
ICANN68 | Virtual Policy Forum – GNSO – BC Open Session
Tuesday, June 23, 2020 – 16:30 to 17:30 MYT

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Hello and welcome to the Business Constituency’s Open Meeting at ICANN 68. My name is Chantelle Doerksen and I am the remote participation manager for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and follows the ICANN expected standards of behavior.

During this session, questions or comments will only be read aloud if submitted within the Q&A pod. If you would like to ask your question or make your comment verbally, please raise your hand. When called upon, you will be given permission to unmute your microphone. Kindly unmute your microphone at this time to speak.

With that, I will give the floor over to the BC Chair, Claudia Selli, to begin. Claudia, please go ahead.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Thank you very much, Chantelle. And thank you very much, everybody, for attending the BC Open Meeting during the ICANN 68. It’s the second virtual meeting that we are having and pleased to see such a participation as I know it’s very difficult for some regions as it’s very early or very late in the evening.

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.

So as you can see on the screen, we have the policy or the agenda up on the screen and we're going to start with the policy discussion followed by the GNSO Council update, finance and operation, and then any other business if members would like to raise any point. Chantelle has already explained how the meeting works.

With that, I would like also to remember that this is an open meeting so it's open to all external participation. This is a reminder for BC members as we used to have a [inaudible] setting. So just keep that in mind. With that, I will give the floor to Steve for the policy calendar. Steve, the floor is yours.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thank you, Claudia. I sent a policy calendar around a few hours ago. I have it in the screen so we can walk through that together.

Since our last meeting, we did submit one new comment. It was a joint letter between the BC and the IPC. And we sent it to Council and to the Implementation Review Team of Council for the EPDP Phase 1. It also includes the examination of the question on whether the thick WHOIS, a transition that had already been underway and decided upon, conflicts with Recommendation 7 of the EPDP Phase 1. So a big thank you to Alex Deacon, Margie, Mark, Susan Kawaguchi, and Ben Wallace for drafting that letter. And of course, it was response to the contract party house letter of 18th of May. That was sent it, and again, appreciate the members of the BC who contributed to that.

Let me move now to the open public comment periods. Four of them are highlighted here for you. The first is that by July the 10th, we have to pull together a very brief comment, I think, on something that the Country Code Names Supporting Organization, or ccNSO, is doing. They have their own PDP, Policy Development Process, and in this case, they've decided to come up with a process for how the ccNSO would retire Country Code Top-Level Domains that are no longer in use, or in some cases, no longer should be used. An example, .SU for Soviet Union, would be an example. So it's only a process proposal. It isn't a proposal to take down any particular ccTLD and I'm not even aware of any that they're proposing immediately.

Jimson, let me thank you for stepping up with a draft comment. We reviewed it briefly on the last BC call on the 17th of June, and you note that they did stress testing. You say that their plan is comprehensive and thorough. You note that the process of interest is the event that triggers the transmission of a notice of retirement to the ccTLD manager. And this is potentially out of scope for the terms of reference for the working group, but for information purposes, you think a link to the process would have been useful. And you note that the decision of the IANA function officer should be driven by a mandatory periodic review of that United Nations ISO 3166-1 table. That's the table of the two-character country codes that we're speaking of. Jimson suggested it be done once or perhaps twice a year. Are there any comments, things you want to add, Jimson, Lawrence, or BC members on that draft comment?

I am not seeing open questions. You do know that you can put your question in the chat if you wish or raise it in the open question and Chantelle will monitor it. Thanks, Jimson.

Second one up, ICANN has a regional strategic plan, in this case, for Latin America and the Caribbean. This is the [strap] plan for the periods 21 through 25. Those comments close 14th of July and I wanted to thank Mark Datysgeld for volunteering on this. The BC last commented in October 2016 on the marketplace due to help from [Isabel Rutherford] of Amazon, Andrew Mack. Can we get any other volunteers that would assist Mark Datysgeld at drafting a BC comment on the Latin American/Caribbean marketplace?

Again, a reminder that when you do the chat, always chat to all panelists and attendees so everyone can see it. Yeah, good idea, Mark. Try to recruit Andrew Mack if you can. Are there any other volunteers?

It would be useful to get not only Andrew, but [Gabi], since the three of you did participate in creating a study that the BC commissioned from the three of you last year. So Mark Datysgeld has agreed to do an outreach to [Gabi] and to Andrew. Please let us know how that goes and I hope you guys can work on it together.

Next one up, the ... Let's see, [Gabi] and Andrew. Great. Next one up, which is number three on my list, is the Accountability and Transparency Review Team or ATRT. And since it's the third one of these, we call it the ATRT3. These are one of the four specific reviews that were required by the affirmation of commitments back in 2009 and then in 2016, the BC led the effort to bring those specific reviews

into the ICANN bylaws so that they would be a permanent in a post-transition ICANN. That ATRT3 review has uber responsibility over the other specific reviews that are done and even touched on the organization reviews that have long been part of ICANN bylaws.

We're lucky to have the CSG representative be a BC member, Tola Sogbesan, and Tola had been giving us regular reports on what ATRT3 was up to during the course of its meetings. Tola did his best to argue for some strongly made points that the BC submitted in January of this year thanks to Barbara Wanner, Denise Michel, Tola, and I. And despite that strong effort, the ATRT3 comment didn't align with what the BC had suggested. And the BC was able to get support from the other two members of the CSG, the ISBs and the IPC, to file a minority statement against that final report.

So we're on record and our minority statement is raising concerns. And now we have the opportunity to do a formal public comment on that. We need some volunteers to help draft the BC comment and it wouldn't be due until the 31st of July. Tola, thank you for noting in the chat that your group is putting on a webinar for that public comment on July 15th and 16th. And Tola, would be great for you to circulate that to the entire BC as an e-mail sometime after the call.

Do we have any volunteers to work on that final comment? Thank you, Mason. Appreciate that and I'm sure we're going to get some help from Tola, but as a member of the drafting team, it's always better to do that. Any others though? Mason and Tola. Yes, and Lawrence is noting in the chat, I know you had volunteered to help Jimson with

that. Please do, Lawrence. Weigh in on those three paragraphs that I have in there from Jimson. Appreciate that. Susan Kawaguchi, thank you for helping with the ATRT3.

Okay. Let me move on to the very final one. It's number four. I have it up on the screen in front of you in Zoom. One of Cherine Chalaby's strategic initiatives while he was Chairman of the ICANN Board was to try to improve and enhance the effectiveness of ICANN's multistakeholder model and there was a whole series of analyses. There was a consultant, Brian Cote, who was hired to lead discussions of that within the community. And we now have the next steps on implementation of enhancing that effectiveness. Those comments don't close until the 2nd of August. We have a lot of time. It was last October when we put in a pretty detailed comment thanks to Mark Datsygold, John Berard, and Andy Abrams. So far, we already have Mark, John, and [Arinola] – thank you for volunteering – to draft the BC comment. Are there any others that want to join that drafting team?

Okay. I think the three of you will do a great job and I'll be there to help.

Okay, next thing up on here is a recap of the whole process whereby ICANN Community Org and Board have been modifying its WHOIS policies to comply with the GDPR. I did not know a hand was raised.

Okay, Mark, go ahead please.

MARK DATYSGELD:

Thank you, Chantelle. Thank you, Steve.

Very briefly, just commenting on the ICANN MSM reform, one thing to be aware of is exactly the timing of our last comment and how much the situation has changed from that point. So I do think we will need to rethink this a little more truly than it would otherwise be necessary. So I would like to invite all of our constituents, if you have any thoughts about what's going on in terms of the online meetings right now, it would be really good that you forward it to us so that we can try to incorporate that somehow and make it more relevant to our current time. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

That's a great point, Mark. The entirety of online models will be debated later this week in a plenary session here in ICANN 68, but you're absolutely correct. It does affect how effective the multi-stakeholder model is. Thank you.

So on the modification of WHOIS policies to comply with GDPR, I always provide a brief recap, especially for new BC members, and then highlight for you in the policy calendar late-breaking news and invite an update from Mark Svancarek and Margie Milam. First thing I'll note is that on our last call, we discussed whether the BC through its membership or through its actual funding of the BC itself could help with a study that Interisle is proposing to do on WHOIS data. And the idea here is a long held BC tradition that using data is the foundation for policymaking. In this case, try to find some data on how much contact info is still available under WHOIS which I think will point to

gaps as well as enforcement problems with respect to the Temporary Specification, and then with regard to Phase 1 of the EPDP. They are proposed. Interisle has proposed a \$200,000 budget and they have lined up about half of that so far.

Based on our last call, the ExComm held a discussion and your Executive Committee reallocated \$20,000 from the BC's 2021 outreach budget of roughly \$41,000 in order to be able to pledge \$20,000 in support of that study. And it's contingent on Interisle raising the full \$200,000 that'll come up from the BC.

Let me move on to the next one. The GAC, on the 22nd of June yesterday, wrote a letter to the GNSO Council expressing concern about the fact that Council and the EPDP Phase 2 have not come to a solution for the distinction between legal and natural persons being either published or disclosed under the new WHOIS and also the accuracy of registrant information.

So the GAC letter was the subject of a hot discussion just a few hours ago today when the GAC hosted its own working webinar. And NCSG members were present and quite active in that. I will look to Mark and Margie and those of you who were on the call to discuss any outcome from the GAC's decisions. I wanted to note that the current Chair of the EPDP, Janis Karklins, he ends his role as Chair on the 30th of June and at this point, the liaison to the EPDP from Council is Rafik Dammak from the NCSG and he is stepping up, seeking the role as the acting Chair, but due to circumstances in his own work life, could only do it for the month of July, which really puts into question how the EPDP

could continue beyond the end of July and whether the NCSG is a good person to have in the Chair role.

So Mark and Margie have been our tireless workers on the EPDP. A lot of assistance comes from Alex Deacon, from Stratton, from Mason Cole. But Mark and Margie are our leads, and at this point in the call, I wanted to turn to them to talk about the current state of play and what we expect to happen on today's EPDP call. Mark or Margie, I'd like Chantelle to unmute you and you can tag team on this one.

MARGIE MILAM: Sure. I'd be happy to address the group.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Please.

MARGIE MILAM: Hi, everyone. We are in the final midst of negotiations for the EPDP policy and having meetings throughout this week at our normal time, so it's actually very difficult with the ICANN meeting. But what I think the BC folks need to really understand is that the policy doesn't seem to be headed to a place where we will be able to support it. There's been a tremendous amount of work done in evaluating the public comments that were received and they were extensive. We had comments from the SSAC, from the GAC, from the ALAC, from the IPC and BC that really highlighted some of the missing pieces of the policy that would make it workable for us.

And that's the issue that I think we aren't able to negotiate in the final changes here. What we'll be talking about today in particular is Recommendation 6 which relates to the actual process for evaluating the recommendations. And it's tough. It's very tough negotiations. We're not getting the certainty that we'll be able to have our requests for legitimate access for cyber security and intellectual property purposes evaluated in a way that would give us the assurances that we would have data to satisfy those needs.

We don't have assurances that, for example, that only personal data is the data that will be subject to the balancing test as an example. And so one of the things that we're really pushing on is this legal natural person distinction in that we feel that if the information is only that of a legal entity, that there shouldn't even be a balancing test because there is no personal data that's being protected under GDPR. And we're hoping that we'll make some progress in that way.

I think that's the fundamental concern as we work through the final stages of this negotiation is that where we've landed in several cases goes far and beyond what actually GDPR requires and that's really what Mark and I have spent a tremendous amount of time trying to negotiate that the policy tracks what the GDPR requirements are but doesn't go beyond it so that that information can be available for cyber security needs.

And so I think that's some of the things we'll be talking about today. And I'll hand it over to Mark to see what additional comments he'd like to add.

MARK SVANCAREK::

As usual, great summary, Margie. Other topics that we'll be discussing are things like SLAs. I think that'll probably come up in a few hours. That's a tricky topic for us and I see some requests for some changes.

The way that I had hoped to structure the SLAs was to maximize two things: one, flexibility to adjust them over time as we learned more things, and two, massive transparency. The SLA concept goes hand in hand with the logging and reporting concepts. And we'll see if these things stay in tact as we go through the comments in the discussion later today. There was some feedback from a variety of people that they don't really understand the structure of the SLA proposal that was put together by the BC and the registrars. And so this is holding us back a little bit because it's something new that we're trying, something different.

And I don't want that complexity to force us to lose the things that we really need, namely the ability to adjust later over time and the ability to ensure that we have transparent statistics coming out of this thing. We all know how whenever we try to be data driven, that we don't always agree with each other's data and so a system that generates objective, consistent statistics is a really important part of this whole thing. And that, we'll be discussing that in the SLA section and in the logging and in the reporting sections. So wish us luck that we could hold the line on those. Thanks.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Mark and Margie, thank you for that report and for all the effort you're putting in. There's a question in the chat from Marie that there were references during the GAC call a few hours ago to Amr Elsadr – he's an NCSG member – a compromise that he had proposed and I believe you're speaking of the small teams work on the mechanism for how to evolve, Marie. I believe that's what you're speaking of. And Amr's compromise is another variety to a standing committee, a structure whereby GNSO would decide whether to enable the automation of disclosure for groups other than the GAC and law enforcement as we learn more from the courts or maybe even from the data protection board on whether disclosure is allowed for things that the BC wants it, for instance, protecting our users, our business users and customers from fraud and abuse. So the notion of a compromise there was trying to come up with different models.

And the key element here is whether Council alone gets to block the evolution in that evolutionary mechanism and whether, if Council got to vote on it, must it be unanimous with the support of all or perhaps it would just require the support of the contract parties since they are the ones who are ultimately liable if it turns out that the policy violates GDPR. So I believe that that compromise was in the nature of the structure of it but I believe the key factor is whether it has to be unanimous, full consensus as they call it on Council, or whether a super majority would be sufficient. But Mark, Margie, Alex, and others, anyone want to help to clarify that answer for Marie?

MARK SVANCAREK: I don't know that anyone here on the call is in that small group and can really speak to those details. I have not heard. Everything I've heard is anecdotal. I haven't gotten any direct details so I couldn't speak to it.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Great. Thank you, Mark. Margie, anything to add, or Alex?

MARGIE MILAM: Sure. I think just to explain what the issue is. When we first started negotiating the EPDP, we were hoping for a centralized model where the intake and the decision making would be centralized at the gateway and ICANN, essentially, would be doing that. At the beginning of the year, we shifted to what we called a hybrid model because we felt that there could be some scenarios where ICANN could do it and other scenarios where it would need to be sent down to the contracted parties because there wasn't legal clarity. And the only reason we agreed to even shift from a centralized decision making model to the hybrid model was because we understood – and this was actually a compromise proposed by Ashley Heineman when she was at NTIA – that there would be an easy way to adapt the policies to reflect changes in the legal framework that support disclosure. And so that's what we've been fighting about.

And what we've been opposing is a scenario where one stakeholder group could essentially block any further changes. And the current version right now has very little that's automated. Obvious cases of

phishing, for example, or even simple trademark related abuse is not something that the contracted parties are willing to consider for automation at this point. And so that's why everything rests on the evolutionary model. And if the evolutionary model mimics what a PDP is or asks for a PDP, then we feel that, essentially, it'll just preserve the status quo and it'll never be a situation where we would have more automated use cases and more ability to process disclosures at the centralized level, at the ICANN level.

And so that's why this issue is so important and that's where we've sort of been concerned that one stakeholder group, for example, the NCSG, could block future decisions that relate to whether the decisions can be automated. And so we're working closely with Brian King. I don't know if he's on this call, but he's been sort of leading the discussion on that point.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Margie.

MARK SVANCAREK: Yeah, and to be clear, NCSG has, or at least Dr. Milton Mueller has been very clear that it is a priority for him to oppose centralized decision making, not so much automation necessarily but any sort of centralized decision making, that's a hill he's willing to die on. And so you can imagine how this could set up a situation where a single group would have veto power over any sort of evolution.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Mark and Margie. I'll note that NCSG's firm position on that seems to be there, notwithstanding that we may get court orders, court rulings, or different interpretations of the GDPR of European authorities.

So let me move now to channel two of our policy calendar which is GNSO Council. So our current councilors are Marie Pattullo and Scott McCormick. Mark Datysgeld is to be congratulated for stepping up and being elected as our councilor to succeed Scott McCormick at the annual general meeting in October of this year. So I'd like to turn it over to Marie, Scott, and Mark as well to walk through the agenda which I've got placed in the Zoom chat. Marie, if you wish, I can always upload one of the e-mails you sent in the last hour or so. Marie?

MARIE PATTULLO: Thank you, Steve. I don't think we'll need to go there, but let's see.

First up, it's really great to talk to you all. I wish I could see you all. I can just about remember what you all look like. As you know, tomorrow, we have three different Council sessions. We've got the Council itself – you've all seen the agenda – and we also have joint meetings with the ICANN Board and also with the Council of the ccNSO. With many thanks to Natalie who has just circulated the PowerPoints for those. I've sent them on to you. Of course, if you have comments, please let Scott and I know.

Now, first up, we have one vote tomorrow during Council which is to request the issue report on the transfer policy. I'm presuming we vote

in favor because I haven't heard anyone say that we shouldn't vote in favor. So unless we hear from you differently, we will vote in favor. We're going to be discussing the auction proceeds final report. I expect quite a lot of discussion there from the IPC. I haven't seen much that you from the BC want us to say. Again, if you do have anything, now is the time to let us know.

There's also going to be a scope and discussion on the Work Stream 2 CCWG accountability implementation assessment report. Now that was so much work and obviously a big shoutout here to Steve for how much he did on that. If you have anything specific that you think we need to watch out for or raise, again, this is the time.

Now snuggled under AOB at the bottom of the agenda, one is Mason's favorite subject, DNS abuse. So far as I know, it's still a major priority for the BC, not just the BC, the GAC and others. But we still don't really think it needs to be on the Council agenda because we're not quite sure what the Council could do about it. If anybody has changed their view about it, then again, please do let me know.

Now something more substantive that's also under AOB is about the Council's proposed response to the ICANN Board about the Registration Directory Service Review Team. So the RDS Review Team with huge thanks to Susan who is on that review team. You'll see that I sent you around an e-mail earlier, my earlier this morning, your earlier depending on where you are, earlier, where I've got a suggestion on how we should respond to that.

My main concern about this is that linking into what Margie and Mark were saying about the EPDP, data accuracy is a major, major, major problem. I'm talking about registrant data accuracy in this point. Now this RDS letter at the moment says, "if and when the Council decides to request an issue report on data accuracy". I don't think that's strong enough. I think we should be saying we need an issue report preferably yesterday on data accuracy. So you'll see my suggested wording that I've already sent through to you by e-mail. I know that you're all horribly overworked. If I do not hear from you, let's say, within the next four or five hours, I will presume it's okay and hit the send button. If you've got any questions, obviously, let me know, and of course, Susan. We have her on the call as the expert.

And then going, circling right back to the EPDP, we've got a couple of process points. The first one is that there is an official project change request. All this means is we're not going to get it finished by the end of June. We're going to have to take some of July. Are you, the Council, okay with this? The answer, presumably, is yes. Again, if you look at my e-mail, you'll see what we've already said to the list.

But there are two things on which I do need your views. One is what do we do with the issues that fell off the EPDP table? We keep talking about them. They are priority issues. They include legal and natural data. They include privacy proxy. They include, of course, data accuracy. Rafik, who is the Vice-Chair of the Council and also liaison to the EPDP, as you know, came up with suggestions. I got my draft response to that, again, on the e-mail to you. Again, if I don't hear back from you, I'll just hit the send button.

And then for the more technical among us, we have a draft letter from Council leadership to the SSAC because the SSAC sent in comments on the EPDP Phase 2. So I've sent that around to you. If you have any views on that, I'd be really grateful because as soon as it has the word "technical", I am completely out of my depth.

Okay, Steve, that's it from me unless you need anything else.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Marie. Anything further from Scott or from Mark or questions for our councilors?

MARK DATYSGELD: Very briefly, Marie, I wonder where exactly on the matter of privacy proxy, on yesterday's session, the GAC seemed to be quite interested in this subject. There seemed to be quite a bit of willingness to tackle this subject from their part. I wonder where the discussions with them stand or whether we know what their [inaudible] is in relation to this right now.

MARIE PATTULLO: You're going to have to forgive me, Mark. At the exact time that you got to the main part of your question, my next door neighbor's kid started crying. Could you repeat that?

MARK DATYSGELD: Yes. Do we know the position of the GAC in terms of privacy proxy right now? Have we discussed that with them? Do we have any line of communication there right now?

MARIE PATTULLO: We haven't discussed it recently to my knowledge. However, if you look at the e-mail I sent you guys around earlier about the GAC who is meeting this morning, they, the GAC – sorry – have listed privacy proxy as one of their key issues that need to be dealt with. Interestingly, they linked it to WHOIS. But I'd like to open that up to the experts on the line because I'm sure someone has more than me on that.

STEVE DELBIANCO: I'm putting in the chat that one of the key elements here is restarting the implementation of an approved consensus policy on accrediting privacy proxy providers. And that's been stopped by ICANN Org pending the workout of this EPDP. So that might be one element of concern. Are there others that you're aware of, Mark, Margie, and others? Great. I'm pretty sure it's the restarting of implementation and I don't think we have anything more on that, Mark.

MARK DATYSGELD: Yeah, following up briefly, following up on yesterday's discussion, I do think it is a valid path to pursue talking more with them and seeing what we can get out of this to at least move forward with this particular topic. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, and Margie Milam, your hand is up.

MARGIE MILAM: Sure. And I agree with that. They seemed to, when Laureen was talking about it, seemed to be very supportive of continuing to ask about that issue. And just so the BC members understand, in particular with COVID-related abuse, a significant portion of registrations are covered by privacy and proxy services. The study that was put together by the National Board of Pharmacy, I think it was, identified that of COVID-related domain names, over 90% were using anonymized domain name registrations like privacy proxy services. And so what that does, it creates really difficult situations for both law enforcement and for cybersecurity firms trying to mitigate DNS abuse. And so this has been the topic of this meeting. We should do whatever we can to encourage the Board to get ICANN to restart this effort.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Margie. What Alex has placed in the chat is another potential concern which is the policy language in the EPDP Phase 2 that could effectively double-blind the contact information. Alex, do you want to frame that a little bit better for us, please? And Chantelle, can you unmute the line for Alex Deacon?

ALEX DEACON: Yeah, hi. Can you hear me?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Wedo.

ALEX DEACON: Yeah, I think that's the... You described it correctly, Steve, just there's a chance that the language that as currently written could be confused and allow for this double-blinding of privacy proxy information so you would jump through the hoops to get the data revealed by the SSAD, and in the end, it would just end up being a privacy proxy registration which then you would then have to go to the privacy proxy provider to request that information.

There was a lot of confusion I saw in the comments during the public comment period on that and I think there is improvements that can be made. The last I looked, I wasn't quite satisfied with the language changes to address that issue so we should keep an eye on that. So as I mentioned in the chat, I do agree with the GAC that it is a concern.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Alex. Hey, now we'll move on to the third channel of our policy calendar which is the Commercial Stakeholders Group which is a combination of the BC, the IPC, and the ISPs. And Barbara Wanner is our elected liaison to CSG. So Barbara, I placed in the Zoom, the current set of items that are active in CSG and turn it over to you.

BARBARA WANNER:

Excuse me. Thank you, Steve. I guess I'll just begin with something that was something that appeared on our plates last week in NomCom Review, the [inaudible] team has a draft report prepared that is open for public comment. As Steve has described on the policy calendar, it could potentially endanger our current allotment of seats on the NomCom. I have reached out to both of our CSG constituencies, the IPC and the ISPCP, to bring this to their attention and to ask for their cooperation and collaboration in preparing a response.

So we have a bit of time. The due date isn't until well into July but I think it's important for us to begin thinking about that now and maybe the individual constituencies can decide if they want to submit individual comments or work on a collaborative CSG submission or maybe all of the above. Maybe that would be a more impactful approach.

You see the schedule for the rest of the week here. We will have our meeting with our GNSO appointed Board members, Becky Burr and Matthew Shears, on the 8th of July. Again, I have proposed topics that we might want to focus on there. But we're certainly open to considering other issues in time for that meeting.

And then, let's see, we will also have a special meeting with the ICANN Board to follow up on our April 24 letter to them concerning Recommendation Spec 11, Section 3.18 of the registry agreement, DNS abuse, again, privacy proxy implementation. So we will get back to you when that date is confirmed.

And finally, we move into the upcoming election. Keith Drazek's term will expire as GNSO Council Chair. The CSG has united to support Philippe Fouquart of the ISPCP and members of the CSG ExComm have reached out to the NCSG to ask if they would unite with us in supporting Philippe. They are not anxious to make that decision since, really, the clock will begin ticking on that in August. So I don't imagine we will get any sort of clarity on that in July. We still do not know yet if the contracted party house will put forward a nominee.

Then why don't I just leave it there, Steve? Rafik Dammak's term will expire as Vice-Chair. We have an agreement within the non-contracted party house that one of us would hold the Vice-Chair seat if the other house or the other side of the house has the Chair seat. If indeed, they unite with us in supporting Philippe, then it would be up to them to decide who would succeed Rafik in the Vice-Chair position. And I'll just leave it there. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thanks, Barbara. One of the first items that you covered was the Nominating Committee and I'll ask [Arinola], you're on that Nominating Committee Implementation Team. Is there anything you wish to add to the item that's up on the top of the screen? Just note in the chat and your line will be unmuted, [Arinola]. Okay, well, I'll assume there's nothing more there and we're finished with the policy calendar so I'll turn it back over to Claudia. Thank you.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Thank you very much. Sorry, I was on mute. So I will leave now the floor for Jimson for the finance and operation update. Jimson, are you there?

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Hi, Jimson. Can you [inaudible]?

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Okay, so I just have control now. So greetings to everyone. Well, with regard to finance and operations, Chantelle, can I share my slide or you will just share there?

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Hi, Jimson. You should see it on your screen.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Okay, great. So first and foremost, on finance, we're talking about the BC FY21 budget and to let you know that, yes, it's been approved by the ExComm. It's to run between July 4, 2020 and June 30, 2021. So the ExComm approved this in accordance with Section 2.6.2B of the BC charter. That was on the 19th of June this year.

An approved copy, so the final copy has already been sent to the members list so members can review the details of what has been approved and that includes the funding set aside for the [inaudible] study. We hope [inaudible].

We also hope that we can still celebrate the BC 24th anniversary, March 20-21 during the ICANN 70 in Cancun provided the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic [inaudible] is successful. So funding for that is already built-in into the budget. Next slide, please.

Okay. Still on finance, I want to appreciate members that have expeditiously paid their dues. Over 50% of members have done that already, quite a record. Even before the end of the fiscal year, the end of fiscal year is June 30th. About 50% of the members paid for the next fiscal year. That's quite commendable, and also to use the opportunity to welcome to [inaudible] again, Fox Cable News Network that is joint membership. So [inaudible], welcome again. Next slide, please.

On the operation side, I would like to extend congratulations to Mark Datysgeld, our newly elected councilor. He'll be taking his seat at the end of our general meeting at ICANN 69. And also, I looked at NomCom reps for [inaudible] comic and I did [inaudible]. For a small business, I just want information. Mark will be taking the seat that will be left by Scott McCormick the next general meeting of ICANN.

And now for information, the BC ExComm election will be coming up the last quarter of the year. The BC office has election has to do with the office of the Chair, the Vice-Chair, policy coordination, and the position of the Vice-Chair, Finance and Operation.

And lastly, please feel free to download ICANN 69 special newsletter edition [inaudible], anniversary of the BC newsletter which has been published successfully without any [brick] to every ICANN meeting. So you can see the link there. So we also have a past edition right there. I

would like to use the opportunity to thank all those that [be] working on it, in particular, Chris Chaplow and our secretariat, Chantelle Doerksen. I know the office has an outreach committee members because they always sent in their report and they always published there. So, thank you all for your support and cooperation that's made the newsletter a huge success over the years.

And on this note, I think there is the last slide there. I want to say do keep well and safe and thank you. So back to you, Claudia.

CLAUDIA SELLI:

Yeah, thank you very much, Jimson. I think we have concluded the points on the agenda. I am just looking at the chat in case anyone wanted to raise any points.

I don't see hands up or anything written specifically to any other points. So with that, we can close the call and thank you very much, everybody, for participating and for the engagement and for all the work. So keep safe and we'll continue the ICANN 68. I'm sure we will see each other online. Thank you. We can stop the recording, Chantelle.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]