
BRENDA BREWER: Good day, everyone. Welcome to the BC Membership call on the 16th of December 2020 at 15:00 UTC.

This meeting is recorded. Kindly state your name when speaking for the record, and keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking. Attendance will be taken via Zoom. Please note that Barbara and Jimson have sent regrets. With that, I'll turn the call over to Claudia Selli. You may begin. Thank you.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Hi, Brenda. Thank you so much and thank you, everybody, for participating to our last BC call for the year. With that, I will give the floor to Steve for the policy discussion. You have the agenda in front of you. We will continue with the usual order and having the Policy Calendar to continue with the GNSO and CSG, and then Finance and Operation. Steve, over to you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Claudia. Hey, everyone. I sent the Policy Calendar yesterday. Let's see if we can dive right in. Two things I want to report that since our last call, we did comment on the IANA Naming Function Review on December 2. Thank you, Jimson, for drafting. Jimson is not with us today, he's celebrating his birthday with family. Then on the 8th of December, thanks to work by Jimson, Mark Datysgeld, and Vivek, we filed a comment on recommendations for the root name service strategy and implementation. That's about a risk-oriented discussion of

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.

more widely distributing the root server instances to make the root server system and DNS more resilient to attack. So good work on that for the BC.

Let me move to the open public comments. We have one open public comment, and then one other comment that's not part of the ICANN but it's very important to us. Okay. The first is the ICANN open public comment on the EPDP for Phase 2 Priority 2 recommendations. These comments close later in January and the BC is intimately involved in this, thanks to the great work of Margie Milam, Mark Svancarek, Alex Deacon, and several others who volunteered to help. Mason Cole has been a big help on this as well. And I serve as your alternate.

That EPDP Phase 2 had four recommendations which the BC supported and they're known as Priority 2. We believe that they deserve further action but the Board has asked for public comments on these four recommendations, prior to them voting on it. That gives us an opportunity to put a little meat on the bones and maybe add clarity, add rationale, anticipate objections that we could see, or anticipate problems in implementation and enforcement on the contracted parties. So we have done quite a bit of work on this in the minority statement we filed in July but I do want to try to get some volunteers to help with this to draw on that work. But I don't want to assume or impose this on Mark SV and Margie because they and Alex, we will have our hands full because the weekly calls for EPDP, they start back up again tomorrow.

So looking at the list of participants here on this call, do we have some folks that would be willing to help? I'm watching both the chat and

hands that come up. There's only four recommendations. They're relatively simple: privacy/proxy, redaction may instead of must, data retention period, and the purpose statement.

Alex Deacon, I didn't want to lean on you since you're doing so much work on this. But if you're willing to help, you know it will make it go better. Thank you. Anyone else? Roger, please go ahead. Is that a volunteering, Roger? Thank you. All right, Alex, Vivek, and Roger so far. Thank you. We'll revisit the details of that. I do think that Margie and Mark will assist. If we do the drafting, I'm sure that they'll help out.

The second one up, I'd like to turn it to Mark Datysgeld to discuss a little bit more. Mark, you just circulated a new comment on this several hours ago so people could check their inbox on that. It's not due until January 4th but we ought to come to closure before the holidays. This is something Mark spotted which is the Mozilla Foundation put out a public consultation over the topic of doing your DNS over HTTPS, which is a different way to do DNS resolution in a way that since it's HTTPS, it would be encrypted. They put out the paper and the BC may have some interests in this and we had a pretty vibrant discussion two weeks ago. Mark had done a draft, and then Mark SV, Alex Deacon, and I had provided some input, and Mark has incorporated that into the draft that he just circulated. I'll put that up on the screen while Mark is talking. So, go ahead, Mark. I'll put yours up.

MARK DATYSGELD:

Thank you very much, Steve. Hello, everyone. Very briefly, apart from making some basic corrections, we have incorporated a few things. First

of all, you will see the first point is that some other ICANN SOs/ACs are starting to show interest in this. So I am giving a nod to the fact that ALAC has started to ask ICANN to intervene on this matter. The difference in this case that we're not asking ICANN to intervene on our behalf, we're trying to make our voices heard directly. But still good to up the ante a bit, got a little bit of zeitgeist going. So that one, unless it's very controversial to anyone, I think it's a good inclusion.

The core of the changes focus on the second page where we do bring up some very specific business interest and hopefully it's things we agree on. So the first point is that from the perspective of an actor like Verisign—they are the ones making this argument so they are the ones we are using here—the encryption of the final hop would actually generate cost for them without actually generating privacy to the end users. That's what they claim and they have a lot of substantiation for that. Some of our members have discussed this. It looks like from at least our technical perspective, we agree with that, so it's a consideration. We're putting it out as in we would like some further explanation on whether there's this need for this business cost to be added, this transactional cost.

The second part ties back with everything that we discussed in terms of protection, and even with the WHOIS/EPDP/everything discussion which is we're fighting over this whole possibility to keep contents under control. But with these particular technologies, it becomes much harder to identify certain patterns. So, for example, we are mentioning here matters of activity logging, which is necessary in a lot of countries, copyright protection mechanisms, all of those get changed by this. We

won't be able to operate within the boundaries that we're used to or enforce it in the way that we normally think about it.

What I added—and this is my personal perspective and I would like to be corrected if anybody has any objections—is that what this actually does is that it can create unintended consequences in which governments will still want and need to do this and they will find a way, be it breaking down as fundamental components of the transaction and spying on the connections or not, if that's what they have to do to report to governments, and the government pressures them to do that. That's what they will end up doing. They will have to inspect packages deeply and things like that. So, that might be a very serious unintended consequence that would expose users even further. With that brief explanation, I would like to open this to any of the other members involved—Alex, Mark, Steve, anybody who's interested. I'm looking forward to more impressions. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thank you, Mark. Alex and I had been going back and forth on the last hop, which is the paragraph which is at the top of the screen in front of you. As you write here, we're not clear how that does anything for privacy because that last hop to the authoritative server contains no identifying information of the person who actually did the query, and it contains no information about what query they're doing other than the TLD level.

So my read of the Verisign blog that you cite in the footnote, it wasn't the cost issue so much as it makes it potentially significant delay at

working on Denial Service Attack if the data is encrypted, so that engineers looking at text or automated tools cannot apply rules without going through the decryption steps. So I did not get from that post that it was about cost. I thought it was about generating incremental difficulty, and in some cases adding a lot of extra time to trying to stop an existential attack. Alex knows this way better than me so I would hope that Alex could clarify on that.

ALEX DEACON:

Yes, Steve. Any business, it comes down to cost. I think in terms of the issues they raise in terms of DDoS, knowing the IP address is really what's important there. Knowing what's encrypted, I can't see as being an issue. But in any way, I do agree conceptually that encrypting the data at the hop between the recursive resolvers in the root and the gTLD authoritative resolvers is less important. Whether we want to call out the cost issue or not, I guess we can debate.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

I don't feel that cost is going to be a good argument when you're citing a company with the resources that Verisign has. I wouldn't worry about Verisign's costs. I believe that unless we can say that it would inhibit the ability to stop DDoS attacks, that's going to be the rationale that we would give. Because I wouldn't want the BC to go on record it's worrying about whether it cost extra money for Verisign. And Verisign is a member [inaudible]. I just don't think it's a good argument.

ALEX DEACON: Yeah. If there's any company on the planet that could run an encrypted service at scale, it would be Verisign.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Right. But in this case, they have to be able to decrypt in real time or not be as quick at responding. That's my concern.

ALEX DEACON: Which they'd have to do in either way to respond to the question.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Any other comments on this since we want to work this out before year-end? It's due the 4th of January. Mark Datysgeld observes in the point, "Let's not make it about cost. Let's really read this carefully, those who have the technical skills to do so. If the argument is it makes it harder to investigate then that's the point I want to make. Then we add that it's not clear how the encryption would actually increase the privacy and benefits, potentially just generating difficulty at stopping attacks. That would be the way I want to go." Okay. Thank you, Mark. I'll return to the Policy Calendar now. Okay. Thank you, Mark.

Next one up is I had two little updates on modifying WHOIS to comply with GDPR, and then we'll turn to Council. The first update is that we got a report from Interisle. That's the consulting firm that we decided back in the summer to move 20 of our \$40,000 for outreach and move it over to support a contract where Interisle is doing a study on WHOIS data. Like how much of the contact info is still out there in the redacted world, how many registrants are natural versus legal entities. That last

question is the most important. If we discover that 22% of registrants are natural persons and the rest are legal or vice versa, that will inform the Phase 2A that we're about to begin tomorrow morning on legal versus natural entities in the policy of implementation for the EPDP. So that's important and we expect to get something in mid-January.

Mason, you had a request you sent over to me via e-mail. Talk about that now. We'll do our best to come through with it with respect to Interisle.

MASON COLE: I'm sorry, Steve. Can you hear me?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yeah. We do.

MASON COLE: I'm sorry. Remind me what we're talking about.

STEVE DELBIANCO: I think you had a special request on getting something from Interisle in the timing that they presented.

MASON COLE: Right, yeah. I was interested in having Interisle present their findings in one of our early January meetings, if their findings were available by

then. As far as I remember, they're about to publish but they were waiting until the new year. Is that correct?

STEVE DELBIANCO: That's right.

MASON COLE: That was the extent of my request. It was, can it be arranged for Interisle to present their findings to us before they were made public?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Chantelle and Brenda, take a few minutes and investigate the January dates when the BC would be meeting and put those in the chat, and then I'll have those when I go back to Interisle. Thank you.

The second update on here is that EPDP Phase 2A begins tomorrow. I mentioned that to you earlier that Mark SV, Margie will be our representatives. I'll be the alternate. But Alex Deacon will be there every step as the most helpful person for both the IPC and the BC.

All right. We'll move to Council now because this is really going to be tricky. The next Council meeting is tomorrow at 12:00 UTC. The earlier discussion there was the previous Council meeting of 19 November and we covered all that on our last BC call, right? So I think the most important thing is to dive into the agenda for tomorrow but I'll turn things over to Mark and Marie.

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

STEVE DELBIANCO: Perfect.

MARIE PATTULLO: Thank you. The two very brief updates on the EPDP before we do tomorrow's agenda, there's going to be a couple of discussions between Council and the Board. One, the Board is looking for clarification about the deletion of data in the organizational field. Yes, that old favorite again. Not very complicated. If you want to know more, we'll take that offline.

The other one is, as you know, part of the Council's adoption of the Phase 2 report included a request to talk to the Board to have a consultation with the Board about the cost benefits of the SSAD and how that's going to work out. Now, we're not yet at that stage but we are at the stage before that where a small team of us are going to get together and figure out how we're going to have that consultation. So I will keep you posted when that starts.

Now, Steve, what I know you are most interested in for tomorrow is something else, of course, from the EPDP. Something else we've been talking about for months, the potential expiry of the Thick WHOIS consensus policy. We've been batting this around a very long time in the BC, in the Council, in the small team. Where we are now is that Pam Little—who was the vice chair of the Council—drafted a motion that will be voted on tomorrow. You remember we've discussed this motion a

couple of times before but only as a discussion point. This is for voting. And that motion is completely different from the motions that we saw before in that, in essence, what it does as it stands is to say that the EPDP absolutely intended to overturn Thick WHOIS. That was definitely their intent. There you go. It's gone. It's more or less that but with a lot more words. Now, our colleagues in the IPC, led by the extremely capable and very helpful John McElwaine, have been working on trying to get certain modifications into that motion. John has actually seconded the motion, which means that he's in the best place to be able to put forward a so-called friendly amendment, and we have to do that now, like as soon as this call finishes.

So what we are trying to do is ensure that the motion at least opens the door to the possibility of Thick WHOIS not being completely dead. In that, it should say that the Thick WHOIS data still should be transferred, and that's okay under Rec 7 as long as there is the legal basis. And if the Registrar/Registry believes there is not a legal basis, they should say why they think that is the case. Now, this is roughly where we are. If the BC agree to this—but I'm going to hand it over to Steve and to Susan to give more detail—if you guys on this call agree to this and it is this urgent, I need to get back to John directly after this call and say, "John, get in touch with Pam and put forward that friendly amendment."

She's already seen most of the wording. She hasn't seen yet the last parts that we're trying to adjust. If Pam accepts, what that means is that there'll be a slightly redrafted motion that we will vote for tomorrow in Council. If Pam does not accept, two things could happen. One, she could not accept on the basis that she hasn't got enough time so do we need the deferral so we could talk about it? But she might just point-

blank refuse. In which case, we're going to have to vote no. And you all know the song here that if we vote no, it won't make any difference to the outcome because we don't have the votes but we are on record. Now, I'm going to pause there and hand to Steve or to Susan, for whichever of you would like to take that forward.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thank you, Marie. And I'll tee it up for Susan in a second. We talked about this over the last hour prior to this call. Marie has captured it and it's exactly right. We have a tiny bit of leverage right now in that the contracted parties led by Pam might be willing to accept an amendment. And you have it on the screen in front of you, an amendment. The understanding would be that if we made this amendment and she accepted it as a friendly amendment, it would mean that IPC and BC would vote yes and she'd have a unanimous motion get through Council. The upside for us is it keeps Thick WHOIS transition alive provided that somehow or another we have clarity that there's an appropriate legal basis. A court in Europe or a particular Data Protection Authority issues a regulation. Or a European government or Council issues a new law that makes it clear. It's hard to know what clarity is in that case but it's way better than the resolution as written. You can see that without the amendatory language, Thick WHOIS transition is over as a result of the motion that could be approved as soon as tomorrow.

So the idea here is to give Mark Datysgeld and Marie the clearest possible instructions about how they proceed at bargaining with the little leverage that we have. What Susan is going to introduce in a

moment is a potential improvement on the words you have on the screen in front of you where there is clarity that an appropriate legal basis exists. I think Susan has come up with something a little bit better and if the BC is on board, we'll ask Marie and Mark to pursue that instead. Go ahead, Susan. Susan, we're not hearing you.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: How about now? Can you hear me now?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yes, we do.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Okay. We had this conversation just in the last hour. The thought is that, okay, we're going to defer WHOIS until there is an appropriate legal basis, which I think there will be. I think governments will understand that they need to put laws in that clarify that. So we don't want to lose that, but what can we gain in the meantime? So I drafted one sentence just in the last half hour: "A registrar/registry will be required to provide a disclaimer to ICANN Compliance as to why they believe no legal basis exist."

After I wrote that I'm like, "No way are they going to do this." But the rationale that we were thinking of is let's get something out of them. The biggest problem we have with contracted parties, they often say, "No. We don't have a requirement to do that," but they never will put themselves out there and say why. And a lot of times, they never even respond. That's happened a lot in requesting Temp Spec and the ability

to request registrant data. They just don't respond and ICANN Compliance doesn't make them do anything.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Could you paste that sentence into the chat, Susan?

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Yes. I'll paste the whole thing. That was a good idea.

STEVE DELBIANCO: I wanted people to have a chance to study it while you're speaking. Okay?

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: This is the whole thing. It's just the last sentence. I don't know. I don't know if it's worth the battle or not after I wrote it. But I thought it would be good for discussion. It's the last sentence to that paragraph I just added.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Got it. Thank you, Susan. For everyone to be clear, we're looking to see whether we want to instruct our councilors to use the last sentence that Susan added as our bargain. Then if Pam Little said no, that's not a friendly amendment. I think we would fall back on everything in the paragraph that you have on the screen in front of you except the last sentence. And if she said yes to that, we would vote for the motion. If she said no to that, we would vote no. Alex Deacon, you're next.

ALEX DEACON: Thanks, Steve. I like that last sentence. I think we do need transparency. We need to understand which registries are thick and which are not. I think it would also be important if we could get the rationale as to why they've decided to move from thick to thin or to not go to thick. I would support adding this if we can. There's not a lot that we want here. This is a little tiny bit that we should try for. I do think transparency in this regard is important.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Alex, be more open about it. This is just tiny as you say. If you have in mind something more we could get with the limited leverage available, what would it be?

ALEX DEACON: I don't know, Steve. I believe that what the contracted parties are doing here does not align or is not in alignment with the GNSO process or procedures. Unfortunately, I don't have the deep understanding of those to make a coherent argument that that's the case. Remember the Board has indicated to the IRT that doing what Pam is suggesting can't be done or shouldn't be done. But the GNSO Council seems confident that they can push back on that. So I really don't have a lot more to add here on the substance of this motion because I believe—although it may not be the case—that it actually goes against the process and it sets a terrible precedent moving forward.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Alex, the sentence on the screen in front of you, John McElwaine took the position this morning call that the blue language that we're adding changes this from a complete repeal of Thick WHOIS transition to a modification, which keeps it alive. It modifies it, it keeps it alive in case we get clarity that a legal basis exist. That is a significant improvement over killing it with a full repeal. I quite agree that if there is a process problem, we can argue about it. But if the judge about that decision is Council, we'll lose that decision. So we're just trying to use the leverage we have and get it in. So, do you not value the sentence at the top of the screen where we make it clear that it's not been repealed but only modified?

ALEX DEACON: I don't know. I don't know how to answer that, Steve. If people feel this is the way to go then I'm happy to go along.

STEVE DELBIANCO: We truly value your input on it and have at every stage of the process. So if you think there's something we should do differently, please make the case. But at this point, it looks like Susan's got a couple of edits to the line in front of you. Susan, you're going to go with the word "statement" instead of "disclaimer," is that right?

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Or rationale. I want to make sure that it is something that is delivered. They have to proactively deliver. The statement makes sense or a rationale. I'm fine with either of those.

STEVE DELBIANCO: All right. So the idea here is that—BC members, I'm asking you now to provide concerns or alternatives or objections because at the close of this call, our councilors will work with the IPC councilors and propose this language to Pam Little. Their vote will occur tomorrow. So are there any objections to Susan's first step? The second step is if that's rejected. The second step is the language on the screen in front of you. And if that's rejected, I think we are a no. In terms of a no, if you read the room, Marie and Mark may end up asking for a deferral. And if there's not a deferral, vote no. But that deferral is not likely to get us anything unless it's demonstrated that there's a little bit of momentum to go our way. Any objections? Mark Datysgeld, tell us what's behind your impression that this would be accepted?

MARK DATYSGELD: From the tone that I've been thinking of from the contracted parties, we do talk outside of this context on other working groups such as Universal Acceptance. I see a willingness to make compromise. I don't think they're willing to die on this particular hill. I'm not guaranteeing anything but I am under the impression that this is something they would be willing to compromise on. Again, it's my impression and I'm not promising anything here. But it's a strong impression.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you. All right, BC members, Alex, and others, this is our chance to inform the process for our votes in Council tomorrow. Any last words on this? I see no objections. Thank you, Susan, for the suggested language.

Marie, do you have what you need to quickly write to the IPC councilors and kick into place these two offers—the step one and the step two offer?

MARIE PATTULLO: As far as I see it, Steve, it's the step one. Also we've talked to John already. We put Susan's sentence in as it's already been circulated to us by e-mail. I will send that to John as soon as this call finishes saying, "This is what we'd like you to go for. Good luck. Keep us posted."

STEVE DELBIANCO: Marie, if he comes back and Pam says no, then we fall back to what's on the screen now, John's original offer and we take that.

MARIE PATTULLO: Yes. I'll say to John this is what we'd like including the sentence. If he takes the entire thing to Pam, it depends on what Pam says. If she rejects the entire thing then we don't fall back because there's nothing to fall back on, because she's rejected everything that you see there in blue. Everything you see in blue is already an amendment.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Got it. Try to be fluid about it because if what Pam ends up rejecting is the idea of providing a statement and we fall back to what's on the screen right now, I think the BC is still a yes because that's better than what we're going to get.

MARIE PATTULLO: Well, I can ask John to test the water and see because I know that he has managed to have some very useful conversations with her and constructive conversations. So yeah, I will. If we get Susan's sentence in, all the better. If we don't but we do get what you see here in blue, better than what we have at the moment so we'll still vote yes. If we do not get any of what we see in blue, we're going to vote no, correct?

STEVE DELBIANCO: We agree.

MARIE PATTULLO: Okay. Got it.

STEVE DELBIANCO: I think this is all part of the same amendment which includes the statement that WHOIS has not been repealed but only modified.

MARIE PATTULLO: Yes, absolutely. All of the blue. And there's a lot more blue further up and further down where a number of amendments that John put together to this draft motion when we saw it last week.

STEVE DELBIANCO: The most important part are the resolved clause which you have on the screen in front of you. The whereases contribute but are not as

essential. And the rationale I don't think is binding at all. So those are all things we'd like to have, but the key is the resolved clauses, right?

MARIE PATTULLO: Yes.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Okay. Any questions on that? Then I'll put the Policy Calendar back, the other items. Thank you, Susan. Go ahead, Marie and Mark.

MARIE PATTULLO: Very briefly, not much more for me because most you can read yourself. The only thing I will pull out is that SubPro is not going to deliver this year. You remember we thought it was going to be December. They've come out with a new timeline that's just in January or potentially even February. So it will be discussed as an AOB on the council tomorrow but, of course, nobody is going to complain. They've done so much work. If it takes a couple of months more, then so be it. The rest of it, I don't think you need me to talk to you, Steve. But, Mark, do you want to say anything about the IDN Charter team and/or anything else?

MARK DATYSGELD: Thank you, Marie. Very briefly, not to take too much time. So the IDN team, there's a strong belief that this can be an actual EPDP, as in taking a few months, but it remains to be seen. But at least that's the intention of the team, that it seems to be the consensus position that we can move with this fairly quickly for ICANN standards. The initial timeframe

we're looking at is getting this done by April or so. Don't hold me accountable of that because, as you know, ICANN speed, but that's the general intention.

I would also like to highlight that the RPMs group is coming up with its, let's hope, final impressions. They will present that to Council and there's also a webinar that's happening. I'm not too sure on the window of the webinar.

MARIE PATTULLO: 11th of January. It's in Policy Calendar.

MARK DATYSGELD: Perfect. So, around January. Keep an eye out for that so that we can actually have some insight into that because I honestly lost track of what they were doing a few months ago. Just a small suggestion. Thank you.

MARIE PATTULLO: Thanks for that, Mark. We do have the final report now, the Phase 1 final report from the RPMs. You see the link in the calendar, there will be a webinar on the 11th. It will probably be the usual style so you guys can listen, but only Mark and I can ask questions. In other words, you send us your questions so we ask them, pretending to be. That's really an important thing. Thanks for raising that, Mark. And unless there's anything else, Steve, Council is handing back to you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Marie. Fantastic. We're next going to turn to channel three, which is the work we do in the Commercial Stakeholders Group. Barbara Wanner is our CSG liaison. We have just elected Waudo Siganga to assume that role in January. Barbara is unable to join us on the call today. So Waudo, this is your debut. Take it away.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Thank you, Steve. Waudo Siganga here for the record, standing in for Barbara Wanner. My report are basically just talk about what transpired in the last CSG meeting which was held on the 8th of December. There were basically five agenda items. The first two, we discussed about the ICANN70 planning. Secondly, we also talked about the CSG OEC meeting. OEC stands for Organizational Effectiveness Committee. I remember that was a tongue twister last time. Then the third item was the so-called ODP, Operational Design Phase. I'll come back to that. And then the fourth item was a follow-up on the Cross-Constituency Working Group Accountability Work Stream 2 Final Report. And the fifth and last item was a follow-up on Public Interest Commitments.

If I just go back and start with the first one, ICANN70 planning, this one is a continuing item. It's been having three activities associated with it. The first one is the closed meeting for the CSG that will be there in the ICANN70. The second one is the open meeting. And the last meeting will be the CSG with the GNSO-appointed Board members. Of those three meetings, only two require some input from the BC.

The first one is the open meeting. We are going to try to make this meeting a little bit more interesting than usual. So we are requesting for

any suggestions about potential interesting or prominent speakers who can speak at this meeting. This should be quite easy because the participation will be remote, it will be virtual. So, we should be able to tap some interesting speakers given that they don't need to travel to the venue to give their presentations. In case you have some good ideas about some interesting or prominent speakers that can add value to this particular meeting, please feel free to get in touch with myself or with Barbara while she's still in the position of CSG liaison. We'll appreciate that.

Then there's the CSG with GNSO-appointed Board members meeting. For that one, what we require from the BC is ideas about the topics that should be discussed at that particular meeting. So far, we are thinking of discussion covering the holistic review that is now being thought about for ICANN, now given that the Board has accepted the ATRT report. So now that the smaller reviews, the operational and the specific reviews have been put on hold, there's going to be a holistic review of the whole organization. So, [that will be] on the agenda for the meeting with GNSO-appointed Board members so that we can discuss with them what they think about things like the scope of that review. We're also thinking of a topic, rationale for the ODP. I'll come back to the ODP a little bit later. Another topic that we want to discuss with them is DNS abuse and also budget planning for the Financial Year '21.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Have we lost you, Waudu? We may have. All right, I'm not hearing Waudu.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Sorry, Steve. I think I went muted somehow. I hope I didn't talk too long when I was not on.

STEVE DELBIANCO: We heard you right up to the ODP. We were just finishing up on ODP when we lost you.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Okay. I was just starting on the second agenda item that we discussed on the 8th of December. That was a CSG OEC meeting, the Organizational Effectiveness Committee meeting. That meeting is being organized for the CSG. I think it's currently planned for some time in mid-January. What we are working on now is just to see the scope of the discussion that we shall have particularly on the holistic review for the ICANN.

Then the third item that was discussed at that meeting on 8th of December was the ODP. It is a new proposal that has come from the GNSO. It stands for Operational Design Phase. It's a proposal to actually improve or augment the PDP process within ICANN so that policies that are approved by the GNSO Council, before they are looked at for approval by the Board, they can be further refined. So it's proposed that there should be a process whereby first of all the staff look at the proposal that is coming from the GNSO and refine it with things like costs and implementation issues that might arise and so on and so forth. After the staff have done that—hello, Steve?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yes, Waudo. You did cover some of this earlier before you went on mute. I wanted to ask you to take a look at the screen. What I've highlighted is the next most important thing on your watch will be getting us ready for discussion with Matthew and Becky on the 18th of February, driving the agenda from what topics and having coordination with the IPC and the ISPs so that that meeting really stays focused and doesn't wander around. So that'll be one of the first challenges on you. And I wanted to ask as well, which of the CSG constituencies is in charge of organizing for ICANN70?

WAUDO SIGANGA: I know Heather. I think she's from the IPC. I think she's the one that's the main person that's doing the organization for that.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Okay. What Chris Wilson is saying that the ISPs, not Heather, would be the ones that are in charge for ICANN70.

WAUDO SIGANGA: I'll go check that and maybe I can do the confirmation later on him. He could be correct. Sorry if I didn't get that correct.

STEVE DELBIANCO: The organization of ICANN70 and the February 18th meeting are ideal opportunities for you to create those relationships with the other

liaisons from the rest of the CSG. And I would encourage you, Waudu, to pick up on what Mark Datysgeld put in our Mozilla letter. Because we are focusing on concerns that are relevant to the ISPs on the second page of Mark's letter and we're focusing on concerns that the IPC has that might be interrupted by encryption of DNS traffic. So we are trying—

WAUDO SIGANGA: So you suggest that I could introduce this, Mark's proposal, to the CSG meeting?

STEVE DELBIANCO: I would propose earlier than that. It'll all be over by then. You see, Waudu, January 4th is the closing date for that. So I'm inviting you to take Mark's current draft, the one that just came over half an hour ago, and work with Mark at shooting that over to the IPC and the ISPs, pointing out that they have an interest as well. Mark, would you agree?

WAUDO SIGANGA: Yeah. We'll do that on the side then with Mark.

STEVE DELBIANCO: And you two can work together on that.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Thank you for that suggestion, Steve. You're the person that is so much in command of all that's going on with the policy. So your input and

suggestions and advice is very crucial. Thank you. I think I'll stop there because there were just a lot of procedural details about the meeting. I think I'll stop there and hand over back to you.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thank you, Waudo. Are there any questions for Waudo on the CSG? Okay. Thanks, Waudo. Back to you, Claudia. Is Claudia still with us? I'm not hearing Claudia. So, Chantelle, would you put the agenda back up? The next part is—Jimson is not with us today for Operations and Finance. But Lawrence, who will be our new Operations and Finance, has joined us and is going to give this portion of the report. Go ahead, Lawrence.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS:

Thank you, Steve. I'm standing in for Jimson, who, as we have been told earlier, is celebrating his special day with family. Jimson has provided me an update to give to the BC with regards to our Finance and Operations. Presently, with regards to our finance, our due payment is in compliance of up to 88%. We still have a few members whom we are expecting to make payments. We want to encourage, if you are not sure about your status, to please reach out to the invoicing secretariat, Chantelle or Brenda, to adequately advise with regards to status.

With regard to operations, we have been able to advance further in terms of our committee elections. And the incoming members of the Credentials Committee have reached a consensus to have Zak as the chair for the incoming Credentials Committee. I would like to pause at this point to give a few minutes of our time to Zak to say a few things

about himself and what we should expect from the Credentials Committee going forward. Zak, I leave the floor to you.

ZAK MUSKOVITCH:

Very kind of you, Lawrence. As Lawrence mentioned, Vivek Goyal, Roger Baah, and myself are your new Credentials Committee starting January 1st. So I'd like to take the opportunity of thanking the past members of the Credentials Committee, Arinola, Adetola, Andrew Mack, John Berard, and Lawrence, as well as Jimson as the ex officio member, for all their work during their past term and commend them on their approach in which they improve the online form and the application process. So in terms of the new Credentials Committee members, we plan on meeting shortly and consulting with Lawrence and see if we could better understand the mandate of the Credentials Committee and continue to make improvements.

One of the things that we'd like to discuss further doing is reviewing the existing process in the aim to simplify it even further and assist in the interpreting of the somewhat complex rules in the charter, and perhaps even discuss creation of a mechanism to monitor lapsed members and see the challenges they face and how we can help, and work with the Outreach Committee to be able to explain the full requirements to new members and prospective members during the ICANN BC outreach programs, so as to speed up the application and onboarding process. In short, we look forward to working as a team together, along with Lawrence, on behalf of the ExCom, and hope to serve the BC in its continued work in the credentials area. Thank you.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Thank you, Zak, for that beautiful presentation. I would want to ask if any members of the BC have any questions for Zak before we proceed to other items. Okay, hearing none.

Finally, on the operations belt, we want to say a big thank you to every BC veteran who has served in different capacities for the Business Constituency, not just in ExCom but also in our different committees and ICANN At-Large. We really appreciate the sacrifices you've made and we believe that you will definitely stay engaged. Before I yield the floor back to Steve, I wonder if Mason Cole, incoming chair, has any more words to add?

MASON COLE: Thank you, Lawrence. It's Mason. Can you hear me?

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Yes, we can.

MASON COLE: Thank You for yielding the floor. I do have a couple of items. One is that the incoming ExCom has looked at our meeting schedule. There's a growing number of conflicts with other ICANN sessions or policy development work, meetings and things of that sort. So we're looking at changing our biweekly meeting from Wednesday to Thursday at the same time. So be on the lookout for a potential schedule change in that area.

Also, I wanted to just highlight to the BC that this is the last meeting that Claudia is going to chair. Jimson is not with us today but we have some outgoing ExCom members: Claudia, Jimson, Barbara, and Scott. I just wanted to foreshadow to the BC that we'll have a commemoration of their service in January as a thank you to all the hard work that they put in on behalf of the BC. So be prepared for that as well.

I think that's it for me, Lawrence. Thank you very much.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Mason, it's Steve. And I think what we want to do in the last couple of minutes is to set the date for our January meeting. The days that would be there is January 7, 14, or 21. What would you prefer to do? Mason, this will be your call to make.

MASON COLE:

Wow. Okay. In that case, I'm going to go with 14 because we may still have some people coming off the holidays as early as the 7th. Unless there's a compelling reason to do something earlier, I vote for the 14th.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Fantastic. Claudia, have you rejoined us?

CLAUDIA SELLI:

Yes. Apologies to everyone. Sorry. I was disconnected. So thank you for driving the call forward. Just to say thank you, everyone, for all the work and wishing everyone also happy holidays.

STEVE DELBIANCO: All right. I think that's it for today then. Everyone, have a great holiday. And we look forward to continued dialogue on e-mail and reconvening in the New Year.

MASON COLE: Happy Holidays.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Chantelle, you can terminate the call.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]