CHANTELLE DOERKSEN:	Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the BC Members Call on Wednesday, December 4th, 2019. In the interest of time, attendance will be taken via the Zoom room. With that, I'd like to turn this call over to Claudia, our chair, to begin. Claudia, please go ahead.
CLAUDIA SELLI:	Thank you very much, everybody, for participating in the BC call. Today, we don't have … I think Steve DelBianco couldn't attend, so we'll move to the policy calendar. I will ask Marie to go over it.
MARIE PATTULLO:	Thank you, Claudia.
CLAUDIA SELLI:	Marie, are you there?
MARIE PATTULLO:	I am here. Can you hear me?
CLAUDIA SELLI:	Yes.

MARIE PATTULLO: Great. So, thank you very much to Steve, who of course does amazing work for us, but has a clash today, so can't join us. You see on screen the policy calendar. You know that comments that we've already filed, so thank you very much to all of the members who have done that. I will very quickly run through those comments but would ask that if there are any members who want to comment on them, then please shout out.

Firstly, our finance experts—so, that's Jimson and Tim—have commented on ICANN's Draft PTI and IANA Financial Year 21 Operating Plan and Budgets. Next up, you know that we talked about DNS abuse in Montreal. We'll be coming back to this very shortly. Huge thanks there, in particular to Mason, who has done most of the heavy lifting on this— to Claudia, to Denise, to Chris, to John, to Fred, to Ben, to Stephen, to Tola, and to many other people. I think you can all agree with me that that was a really, really useful comment that the BC made that led into a very interesting session in Montreal.

We have also commented on the Plan for Implementation on Competition, Consumer Trust, Consumer Choice Review. You know that that's still on ongoing process. Again, huge thanks to Mason, and also to Tim, Margie, Ben, and Mark for all of the hard work on that. And then, there were the comments filed on the Public Consultation on Defining and Operationalizing—if I can get that word out--the Global Public Interest. You'll remember that we have rather different view there to our colleagues in the Non-Commercial side of the Council—the other house. But again, great thanks to everyone—in particular to Steve himself, and to Mark and Denise for putting in comments on that.

Before I go any further, just a quick check if anyone wants to go back on to that before we go into the open comments. Okay. Moving right along. Next up, we have a very important comment on the Registration Directory Service Review Team. You know that Susan was one of the chairs there. Do we have Susan on the call? No. I'm not hearing that. You've all seen the draft that's come around. This really is important, so Margie, Mason, Susan, and Ben, thank you so much for all of your work on this. Does anyone want to speak to this? Okay, then please do read this, and please do let us know if you have any views.

Then, we have the Implementation Plan for Red Cross Names. This, of course, is historical. You'll note that Steve has already volunteered, myself, and Mark, to have a look at this. So, I will certainly do that. Mark, I'm hoping that you will be able to do that too, and we'll get something back to you as soon as possible. Of course, if anybody else has any views on that, do jump in.

The next one, the Future Root Zone KSK Rollovers, I am not even going to pretend to pretend that I can help with this in any way. We do need technical people here. Big, big please shout out. Do we have any technical experts here? Anyone with some expertise in this that can help with the drafting? Don't make Steve think that we don't get volunteers when Steve's not on the call. Please. Another please. Okay, I'm going to get Steve to volunteer someone. He's good at that. Now, if we can come back to abuse, you know that this is an ongoing story. So, Mason, if you're on the call, would you like to take over here?

MASON COLE:	Yes. Thanks very much. Can you hear me?

MARIE PATTULLO:	We can. Thank you.

MASON COLE:	Okay. Good morning, everybody. This morning, I recirculated a draft of the letter that's being discussed right now. Just by way of context, it's correct that DNS abuse has been a topic in front of the ICANN community now for a little while, and there was a session in Montreal about DNS abuse. That session concluded with no action items, per se. So, what we decided to do was draft a letter that provided ICANN with some guidance on our part about what to do on DNS abuse. That involves stretching the contracts, and then taking some other measures that would actually help the community be informed about abuse.
	I circulated an initial draft, I believe it was last week. I've had some very helpful input from Jay and Andy. I got some additional input from David Snead this morning, which I will incorporate into the letter. But if BC members could take a look at that letter and provide feedback to me as soon as possible, that would be great. The objective is to get this in front of ICANN as soon as we can, because we know that ICANN and the Contracted Parties are starting a negotiating session over their contracts, as it relates to the implementation of RDAP, and there could be a window that we could exploit to get some additional contract items added. It's a small window, but it's important to try to meet that. So, the sooner that we can get BC feedback, the better.

MARIE PATTULLO: Thanks, Mason. Thank you very much. Do any members have questions—anything they'd like to raise here?

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: I have a question, if I may.

MARIE PATTULLO: Go ahead.

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: Thank you, Marie, and thanks so much, Mason, and Andy, and Jay for drafting this, and for the latest comments this morning from David. Am I correct in that the definition of DNS in the latest draft has been expanded? I'm in particular talking about the first paragraph of the letter.

MASON COLE: Marie, this is Mason, if I may.

MARIE PATTULLO: Please, please.

MASON COLE: Okay. Yeah, Zak. Thanks for the question. If you go back to the Registry Agreement, you can see that their definition of abuse in that includes

those harms. It goes beyond farming, phishing, malware, and botnets. It includes other things that we'd like to see expanded into a formal definition if possible. That's where that was sourced from.

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: Okay. A follow-up, if I may. Thanks, Mason. I'm generally supportive of this, but I'm concerned about this expansion in the latest draft for the following reason. In earlier drafts, there was a focus on the botnets, and the malware, and the phishing. But now, there's reference to trademark and copyright infringement. I'm no fan of either, and I've sued, and brought DMCA notices and UDRPs against infringers, etc., so I'm not defending that practice at all.

But what I'm concerned about and somewhat confused about is what we're really expecting ICANN to do with respect to trademark and copyright infringement, because there's already legal procedures— through DMCA for example, through UDRP for example. And so, I understood from attending the INTA meeting at ICANN In Montreal that there's some interest by some stakeholders to provide a faster or more efficient means of battling these scourges.

But when it comes down to it, are we really looking to ask ICANN to—if there's a counterfeit product on Amazon, for DNS to be disabled, if there's a picture on Facebook, that the DNS should be disabled, if there's a link on Google that's going to a pirate site, that Google should have a problem? This is a slippery slope that I'm concerned about, particularly since there's been tried and true methods already in place

for dealing with these two particular aspects. And so, that's why I'm concerned about this expansion of the definition. Thank you.

MASON COLE: Thanks, Zak. I take your input, and I take it seriously. I might suggest that you and I follow up offline about that language, so that we can see if it's going to be massaged, or somehow be altered a bit, that might be more favorable to you.

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: Fair enough. Thanks so much, Mason, as usual.

ANDY ABRAMS: Hi, Mason. I actually had the same question as Zak with that parenthetical in the first paragraph. I do think that 11 (3)(a) defines abuse, but here, I think we're lumping in certain kinds of website content abuse in the definition of DNS abuse, and I think that's what Zak was getting at. I have that concern as well. I think the letter's great. I think it's much more compact.

And so generally, I think it's in good shape. I also have similar concerns about that first definition, because I don't think it's a one-size-fits-all necessarily. I agree with Zak. Certainly, we do want to handle all kinds of abuse, including trademark and copyright infringement, but possibly not in the exact same way, and perhaps not with the same ICANN oversight over the DNS as with security threats like farming, phishing, malware— that sort of thing. And so, I'm happy to help with any massaging the language as well.

MASON COLE: Okay. Thanks, Andy. I appreciate that offer, and I'll take you up on it.

MARIE PATTULLO: Jay, you're up next, please.

JAY CHAPMAN: Yeah. I guess to respond to the general sentiment, that language that is used in the first paragraph is, I think, more or less verbatim from Spec 11 (3)(a) or (3)(b). It's (3)(a). So, I think that's the basis for why it's included. I certainly do appreciate the conflating the messaging around DNS abuse, and also incorporating trademark and copyright infringement and things like that can be problematic.

On the other hand, I think, to Fred's point, one of the things that certainly folks in BC see often is that there's multiple types of abusive behaviors happening, especially with respect to phishing, when somebody's registering a domain that is infringing on somebody's trademark, or putting up a fake login form, a fake [thanks] site or whatever. So, they're using other entities' intellectual property, but ultimately, it's to facilitate phishing and other cybercrime.

When I saw that revision, initially, I had the same gut reaction as Zak and some other folks have expressed, but then the more I thought about it, I see the other perspective as well, which is that it's kind of a slippery slope argument, but at the same time, this is what's in Spec 11 (3)(a), and if that's a problem for the community and for ICANN, certainly it's a good time for ICANN to revisit that language, right? So,

that's perhaps one reason to leave it in there, just in the perspective of being antagonistic to ICANN, and the wording as it exists in the Registry Agreement today.

MARIE PATTULLO: Thank you, Jay. Fred, I don't know if you can come to the phone and put your comments over, or you just want to leave them in the chat.

FRED FELMAN: It's just a little bit noisy. I've got some work going on at my house this morning. I was just thinking there's a huge amount of abuse associated with brands and trademarks, and where specific brand names are associated with support, or account information, or cheap goods, where it's implicit that actually the site is, in its face, and the domain name is, in its face, designed to confuse. That's where trademarks and copyrights actually often intersect the domain naming system. And those sites are often used to siphon user data, or cause some of the harms that actually are discussed up above. So, I think there is some nexus of trademark and copyright abuse in domain names.

MARIE PATTULLO: Thanks for that. On a personal level—well, on a business level—it won't surprise any of you that I completely agree with that. We have seen a lot of trademarks being used to attract other forms of criminality—so, siphoning the money into other forms of criminality. But Mason, do you have enough, do you think, from this discussion to take this forward. I'm just hoping that you are going to take this forward.

MASON COLE: Yeah. I'll take this on board, and yeah, I do. I will follow up with Zak and others who have some concerns, and see if we can massage the language in a way that keeps our concerns elucidated but without alarming anybody.

MARIE PATTULLO: Thank you so much. I'm just checking to see … I don't see any other hands raised. If I've missed anybody, please shout. Okay. Thank you. Great discussion. Really very, very grateful on that. If I may move along, then, we next up have the infamous WHOIS meets GDPR, creates an EPDP, and has lots of babies. I don't see either Margie or Mark in the chat. I don't know if you guys are on the phone. Okay. I'm not seeing [Statten] either, and we know we don't have Steve.

I don't feel qualified to speak to this, because it's so fast-moving. Do we have any members who think that they can update beyond Steve's written email to us? In that case, under your authority, Chantelle, I'd say that if there is anything on this, f course we will ask Margie and Mark to update us by email, and we can move to channel two. Is that okay?

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Perfect.

MARIE PATTULLO: Great. Okay. I'm now changing hats. I am no longer pretending to be Steve DelBianco, and I'm going back to be me. My name is Marie. I am

one of your GNSO Councliors. Now, we have not had a meeting since the last time we met. You know the last time we met was in Montreal.

We've had one vote since that, which went through by email. It was something the BC had already agreed to. In essence, it's allowing the work of the IANA Naming Function Review Team to start. It was blocked because the rules required that a non-ccNSO ccTLD was involved. The problem is, there aren't any, or very, very few non-ccNSO ccTLDs involved—so, simply changing that around.

A couple of admin points for you is that we will have two new Councilors. We don't know when. Darcy from the Registrars has moved function within her own company, so has had to stand down. And Farzi, who you know was just appointed as Councilor for the Non-Commericals, has resigned. No, I don't know why, but she has resigned, so they are also in their internal procedures to change these two Councilors.

Before I go any further with Council stuff, we have a got a request to Council that came from the Nominating Committee. So, Jay, while I've still got you on the phone, if you can change hats into your NomCom role, would you like to explain to members what you need from the BC, please? Jay, have I still got you? Okay. I'm hoping that Jay can still hear me, or at least will come back.

Going into what the NomCom—the Nominating Committee—needs from us, they, as you know, put forward people who might be on the Board, and also on the GNSO Council. Now, the GNSO Council has been asked by the NomCom to respond to them on the criteria that the

NomCom is using to select whoever will be on the GNSO Council as the NomCom non-voting member, who is not affiliated with a specific house.

They go through the criteria that you know the NomCom use anyway, and they also ask the following questions. Does Council have a preference if the NomCom-appointed rep is from the ICANN community or is an outsider? Does Council have a preference on the appointed rep being from within the GNSO, or for example, could it be from the ccNSO? The ccNSO has specifically indicated to NomCom in the past that they don't want the NomCom to appoint candidates who are currently affiliated to ccTLD operators. And does the Council have a preference on candidates who have previous policy development experience?

Now, we have, as Council, got to reply by the 14th of December. So, Council leadership has asked us, the Councilors, to reply to them by the 11th of December. I'm going to forward this mail on to you, because I know it's a lot of info to take in one message.

But on a personal level, again, we have not seen an awful lot of the NomCom appointed person to the Council being terribly helpful to the CSG, and in particular to the BC. So, I think it would be really good if you could have a look at this. Consider what would be the best for us to help in our voting strategies. I know that Jay will be able to talk to this more if and when he's back. Hoping he's back. Nope? Okay. So, I'll send this email on to you.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS:Marie, this is Lawrence. I would like to be on the queue.

MARIE PATTULLO: I am not on the right screen, so thank you very much for saying. Please go ahead, and I'll change screens.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: All right. Good day everybody. This is Lawrence. We have [inaudible] for information on the kinds—the qualities that we should look out for in terms of the NomCom appointee coming from the GNSO. Like the letter clearly states, these considerations, or the response that we get, will help to match candidates with the requirements that is provided from the GNSO.

This time around, the appointee is not a voting appointee, so it might … I won't say it is not such an important position, but we're just trying to get feelers on what to actually look out for. We have had concerns that the appointees sometimes don't show up for meetings and all that, and we're wondering if there were certain qualities we should look out for in fitting someone into this role.

There were quite some debates about looking at the unique structure of the GNSO. Finding a candidate within the GNSO and still maintaining neutrality and a balance has been a concern. And so, to some extent, members also want to know if there are people, because there are quite some insiders that also apply for positions such as this.

And so, members of the Nominating Committee would like to know if there are certain specific constituencies, if I may use that word, that we

feel less threatened if they would find their way into the GNSO seat. Basically, it's just a guide—seeking guidance as to what kind of candidates we would want to have represent the GNSO. Thank you.

MARIE PATTULLO: Thanks so much. That's really useful, Lawrence. Jay, I see that you're back. Is there anything that you'd like to add?

JAY CHAPMAN: Yeah. I think Lawrence did a great job expressing what we're looking for in the letter. A couple things that I would add, to put more of a fine point on it, is that typically, we get very few applicants for GNSO Council, so we're selecting people from a fairly small pool to begin with.

One of the things that the NomCom struggles with is trying to sort out things like does GNSO Council want someone that has existing ICANN experience? Is it okay if they come from one of the constituencies within the GNSO, or should they be not affiliated with any constituency like that? Does it matter if it's a voting seat or non-voting seat for next year? I think all this information, obviously, while it's not binding on the NomCom, is very helpful in terms of selection process, and our deliberations, and would provide us with a lot of clarity.

I think there have been good candidates that have been passed over previous years because of concerns about these types of issues. Without any clarity on them, it's really hard for us to make good decisions that are actually helpful to the GNSO.

MARIE PATTULLO: Thanks, Jay. That's really good background, and it helps to understand what you need from us. Waudo, would you want to go ahead, please? Waudo, I see your hand up. Would you like to ask a question? Okay, Waudo, if you are on mute, I don't know, but please feel free to jump in if you have a connection issue, or type your question into the chat, please. Mark, yes, I will definitely make sure that you get this email. We'll send it round. And Jay, and Lawrence, and anyone involved, [inaudible] with some great feedback on this. Okay. Anyone else? Thank you.

A couple of other small points on Council … You know that we've been working for some time on improving the PDPs. We call it PDP 3.0. We're now pretty much at the almost final stage, so there's going to be a webinar this coming Monday at 13:00 UTC. We're talking an hour of your time—an hour and a half maximum. And as many of you who can join as possible, it would be really, really useful. We have a small team working on this. As you know, I'm involved in it. We've already got comments in from the ALAC, the GAC, and we're trying to, in essence, make sure that the PDP process works for all of us. So, if any of you are available for that, then please do jump in.

I also should say, at this point, I'm not on the right screen. So, if anybody has their hand up, please shout. Thank you. We also have to put forward a new person to replace Susan Kawaguchi on the Standing Selection Committee. This isn't as hard as it sounds. Basically, it's when we have to, as a GNSO, put forward representatives to certain groups, then it's the SSC, the Standing Selection Committee, who goes through the nominations, makes sure that we've got a decent balance, and people come from various parts of the community for this.

You know about this already. We've raised it a couple times. No one's come forward, and we're hard up against the deadline. So, we would really like somebody else to do this. This is my starting point. But if no one else can, I will step in to cover that, at least for the time being, or to take it on. But if anyone else does want to get involved in this, you are really, really, really welcome to do so, but we need to know now or within a short time of now—as in this calendar day. Not hearing any answers.

Okay. Final point before I go back to Claudia. This will actually probably go over to Mark. The Council is now accepting expressions of interest from individuals who want to serve as the new GSNO-nominated mentor for the ICANN Fellowship Program. As you know, the last one was the wonderful, amazing, and fantastic Andrew Mack.

We've been having a discussion on list, as you know, as to whether or not the BC is allowed to put forward another BC member, and quite frankly, we don't see why not. I have no direct experience with the fellowship program. But Mark, I know that you're online. I don't know if you would like to speak to this.

MARK DATYSGELD: Yes. Thank you, Marie. There will actually probably be two opening. There will be one for the Fellowship, and ICANN seems very actively to be looking for one for the Next Generation as well. So, I don't know under what context we could try to engage with this, because there's two options that I see [already moving through this model].

One would be that we would simply maybe alternate with the NCSG, so trade between NextGen and Fellowship, and that would pretty much establish some sort of pattern, and we wouldn't have to discuss this ever again. That's an option. Or we can simply try to go for it. There's merit to both things. I would just like to contextualize that this is probably happening—that there will probably two different positions available.

Now, from what I have been observing from the Fellows, Andy had a lot of very positive feedback. I make a point to talk to most of them, and everybody that has been coached by him gave stellar reviews. I'm sure this is getting back to the actual program manager—to Siranush. So, it's not that much of a stretch, in case Andy does want to continue, for example, to be re-nominate him.

I just don't know the rules. It's not very clear. And maybe we should try to seek counsel directly with Siranush to move forward. I don't think that's much of a stretch. Maybe after this call, we craft an email for her, and see if her and Ergys can give us a better position. Thank you.

MARIE PATTULLO: Thanks so much, Mark. Andy?

ANDY ABRAMS: Sure. Happy to talk about this. A couple of things … First of all, it has been my pleasure to be your representative as part of the program. It's a lot of fun, and I think it is the kind of thing that … It's a very direct way of working with people who could conceivably be very nice additions to

the BC—often young, very smart, very energetic, and in the case of the last round, a number of people from parts of the world where we are underrepresented, and a nice mix of mostly women and guys.

So, if the group is interested, that is something that I could conceivably do again. I think it's gone very well. I would like us to make sure that we follow up with the mentees, to try to get them in, and track their progress, and things like that. It is my sense … Of my mentees, I think that there were four who were more or less business people, and three of whom seemed very interested and showed up at our inreach event, which was great.

It's my personal sense that unless this is a really, really big effort to fight against NCSG, I think we should continue to put forward our own names, because this is just a great opportunity to get more at bats, if you'll pardon a US baseball analogy. But I think it's a worthwhile thing for us to participate in. Thanks.

MARIE PATTULLO: Thank you so much, Andrew, not just for your comments now, but for all of your service to date. I can't speak for the BC, but I can speak for Marie. I think it'd be fantastic if you kept going in this. But could I maybe prevail upon you and Mark to put your heads together and come up with something we can circulate to the members on this?

ANDY ABRAMS: Sure. With pleasure.

MARIE PATTULLO:	Fantastic. You are both, as always, wonderful. Now, I'm going back. Hang on. If I can figure out how to get back into the chat … Okay, there's an ongoing discussion between Waudo and Jay on the NomCom. Before we hand back to Claudia, Jay do you want to come to the microphone and take us further?
JAY CHAPMAN:	Yeah. I can try. There might be some people on the call that maybe have been involved in the GNSO world far longer than I have, that could speak to it a little bit better. So, Waudo and I have been talking about the structure and the rationale for the members that NomCom puts on GNSO Council. NomCom puts a total of three people on GNSO Council. Two are voting. One is for the Contracted Party house. One is for the Non-Contracted Party House. And then, in the opposite year, we put on a single non-voting member.
	My understanding of the intent of having a non-voting member is that ideally, that person should be more, perhaps, neutral, and have viewpoints that exist across both houses within GNSO. I think in practice that most NomCom appointees to the GNSO Council have been very ineffective, so that's not really played out one way or another. So, that's probably not the best answer, unfortunately, but that's my answer. I don't know if there's others who were around when the GNSO Council structure was reformed in the late 2000s that might want to speak to that, but maybe not.

MARIE PATTULLO: Thanks very much. I'm not seeing any hands up. So, thank you to Waudo for raising the issue, and thank you to Jay for responding.

JAY CHAPMAN: To jump in real quick, to respond to Mark's comment in the chat about ICANN outsiders being a thing, personally, Mark, I agree with what you're saying entirely, with respect to outsiders not really being able to be effective on Council at all. I think the challenge for the NomCom is that the NomCom itself is very diverse, and most of the members on NomCom are not from within the GNSO world. There's five people from ALAC. There's people from RSSAC, SSAC.

So, you have this large part of the NomCom that really is not familiar with GNSO. So, if we could get a letter from GNSO, or even a separate letter from the BC perhaps, that would say, "Hey, you guys absolutely need to pick somebody that has some ICANN experience, even it means maybe they're already affiliated with the constituency or the GNSO," because we'd rather have someone that at least can contribute and be effective, versus someone who looks independent, but doesn't actually do anything.

MARIE PATTULLO: Thank you so much for that. Yes, Mark. We will definitely follow up on this. I will, as promised, forward this email on to you, and that hopefully can kick off the discussion and the potential draft letter. So, again, thank you to both Jay and Lawrence for your service here.

Leading back to the policy calendar, you know that the SSR2 should come out with a draft report quite soon. I don't see Denise or Scott on the call. Are you guys here? Okay. So, if there is something on that, I'm sure they will let us know. Moving on to ATRT, Tola, are you here? Nobody wants to talk to me today. Okay. Thank you so much for the great discussion on this, and I'm handing you back to Claudia. Thank you.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Thank you, Marie. Very briefly, I think one point that we are starting to work on is the Cancun outreach for the 20th anniversary. So, we are in discussion with Chris Mondini and Joe Catapano to try and define the format of the event, and where best the location, and then also the invitees. So, it's a very preliminary discussion, but we're trying to advance. We're also thinking about … One member suggested actually revising, or at least creating, a logo for the BC. Maybe, Mark, you want to say something on that?

MARK DATYSGELD: Thank you, Claudia. Yeah. I did mention, coming from the standpoint of outreach within Latin America, that it's fine, the BC logo, when it's just on the website. But when we were trying to stand out among a lot of other booths, and there were like 80 booths around us, it's just text. It often got lost. We really had to hustle for people to even pay attention to us.

That's been on the back of my mind, that it's a Business Constituency. Everybody here as a logo but the Constituency. So, ever since then I've

been briefing on some ideas. I've just circulated them through the ExCom for now, and hopefully, once it's more mature, I can circulate through the broader list, for us to attempt to have a new logo by the anniversary, unless there's some big discussion around that. Don't want to create any controversy.

But otherwise, I'm feeling that this could be an interesting time to get something new and fresh and show it to people. So, yeah. Working on that, and hopefully we'll keep you guys updated more in the future.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Thank you, Mark. Of course, we will update you on the discussions, and on how it is being organized. Another point that I wanted to raise with you is that we are starting to organize, as well, the main topics and main issue for the Cancun—for the main session and these kind of things. And of course, DNS abuse is, I think, among the topics. If you have any specific suggestion that you want me to bring forward, or in any case the BC to bring forward, please let me know, so that we can certainly make sure that it's passed on. Anyone that wants to jump in on that? No? Okay. And then I don't think … I was thinking that we didn't cover the CSG. Is Barbara there? No?

MARIE PATTULLO: Hi. She had to drop. The information is on the screen for the members, Claudia. Do you want to talk to the Intercessional and the Auction Proceeds?

CLAUDIA SELLI:	Go ahead, Marie, because I need to take a [inaudible].

MARIE PATTULLO:	Yeah. Sure. Okay. I'm changing hats again. I am not Barbara, but on behalf of Barbara. As you know, our representative to the Auction Proceeds CCWG resigned, so the three constituencies came together and agreed to support Anne from the IPC. She's already taken on the role, so thanks to her.

On the Intercessional—now, this is the meeting where the Non-Contracted Party House gets together—there was a push from our Non-Commercial colleagues for it to be another two-day session. Pretty much the entire CSG pushed back on this, because we didn't think it was that useful, to be blunt. We thought the time could maybe have been spent in better ways.

We do realize, however, that there's always a need to come together to talk, to try to build bridges and work together. So, what we're trying to propose at the moment is there would be a day zero in ICANN 68. The reason for that is, as you know, it's a long way away and it's a very short meeting. So, having it on day zero at that meeting would make more sense because your ExCom will already be there, for example. But of course, there will be more on that.

And then, picking up on Barbara's words, she's "very happy to answer any questions by email—of course will take any feedback by email. I have a CSG ExCom meeting early next week," and then she'll be able to provide more details about planning for our next meeting. So, that's ICANN 67 in Cancun. Handing back to you, Claudia.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Thank you very much, Marie. And Jimson.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Thanks, Claudia. We are still trying to get ahold of Jimson. He's currently traveling at the moment.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Okay. I thought he was there.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Yes. He had to drop off, and we've been trying to get ahold of Jim. But if it's okay with you, at this point, I would like to open Jimson's portion of the call, and turn it over the Arinola, who is the Credential Committee Chair nominee for a few brief words, if that's okay with you.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Of course.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Thank you very much, Claudia. At this time, Arinola, I'd like to give you the floor to say a few words about yourself and your candidate statement.

EN

ARINOLA AKINYEMI: Thank you, Chantelle. My name is Arinola Akinyemi, your nominee for the Chair for the Credentials Committee. I'm the CEO for DigiSphere Limited, a company situated in Nigeria. We do IT solutions and internet services. I have been a member of the BC since 2014, and I've volunteered to serve on the Credentials Committee since 2015, and I'm still serving that until date. I have been involved with the onboarding process of new applicants, and also have supported the—at various times, to ensure that the Committee fulfills its mandates as enshrined in the BC Charter.

I am standing for the Chair of the BC because I believe first and foremost that I would want to serve the BC, and also because I believe in the … I appreciate that the critical role that the CC, the Credentials Committee, plays in the growth and quality of applicants that come on board for BC membership as a whole. I have at various times served with AfICTA, with the Africa ICT Alliance, as a board members and committee chairs at various levels, and also with the Information Technology Industry Association of Nigeria.

I am willing to serve. My mission is to ensure that the Credentials Commmittee, which serves as the review committee for new applicants into the BC, and also to review the status of current membership to ensure that they are still eligible—to check their eligibility status, more like it. Also, I intend to bring in new ideas into the Committee, such as ensuring that there's a prompt consideration for new applicants, and also to create available database for our [inaudible], and the CC goes on its mission, so that we will have that for record purpose, and also for reporting to the BC as a whole. So, I am open to questions, if there are any. Thank you.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Thank you, Arinola. Any question for her? No? Chantelle, did you manage to get ahold …

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Hi.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Yeah. Okay.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Hi. Can you hear me?

CLAUDIA SELLI: Jimson, go ahead. Yes.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Yes. I've actually been traveling, and a place where the internet is quite challenging, but I managed to get through now. So, sorry that I wasn't n there exactly during my session. And thanks to Chantelle for [kicking] it, and Claudia as well, and Marie. Thank you. Thank you, Arinola, for your presentation. Yes, you've been in the CC for quite a while. I've also been serving in the CC, the Credential Committee. So, what new things do you think you will bring on board? Thank you.

ARINOLA AKINYEMI: Thanks, Jimson, for your question. Serving in the Credentials Committee has been quite exciting. It has given me more insight as to the workings of the BC. And also, there have been a bit of challenges here and there, but we've been able to surmount it, and it has also helped me to appreciate the ideology behind the consensus policy. We've been able to get through so much within the years I have been there, and I have also learned a lot from others within that period. It has been good.

There are a few challenges with also I have seen, and I'm hoping that my coming on board as the Chair will help to mitigate those challenges, and bring the CC to produce excellent work for the BC. Thank you. I hope that answers your question, Jimson.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Okay. Thank you, Arinola. No further question from me. Is there any other question elsewhere, or from any other member? So, in the absence of any other question, the CC will conduct the election among their members, according to the charter. Thank you.

Next is on dues. Thanks to members, we reached over 88% of payment of dues, so thank you to members. And those that are pending, we look forward to a resolution of those payments. On the 20th anniversary, I believe Claudia may have given some brief. If not, please, Claudia, over to you.

CLAUDIA SELLI: I already did. Thank you.

EN

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Okay. Thank you very much. So, in this regard, I don't have any other thing on my side. So, over to you, Claudia.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Thank you, Jimson. Is there any question from members, or any issue that anyone wants to bring up? Everyone is very silent, so I think that there is no issue for the time being. And so, I would stop the recording and the call for today, and we'll speak in two weeks. Thank you, everybody.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Yeah. Thank you, Claudia.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]