. And since there's no demand for a disclosure system, WHOIS is officially dead and we're not going to get anything more moving on that.

So that means we do have to generate good faith legitimate requests for disclosure, and I've worked very hard to be sure that they'll all be saved, that we can count them, and we can use it to try to drive policy later on.

Were there any other BC members that have tried using the RDRS that want to share their observations on that? Looking for hands. Faisal Shah, not on the call today, I believe has started using. And I am working with Faisal and Steve Crocker at trying to do a bulk upload app. Chris Lewis-Evans, your hand is up.

CHRIS LEWIS-EVANS: Yeah, as I did see Faisal just unmute himself, so if you want to go first.

FAISAL SHAH: Yeah, so one of the challenges that we found—and I think you and I talked about this, Steve—is that we thought we could actually come out of…you know, just have one account and then from that account [a tracer] could then submit all the requests from that particular account.

We're trying to figure that out because it looks like right now we have to have a separate account for each one of the different brand holders, right? So a brand protection company has to go in there and they set up an account for Meta, set up an account for all of our other clients. So that is something we're trying to work out and trying figure out internally how we do it so that it's a little more convenient as opposed to having this huge manual process of having us to go in and set it up for every single one of our different customers because it could be quite a few.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Faisal, has he reached out at all to ICANN staff on this?

FAISAL SHAH: We're trying to figure it out internally first before we reach out, but at some point here we may have to do that, I think.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yeah, because if you do it all on the part of tracer, you're saying that you have to then indicate the client on whose behalf you're acting and that the system is forcing you to have a separate account every time it's a different client. That is not the way this was envisioned, I can tell you that.

FAISAL SHAH: Okay.

STEVE DELBIANCO: We wanted you to have bulk uploads, and that's something staff [won't] build for us so Crocker's going to help. And Steve Crocker is well-known to many of you. Former chairman of the ICANN Board, the co-inventor of TCP/IP protocol, and he's got a petition in to join the BC through his business consulting service. I guess at some point, Mason, you can report on if we have a decision yet from the credentials committee. But he's willing to do the work to build an external, but he just needs to know what people need. And I think, Faisal, if you share with Steve the need for multi-client uploads in a single batch, I think he can help with that.

FAISAL SHAH: Yeah, we're setting up a call with him probably if not next week the week after. And then we're going to kind of run through our system with him, and he can actually see maybe some of the features that he can implement so that it actually makes our system easier for our clients.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you. Chris Lewis-Evans?

CHRIS LEWIS-EVANS: Yeah, thanks. So I've done a couple of training sessions for some law enforcement folks doing these sort of requests. The feedback I've got is it has not really reduced the friction that they had for getting the requests. So they're still mindful of sending them as they were before the RDRS came out because there are quite a few registrars [that are finding they aren't] on the system. I think that's probably the biggest thing. So why log into the system, fill out everything on the system to then find out they're not in the system? You might as well just do it the old process. So I think there is a little bit of a problem on that side.

And there was an article on the mailing site which did list a number of registrars they had found not to be partaking in RDRS at the minute so [inaudible].

STEVE DELBIANCO: Chris, you and Crews Gore have similar comments. Tim Smith, one-third of this were for nonparticipating registrars. And I've got ICANN to agree to save every time you do a domain name request for a nonparticipating registrar so we can use that to pressure them to join. But I would ask you to please be sure to save the evidence that you compiled every time you submitted something. That is how we're going to drive policy in the future. I know it's an extra step, but when you submit please save a copy in some archive somewhere that we can access. And it will be soon, early in the new year.

CHRIS LEWIS-EVANS: Will do. Thanks.

EN

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you. Appreciate it. Any other comments? Margie, please?

MARGIE MILAM: Hi, everyone. Yeah, we've been looking at it. I haven't submitted yet through the system. But it's a little cumbersome in the sense that you've got to go through your ICANN account which is outside of our normal processes, so we're working with our vendors to figure out how to do that.

And the other thing is that it's limited in the types of legal basis that it identifies as a reason for request. So for example, I don't believe there's a dropdown—they have a dropdown of GDPR 6.1(f), 6.1(c)—but they don't seem to address NIS at this point. And there's clearly legal bases created under NIS2 and that's a law in effect right now in Europe.

So anyway, hopefully by the next time we have a call I can have a little bit more information on how we're seeing the procedure and whether it's making any improvements in the process.

STEVE DELBIANCO: All right, Margie. Thank you. Any other comments? Because I'll carry this forward to the meeting we have with the full small team. ccTLDs was another topic that came up, that if you're requesting a domain name and it happens to be in a ccTLD, why can't the ccTLD's registrars, why can't registrars who sell to that ccTLD, if they're participating, they ought to be able to help. And I was surprised that we didn't get any pushback from registrars on that.

FAISAL SHAH: Hey, Steve, how about registries, ccTLD registries?

STEVE DELBIANCO: They don't have the relationship with the registrant. So this is a system that under GDPR is supposed to go to the person who has the relationship. I know NIS2 will change what registries have to keep. Whether they're thick or thin they'll have to accommodate that under NIS2, but currently this is designed only to work with registrars. Whenever we've mentioned registries, ICANN legal just says it can't even happen.

FAISAL SHAH: So we in the past have sent submissions to…sometimes we'll send it to both the registry and the registrar and we'll get responses back from the registry, compliant responses, and not the registrar.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Right, but the registry doesn't have a relationship with the registrant in the way ICANN legal suggests it is that a registry cannot do a legitimate evaluation of legitimate interest because they do not have…they're not acting in a relationship with the registrant.

FAISAL SHAH: Hmm, okay.

STEVE DELBIANCO: That's what legal says, and I'm not an attorney so no idea whether that's a bullshit answer. But we have for three or four years now had no luck at all getting registries, thick registries that is, to be part of the response. This is a registrar system.

FAISAL SHAH: I think that's interesting because we haven't gotten that pushback from the registries that they don't have the relationship.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Well, yeah, because sometimes they'll do it anyway, right?

FAISAL SHAH: Yeah.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yeah. Hey, Chris Lewis-Evans, why don't you take the microphone and explain what you do to put in NIS2 as the legal basis when it's not in the dropdown.

CHRIS LEWIS-EVANS: Yeah, sure. So this was part of the law enforcement training, actually, so it wasn't for NIS2 but it was for GDPR Article 22.1(d), I think. So, yeah, there is an "Other" in there and that then allows you to type in what your legal basis is. So for law enforcement they've got a separate one, they can type that in. And, Margie, if you needed to write something around NIS2, you could put it in the "Other" there.

EN

STEVE DELBIANCO: I can see the value though at having NIS2 be in the dropdown. I'm not going to be able to get that done until there's transposition of NIS2 by some member states.

CHRIS LEWIS-EVANS: Yeah, and I specifically asked [Yuko] because obviously I was on the PSWG at the time around adding the cutout for law enforcement as a legal basis and they just said that they couldn't list all of them. So that was sort of a no from ICANN on that one.

STEVE DELBIANCO: You know, ICANN won't make any changes because they were so desperate to achieve their targeted deadline to release the RDRS. But if I ask them to add a new item, it will get into a fight, but what if I added text right below the dropdown that says "you can use the other to indicate legal bases not in the drop down, such as NIS2 transposition"? You know, I could do something in the text perhaps. Because what Margie is getting at is we want to prompt the requester to remember they have more legal bases than appear in the dropdown. Right, Margie? It's about reminder.

MARGIE MILAM: Yes, that's correct. And if I can jump in, it's also ideally we'd like the system to work. And so the more…obviously some of us are very aware of the NIS2 development, but a lot of folks aren't. And the more…anything that helps that increase the compliance rate or the

success rate I think is good for the entire system and I would encourage people to keep on submitting requests. So that's my thinking. I mean, I am aware and I'm going to use the other when it makes sense, but I just wanted to point out that now that we have that it's something that I think ICANN should be thinking about.

STEVE DELBIANCO: I'll keep hammering it, Margie. I promise. All right, that's it for the policy calendar because we already covered the subsequent rounds where we got volunteers Chris and Margie. So I will send it back to you, Mason. Thank you.

MASON COLE: Thank you, Steve. Appreciate that very much. Any follow-ups or questions for Steve please? Okay, it looks like the queue is clear. All right, let's proceed to Item #3 on the agenda which is finance and operations update. We are in a…

[audio cuts off]

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]