ICANN69 | Community Days Sessions – GNSO - BC Open Meeting
Thursday, October 15, 2020 – 16:00 to 17:00 CEST

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Hello and welcome to the Business Constituency's Open Meeting at ICANN69. 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 the session, questions or comments submitted in the chat will only be read aloud if put in the proper form or captured for follow up after this session, as I will soon note in the chat. The Chair will read questions and comments allowed during the Q&A portion of the session. If you would like to ask your question or make your comments verbally, please raise your hand. When called upon, kindly unmute your microphone and take the floor. Please remember to state your name when speaking for the record, speak at a reasonable pace, and please mute your microphone when you are finished. With that, I will hand the floor over to our Chair, Claudia Selli, to begin. Claudia, please go ahead.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Thank you very much, Chantelle, and thank you very much, everybody, for participating to our BC call during the ICANN69 virtual meeting. I see that we have quite a high attendance, so thank you all for being there. I hope everyone is well and safe.

You have the agenda of today in front of you. We're going to start the meeting with Sally Newell Cohen, who's the ICANN Senior Vice President of Global Communication and Language Services; continuing with the Policy Update from Steve DelBianco, BC Vice Chair of Policy Coordination; to end up with Finance and Operations with Jimson Olufuye, which is also the BC Vice Chair of Finance and Operations. And then we should have time as well for Other Businesses in case anything comes up. I would like to remind everyone that this is an open meeting so be also aware that there might be a larger audience in the room than all the BC members.

So with that, I would like to invite Sally Newell Cohen. Thank you very much for taking the time to be with us today. I really appreciate it. I don't know if you would like to start with a short maybe presentation and allow time for some questions?

SALLY NEWELL COHEN: Yes, Claudia. Thank you. We do have a short presentation and I think there'll be ample time for questions after that.

First of all, thank you so much for the opportunity to come and speak with you all about the Open Data Program. I know previously you've received updates on the program from the Operations team. But recently oversight of the program transferred over to Global Communications, particularly because of the relationship and the synergies between the Information Transparency Initiative and ODP. So for this update, we're going to review the goals of the project, our

progress, the challenges that we're facing, and next steps. So if we could go to the next slide, please. Thank you.

When the Open Data Initiative originated, several goals were identified. And I know these are familiar to you but I thought it was a good level setting conversation, too. The goals were to increase transparency and provide comprehensive accessibility to raw data; to strengthen ICANN Org's procedures, processes, and standards, to improve usability of data; to enhance the community's ability to understand and use published data; to enhance that data on the platform, ensure that it's accessible and usable, comparable and interoperable, and able to be leveraged for improved governance engagement. It was also to enable registered users to search, browse, view, and download the data, and to allow users to save custom analysis, receive notifications, generate API keys, and to view API quota usage. So those were the primary goals. Next slide, please.

Version one of the Open Data Platform launched in March of this year during ICANN67, and it was just prior to ICANN Org shift to a remote workforce as a result of COVID-19. But upon the launch, there were 40 datasets included, and they were Domain Name Indicators, Identifier Technology Health Indicators or ITHI, the Per-Registrar Transaction Reports, and the Registry Functions Activity Reports. You'll see a number beside each of those categories and that represents the number of reports now available. There are of course many more datasets to come. Next slide, please.

Since that launch, we've been tracking information. We thought it might be interesting to you to know a little bit about the usage data. So today there are more than 740 unique users on the platform. There have been more than 30,000 API calls, and the five most accessed datasets are the Per-Registrar Transaction Report for 2019. The ITHI: DNS Root Traffic Analysis, the compound annual growth rate of domains by TLD category, the Registry Functions Activity Report, and the Per-Registrar Transactions Report for 2020. So this clearly illustrates the demand, the need, and the interest for this data. Next slide, please.

So this is where we'll talk a little bit about what we've been doing and what the progress has been since the March 2020 launch. Since then, we've added seven new indicators to the Domain Name Marketplace. And you'll see on the list, it's the number of IDN second-level domains, the net change in IDN second-level domains in gTLDs and ccTLDs, compound annual growth rates of IDN second-level domains, percentage of gTLD operators and registrar websites with domain registration terms and conditions in multiple languages, percentage of gTLD registrar websites offering multiple payment methods, the number of UDRP complaints, and the percentage of complaints decided against the registrars and the number of URS complaints and the percentage of complaints decided against registrars. I think it's important to note here that while we would like to have added more data in the time since the launch, we've experienced a couple of challenges and I want to share those with you. Next slide, please.

Our hope was to establish a cadence for launching the new content soon after the launch. However, we found an issue in the Registry Functions Activity Reports, where the structure of some of the files didn't align properly with the platform and we believe it's necessary to implement the bug fix before adding any new content. One of the primary objectives of the Open Data Initiative is to build an established trust in the data. So, safeguarding it is critical to the success overall of the platform and in maintaining the data authority and integrity. So we first are tackling the bug fix, we're actively working on it, and we anticipate its release next month. Next slide, please.

I know there was a question. It's my understanding there was interest in knowing about the budget and how we're tracking to it for this project. The budget itself is made up of the platform license, administration and minor customization fees. In Fiscal Year '20, this budget was $100,000 and we met this budget. We didn't exceed it. In Fiscal '21, it's approximately the statements of administration fees. But again, we're expecting to fall right into budget.

The real cost drivers for this project are resources. Existing ICANN Org staff are leveraged for this project, with partial staff allocations in Communications, in the Legal, Engineering and IT, and along with the functional owners of the data. So that's really what makes up the cost here, if you will, although it's not budgeted cost.

Now, in July, we had an ICANN Org reorganization, as you know, in part because Susanna Bennett left the organization. Under her

responsibility was oversight for this project and, as I mentioned at the beginning, this transfer to the Global Comms team, because of the synergies with ITI particularly. And then other members of the Operations team were dispersed into other functions within ICANN teams and they gained new and different responsibilities. So this changed the makeup of the team that was focused on ODP. This created a challenge and an opportunity for us. We had a smooth transition. The critical team members remained and then we brought on new folks, particularly in the management of the project. So the transition has been smooth but it's also given us an opportunity to step back, reassess how the resources are being used, and assess the roadmap. So that's something that we've been focused on in the past several months. Next slide, please.

In addition to reallocation of the resources and the bug fix, we also ran into a period of shifting priorities as a result of COVID-19. And so we did have resources that were temporarily drawn away from the project. But I do want to assure you that ICANN Org continues to be committed to this project and to the Open Data Initiative in general. We believe that through this reassessment and putting ourselves back into fixing the bug and tightening the roadmap, we've chartered the next immediate steps and we're feeling confident about those. So it's important to know that, following this release, we will complete the planning and prioritization, particularly we will be focusing on ITHI. As you know—yes?

CLAUDIA SELLI: Sally, apologies. I see that there are a couple of questions that may be related to what you were discussing right now. So I wonder if we can address those while you're giving the presentation, if you don't mind. And one of the questions is, "How many ICANN staffers are working on the Open Data project?" And then the second question was, "DNS abuse data come from the Salesforce reporting system?"

SALLY NEWELL COHEN: Okay. The first question, I would tell you there are approximately seven resources that are applied to this initiative. So that comes from the different functions in ICANN Org, whether it be Legal, Communications, Development, Project Management, or Product Development.

And then the second question, I'm going to turn to my colleague, Matt Larson, and ask him if you could address the question about DNS abuse content. Matt, are you able to speak to this?

MATT LARSON: Hi. I am. Thanks. Can everybody hear me?

CLAUDIA SELLI: Yes. Thank you.

MATT LARSON: So the domain name abuse data that is in ITHI comes primarily from the data that feeds the DAAR project. I'm going to put a URL in the chat

when I'm done speaking and point everyone—ITHI has its own website. It was developed to look like the very best of the web in 1998 so don't criticize us for the look of the website. Content over style in this case. But the data that's available in ODP, the subset, all of that data is available right now on the ITHI website. Our long-term plan would be to get all of the ITHI data into ODP, but for now we do have this separate website where it's available. So I'll put that link in there in the chat shortly and you can see where I'm referring to.

SALLY NEWELL COHEN: Thank you, Matt. There's another question about what metrics will be published in the area of domain name abuse.

MATT LARSON: Let me just refer everybody to the website that I'm about to put in because there's enough detail there. It would be easier to refer everybody there rather than me to talk about here.

SALLY NEWELL COHEN: Sounds great. Thank you. Before I move on, are there any other questions?

CLAUDIA SELLI: I think that the questions that are on the chat are primarily oriented also on the DNS, the pulled up questions. And then, of course, Mark wants to ask you a question or all a question. So please go ahead, Mark.

MARK DATYSGELD: Thank you very much, Claudia. In relation to the actual datasets, some of us who are researchers—and that is my case—before everything, when this was still being discussed, we had this vision that maybe we would be able to incorporate some of our original research into the database. I had started a conversation at the time with [Fedora Young]. I thought we were going somewhere but then COVID happened. And of course, priorities changed very much and everything got lost in the process, but I'm still very much interested in understanding how the researcher community can actually make ODI-ready datasets. How can we make sure that your research is at least up for evaluation by ICANN or whoever is out there looking at this, to see if this can be a more organic process. So I would like to understand right now who would be the contact point, who should we be talking to, and who is currently managing anything related to that, if you could clarify? Thank you very much.

SALLY NEWELL COHEN: Okay. Yes, Mark. Thank you for the question. What I would recommend—we have kind of a core team that is working on this together. So what I would actually suggest is, if you could contact me directly and then I'm going to point you to the right person on the team, if you don't mind doing that. But I want to connect with the team to who is most able to connect with you and follow up. And I think probably [Edmond] Perez will be one of those people.

MARK DATYSGELD: Thank you very much.

SALLY NEWELL COHEN: Yes. Thank you.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Thank you, Sally. Meanwhile, the website has been posted. So I don't know if there are specific questions on the website and the content there, or if Sally can continue the presentation.

SALLY NEWELL COHEN: There is a question I see asking about which datasets contain registrar data related to URS and UDRP. I'm not sure. I'm going to look to my team and ask if there's anyone that can address that issue specifically because I will not give you all the right information. Matt Larson, is this something you can respond to?

MATT LARSON: Sure. Only to say that that's not data that is in ITHI. So if that data were to eventually be on ODP, it would have to come from elsewhere in the Org.

SALLY NEWELL COHEN: Okay. Thank you very much. If you don't mind, I'll continue and talk a little bit more about the next steps.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Of course.

SALLY NEWELL COHEN: Thank you. Okay. As I've mentioned, we have one dataset available for ITHI at the moment, but we anticipate and are planning for adding all of the other datasets that you see on the screen. And we're working very closely with the Office of the Chief Technology Officer and Engineering and IT to get those remaining datasets on the platform. So I wanted to make sure that you were all aware that this is a focus for us. Let's see. Next slide, please.

I didn't know if this would be useful but I thought it might be valuable to at least talk about the major milestones that have happened. So much has been accomplished since that original Request for Proposals to secure a software as a service provider was announced during ICANN61. So we have progressed through many critical milestones through the time that we've had since that original point.

Our future efforts will include setting additional milestones. So when we speak to you again and probably before that, we'll be able to share a more detailed roadmap with you. So I think that's something you're probably very interested in and we're looking forward to having that finalized to share. Next slide, please.

This is just a little bit of information about the Open Data Set features, if you haven't had a chance to look at ODP and check out some of the tools. What you'll see under the Charts page, there you can visualize multiple datasets, you can compare to the Analyze tab. On the API

page, you'll see an interface for programs to communicate and exchange data. And you can always go to the About page and Help page for more information. The next slide, please.

The Domain Name Place Indicators—that dataset presents statistics pertaining to the marketplace for gTLDs and country code TLDs. We collaborated with the Advisory Panel to develop the relevant indicator schema and taxonomy. We've released two refreshes so far, and they're available on ICANN Org and in an Excel sheet format. They're also updated twice a year. We are transitioning from the Excel sheet to the ODP. It will not only provide users ability to refine the data with search and filter functionality, but also the opportunity to visualize data and tell their stories.

There's information on ITHI. It sounds to me like you're very familiar with this, so I won't go through these and I know Chantelle is sharing this presentation with you. So you can always look at that. And then of course we have the monthly registrar reporting, and that's part of contractual obligations.

So these are these are just some of the features we wanted to share with you. You can certainly look at the presentation after I realized that we're close to being at time. So what I'd like to do is conclude the update and answer any additional questions you might have.

CLAUDIA SELLI: I see that there is a question in the chat from Jimson that is asking, "Is there any timeframe for the DNS Abuse data from DAAR to flow into the platform?"

SALLY NEWELL COHEN: Yes, Jimson, that's a good question. There is still some significant planning to be done in this area so I don't have a timeline to share with you at the moment, but we will be able to provide a timeline very soon for this.

Let's see. Is there anything else?

CLAUDIA SELLI: Thank you very much. I don't see other –

SALLY NEWELL COHEN: Okay.

CLAUDIA SELLI: I don't see other questions in the chat. Thank you, Chantelle. She's sharing your presentation with us. I would like, really, to thank you for accepting to speak to us and update us. And certainly we will continue that conversation. As you see, we're very interested into that program.

SALLY NEWELL COHEN: Yeah. Thank you very much for giving us the time, too.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Thank you. Until next time.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: This is Jimson. Just a quick comment. Yes, we really thank Sally, and I want to say plus one to that, and to thank the entire team, the Operations team that worked on this project. And just to also remind our members that this was an initiative that was heavy and, I think from our perspective, we are happy that the Org took this very seriously and they've come up with something substantive. So just to recommend that we should use the system, the facility, and we will consult with you surely for improvement and also to get feedback. Thank you very much.

SALLY NEWELL COHEN: Thank you, Jimson. I appreciate it.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Okay. Thank you, Jimson. Maybe we can continue also our meeting, and the second item on our agenda is the Policy Calendar. So, Steve, if you want to take the floor and update us?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Okay. I should hope that the Policy Calendar is displayed right now in the Zoom meeting. I sent it around two days ago to BC members. So we went through this every two weeks. This is for outsiders that are guests to the BC today. Every two weeks we run through this Policy Calendar that delineates multiple channels: the Public Comment

channel, Council itself, and then our Commercial Stakeholders Group. And in each of those channels, we look at things we've done in the last two weeks. We look at the upcoming meetings and comment opportunities, and we use it as a guideline, an outline on which we have detailed discussions on policy matters. The BC does this every two weeks through a lot of e-mail correspondence as well.

So the first channel is this Public Comment process, and in the last two weeks we did follow response to questions on the Draft Final Report of SubPro, gTLD Subsequent Procedures. I want to thank Mason Cole, Tim Smith, and Statton. And then several of us also provided edits on that, but it was a substantial amount of work, especially because ICANN is continuing to use those Google forms for purposes of responding. The challenges remain in that the forms are faulty at saving your work as you progress. Again, I had our work lost after two or three hours of entering and it's extremely unwieldy for us to review what we've submitted and to compare to others. So I think that ICANN has some ways to go at taking the responses to those Google forms and making them accessible in ways other than that giant Google sheet that they published today.

So SubPro—I had two meetings yesterday. I sat in on a couple of them to try to figure out where they're going next, but they're painstakingly going through all the comments that were submitted, including our own, and trying to come up with their final report by the end of the year.

All right, so right now we have several open public comments at ICANN. I want to do my best to solicit volunteers from among BC members that are here on the call today since we have several to get done by late November. So the .JOBS Registry Agreement has a proposed amendment, and the amendment comes from the .JOBS operator. For years, since they were launched as a sponsor TLD back in 2005, they used the Society for Human Resource Management as an independent evaluator when registrants wanted to buy a name in .JOBS and they had sponsored TLD requirements at the time. So a sponsor TLD was sort of a relic of the past. It's not quite the same as a gTLD because it was sponsored with criteria for eligibility. At this point, the owner/operator .JOBS wants to take over that role of evaluating registrants against that requirements. That's comparable to what's already done in .AERO, .XXX, .COOP, and .ASIA, and the BC has supported those moves as long as they didn't involve watering down the registration requirements like .MUSEUM tried to do. If you recall the BC objected to .MUSEUM, pretty much ditching the requirements that they originally won that sponsored TLD with. So we do need volunteers to draft a BC comment on .JOBS. Is there anyone who can who can step up, who's got some experience in that area? And I'll watch the chat as well as the participant list to see if people want to step up.

CLAUDIA SELLI: I think Jimson has his hands up, unless it's an old hand.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Jimson, is that a volunteer or for you?

JIMSON OLUFUYE: That's an old hand.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Okay, because Jimson volunteers for everything, and it's really not fair. The last time we commented on .MUSEUM and the sponsored TLD, it was Phil Corwin and myself that did the drafting. So I'll come back to folks on that.

Next up is the recommended early warning for root zone scaling. This is an interesting idea. This comes from ICANN Org. They're proposing maybe an early warning mechanism as the number of new TLDs really started to expand in the root. I mean, we added in the neighborhood of a thousand and currently have somewhere less than 2,000 TLDs in the root. The question is, if you add thousands and thousands more, what would happen? Could there be an increased difficulty dealing with a number of new gTLDs? And the BC has been invited to draft a comment. Since one of their concerns is anti-DNS abuse communities and law enforcement, I'm pretty confident that we have BC members that can weigh in.

Okay. I appreciate that, Mark, but do we have anyone else that could be—hey, Phil Corwin. Do we have anyone else to can help to do this recommended early warning? It's not a very long report, easy one to digest. Mark Sv, thank you. I think that'll be an easy one.

Okay. Let's move to the next one. There's an Operating Plan and Budget for PTI and IANA. PTI is Public Technical Identifiers. It's a corporation that ICANN created when we helped to engineer the IANA transition. We've commented on this every year on their five-year plan. We comment on their one-year plan. Typically, Jimson, Arinola, and Tim Smith on our Finance Committee handle that, and we usually do a brief comment.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Yes. I'm in, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Jimson. Typically, Jimson will enroll the other members of the Finance Committee and bring them along as well.

TIM SMITH: Happy to help. This is Tim.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Tim. I appreciate that.

ARINOLA AKINYEMI: I'll be happy to help. This is Arinola.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Arinola. Okay. Next one off is the preliminary issues report on a new PDP for the Transfer Policy. We used to call it the IRTP (Inter-

Registrar Transfer Policy). The BC was very active on this for well over 15 years—inter-registrar transfer, moving domain names between one registrar and another. It's been renamed and we now call it the Transfer Policy. The BC has an opportunity now to comment on a status report that is recommending a formal review of the policy. So this is not one of those other reviews that we're always doing on specific reviews like ATRT and SSR, nor is it a GNSO structure review. This is a new review, and the ICANN Org is recommending at this point to come up with one.

We need volunteers who are familiar with all the vagaries of inter-registrar domain name transfers and the problems that that entails. Do I have any volunteers so far? Thank you, Susan. I think you helped to work on the previous ones. I appreciate that. And what I'll try to do is dredge up the earlier work we did on IRTP and help to get that started, Susan and Jay. Thank you.

Next up, final one on here is not due until the 2nd of December is the IANA Naming Functions Review as an initial report. The Functions Review was created out of that IANA transition I talked about earlier, and we've commented on it back in 2014, and we also supported Bylaws changes for the IFR last summer. So this is not a very difficult one. It's an initial report and, for the most part, the IANA functions are performing as the customers require. Can we get some volunteers on the BC that would help with that? All right, I'll come back around that one in our mid-November meeting.

Okay. Now the part of the Policy Calendar that's up next was typically this long catalog of what's been happening on modifying WHOIS policies to comply with GDPR. I moved that to the bottom of the e-mail. I'll scroll down there right now. I moved it to the bottom so it doesn't get in the way, since the PDP has concluded its currently active work. But there are three things I wanted BC members to be attentive to. On the 2nd of October, Göran wrote that letter to the EC about registration data and I have a link to it there. The second thing is that Thomas Rickert in the ISP Constituency did a CircleID posting about the WHOIS wars that go on. I respect Thomas and his views, the ISPCP didn't agree with the BC and the IPC, but you all ought to read Thomas's posting.

And then finally, the .EU registry operator did a study on practices they've used to combat speculative and abusive domain name registrations. It's fascinating to where they analyzed required identification when somebody tries to register a name. And they use some machine learning techniques to figure out the kinds of names that might be prone to phishing or DNS abuse. But challenging the registrant to do authenticated identification, they're finding that a lot of these registration requests are abandoned. That's fascinating, this idea that the simple challenge to somebody to identify themselves is enough to make a phisher back down. So more should be done in that area and we ought to consider it for the New gTLD Program.

All right, back up where I was, which is Council. So I wanted the next segue to Scott McCormick and Marie Pattullo—they are current GNSO Councilors—and also invite Mark Datysgeld to join this discussion,

since Mark takes Scott's seat at this meeting as our newest GNSO Councilor. So, Marie, Scott, and Mark, over to you. I'm not hearing you, Marie.

MARIE PATTULLO:

Sorry, Steve. I hit the wrong button. Hi, everybody. This is Marie Pattullo. I'm one of the two BC Councilors, as you just heard. And for those who don't know the BC as well as some others, we are directed on Council. What that means is that Scott and I or, as of next week in a bit, Mark and I don't do what we feel like. We do what you tell us to do. So it's very much a collegiate efforts of what the BC members feel is important and telling us how to vote.

Now, we have the next meeting coming up on Wednesday. You've all seen the agenda. We've circulated that already. It's all online. It's going to be a really heavy meeting and everybody is, of course, more than welcome to attend. We start in Council next week with what we call the Consent Agenda. That's the bits where we don't discuss anything, we just say yes. That said, this Consent Agenda is really important for the BC. You know that we've just closed out on the Phase 2 report, by that I mean Council voted to approve a Phase 2 report. The BC and the IPC didn't vote for all of it but we don't have the votes to make a difference there.

But there were certain items that did not make it through into the Phase 2 report which are vital to business. One is, as you see as Steve has put on the screen, the difference between legal and natural data, which is, as you know, a very different difference under the GDPR

itself, and the so-called unique identifiers, so an anonymous mail. The other hugely important is the massive subject of data accuracy. The BC has always believed that this was firmly within the EPDP. Unfortunately, our Council colleagues disagreed, but we do have a whole new PDP to be on data accuracy. This is a call out to anybody who is involved in these really important subjects, because, as you see, we're going to be launching this procedure. Meaning, we're going to have a new scoping team. Meaning, we're going to need the experts on our scoping team. So, really big shout-out, as soon as that call comes out, you'll see it from us. We do need you on board, please.

You'll also see that there's going to be next steps on WHOIS Conflicts Procedure IAG. I won't go into that unless anybody needs me to, but again there's going to be—if you go down to the bottom there, Steve— a launch for more volunteers for small team to develop a draft Charter on IDN Policy Track. Now, the small team there will be between Councilors, and I'm kind of looking at again to Datysgeld because I know how interested you are on IDNs. So just a heads up, you might be coming onto Council but you got your work cut out for you, buddy.

Now, seriously, back on to the next motion we're going to discuss at Council, which is you see, is about lots of words that translate as Thick WHOIS. There's a small team of Councilors. We had our last meeting this morning. There's been a disagreement for a long time as to whether or not the Thick WHOIS Consensus Policy and the EPDP Phase 1 report actually worked together or not. The IRT has not managed to come to a conclusion or a solution on that. It was given to a small team in Council who—it won't surprise you to hear—are also not come

to an agreement on that. There's a draft motion to basically kick off a PDP—or an EPDP as some would have it, according to Barry at least—that there would be a new PDP looking at Thick WHOIS. It's very complex. It's very detailed. Alex Deacon, God bless him, he's very down in the weeds. If anybody does want more on this, I'm very happy to take that offline, Steve, because I know we just don't have time to do it now. But that's to tell you that's what that discussion is about. Kicking around in the community, item 5, you've seen that –

STEVE DELBIANCO: Marie?

MARIE PATTULLO: Yes?

STEVE DELBIANCO: A quick question. You have a draft motion on the agenda for Council next week. So do you believe you guys will vote on that motion or simply discuss it? Thank you.

MARIE PATTULLO: No, Steve. Thanks for the question. I put that wrong. The draft was put together by Vice Chair Pam Little and staff member Berry Cobb. In the original iteration, it did seem to be we are going to start voting on this at Council next week. We and the IPC push back on that because we don't believe that we've had that full discussion. We also have disagreements about some of the terminology used and some of the

wording used, but this is basically a draft motion for discussion. It's a potential way forward out of the so-called impasse on Thick WHOIS. There may be other things discussed as well, other potential steps forward, but being realistic, Steve, I don't think they're going to get traction. Does that answer your question? Yeah, you're nodding.

So, kicking around in a community, you've seen that ICANN Org has come up with a so-called Draft Operational Design Phase. What this seems to be is that rather than a report coming out of Council and going to Board, there would be a kind of interim but parallel phase. So, if ICANN Org sees things are going to be really expensive, really complex, really difficult for ICANN Org itself to take on, it should start working on this Design Phase, i.e. it should start working on really scoping out, giving data help to the Board so the Board knows what it's doing properly. And the best live example we've got of that is the so-called guesstimate on how much the SSAD would cost. Now, that has come out on a couple of e-mails. It's been discussed briefly with Council. I know it's been discussed in every Board session that has been had so far with anybody, but it's one that we do need to look out for. It is going to be important. Yes?

STEVE DELBIANCO: On that one, I think that this morning's CSG meeting with the ICANN Board is very much on point. Alex Deacon buried himself in weeks of researching and development to show that ICANN Org already has a system, a Salesforce system that could easily accommodate acceptance of disclosure requests and route them to the right

registrars or registries and keep track of the responses. So, Alex, this presentation, if you don't mind, Alex, to send that to the entire BC so we'll all have what you presented this morning. And Alex can take questions on that. But during the discussion, Marie, don't hesitate to mention that the BC is trying to be pragmatic and constructive and suggest that software that ICANN Org already owns and already uses can be used for a very cost-effective implementation of this ticketing system. And the most important part of it, it was Alex demonstrated that if legal clarity were to arrive, that it would also lend itself to evolve. That kind of a Salesforce system could evolve into one that automates even the disclosure. Alex, is there anything you want to add for Marie to equip her for that meeting next week?

ALEX DEACON: Hi, Steve. No. I think that that was a good summary but, Marie, as always, if you have any questions or need more guidance, please do let me know.

STEVE DELBIANCO: And, Alex, if you can, make sure you're on our Skype channel during the Council meeting next week for that discussion, please.

ALEX DEACON: Yes. I was just looking at that. I will do that.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks. Back to you.

MARIE PATTULLO:	Alex, you just read my mind because I was just going to ask you to do that. Yes. That whole discussion with the Board on cost, as you know, is something that the Board was asked specifically for by the Council in the motion to adopt the Phase 2 report, so they are prepared for it. But I am not the expert here, Alex. So I'm so, so glad that you'll be around. I'm really grateful for all you do.

I think really, Steve, the only other thing I want to say about Council is "yay" to everyone coming on board, but to let everyone know that Philippe Fouquart, who is with Orange based in France, the French ISP, is going to be our new Chair. We're going to just do that by roll call votes because there's only one candidate. Pam Little will stay there for the Registrars as one Vice Chair, and the other Vice Chair will be Tatiana Tropina from the NSG. Thanks, Steve. Back to you.

STEVE DELBIANCO:	Thank you, Marie. Are there questions for Marie, Scott, and Mark, our Councilors? Again, that meeting is on the 21st of October. Looking for hands. Mark or Scott, anything you'd like to add? Margie Milam, your hand is up. Go ahead, please.

MARGIE MILAM:	Sure. Hi, everyone. One of the things I'd be curious is if the Council is going to talk about the new procedure that ICANN is talking about all this week, I mean, in terms of how does it fit in the Bylaws? How does it fit in a PDP? When I took a look at that Operational Design Phase, it

had good questions. I mean, it's certainly not a bad concept, but in my view, it would have been more appropriate to have that discussion before the PDP concluded its work so that the policy could address any of the concerns that the Board has. This weird interim thing now that has just been made up from thin air and it just seems like the Council should be talking about it and ICANN should be asking for community input on on whether that process makes sense, rather than just implementing it without really having for them discuss it with the community. And again, it's not that the concept is bad. I think it raised a lot of really great questions. But it just, to me, seems like it was the wrong time and place to be doing it.

MARIE PATTULLO: Thanks, Margie. If I can reply to that briefly, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Of course.

MARIE PATTULLO: Thank you. They are asking for comments, Margie. They have not given us a timeframe for comments. We've asked them specifically for a set timeframe and what they replied to is something along the lines of, "We will be discussing it during ICANN69." But I believe that there is going to be an official request for comments but it's certainly something I 100% agree with you. I would be very supportive of the BC putting in official comments on that, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO: That's awesome, Marie. Thank you. Any other questions for our Councilors or Councilor interventions? Mark Datysgeld?

MARK DATYSGELD: Thank you very much, Steve. Very briefly, I've been quite aware of the fact that we're having a lot of renovation. We'll have a BC ExCom, I'm stepping in into the Council as well, there will be a lot going on. I have been trying my best to really pick up very fast on the matters of the Council. And as Marie pointed out, I will be jumping to the IDN Track to kind of see if I can really speed up my entrance there and make some inroads, but I'm pretty sure we have a lot of work to do between ICANN69 and ICANN70 in terms of seeing how this new dynamic will work. I'm fairly aware that Barbara, Steve, Jimson will be watching our backs, but any help we can get, it will be more than welcome. It will be a pleasure doing this. Thank you, everyone, for trusting me, and everybody who is coming on board, thank you very much.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Mark, Claudia said you are already up to speed since you've done so much volunteer work for the BC. Thank you for your intervention this morning with the CSG Board meeting on the multistakeholder model evolution. I really think you persistently and politely brought up the key point that ICANN asked the wrong questions and misinterpreted the answers when they asked us for priorities. That was very well done. Thank you.

Okay. Any other questions for Council? Barbara Wanner, over to you for what we call Channel 3 here in the BC, which is the Commercial Stakeholders Group. Barbara is our elected liaison for the BC. Barbara?

BARBARA WANNER: Thank you, Steve. Can you hear me okay?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Perfect.

BARBARA WANNER: Great. I just wanted to thank everybody for their support for the past four years that this meeting is sort of my swan song of sorts in this capacity because I am term-limited and it looks like Waudo will succeed me, so I have a wonderful successor and I know you will give him the support that you've given me. But this has just afforded me an extraordinary opportunity for substantive of growth and relationship building and I've been grateful for this privilege to serve you in this way.

Quite honestly, the bulk of the work that I've been doing in the run up to ICANN69 pertained to planning for ICANN69 so there's really not too much new to report today. I will just note that Steve attached in his e-mail to the BC Martin's letter regarding our thoughts on delaying the GNSO review. I think probably we would want to discuss this further maybe in our next BC call, but certainly next week on the 21st when the

CSG meets, I think we will want to discuss and see if we can find a consensus view on that.

I also want to note some important plenary meetings that will take place next week substantive in nature, where BC members will have important speaking roles. In particular, Mason and Mark and Fred will talk about the follow-up, all of the work they've been doing about domain name abuse and improving compliance on Tuesday. And then Fred and Mark Svancarek will also participate in the ALAC's Consumer Protection and Post WHOIS plenary session. So these are very important opportunities that our members are stepping up and making the BC point of view known within the context of this broader plenary discussion.

You have the schedule before you. So there's really not much more I have to say there. I will just note that as a follow-up to all of this work that has been going on behind the scenes and at ICANN meetings concerning the need to improve compliance, addressing compliance issues, to address DNS abuse and so forth, a few members of the CSG have formed an informal group that will speak on an informal offline basis with Jamie and others, and ICANN Org as to how that approach to enforcing compliance can be improved. Dean Marks and Mason Cole are sort of leading the effort and they will update the CSG regularly as to the progress of those discussions.

And then finally—and Heather Forrest very eloquently reviewed this in our meeting with the Board a few hours ago about the NomCom review issue, the NomComRIWG has proposed that we lack sufficient

data, that it would benefit from a holistic review. We have been going forward with it. I want to call it a more fluid approach, the chat for our session. I feel we risk disenfranchising a very dynamic portion of the ICANN community and that is the small business community that brings so much energy in terms of innovation and new approaches to DNS management so that I would hate for us to lose that small business seat because of all the energy and contributions they've made to the community over the years. So the Board made it very clear that it's sort of not quite in their ballpark yet, but I know we will speak about this more in the CSG Open Meeting next week about how we want to take this forward in terms of our counter response, I guess you could say, to Tom Barrett's rejection of our point of view.

So I'll leave it there. And I welcome any questions from people. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Barbara. I appreciate all the work you put into that. Do we have any questions for Barbara on CSG? Barbara, thank you again. Claudia, back to you for the main agenda. Thank you.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Thank you very much, Steve. Thank you very much, everybody, also for your contribution. Last but not least, we have the update from Jimson, Vice Chair of Finance and Operations. Jimson, the floor is yours.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Okay. Thank you very much, Claudia, and greetings, everyone. For finance, just to let us know that we are at the 85% compliance level. So 85% of our members are fully financially compliant. So we like to thank those that expeditiously paid their dues. And also thanks in advance the remaining 15% that will very soon comply.

This is necessary because as when the election vote, talking about election now, that if any member did not comply, they will not be able to vote. That is to tell us that the BC election is still on and nomination period has been open since Monday, the 5th of October 2020 and to close by Monday 19th of October. That's next Monday. Candidate statements will be sent to the BC [inaudible] by Tuesday, 27th of October, by the end of business that day. And then we'll have candidates call on the 28th of October at 15:00 UTC. The [inaudible] will move forward on the 29th of October until 4th of November. Announcement will be made by the 5th of November with regard to the outcome, and the newly elected officers will take their seats by the 1st of January 2020.

I will quickly make a reference to the Charter provision with regard to this election, Section 2.3.1 says officers of the Executive Committee will be elected for one-year terms. 2.3.2 says that an officer may be re-elected for up to three consecutive terms in one position but no more than five consecutive years in any Executive Committee position, with the exception granted when no other candidates exist.

So what this means is that wherein there is no other candidates proposed for a position, an officer that already served three years will

have no more than two more terms to stay in that office. So just for us to know. And the offices available open for contest: the office of the Chair of the BC, the office of the Vice Chair of Policy Coordination, and the office of the Vice Chair of Finance and Operations. That is my own office and I'm glad we have two contestants that are vying for this position. So, I will informally brief them and I wish them good luck. You can be sure that whoever wins, I'll give you my full support. That is why we have the transition period between the conclusion of the election and January 1st, so that the outgoing can interface with the incoming for smooth handover.

And finally, on the newsletter, yes, I want to thank you all for your well wishes and compliments. We all did this together. The new one is out, for those that are not members of the BC, [inaudible] that are here. I will post the link to our latest newsletter for you to review what we have for you. So on this note, I want to say thank you very much. It has been a great time also serving the BC, and thank you all for your cooperation. Back to you, Claudia.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Thank you very much, Jimson, and thank you in particular for what to have been doing for the BC. It's really a great, great job as it was highlighted also this week in the chains of mail.

I don't know if there's any member who would like to bring up. I don't see comments or hands up. If there are no further points or comments, with that, I will adjourn the meeting and we will certainly

continue to see each other throughout the ICANN69 and I hope you can all stay safe. Thank you very much for participating.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Thank you, Claudia.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]