
BRENDA BREWER: Good day, everyone. Welcome to the Business Constituency Candidate and Membership call on the 23rd of September 2021 at 15:00 UTC.

This meeting is recorded. Kindly state your name when speaking for the record, and have your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking.

Attendance is taken from Zoom participation. Please note the first 40 minutes of today's meeting is dedicated to the candidates call. When finished, the BC Membership call will begin. I will now turn the call over to Mason for opening remarks. Thank you.

MASON COLE: Thank you, Brenda. This is Mason Cole, chair the BC. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. Welcome to the BC call on 23 September. We have a 90-minute call scheduled for today due to the Candidates Forum, and then our regular agenda. Before we start, are there any updates or suggestions for the agenda? All right. I see no hands. All right. It looks like some people are still coming into the call. But we're going to go ahead and get started anyway.

So as I mentioned, we have 40 minutes dedicated to the Candidates Forum. Brenda is going to be running that portion of the call, and then she'll turn it back over to the ExCom for the rest of the meeting. So with that, Brenda, allow me to turn the floor back over to you and conduct the business with the Candidates Forum. Thank you.

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.

BRENDA BREWER:

Thank you very much Mason. Welcome to the Officer Candidate portion of today's call. As moderator, I would like to advise BC members that both the nominators and the nominees qualify according to the BC charter rules as paid members of the Business Constituency, and therefore, all nominations are valid. Nominations for the role of chair and vice chair of Policy Coordination, vice chair of Finance and Operations, and the representative to the Commercial Stakeholder Group were received.

For the role of chair, we have one candidate Mason Cole. For the role of vice chair of Finance and Operations, we have one candidate, Lawrence Olawale-Roberts. For the role of vice chair of Policy Coordination, we have one candidate, Steve DelBianco. For the role of CSG representative, we have one candidate, Tim Smith.

On today's call, I will first open the floor to candidates themselves for introductory remarks. The candidates will proceed in the following order: Mason, Lawrence, Steve, and Tim. After introductory remarks, we will then open it up to questions from the BC members. BC members participating on the call may submit their questions verbally or via the Zoom chat and I will moderate this portion of the call as well. And as a reminder, this portion is limited to 40 minutes, so 10 minutes per candidate, please. Then we will transition to the usual Business Constituency members meeting.

Ballots for election will be sent on Friday, 24 September, opening the voting period. On 30 September 2021, the voting period will close. Only BC primary member representatives in good standing will receive a ballot. The results will be submitted to the BC ExCom for the review.

Once confirmed, staff will announce the results on approximately 1 October 2021. And as a reminder, the new terms of the BC officers begin on January 1, 2022.

With that I would like to open the floor to the candidates themselves for further remarks. And may I kindly remind each candidate to have your video on when presenting. We will first start with the position of BC chair, Mason Cole. Please, the floor is yours.

MASON COLE :

Thank you very much, Brenda. Again, greetings, everyone. It's Mason. I thank you for being here for the Candidates portion to the call. It's good to have some BC members standing for office and I look forward to a productive year in 2022. I don't have a lot in the way of opening remarks except just to say that the BC has had quite a challenging year in 2021. We've had some successes. As you might guess, we've also faced some headwinds as I outlined in my candidate statement.

I wanted to outline a bit about what I foresee for 2022 as well because the priorities that we established about four months ago are going to help dictate the direction that the BC goes in terms of how to filter its work and how to prioritize its work. So as I've mentioned before on BC calls, we have four established priorities in addition to the policy work and everything else the BC is engaged with. Our priorities are decreasing the incidence of DNS abuse, improving the ICANN Compliance function, improving legitimate access to domain name registration data, and bringing ICANN up to date on its overdue obligations.

So, on these fronts, we've made some progress in 2021. But as I mentioned in my candidate statement, there are headwinds facing non-contracted parties. In fact, I've seen in 2021 sort of leaning against non-contracted party interests more than I have almost any time in my 21 years of being involved in ICANN. Now, that's not to say that now is the time to shy away from our work, we have significant work to do. But it's going to take some cooperation with others in the community, it's going to take cooperation on the part of members of the BC, and it's going to take a lot of hard work for us to get our issues advanced. But I am confident that we're able to do so.

So before I turn the floor back over, let me just spread a couple of thank yous around, if I may. The first is to BC members and for everyone who's contributed to our outcomes. In the past year, we've had some very good work contributed to what the BC is doing. And so I would like to thank the broader BC for its work. I also want to thank my fellow members of the ExCom, Steve, Lawrence, Waudu, Marie, and Mark. And I'd like to thank Waudu in particular. He is not standing for CSG liaison again but he did a wonderful job in that role in 2021, and I'd like you all to join me in thanking Waudu. And then finally, I just want to thank a member of ICANN staff because she's been so good to us in terms of her support, and that, of course, is Brenda. So, Brenda, you have our thanks as the BC and thank you for your ongoing work. That's it for me for now, Brenda. I look forward to questions and I turn the floor back over to you.

BRENDA BREWER: Thank you very much, Mason. We will now have Lawrence Olawale-Roberts, candidate for vice chair of Finance and Operations. Lawrence, you have the floor.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Thank you, Brenda. Good day, everybody. I'm happy to be on today's call. Again, I will want to just ride on where Mason stops. First of all, thanking everybody for a wonderful first year in my role as vice chair for Finance and Operations. Prior to taking on this responsibility, I had a very good understanding of how the functions were to go. But I will tell you that I definitely underestimated the demand of the office. I found I've been able to do quite a lot in a short while with the help and cooperation of all the ExCom members. Thank you for your contributions, advices, and approvals as when due. I also want to thank all the BC members who have in one way or the other contributed to the success that we have seen so far.

It's been quite a challenge that the pandemic has presented in the sense that we have gone completely virtual for this year. But it also has not reduced in any way the resiliency that I know and see of the Business Constituency. We have done exceptionally well as a constituency staying engaged and on top of issues.

I'm happy to report that in the process or in the period on the review, just one member company exited the BC, and we are hoping that in the current financial year, we will have a number of other companies join our fold. We have seen an increase in ICANN support, both financially and in terms of staff support also. So I feel that it's been quite a good period, so to say. Members have actively helped to support our

initiatives, especially volunteer initiatives. And we want to thank everyone who has stepped forward to serve the BC in one role or the other.

I definitely do not plan to bog down to take a chill pill or some rest, keep hoping to fire on all cylinders because there is still a lot of ground to cover. And I believe that by the end of the coming year, so to say, we're given an opportunity to serve the BC again in this role. There will be more grounds covered and there will be a lot more to show for my responsibilities as your vice chair. In the coming year where I have an opportunity to keep serving, I hope to focus a lot around outreach and also inreach, getting members and getting members to stay engaged, and also trying to see how we can get members especially from areas where we do not have very strong or active participation. In all, I want to thank everybody and I will look forward to your questions if you have any for me. Thank you. I yield the floor back to you, Brenda.

BRENDA BREWER:

Thank you very much, Lawrence. Next we have Steve DelBianco, nominate for vice chair of Policy Coordination. Steve, the floor is yours. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thanks, Brenda. Hello, everyone. I've been your vice chair for Policy Coordination for many years. So most of the way in which I want to try to manage that function and serve you is well known to those of you that have worked with me. The term limits that are in our charter would suggest that I shouldn't be running right now, that we should have

another candidate step up to that role. I've done my best to try to encourage a lot of you to think about it and to offer to assist with it, but we didn't have any candidates step forward. So I am glad to stand for the role for re-election on that. And our charter does permit that when no other candidate has come forward. So I'm glad to do it again. But I do want to use this opportunity to try to encourage BC members to take up the challenge and be standing in my place next year to step up for Policy chair.

You have a good sense as to how I have done things, but most of what I do is coordinate so that all of you can contribute and that we can find a way to integrate the various points of view to come up with a cohesive statement. Now, in 2021 so far just through this time, we've submitted 19 comments, which really doesn't feel like a lot compared to what the BC usually does. But look, I went out and counted the number of public comment opportunities this year was just 18 through September, and that's because ICANN has slowed down the number of public comments relative to previous years. I don't think it's strategic initiative. But there are many other ways in which we submit comments that aren't part of the public comment period. And I'm speaking then of internal documents inside of a PDP or working group, think about letters that we've sent to the European Parliament and Council, the work that Mark Datysgeld helped us with when we commented on what Mozilla Foundation was looking at, and we also with Alex Deacon's encouragement commented to the .us registry.

Now, during previous years, I've really worked hard to get more of you to participate. I am thrilled to report that about half of the members of the BC contributed to comments so far this year. And I have all your

names in the list that I circulated with my candidate statement. I'm very grateful to those who step up, and particularly those who are new. I mean, we have volunteers to step up time and time again and you deserve the majority of the credit. But it's also great to have new people step up and they are really contributing so much—Tola, Waudo, Nick, Brian, Yusuph, and Ben Wallace were among those who contributed for the first time and did an excellent job.

I did want to say that our public statements and press statements that we make are essential but we also have to engage carefully in the working groups and review teams. So, Mark Svancarek and Margie, along with Alex Deacon and Brian King, deserve tremendous credit for that long slog of the EPDP Phase 2A that went this year.

I'd also like to say that we have a new group that Mason helped to initiate on DNS abuse. And that internal working group is inviting some more participation, which is essential. But I do think that that dovetails nicely with the priorities that Mason discussed earlier today.

I also want to thank Susan Kawaguchi and Alex working with Mark on the Implementation Team for Phase 1 EPDP. It looks as if that Implementation Team is going to be expanded to take on EPDP Phase 2A if it gets through Council this time next month. Jay Chapman, Zak Muscovich, you've been super about stepping up on working groups representing the BC, and then helping the rest of your BC colleagues understand when and how we need to funnel input into that process.

So as Mason said, we have priorities and include mitigating DNS abuse. And I would suggest that holding icann.org accountable for enforcing agreements and contracts is partly going to be done through the

initiative on mitigating DNS abuse. As you all know, there was an audit of registrars and they had dismal, dismal performance in terms of having a point of contact to do intake of DNS abuse reports. So I'd really like to push on that and get ICANN Org to do an audit of how well the registrars actually respond when they're given reports of DNS abuse. And that's going to be a challenge because we have to find a way to inject DNS abuse reports so that we can measure how quickly and adequately they respond.

Mason, I don't know that you've mentioned this explicitly but we are coming up on the expansion of new gTLDs and the BC's position on that is to have that be done responsibly and implement obligations and recommendations from previous reviews. And we also want to use the opportunity to take to take the leverage of the new gTLD expansion. Remember, the Contracted Party House has plenty of parties in there that want the next expansion to begin. So that's an opportunity for us to say that in return for doing the expansion, we need to implement some improvements on integrity and availability of domain names that fit within the BC priorities.

And finally, we are going to work hard in the next year to try to restore some semblance of access and disclosure for registrant data. It's been very disappointing on the EPDP in all of its phases, and we've put an awful lot of stake on the hope that the European Parliament, European Council will approve and begin to transpose the NIS2 recommendations because they will create some obligations for accurate publication of legal person data. And that is going to fly in the face of what we've just done in the EPDP Phase 2. And if it contradicts the policies that ICANN has approved, then we will have the ammunition we need to get

another Temporary Specification or a new PDP going. All right. I think that's all I have for you in terms of introductory remarks. Thank you again, the volunteers in the BC that have made everything happen, and I look forward to your questions.

BRENDA BREWER: Thank you, Steve. And next for the role of CSG representative, candidate Tim Smith, the floor is yours.

TIM SMITH: Thank you very much, Brenda, and thank you all for being here today. I'm sure I'm the least well known of all of the candidates here on this roster. So I'm hoping that the candidate statement that I provided gives you some background of who I am. As you can see in the background, I'm with you today from the Bald Prairies of Canada and where I'm located in Winnipeg.

I have been involved for nine years with ICANN, attending ICANN meetings for the past nine years. And as I said in my in my statement, I have contributed from time to time in the work of the Business Constituency. But I have, for large part, remained on the sidelines observing, watching, learning. I've been busy with my day-to-day work running a small Association.

But I do feel now is the time for me to get more engaged. I have the capacity, the time to be able to do that. And I did think that the CSG representative would be a good place for me to enter and to become more engaged. While I had been on the sidelines, I will say that every time that I have a step forward with the Finance Committee or with the

DNS Working Group, I have prepared myself. And in other public comments that I've done, I've made sure to be fully informed.

So I'm here hopefully to be able to do that for you for the coming year. I support the priorities that that Mason outlined earlier on, and I hope to be a good liaison to the other members of the CSG. As I think Andy Mack said—and I wish I had said it myself—I do have an ability to be a bridge builder and that's what I'd like to bring to this role. I really yield back to you and look forward to any questions you may have about me or about what we hope to achieve.

BRENDA BREWER:

Thank you very much, Tim. We will now open the floor for questions. Please raise your hand and when called upon, state your name and continue to ask your question. One moment, please.

We do have a question for Waudu. Your line is open. Or I should say—there you go. Your line is open, Waudu. Thank you.

WAUDO SIGANGA:

Thank you, Brenda. I think first of all, I'd like to congratulate all the four candidates for being nominated, and particularly Tim Smith who's the new person that has been nominated for the position. I hope you'll be able to enjoy the position of a liaison that I was doing. I'm sorry, I was not able to do another year because of the nature of the work that I'm now doing. So I hope Tim Smith will be a good fit. I'm sure he will be after reading his candidate statement.

From what I saw last year, we had a practice where we allowed the person that has been elected or selected for the position of CSG liaison to come and join the meetings that are held well before the time of taking over the office in January. So I think if that can be arranged, I think that can be good so that Tim can get a soft landing in the CSG.

Apart from that, I don't know whether we can call them questions or observations, maybe someone like Steve DelBianco who has been with the BC for some time and knows a lot could maybe have an idea or something to say about it. The first one is I've been wondering when we are having election of officers like this, I'm not an expert on the BC charter or the BC history but I'm just wondering, what is really the purpose of having an election when we have only one nominee per position? Is it necessary to go through those motions of an election? Or is it something that you can think about changing the charter of the BC? Particularly this time now, we are working on Work Stream 2 suggestions which might require some changes on the charter. Maybe this could be something that we could think about to make it much more practical that once we have just one nominee, then there is no need for an election going forward.

The other observation I am thinking about also, which might also touch on the charter, is I'm wondering if we do the election like now, let's say September, October, and then there's quite a long wait before the people that are elected take their positions in January, I'm wondering would it not be an idea to align the taking over of the offices with what happens in the rest of the ICANN where new officers take over offices after the AGM. For example, the people that are selected by the NomCom take over immediately after the AGM. So that is not a long,

long wait. So I think those are my two observations. Maybe someone like Steve DelBianco who has been with us for a long time may have some comment about this, too. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thanks, Waudo, and thanks for your service this year. I'll try to respond since you mentioned my name there. With respect to elections where there are not multiple candidates for an office, you're right that there's an extra level of administration to distribute the e-mail ballots and have a BC member indicate whether they approve or abstain for those candidates who are unopposed. But that entire ballot comes in one e-mail. So you'd always get the ballot as long as there was at least one contested office. And I do think that the process of figuring who's going to run, nominating and sending a candidate statement are things that we should do even when there is only a single candidate. I also find the process of writing the statement, which I've now done every year for many years, really forces me to go back and look at the previous year to think about those who contributed to acknowledge those who did. And it also gives me the opportunity to talk about what we're going to work on next year. So even if there were multiple candidates, even if there are not multiple candidates, I find the entire process helpful right up to the point of sending out the ballots.

So I take your point that we could examine our next charter revision. And it might indicate that in a situation where none of the four offices have multiple candidates that we could forego the e-mail ballot. But I would suggest that that only saves a very small amount of administrative burden and it really doesn't take very much time for you

to tick off that ballot and hit resend. So I would want to retain the things we're doing today even if we only have one candidate.

Your second question was really intriguing. The idea of our timing, we have for at least 10 years pretty much kicked things off in January the calendar year. And we hold the elections early enough so that there's an opportunity for candidates to pull together and we also don't want to overlap too much on the elections that we hold for our councilors because we do want to try to space out the elections to be to different points of the year. I think it's a valid suggestion that perhaps our officers could potentially start after the Annual General Meeting. But even that doesn't track to a fiscal year, the way we do in the BC.

I'd like Lauren's perhaps to comment on the wisdom of changing the timing of one when we worked here because the bulk of the work that is calendar-focused is the work that Lawrence, and before Lawrence, Jimson, used to do, which is the idea of handling the financials, the tax returns and annual reporting, getting out dues, invoices, and preparing budgets that all the BC members can approve. So Lawrence, why not speak to the issue of timing and Waudou's idea? Thank you.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Thank you, Steve, and thanks, Waudou, for bringing up those questions. To the second question which Steve has helped to speak to an extent, the common practice is, how's our financial year, how's our operational year as the BC is starting on the 1st of January? And in between that period, there are numbers of elections and activities that take place. In between our time also, we have to meet with certain obligations that are ICANN based and also have to work at getting our financial records

put together and the tax compliance in order. If we were to revert to, say, BC officers taking their seats right after the AGM, there will be quite a number of disruptions and it will have some impact especially on operations. It will mean that we might be officers, change of guards might be caught in between preparations or finalization of accounts, the BC budgets to a large extent will also be impacted by this. And there could also be some readjustment that will need to be done in terms of keeping with timelines, production of—right before every BC meeting, we have to do our newsletters. There are quite a number of other activities outreach-based. If not, that has to be conducted before, during, or after each public meeting. So to a large extent, you might have a situation where you're changing that in between plans that have been made from the beginning of the year and not have the same officer or ground to drive those implementations through. Aside from the sudden break that we could have, there could also be some impact in terms of our contracted parties' invoices and stuff like that that needs to be dealt with.

So I believe that it's either one of two things. We see that we are recognizing the 1st of January, as you know, the start and stop of the operational year as well as the accounting year. Or, in this regard, we recognize the 1st of July as the beginning of the accounting year but the 1st of January as the beginning of our operational year, which has worked very well over time. We're going to make adjustments. It's an experiment that could be tried. But my notion would be we might not need to fix anything if it's not broken. Thank you.

BRENDA BREWER: Would anyone else like to reply to Waudó's questions? Very good. We will move on to the next question from Barbara Wanner.

BARBARA WANNER: Hello, everyone. Can you hear me okay?

BRENDA BREWER: Yes.

BARBARA WANNER: Thanks very much. First of all, I commend all of the candidates that are on the call today. I think this will be a wonderful, new ExCom going forward. Everybody has just critical leadership skills that will be coming very useful as we look at the new year. So I commend you all for standing for re-election.

My question really is in that spirit is not meant to challenge you, really. It's more to solicit your thoughts to help me understand how I might focus my involvement going forward. But going back to Mason's point about the headwinds that the non-contracted parties have encountered this year, particularly with respect to securing access to registrant data for legitimate purposes and the entire EPDP process. My understanding is—and correct me if I'm wrong—that the ISPCP has been a little reluctant to join forces with the BC and the IPC on this issue, and truly providing united front. So my question is, is it at all possible to build a bridge on that issue with them so we can enter the new year presenting a stronger voice for the non-contracted parties on this issue, point one and point two, if that really isn't possible because of their own

existential interests? What issue would you single out as one that is ripe for leveraging CSG impact? Thank you. And I would say that Mason, anybody, just jump in. Mason, Steve, Tim.

MASON COLE:

I'll go first, Barbara, if I may. Thank you for your question. It's a very good one. You're right that the headwinds have been pronounced in 2021. With regard to your question the ISPCP, I can tell you, for the most part, we have a very good working relationship with the ISPCP. They are a little reticent in terms of sticking out positions within the ICANN sphere, as you know, in a pronounced manner as we do and maybe the IPC does as well. So I'm hoping that in 2022, we'll have the opportunity to bring the ISPCP around to present a more united front. I'm not sure their reticence, I'm not sure for the reasoning for the reticence, but I can tell you that as a CSG, we generally have a very good working relationship with the ISPs and they share our priority list which was established in the context of the CSG and then brought into the BC as well.

With regard to your second question, which I believe was if not restoring access to WHOIS data, then what? I would say the situation with the WHOIS problem, if you will, is ongoing. It's been ongoing now for more than three years, as we all know. And just let me, by the way, just as an aside, say thank you to Margie and Mark and Steve and Brian and everyone who's contributed to the EPDP. I managed to leave them out in my opening statement. I apologize for that because they've done an amazing job trying to hold the line against contracted parties in terms of WHOIS outcomes.

So while we were frustrated with the outcomes of the EPDP, we are seeing progress in other areas sort of outside of the ICANN sphere. In the last several months, we've been very involved in working influence the European Parliament and European Commission on their NIS2 directive or at least part of the directive is meant to clarify rules around WHOIS access. Now, we don't know what that's going to look like over the next 18 months or so. But what we're learning is it takes engagement on multiple fronts, not just inside of ICANN in order for us to advance our priorities. And sometimes that means governmental engagement, sometimes that means engaging with third parties, as well as engagement inside of ICANN. So it's going to take diplomacy and some alliances within ICANN, not just with the CSG but with organizations like the ALAC, the SSAC, the GAC, and others who are interested in the outcomes that we're interested in. So it's a multiple front battle here for 2022 which I expect all of us to be engaged on. So I hope that helps. I yield the floor over to the rest of the ExCom for their input as well.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Barbara, it's Steve. I'll give you three ideas for drawing the ISPs into a stronger alliance in the next year. The first would be looking at DNS abuse as a problem where DNS abuse is focused on Denial of Service attacks and other attacks that create huge problems for Internet service providers. So think about malware exercise by armies of deployed bots, that is an ISP problem. And many times a DNS abuse problem turns into an ISP issue. So as long as you focus more on security, malware, spam, and things that ISPs deal with will do better than focusing on intellectual property issues which the ISPs, to a large extent, would prefer not to

deal with. So it's really just a matter of how we couch the DNS abuse in terms of non-IP related matters even though, of course, if we're going to advance that agenda.

A second would be accountability and reviews transparency. Two of the leaders of the ISPCP legacy leaders like Tony Holmes and Wolf-Ulrich, have for decades been very concerned about the accountability of ICANN Org, the way GNSO is structured, the way in which CSG voting can be cancelled out by the NCSG. So issues on accountability and reviews is a great way to draw them in, and then finally, maybe the next round of new gTLDs. There may be a handful of things that we can work with the ISPs on to make sure that they make it into the next round of contracts. It's a great question, Barbara. Thank you for that.

BARBARA WANNER:

Thank you. Does anyone else wish to reply?

TIM SMITH:

Hi. Obviously, some of these things are I'm not completely up to speed on. However, I will learn more about them and take direction from the ExCom on how to approach. I think both Mason's and Steve's suggestions are good ones. I think developing good relationships within the other houses is important and I know Tony, I know Wolf-Ulrich, and hopefully we can find a way to bring them along with some of our thinking. Thanks.

BARBARA WANNER: Thank you, Tim. We'll move to the next question from Marie Pattullo.

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

BARBARA WANNER: Yes, we can. Thank you.

MARIE PATTULLO: Great, thank you. And thank you to Barbara because my question actually segues into hers, although I did not know what she was going to ask. I'm looking at this on a slightly wider level, not just at our relations within the CSG but our relations on a wider ICANN community and/or ICANN Org level. Now, we all know the efforts that everybody on this call and beyond has put into the work. We all know the people who've done the amazing work. And by the same token, we also know on Council level, on the Council side, that there's a them and us. And very often it's the contracted parties and the non-commercials against us. And even within the CSG, the us is boiled down, as Mark will confirm, as Susan will confirm, it's very often, well, it's the BC and IPC complaining about everything again, which is infuriating and maddening and unfair and untrue. I know that Mason and others have heard really interesting outreach lately with ICANN leaders about this. But my question is, I guess, to Mason, in particular, and also bizarrely to Tim. Now, first up, Tim, everyone does know who you are and you're going to be fabulous in this role. If anyone can build bridges, it is a Canadian. My concern is that we don't have good enough links with the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group. I'm not talking about personal links, I'm talking

about they will do everything they can to scupper everything we are trying to do. And I'm sorry if that sounds unfair, but it is the way I feel. So in your CSG role, Tim, part of your job, in my mind, is also trying to get us in the Non-Contracted Parties House, so the CSG and the NCSG to work together. Anything you could do to take that forward, we would all love you if you could make that relationship better. But Mason, on a wider level, how do you think we get the BC to be regarded as being the professionals and decent and reasonable people that we are? So not a small ask. Thank you.

MASON COLE:

Thanks, Marie, for the question. And thank you for the use of the word scupper. I think that's the first in the BC meeting, so well done. You present a very good question. Our relationship with the NCSG is not non-existent but it's not productive either. I'd like very much to change that. I think that the NCSG, you're right, coupled with the contracted parties hold a great deal of power over the GNSO and its outcomes. When I first got involved with ICANN, I remember the BC being seen as sort of the constituency that's there and contributes but doesn't hold the sway or the power that say a Contracted Party House does or a Contracted Party Stakeholder Group. I've endeavored to change that over the last year and I hope it's been productive.

One of the questions that came up in a recent meeting that our BC leadership had with Göran and some other ICANN executives was around the BC's level of influence, not just the BC's level of influence but the fact that BC and non-contracted outcomes are not advancing inside of ICANN as quickly as contracted party outcomes are. The suggestion

on Göran's part during that call was that the BC picks issues that are too hard, that if we picked easier issues that we could chalk up some wins and feel better about ourselves, I guess.

I strongly disagree with that. I think that now is not the time to shy away from the important topics that are in front of us. Some of them are significant, and we shouldn't shy away from them. The issue of WHOIS access is significant. It impacts the entire industry. It impacts people outside the industry, as we all know. The issue of having a good compliance function inside ICANN is critical. We need ICANN to hold contracted parties accountable to their duties to the community.

So there are myriad issues there in front of us. And in addition to the bridge building work we did in 2021, we're really going to have to ramp that up in 2022 if we're going to expect to make any progress. Without alliances and without friends in the ICANN sphere, we're going to be shouting into the wind, and that's no way to conduct a constituency business.

So I've walked around your question, now let me address it directly. The relationship with the NCSG needs improvement. I think the incoming ExCom is in an excellent position to do something about that. We need to find some common ground with the NCSG and find out where we can advance issues of mutual importance. But at the same time, we're not going to back away from BC priorities because it's simply too important to the BC members and they're the companies they represent for us to say that we're going to play the junior role inside of ICANN. The BC deserves more than that and we'll get more than that from the incoming

ExCom. So I hope that helps you with your question, Marie. Thank you very much for it.

BARBARA WANNER:

Thank you very much. And I'd like to say that that will conclude the Candidates portion of today's call. Thank you. We will move into the Membership portion of the call and I will turn the floor over to Steve DelBianco. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thanks, Brenda. Let me put up the Policy Calendar. I sent this out yesterday. So hopefully, you've all got it. Since our last call, we've made one statement that we published which was the minority statement on the EPDP Phase 2A. This was the updated Final Report that ICANN has now posted, and I've got a link to it there. Now it includes minority statements from a majority of the EPDP, and some of them are conflicting, some are consistent. But it looks like practically everyone did a minority statement. I'm looking here to see if anybody didn't. I guess the ISPCP, who we discussed earlier, are about the only group in there who didn't do a minority statement. So thanks for the great work on that. I hope that Margie, Mark, Brian, and Alex, I hope you enjoyed the last two weeks with not having to do the two calls a week and all the homework.

All right. Moving on to the current open public comments, we have three of them that we're going to need to work on in October. The first one is an amendment to the .name Registry Agreement and the amendment that ICANN and the operator of .name, which is Verisign,

they're proposing to incorporate provisions from the base Registry Agreement that we have supported, as well as the .com Registry Agreement. And it brings it into legacy. In general, we've been supportive of bringing those into legacy agreements. Now, this is an open TLD, a .name, and the last time we've done a comment on an open registry were for .com and for .biz in February in May of this year. So the comment that we have that might be the most appropriate is our .biz comment. Zak Muscovitch has done two superb brief comments on sponsored TLDs recently, .aero and .jobs. But this is more like the .biz comment.

Do I have any volunteers in the BC that would be interested at looking at these amendments, working off our .biz comments, and make a BC comment? Can we bring up the chat as well in case somebody volunteers in the chat? We don't have Zak on the call today because I know he's super about helping on these agreements. All right. I will ask again on our next meeting. These comments are closing on the 20th of October.

All right. The second one up is something that Jay Chapman is going to talk to you about in a moment. But there's an EPDP, an expedited PDP that specifically addresses one category of potential registrants, International Governmental Organizations. And they're concerned about registrations that occur that conflict with or confuse people with respect to the acronyms or names of IGOs that are used. So we want to try to figure out how to give them a right to cure problems with infringement over their names. So we have commented about a year ago—two years ago I guess it was—on recommendations. And Zak worked with Andy and Marie and Jimson that. So, Jay, why don't you tee up the issue for

us? And the hope is that you'll lead our effort as our rep on this PDP and I want to try to recruit some extra volunteers. Jay?

JAY CHAPMAN: Sure. Thanks, Steve. Can you hear me okay? Hello?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yes, I hear you perfectly. Thank you, Jay.

JAY CHAPMAN: Thanks. Hello, everyone. This EPDP was actually formed with a very limited scope which was reassessing the unique situation where the GNSO rejected Recommendation 5 of the previous IGO PDP. Just to, I guess, do a little bit of history here. So back in 2014, a PDP was formed to try and assess whether IGOs and INGOs needed their own Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms, and if so, how those things would play out. That working group worked for four years. There were no IGOs actually in that working group. They were trying to work through other avenues to try and influence the work, and ultimately, I guess the GNSO's determinations on the work of that PDP. Nevertheless, that PDP came up with five consensus recommendations where they did not create an IGO-specific RPM based on evidence that they found that some IGOs had actually utilized the existing UDRP and had used it successfully. And so they didn't create a new RPM for the IGOs. That was one of the five consensus recommendations that came from that previous PDP.

The fifth recommendation was a very narrow and rare circumstance where an IGO complainant, if they won their UDRP, that the registrant would then, if they filed in a court of neutral jurisdiction—again, we don't call that an appeal. It's a de novo review—but where the respondent did file in the court—and here is the kind of the big bogey and all of this—the IGOs want to enjoy their jurisdictional immunity they may have in certain circumstances, and so they would object to jurisdiction in the subsequent court procedure. And if the court said we can't get jurisdiction over this IGO because of the IGO's jurisdictional immunity, then the previous UDRP decision in favor of the IGO would have been vitiated. So just basically cancelled and it would have put the parties back as if the UDRP had never happened. But obviously, not only did the GNSO disagree with Recommendation 5, the BC did as well in that comment that Steve referred to. So what we're supposed to be doing in this particular EPDP is to assess whether there is an appropriate solution for that narrow, rare type of situation where a UDRP decision in favor of an IGO could be vitiated.

So that's where we went. And at this point, we're trying to come up with a solution to that that accounts for the possibility that IGOs do enjoy or may enjoy jurisdictional immunity in certain circumstances. One that does not affect the rights and ability of respondents and registrants to file judicial proceedings in a court of competent jurisdiction, a solution that preserves registrants' rights to judicial review of the initial UDRP and recognizes the existence and scope of IGO jurisdictional immunity in any particular situation would be a legal issue to be determined by a court. So those are just kind of the parameters built around that. So while it was supposed to be very limited in its review, the IGOs have kind

of tried to backtrack and they seek to actually create their own IGO RPM, effectively an IGO URS and an IGO UDRP.

The specific demands and where that kind of diverges from the existing UDRP that they're seeking an exemption from the UDRP's mutual jurisdiction requirement, which for those of you who are unclear, anytime a complainant files a UDRP, they are required to submit to mutual jurisdiction, meaning that in the event the registrant, which is to the respondent, wishes to go to court that the complainant agrees that it's okay that they agree that they'll be willing to go to court and either the registrant's location or the location of the registrant's registrar. So that's one thing they're looking for. They say because of their jurisdictional immunities, they just feel like that mutual jurisdiction should be removed. They also are seeking to prevent and discourage losing respondents from effectively seeking de novo resolution in court and while in trying to actually assess what we call the Recommendation 5 situation where the losing registrant, losing respondent in a UDRP goes to court, court says, "We don't have jurisdiction," there's an appeal process that's actually being created. So we actually have done work on a situation that specifically engages Recommendation 5. The concern with that is that the IGOs are actually seeking to water that down. So instead of trying to create some sort of an arbitration process that might reflect as closely as possible to a typical court procedure, the IGOs are suggesting that perhaps they'd be more interested in something where there were no hearings, no ability to present cross-examine witnesses, things like that. And this is all relevant for businesses within the BC as well as those just businesses in general who might be brought into a UDRP or URS matter with an IGO, and specifically because the basis of all these PDPs that we've been doing are about acronyms. As we know,

many of our own businesses, if not thousands of others around the world, use acronyms within their names, products, and things like that.

So I provided a couple of previous updates through e-mail. I'm happy to re-circulate those if people would like to see. I obviously will be happy to help lead the comment on the BC's behalf but would appreciate any help in that. Steve, sorry to get into the weeds, but it is a narrow situation but it is quite complex and it's been quite the saga for the longest time. The IGOs have sought preventative preemptive rights. I think that's the ultimate goal and right now, though, kind of seeking to get their foot in the door through these curative rights. So again, forgive the going maybe too deep for the call, but it is what it is. Thanks.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Okay. Thank you very much. I really appreciate that. And midway through your discussion, I displayed on the screen a comment from two years ago. I focused only on the section where we address the very same issues that you're bringing up right now, and the BC had supported two years ago with consensus from our membership the minority position about the de novo review, and then take a look at that.

The BC had a preference for the minority position. It's complicated but the BC has a position already, which makes it somewhat easier for us to map that onto the current question before the EPDP Working Group and see whether the BC wants to affirm or modify from where we were two years ago. And on that comment, we had Zak, Andy Abrams, Marie, and Jimson. So we had Zak from your group from ICA, which was great, because I think he led some of that, and then Andy coming at it from the .google's trademark group. So I feel like we had a good mix there and I

will do my best to see whether we can recruit Andy, Marie, Jimson, and Zak to work with us on that. Andy, you're on the call now. Do you think you'd be able to help? Fantastic. Thank you. I'll reach out to Zak. I think Marie's got her hands full. Marie, we'd love to have you on that.

MARIE PATTULLO: I already put in chat that I will help, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yes. You guys are the best. Okay. Let me go back to the Policy Calendar. I had one more currently open public comment and it's on the draft Op Plan and Budgets for next year for two entities, PTI and IANA. So these are the technical indicators parts of ICANN when IANA budget was brought in as a result of the transition. Last time around, when we commented, it was Jimson, Lawrence, and Tim Smith. Typically, we have our Finance Committee weigh in on these. Do we have any volunteers that would be willing to work on that?

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Yes, this is Lawrence. I'll be volunteering to work on this. Also I will volunteer to work in Finance Committee.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Lawrence. Anyone else?

TIM SMITH: Hi, it's Tim. I volunteered as a member of the Finance Committee.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thank you, Tim. I appreciate that. That's due to the 25th of October. It's a relatively brief comment. I don't believe anything has happened in the last two weeks with regard to our advocacy to European Parliament Council and Committees on NIS2. I don't see Drew or Nick on the call today but I don't think we have an update. So I will speak up if anybody has one. Otherwise, I'll work down to DNS Abuse.

My only update on DNS Abuse is I wanted to thank Jay Sudowski and Vivek who volunteered on our call two weeks ago, joined that DNS Abuse Working Group. Then finally, let me turn it over to our councilors, Mark and Marie. As you walk through the agenda and particularly the draft motion on the Final Report for the EPDP, I'll display the motion on the screen. So just let me know when you want to put that up. So, Marie and Mark, over to you.

MARIE PATTULLO:

Thanks, Steve. I'll kick off. And if it's okay, we'll come to EPDP last, because that's the one we'll talk about most. We have a call this evening at UTC 19:00. Brenda, I'd be really grateful if you could put the link to that in the chat. If you can't, don't worry, I will put it in later. Because it's going to be a really interesting Council and I would very much appreciate it if our subject matter experts could join and feed Mark and I during the call because some things are going to come up.

Now we're going to have quite a long discussion about the URDP. As you remember, ICANN staff think they're doing a Policy Status Report. Steve's already given you the slides. I've got a whole bunch of comments

on those, which I am in the process of cobbling together into a mail that I'm going to send to the Council list prior to the meeting this evening, because bluntly, ICANN staff has never taken the UDRP. I'm really concerned about some of the ideas they have for this, mainly because I don't think it will be any use whatsoever what they're planning to do. But anyway, we don't have to waste time with that now. Once I've got this mail drafted, I will, of course, share it with you if you're interested.

The part about the Work Stream 2 implementation, that's pretty quick also. You remember all of the discussions that led to that being adopted, all about the accountability that we have after the transition. What's happening at the moment is looking at how it can be implemented in how all of the different stakeholder groups and constituencies including us need to amend our own charters, rules, the way that we work. There's an effort that's already happened on that. And, Lawrence, bless him, is leading the effort to the BC on that.

There's going to be some Consent Agenda bits. We've got a chair for the Accuracy group, Michael Palage. We've got a chair for the IDN EPDP, Donna Austin. We're going to be talking about the SSAD ODP in so called Any Other Business. There's going to be a webinar on that at 3:00 UTC tomorrow morning. That's 5:00 AM Belgian time. So forgive me, I'm not going to be on that webinar but it might work for some of you. We're also going to be talking about a liaison role between the Council and the new ODP that will be starting on SubPro.

Now, Steve, back to the most important clearly is EPDP 2A. If you could put up the motion, I'd be grateful. For your background and information, what we're doing this evening is discussing. We are not voting, we are

discussing. However, Steve, could you scroll down to put 11? No, go up to the [inaudible], please. Go up a wee bit. If you read number 11, and bear in mind what Steve said when he referred to this earlier in the call, I'm having difficulty in understanding how we can sign on to a motion that says all recommendations concede the consensus support. When as you very rightly pointed out, Steve, pretty much everyone put in a minority statement. Now my request here to you, to Margie, to Mark, to all of our experts—I know Susan's on the call also—is what do you want Mark and I to say in the discussion this evening, please?

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Marie, it's Steve. You've got to point out that—and Margie is on the line and can help with this—but when the time came, a little over two and a half weeks ago, to indicate any "I can't live with" recommendations. Call it exhaustion and frustration but nobody at that point came up with any "we can't live with" on the recommendations. And our minority report explains that our problem was that none of the recommendations imposed obligations. In other words, nothing went far enough. But there was nothing inherently objectionable about the inadequate recommendations. So we passed the post without indicating at that point inside of the working group that we couldn't live with anything. That doesn't remove the ability for our councilors, you and Mark, to vote no on any or all of the recommendations.

I'd like to think about the strategy that would be employed because you know that the contracted parties and NCSG who have the majority of Council would be perfectly happy if this entire Phase 2A was ditched. They absolutely would. And if they get an indication in the discussions

today that IPC/BC are thinking about voting no on the EPDP recommendations, it's my belief that they may not say so today, but come time to vote, I think they would all vote no. They prefer not to even implement the field for legal/natural, they prefer not to do anything.

So strategically, I think we have more to gain by supporting the recommendations so that we do create a field that can be used when this tool is approved and that we task ICANN with monitoring the developments of NIS2 so that it can't pretend that it came out of the blue. I believe we have more to gain by voting for it. And voting against it could well mobilize the NCSG and contracted parties to vote no and the whole thing dies. Margie, I'd love to hear your views on this. Brian King, others?

MARGIE MILAM:

Hi, everyone. I don't think I could support that position. I think that the way to present it in Council is that we asked to have voting on a per recommendation basis, and we weren't allowed to do that. I think Keith was at the position that he just wanted to have everything together. I don't think there's a risk that the contracted parties would not support it. I think it would be essentially an acknowledgment that the entire process failed. If that were the case, I don't necessarily think that that's a bad outcome, given that a lot of the effort in this regard is looking at the regulatory side of things. I think that contracted parties in the end will support it. Because otherwise, it just points to even stricter regulation, which I can only imagine they don't want.

So I would encourage our councilors to continue to vote against the recommendations. And it very well may be that if Steve's scenario is correct that they do vote against it, then that really puts the Council in a bind where something needs to be done. So I'm firmly in the camp of continuing to vote no and indicate the fact that we weren't able to vote recommendation by recommendation.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Brian King, please? Thanks, Margie. I'm not at all surprised by that. But I don't understand what bind it puts Council in, since they're happy to have everything settle back on Phase 2 and ignore Phase 2A.

BRIAN KING:

Thanks, Steve. Margie makes some interesting points. I thought Margie might have said something about recommendation for EPDP Phase 1 recommendation. I think it was 17.3. It was the third part of the recommendation that said that contracted parties may but are not required to distinguish. That was the first part of that recommendation. But the third part said that this issue will be determined and resolved in Phase 2 of the EPDP.

Well, I think I agree primarily with Steve, that we should vote yes in order to get that field. I do agree with Steve that if contracted parties thought that we would vote no, that they would too in order to avoid having to do that work or have ICANN do that work to create a standardized field. I think if that's all we can get, then that's all we can get as far as getting the contracted parties to agree to it, to having ICANN create that field, given that it's entirely optional for contracted

parties. But I do think that there's a risk that they would withdraw from that.

So I wonder if there's the opportunity for us to say—I'm very glad that this is not being put to a vote this time for Council discussion. Be mindful that maybe we don't want to ask this in a question form. But how is this going to be determined and resolved? This is unacceptable. The outcome is not good enough. It's not okay that contracted parties are allowed to do nothing and just simply redact data that there's no legal basis for redacting. That is not determined and resolved. What was supposed to be determined and resolved was how they would differentiate the rules and requirements around differentiation and that didn't happen. At the Council level, the vote on whether the process was followed, you can say, "No, it wasn't." This was not determined and resolved because there's no differentiation. Perhaps that's one way to go about how we would frame this at Council. Still, I'm not sure how effective a no vote will be. Certainly, again, I don't know how much we would care about this or prioritize it, but it would certainly just feed into BC's never happy and we can't do anything to—just keep objecting because we're not getting our way. We play into that narrative, perhaps, but I don't know how much we care about that. Thanks.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thanks, Brian. And as you say, it's a good thing we don't have to vote today. So, Marie, I'll kick it back to you and Mark. But I do think that it would be appropriate to sound out your colleagues on Council today on the notion of breaking it up into multiple recommendations, which was Marjorie's first point, and continue to ask for that in real sincere way.

Then see if you can sound out whether NCSG and contracted parties are leaning towards a yes or no. And of course, a lot of this will happen on list in the next month. But prior to the next Council meeting, I promise that we'll be able, through the BC, to give you and Mark a clear indication of whether you're a no or yes or an abstain. Marie, over to you.

MARIE PATTULLO:

Thank you. I see, Brian, you've raised your hand again. First up, from what I'm understanding, we are not going to come in strong and be negative this evening. We are going to be in listening mode asking certain questions, but we can definitely get more disappointed about breaking up the racks. I would very much—and I underline very much—appreciate a week or so before the actual vote if we can have a call with the experts so we have complete clarity on how you want Mark and I to react.

But before we go back to Brian, Steve, could you please scroll up to clause number seven, because I have another question there which strikes me as we didn't finish stuff, but never mind, so what? And what is this stuff we didn't finish, never mind, so what, and how do you want us to address that, if at all? When you read it, due to time constraints, this is what we heard in Phase 1 when things were kicked into the long grass. In Phase 2, when they've kicked out of the wrong grass and into the long grass behind the long grass. And then we got 2A which we fought tooth and nail for, and now I'm still reading that stuff, "Well, whatever. We didn't have time. Never mind." I find this incredibly frustrating.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Think about accuracy which Susan and you've been working on. Let's do that. We'll take a look at the Phase 2A items. I wouldn't bring it up today other than to ask a question about it. I mean, I do think you should be forceful about breaking it up into pieces. And I do think you can ask the question, "Hey, let's talk about what is Council—how to address..." You can say to leadership, "Hey, how are we going to address the remaining priority two items?" and ask it that way. Probably it would be a good way to proceed.

MARIE PATTULLO: Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: No, thank you. Brian?

BRIAN KING: Thanks, Steve. I had a lot of points to make there. So I naturally forgot one. One point that I didn't make that may factor into the calculus is that everyone, in particular the contracted parties, NSCG, everyone's sick of this, and everyone is just tired of the EPDP and no one wants to do it anymore. So don't underestimate the power of that, I guess, or the desire to just have this be done. And maybe that means that they'll vote to pass it anyway, regardless of what's in it. And maybe that's helpful or maybe it's not. But if we're going to vote no in an attempt to keep the issue open, we're going to have a lot of resistance there. But I guess just

adding a factor into the calculus. Don't underestimate the desire to kill this once and for all.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

In my view, is that if Marie or Mark did anything to indicate, we were leaning to no, it would generate the momentum to get to a no, NCSG would pick up on it. I know they're not voting today with the conversation we've had that way. We're undecided as of now so there's no need to convey any inclination.

MARIE PATTULLO:

We will remain neutral, Steve. And that's the guidance I think we needed for this evening. That's incredibly helpful in particular to Margie and Brian, thank you so much. I will stop talking. But I would ask Mark if I've missed anything or anything that we have from your side, please?

MARK DATYSGELD:

Thank you so much, Marie. That was really comprehensive. What I have left to say is in regards to IDN EPDP. So we finally have a chair for that. We're going with Donna Austin for this one. And hopefully, that will get the group back on track and it will actually move things along. The first action item that they're planning of substance is a bit of an outreach letter to SO/ACs. We will eventually receive that one. Probably, it will arrive in Mason's inbox. I'll be on the on the lookout for any material that would be relevant to know ahead of time for that, but basically more to keep the leaderships in touch with what's going on in the group

and what are its objectives. So that should be okay. I think that's the only thing of relevance that hasn't been covered. Thank you very much.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thank you, Mark. Any other questions for our councilors? I see none. Waudu, coming up to you on the CSG report, which I have on the screen in front of you. Go ahead, Waudu.

WAUDO SIGANGA:

Thank you, Steve. I think my report will be fairly short one. Actually, the CSG doesn't discuss policy issues unless we're meeting with stakeholders and we haven't had any meetings with stakeholders of late. What we do in the interim is to compile the policy issues that we would like to discuss with the policy with stakeholders in upcoming meetings. In this case, the upcoming meetings will be ICANN72 meetings. We are thinking of having at least two major meetings. One will be the open CSG meeting and the other one will be the CSG meeting with the Board.

So starting with the open CSG meeting, that has been penciled in for the 26th of October at 21:30 UTC. The way we are going to organize that meeting is we have invited two stakeholders, the Non-Commercial Stakeholders Group and also the Contracted Parties House. So they are going to share the one-and-a-half-hour slot. Each group will have 45 minutes.

So far, the topics that we are thinking of, the policy issues that we're thinking of is, number one, will be ICANN Compliance, which fits in with one of the priorities of the BC. Another one is the Accuracy Scoping project which Marie has just mentioned also the GNSO is discussing.

We're proposing to look at the ongoing NomCom Review Implementation process. Then there is another one that, unfortunately, didn't fit in here which we are thinking of and that is universal access. We're also having a thought maybe that we might discuss how ICANN is adapting to the cybersecurity as a cross jurisdictional issue. But we're not yet decided whether we'll discuss that in this meeting with the NCSG and CPH or in the meeting with the Board. So I'll inform you later when that one is firmed up.

Then for the meeting with NCSG, we'll have Paul McGrady. Some of you might know him. He is the new NomCom appointed GNSO councilor representing the Non-Contracted Parties House. I think he took over from Carlton. So he will lead the discussion for that 45 minutes. We're working on the agenda. Once it's finalized, then again, I'll share it with you maybe in one of the upcoming BC meetings.

The other item that is going on with the CSG, although it's just at starting stage, is looking at the WS2 Recommendation 6, the areas that are pertinent to the CSG. Unfortunately, we have not really gotten deeply working with this, but what I can mention is that what stuff have marked on the report is that most of the items that are related to the CSG can be marked as complete, which is good news for us. So we only have a few items that we are going to have a look at. I've included there the link to the recommendations. If you do you have time to look at that, you'll see the parts that are still to be looked at by the CSG and the parts that staff have come to the conclusion are complete.

Then the only other item I can mention is just maybe informational is that we have a new member of the CSG. That's Christian Dawson. It was

taken over from Jennifer Taylor Hodges who left a while back after getting another job. So that is a short report from the CSG. Thank you, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Waudu, the Non-Commercial Stakeholders Group, have they agreed that Philippe would be the NCPH chair nominee?

WAUDO SIGANGA: Yes, they have, which I think will give them the chance to nominate a vice chair.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Got it, Marie?

MARIE PATTULLO: That's great news. Thank you. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: I only had one other item. Sebastien Bachollet with the ALAC called me on Saturday and said he was proposing an ALAC Policy session at ICANN72. Not a plenary but an ALAC Policy session on Accountability, Transparency, and Reviews. And he asked whether I could represent the BC on his panel knowing that we would be advocating for a strong implementation of what the reviews have done and that the BC would advocate for a holistic review. [inaudible] look at the structural problems we have in GNSO. So I accepted that invitation preliminarily. Mason, I'm

so sorry. We have gone so long here but I'll kick it back to you for the remainder.

MASON COLE:

Thanks very much, Steve. We're getting tight on time here. We have six minutes to go. I believe that Lawrence is next on the agenda. Lawrence, once again, I apologize. But can you run through your agenda items quickly first, please?

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS:

Okay. Thank you. I just posted in the chat a link to the draft outreach strategy for the BC. Normally, this is a requirement for the BC to be able to assess CROP and any other thing that requires membership, traveling, or organizing the outreach. We are still operating in a virtual mode but it is my thinking that we should also be up to date with this process. Kindly spend time to look through these shadows of the last meeting. And this particular, hopefully by the coming week, where we don't have any further [inaudible], we would like to finalize this document.

We have our call for the BC newsletter up until the 28th of September. A few members have indicated interest to put articles together. Thank you, we appreciate that. And we will encourage members who can to still submit articles that will be of interest to the BC Membership. Because our newsletter enjoys a wide reach, it will be of interest to the wider ICANN community. The 28th of September is the date where we expect this to come in.

Ballots for the ongoing election for BC officers will be shared by Friday. If you are in primary contact of your company and we don't receive ballots

after Friday, knowing that there's a weekend, please kindly reach out to Brenda on Monday. The process of voting will be open for another two weeks. So we'll have enough time to look through the records just to ensure that every financially up to date member has an opportunity to vote. We still have a few members who were expecting to pay off their dues. Kindly do the [inaudible] and we will appreciate that happening.

Right after the officers' election which results will be announced on the first of October, by the first of November, we will open elections for our different committees. There are some committee members that are eligible to stay on for two years. For such members who indicate interest to stay on in their committees, there will be no need for them to stand for election, except if more than the required number, which is five people show interest for each committee. But we will share more information around this just before the 1st of November. Thank you. That would be all for me. I yield the floor back to you, Mason.

MASON COLE:

Thank you very much, Lawrence. I appreciate you being efficient. Thank you for that report. Okay, ladies and gentlemen, we're almost at time and I wanted to highlight before we turn to AOB our next meeting which is going to be 7 October. We have tentative agreement from Göran Marby to be our guest at that meeting. He would be there for the first 45 minutes having an informal discussion with BC members about issues of importance on both sides of the table. So if you have issues that you would like to raise with Göran, please e-mail those to me your first opportunity so that I can put together an agenda for that discussion. If a conflict arises and Göran can't make it, then I'll advise the BC. But for

now, it looks like that's what we're going to do in two weeks' time. We are at AOB now. Jimson, your hand is up. Go ahead please.

JIMSON OLUFUYE:

Thank you very much, Mason. Greetings, everyone. On behalf of the IGFSA, I want to say thank you the entire BC and to ExCom for the support placed. It would be good if Lawrence can communicate to me when the IGFSA can get the funding promised. Thank you so much.

MASON COLE:

All right. Thank you, Jimson. I'm sure Lawrence will follow up with you in due course about that. Thank you for raising that. All right. Is there any other business for the BC today? All right, I see no hands. We are at 9:30 Pacific on the button so that means we're at time. Thank you all for attending. Thanks in particular for the candidates for ExCom being ready with their candidate presentations today. Thanks, everybody, for attending today. The BC is adjourned. So long.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]