CHANTELLE DOERKSEN:	Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the BC members' call on December 18th, 2019. In the interest of time attendance will be taken via the Zoom room. I would like to remind everyone to please keep your phones and microphones on silent when not speaking to avoid background noise. With this, I'd like to turn it over to our chair, Claudia Selli, to begin. Claudia, please go ahead.
CLAUDIA SELLI:	Thank you very much, everybody, for participating on the BC call. We'll give the floor directly, this time, to Marie, for the policy discussions in [Steve's] absence.
MARIE PATTULLO:	Thank you, Claudia. There is very little I can say to this. You will see that there are a number of comments that we have filed. Thank you very much to everyone that participated in that. You can all read what's on the screen and you have all been involved in this, anyway. On the Red Cross names, it was simply saying that yes, we agree, because there was nothing controversial in there.
	The letter on DNS abuse, you know that there was a lot of back and forth on the list. I don't know. Mason, at this stage, do you want to make a comment to that?

MASON COLE:	Good morning. No. I think the letter speaks for itself. Not at this point. Thank you, though, Marie.

MARIE PATTULLO:	Well, thank you for all of your leadership on this. It's very, very much appreciated. On the RDS WHOIS, do we have anybody who is online that wants to speak to this? Okay. The financials, the draft PTI and IANA FY21 operating plan. If Jimson's okay with this, we'll leave that until we get to his finance section later. Have I missed any from that list? I'm just flick-reading. No, I don't think we have.
	We still don't have a volunteer for the future root zone KSK rollover comments. If anyone can come forward for that we would be very grateful. I know that I, for one, certainly can't, because I don't know anything about it. But I know we have some incredible experts in this group so please either raise your hand now or let us know. That would be very, very much appreciated. Unless anyone has an objection, Claudia, we can move to the part to do with WHOIS, GDPR, and the ePDP.

JIMSON OLUFUYE:	Marie?

MARIE PATTULLO:	Yes?

JIMSON OLUFUYE:	Marie? I could take a look at the future root zone KSK rollovers.

MARIE PATTULLO: Noted, Jimson. Thank you so, so much. That's really, really appreciated. Any other comments? Moving right ahead. Thank you so much. On the ePDP, I know that Mark is not in the office at the moment. Margie, are you online?

MARGIE MILAM: Yes, I am. Can you guys hear me okay?

MARIE PATTULLO: We can. Would you like to take this section, please? Thank you.

MARGIE MILAM: Sure. Good morning, everybody. Essentially, the ePDP is working towards publishing their initial report but it has been delayed. Originally, we were trying very hard to submit it by the end of this year and the timeline simply didn't work for us. Part of what we're trying to do is wait and see whether we get any input from the Data Protection Board, from its January meeting, to see how it might affect the issue that we're dealing with in the liability associated with creating the standardized access, the SSAD system.

Mark and I have been working hard in the meetings. We've actually had multiple meetings during a week more than normal to be able to work out the different building blocks. We still have some significant issues that we haven't yet resolved. For example, will there be a third party

purpose for accessing the data for cybersecurity purposes and intellectual property infringement?

As many of you may recall, the BC and the IPC dissented from the very first Phase 1 report because it did not provide specificity on those purposes. Today, we still don't have resolution for that. I believe it's on the agenda before the end of the year but I don't know how those issues will be resolved. And so, we're slowly working through different parts of the building blocks.

But like I said, there's a very big question as to how we submit requests in order to do our very important cybersecurity and intellectual property work. It's not clear yet, at this point. I'm hopeful that we'll be able to negotiate with our colleagues. Hopefully, by the time that we get back from the new year, I'll be able to report some progress in that regard.

And then, the other piece to this is that there's also the Phase 1 implementation work that's underway. I believe Susan Kawaguchi and Alex Deacon are participating in that. Perhaps they can provide their opinion on that. But from what I have observed in the meetings that I've attended, there has been a lot of cutting-back of some of the recommendations, even from Phase 1, that we thought were pretty clear.

That's a bit troubling in that we really feel that even the small concessions that we had in Phase 1 should carry [us to see that] [inaudible] concern from the contracted parties. I think that [due to that] analysis, probably. [Provide you with more color] as to what those issues are.

I think I'd better drop off because it's pouring rain right now in the car and you guys may not be able to hear me. If you have any questions, put them on the list and I'll try to respond to them by e-mail.

MARIE PATTULLO: Thank you, Margie. That's very much appreciated. Susan, do you want to add anything?

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Sure. Can you hear me?

MARIE PATTULLO: We can, loud and clear. Thank you.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Okay. I'm never quite sure when I'm off mute on Zoom. Yeah, as Margie said, we're losing ground. There has definitely been a lot of discussion since July, for me, on whether or not … It's very clear in the recommendation that it's optional for the registrant to provide some information like a tech contact or org information. But the registrars seem to feel it's also very optional for the registrars to decide if they'll collect that or not.

So you could have a situation where registrar X would follow the language as we'd see it and allow the collection of that information and provide a template in the registration process where you could enter that, where others would not. I think that's going to really disjoint the WHOIS or the

registrant data record. If we don't have all of the registrars allowing this same action, that's going to be detrimental.

And then it's fairly clear, in my opinion, in the language that if the registrant provides the information then it has to be processed. There seems to be pushback on that concept, too; that that's not true in their opinion. We have argued extensively over footnote seven. As we all know, language is extremely critical in a report but they're reading it one way, we're reading it in another.

They're also trying to limit the definition of law enforcement. It was pretty broad in the recommendation but they're adding language to that. We have a meeting, today, at 09:00 AM and we'll be arguing about that and trying to remove that language. Well, the language isn't in yet but the registrars are insisting that it be in the document. So it seems like they're just cutting and dicing. I'm not sure that we're going to get much out of this phase of the ePDP.

MARIE PATTULLO: Thank you. That is truly depressing but thank you so much for all of the hours that you guys are putting in, here. I'm not seeing any hands raised in the chat but does anybody want to shout out with a question?

MARGIE MILAM: Marie, if I could add another thought?

MARIE PATTULLO: Please, go ahead.

MARGIE MILAM: Sure. Just to give an example of what Susan's talking about, in Phase 1 we had a timeline for when you needed to respond to a request per urgent request. Essentially, in the implementation, they're trying to state that the only party that can submit an urgent request is law enforcement and that was not the intent of our recommendation. And so, it's things like that that really cut back on our ability to rely on what we thought we got out of Phase 1.

And the other piece that Mark and I are really working on is in Phase 2. Because we've seen so many difficulties in the implementation we're being very careful about the language that we recommend. For example, if the recommendation uses the word "should," we've asked ICANN Compliance whether they would enforce that language. To date, ICANN Compliance has not confirmed that they would enforce an obligation that says "the registrar should."

I'll give you an example of what we're really fighting hard about. The recommendation we're trying to address is the one regarding the disclosure. Is disclosure required if you submit a valid request that is supported by legal evidence and follows all of the information that is spelled out in the policies? If you imagine that we submit a request because there's a phishing attack and we cite that our legitimate purpose is that we're trying to protect our users, the balancing test under the GDPR would fall in our favor because we know our rights are more important than the ones of the registrant who engaged in the phishing attack, as an example.

And even in that scenario, we're pushing for that there must be disclosure. And that's the policy word we're looking for. We're fighting over whether the language is going to say "may," "should," or "must." And if we don't have "must" then we're not clear that ICANN Compliance will enforce the contract.

And just to remind the rest of the BC that was in Montréal, remember, we had this conversation with Jamie Hedlund where he pretty much said that his hands were tied and that they're not able to interpret the contract in a way to enforce compliance in certain aspects because they don't have the appropriate language. And so, we're trying to avoid that scenario in this case by insisting that the word in the policy is "must" as opposed to "may" or "should."

Those are the kinds of issues, just so you understand the level of debate that we're having in the ePDP. It's hard to make progress when our colleagues are pushing for "may," which means that we will never have certainty or predictability in the system if it's always up to the registrar's discretion as to whether or not they will disclose even if we've submitted a fully valid request and have ticked all of the boxes that the policy requires.

Anyway, I just wanted to share that that's the kind of debate we're having and we that push very hard but it's difficult to get our colleagues to agree to the language that we need.

MARIE PATTULLO: I think that Santa should be bringing you a sack full of patience this Christmas. Thank you so, so much, even if that is even more depressing.

Would anybody like to ask Susan or Margie anything before we move forward? Okay. Not seeing any hands but please do shout out.

If we can scroll slightly down? Thank you, Chantelle, for reading my thoughts. The next item is the council. In fact, we're going to start with the same subject so that we can keep things together.

We have a meeting tomorrow and there will be one vote. Well, there are some votes of [consent agenda] but they're very non-controversial. As you see on the screen in front of you, there is a vote about Phase 1 of the ePDP which has still not gone away.

Now, you will remember that the board did not adopt two of the recommendations. The one that they've asked for more clarity on is rec #12, which in essence is the deletion of the data in the organization field. There has been a lot of movement over the last 24 hours or so with our experts involved in this, both from the BC and from the IPC. And within about ten minutes before the beginning of this call, I have been asked to put forward to council the request that in the supplemental recommendation that is about this organizational field, that we again ask that this data should not be deleted but it can be redacted.

Now, there are certain things that you guys need to decide what you want your councilors to do, here. One is that we're not going to win. I'm going to put that out straightforwardly. We are not going to win on this one. But it does, of course, stick to our general principles and our beliefs because we don't think the data should be deleted. The worst case is redacted but at least it's better.

We don't know if the IPC will support us. Indications at the moment are that they will. That would be good. But at the moment, even if they do, we have four votes. This means that we will not have enough.

The negative – or the risk – of this is that going forward, regarding our colleagues from the other parts of the council, we may lose favor with them because we're voting against. Again, I can guarantee that certain people will make the same comments about the BC trying to change things again.

But none of that matters. If you want us to do that, we will do it. I know that Margie, as our team leader here, thinks that we should. But Steve, our absent hero for policy, thinks that we should discuss it. I agree. And I'm certainly, with all due respect to the IPC, not taking their instructions. I only take instructions from the BC. I would like you guys to tell us what to do tomorrow, please. I hope that made sense.

JAY SUDOWSKI: Marie?

MARIE PATTULLO: Yes, please.

JAY SUDOWSKI: I'm very curious. What is the rationale for deleting the data? Logically, it just doesn't make any sense. Why do they feel it's necessary to delete this data?

MARIE PATTULLO: Oh, gosh. Yeah. Logic doesn't necessarily play a part in this, as you know, Jay. I will now call on Susan to explain this better but my understanding is that there is so much inaccurate data that they don't want to retain, respond with, use, or any of the above, inaccurate data. Of course, you'll remember we have to circle back to the BC over the last few months trying to say that there should be best efforts made to have accurate data. But apparently, that can't happen, either. Susan, if you're still on the line, can you speak to this, maybe?

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Yeah. You know what? I'm a little bit distracted because I've just realized that Caitlin Tubergen from ICANN staff just sent out a clarification on the registrants' organization field. It's sort of staff's perspective of this. They're saying that the implementation [advice] do not reference the registrant organization field as "maybe," or, "given option," or, "if offered," as far as I'm reading this – I may need to read this a second time. I'll forward this to the BC.

They've put recommendation 12 in this communication and they're emphasizing that the organization field will be published and there will be a phase-in period to deal with existing registrations. But they are saying that they can be redacted or the original recommendation 12 can be redacted in the meantime. It looks like they actually … Unless I'm reading this wrong. Margie, I don't know if you've seen this. They are clarifying our side of the argument.

MARGIE MILAM:	Sure. Marie, if I could jump in the queue? Sorry, I'm not online. I think, Susan, that might be for the Phase 1 implementations. But I'm not sure that addresses the board question and what the supplemental recommendation should say.

What I understand the argument to be is that a lot of the retail registrars feel that the data they have in the org field is inaccurate. People just fill it out even if they're not actually an organization. And so, that's what this phase-in period was intended to address; our ability to clean up the data and ask the registrant to confirm their data.

But the question is, what happens if the registrant doesn't confirm its data? And that's the issue that we've been fighting about. And this is the reason why we're pushing for the BC to vote "no," even though we understand that our colleagues will be upset. Because it leaves the scenario that there could be a registration that doesn't have a minimal amount of data. And the language for the council, first of all, is not a policy recommendation. It's implementation guidance.

And so, knowing what we've seen already in the implementations phase, if it's not even a policy recommendation it's a lot harder to get it actually implemented. The language in and of itself is vague. It doesn't talk about, what is the minimal amount of data that needs to be in the WHOIS record?

I think that it's worthwhile for the BC to stand and say, "We understand that there were some attempts to address this but this doesn't go far enough. It doesn't say that a WHOIS record for an organization has to have a minimal amount of contact information."

That's the reason we've been pushing for the BC to say "no," even though we know that others will disagree with us. I think that it's not going to be unexpected, at least on the ePDP side. We've been telling our colleagues all along that there are certain issues that are very important to us. In particular, ensuring that there is a minimal amount of data that's available, even if it's redacted. We understand. Redaction is fine. We just don't want to be in a scenario where there's a WHOIS record that doesn't have minimal contact information and that's the issue we're fighting about.

[SUSAN KAWAGUCHI]:   Yeah. And the WHOIS review team, the RDS review team, according to ICANN's own reports, the ARS reports … 30% of current WHOIS records only comply with the 2009 RAA, which does not include e-mail and phone numbers. So we already have a situation where ICANN cannot tell us and the registrars won't, for the most part, whether or not they have collected an e-mail address and phone number for a registrant because it was not required in the 2009 RAA.

And then, if we are allowing this policy to go into effect where admin contact is no longer collected, and then they allow the organization field to be either redacted or deleted, you could end up with very little information for the registrants for registration before it that adhered to the 2009 RAA.

I agree with Margie that there's just not enough guarantee that there's information. Now, registrars always have pushed back on what ICANN

calls "the grandfather domains." They say, "No, no, no. We've collected all of that." But they will not pony-up any statistics.

MARIE PATTULLO: Thank you.

JAY SUDOWSKI: I certainly support dissenting on this. The whole concept seems like throwing the baby out with the bathwater. The argument is, "Well, the data we have is maybe not so good in the first place so should we just get rid of it?" You would think that it would actually be in the registrars' best interests to know who their customers are and have accurate contact information.

I mean, it just boggles my mind from a business perspective how it makes any sense at all to say, "We don't even know if this data is good. But these people are still paying their bills, right?" I mean, most people aren't registering domain names for ten or 15 years at a time. They're registering for one to two years at a time. It's just very bizarre to me. It's like The Twilight Zone; surreal.

[SUSAN KAWAGUCHI]:   If you want more surreal-ness just join the ePDP with Margie.

JAY SUDOWSKI: I don't know. I might need a bigger bottle of Xanax or something.

[SUSAN KAWAGUCHI]:   Exactly.

MARIE PATTULLO: Yeah. Okay. Thank you so much, guys, all of you. I am taking this conversation to mean that, yes, you do want me to send an e-mail later to the council list saying that the reference to the data being deleted should be struck from the supplemental recommendation. The wording is in the e-mail list that we've been sharing. Margie, I'm vouching for you as the team leader on this one. When you get back to your screen, if you can just say "yes" then I will hit the send button. Obviously, Susan, please jump in. And Jay, if you want some more crazy, I'm really happy to add you to that e-mail list.

JAY SUDOWSKI: I think I would get in trouble.

MARIE PATTULLO: As if. As if! I'm actually going to turn to you next anyway, Jay, because the NomCom, as you all know from our last call, requested the council to comment on the NomCom criteria for choosing a GNSO councilor. Again, as you know, the council itself has responded. But separately the BC also sent in a letter. Jay, would you like to make any comments about that process?

JAY SUDOWSKI: I mean, in general, I can say that we have received both of the letters. I believe the GNSO one has been distributed to the NomCom and the BC

EN

one will be, shortly. I think the GNSO Council letter actually provided some additional, helpful information for the NomCom, compared to previous years. Certainly, having input from the BC, I think, will be helpful for the committee. We certainly thank you for your input.

MARIE PATTULLO: And we thank you for your service. Does anybody have any comments that they want to raise with our NomCom representatives? Okay. Another item that's coming up under council is that, as you know, the entire GNSO should put forward a candidate to be the new fellowship mentor. The mentor for the last year was our very own Andrew Mack, who has, again, put forward an EOI to – an expression of interest, I'm sorry – to be a mentor for next year.

At the moment, there is a whole bunch of people who have put forward such expressions of interest. There are 12, in fact. So the council is going to be looking at that during the month of January. Andrew, I don't know if you want to say anything about this? Nope? Okay. Other council … I'm sorry to revert …

ANDREW MACK: Marie?

MARIE PATTULLO: Yes, please. Please, go ahead.

ANDREW MACK: Hi. No, nothing more than that it has been a great experience. I think it's a great way for us to get new voices into the BC and I'd be honored to have the opportunity to continue to do it if people would like me to.

MARIE PATTULLO: Well, we certainly thank you, Andrew, for all of your service over the last year and for stepping up, again, as a volunteer. Let's wait and see what the [standing on selection] committee decides.

Right. As I say, the meeting is tomorrow. It's tomorrow evening, in my world. That's 21:00 UTC. I am very, very much hoping that my ePDP experts can give me instructions via the Skype channel. And of course, if any members do want to listen in, you are more than welcome to do so. If you can't find the link to do so, let me know and I'll send it again to the list.

The other things that are ongoing in council: we still have the SSR2 underway. I don't see Denise or Scott on the line. Okay. But we also have ATRT3 underway and I do see Tola on. Tola, do you want to speak to this? I'm not hearing you, Tola, if you're trying to speak. Okay. I'll just keep going. Please, do feel free to jump back in at any point. Now, I think, Chantelle, that that's me out. Unless I've missed anything. Can I please hand back to our chair?

CLAUDIA SELLI: Hello. Yeah, sorry. I think that now we have the CSG part of the calendar. Barbara, if you are online, can you give us an update?

BARBARA WANNER: Yes, I am. Can you hear me, everyone?

CLAUDIA SELLI: Yeah.

BARBARA WANNER: Great. Thank you. Okay. I think it's all very self-explanatory, here, if you look at the policy calendar that Steve sent out. Anne Aikman-Scalese will represent us on the CCWG auction proceeds. The CSG ExCom currently is trying to develop an intersessional meeting that is useful, as contrasted to previous intersessionals, which we have found not to be very useful.

And so a format that has been proposed by Heather, which I think is a good one, if for the individual constituencies to just meet on our own in the morning – this will be the day zero of ICANN68 in Malaysia – and then spend the afternoon working with the NCSG.

In terms of ICANN67 in Cancún, we also made a decision, the executive committee, the hold the CSG closed session to a call before the meeting. It'll be recorded and transcribed as per usual but the reason for this was to free up more time during the actual meeting and not run the risk of conflicting with any of the working groups, the ePDP, or whatever. I hope that's acceptable to everyone. The planning grid, I have also made available to you.

Again, I'll need your suggestions in terms of speakers that you would find useful to engage with at this meeting, in addition to Göran, and specific topics. Another important point that we're also going to have to discuss

in the coming weeks and months is who to support for board seat 14 because Matthew Shears' term will be up.

We also have to determine who to support for GNSO Council chair. Keith is limited. Maybe Marie knows the answer to this. I don't know if he can run again or whether he's just term-limited and cannot. In any case, we have to discuss that. And also, very importantly, we have to discuss who will serve in the vice-chair position because that will rotate to the CSG, this time. Rafik will step down. We will also have councilor elections in April or May of 2020.

A lot of leadership-type decisions that we'll have to be making in the coming weeks. That's about it right now. I think everybody is just wrapping things up for the end of the year. That's my report. Thank you.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Hello? So [for hands], there is work ongoing for preparing the ICANN67 plenary. I have sent around the three main topics that have been suggested. I noted Mark's comment on the fact of making discussions more concrete. It will be reported. I think this was the main thing. And the other thing is that we're starting, with the other SO/AC chairs, a call during the year.

We're going to start in January to basically work on the main topics of interest and to keep in contact trying to overcome eventual differences. I will report back as the discussion starts. If you have any comments on the preparation of ICANN67, please let me know. I will turn to Jimson. Thank you.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Okay. Thank you very much, Claudia. Greetings to everyone. Thanks again to everyone for expeditiously making their dues/payments. Though we still have, I think, two or three members that will be following up. We hope their processes will be through with payment compliance.

But we intend to rule by the end of this year, by January. We will have a clean slate for FY20 compliance members. If you have not heard from me it means, maybe, you are in good standing. Many are in good standing, really. Thank you.

Next is on the anniversary. Claudia is the chair of the BC 20th anniversary committee. I believe Mark will have some things to share. Mark, are you there?

MARK DATYSGELD: Thank you, Jimson. I'm here. Hello, to everyone. Chris Mondini has been taking a bit of a lead in helping to organize this party, together with Chantelle. Thank you very much for your support, Chantelle. As it stands right now, it's still unclear exactly what the focus of the celebration will be. This is something that we will have to look into finishing this year and starting next year.

The basic question is, will we do this event in the venue and be something a little more predictable, a little more pedestrian, or will we do it out of the venue and do something a little more bombastic? I guess that's the question that needs answering. The team that has been working on this will be discussing this shortly, I believe, but we had to postpone that call.

If anybody has any ideas, or feels very strongly, about a certain angle, please be sure to contact any of us. Even if you have suggestions for what you would like to see in terms of a video from the BC or what kind of action we should be doing, it's very welcome to have the opinions of the constituency to back us up. There are discussions with Chris, and such. Thank you very much, everyone. Talk to you soon.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Thank you very much, Mark. Of course, as you can recall, the whole idea of a 20th anniversary [came in] with the FY20 budget proposal. [inaudible] [in April]. The whole idea, as Mark also said, it will also commemorate. Surely, there should be a video. Yes, we should have a commemorative video that [inaudible] brief recap of how we have fared since 1999.

The BC has impacted ICANN seriously on behalf of the global business [road] [inaudible] now with regard to DNS abuse. You can see the BC is taking a very strong leadership position on it. Some of the remarkable achievements of the BC over time is [the transition] [inaudible] change in the structure. The BC has had a commendable impact.

I think some of our members will have something to say, those who have been here for a long time. For example [inaudible] AT&T [has] been there at the very beginning. [inaudible] companies like that. We'll be able to put something together. Well, if ICANN can no longer [conceit until] [inaudible] about bringing the video documentary. The intention is to have a script in place. Once we have it in place, we can always [inaudible] Mark [inaudible] have has been on for quite a while. Thank you [inaudible].

MARK DATYSGELD: Hello?

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Yes. Okay, I'm back. Sorry. The Internet [is terrible] since we started. [I also know] what happened now but I'm back. The point is that we are looking at updates with the logo as well. Thanks to Mark for bringing the idea up. We're looking at it. As I said, please, more ideas are welcome. Yes, Andrew?

ANDREW MACK: Yes, really quickly just to give everybody a sense of what we're trying to do. We're trying to figure out whether we can do an event that will be a real, full-on party that everybody at our BC meeting seemed to want. There are some real limits as to what we could do at the venue. We're still finding out what those final limits are, what other options we might have, and quite frankly whether they would fit within the budget.

In terms of what we would be asking of BC members for their participation, things like that, we will try to keep it absolutely as simple as possible. We don't want to overburden people. We just want to make sure that we have something to celebrate our time so the video could be relatively simple.

When we talked with the ICANN people, they a lot of limitations about what they could and couldn't do and things like that around the video. It may be the better way for us to go to just do it ourselves. Again, it won't be that difficult. We're not going to structure it as a major opus.

And if anyone has a really strong preference, as Mark mentioned, please just shoot it to members of the group so that we can get a sense of it. We'd like this to be fun for the BC. We've made a really good effort, I think, at the "in-reach."

Again, many thanks to Tim for organizing that up in Montréal. We'd like to continue to build. We thought that that was very successful. We think this is a great opportunity for us to build off of that with the Latin American community as a new emphasis. Thanks, everyone. Bye-bye.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Yes. Thank you very much, Andrew. In fact, all of us are looking forward to the fun in Cancún because we have not yet recovered from Montréal. You are [merry], you are really great. We look forward to such a wonderful gettogether. People say, "Oh, so BC can actually relax like this?" They didn't know that we could actually relax and have fun. They thought we are just too serious and being the most thought-provoking constituency in ICANN, so to speak.

Well, the last points from my side are with regard to the recent election that happened. I would like to use the opportunity to congratulate the chair-elect for the [accreditations committee], Arinola Akinyemi. She will be taking her seat in January.

Also, just a point to appreciate Andrew Mack. He's done a great job as the chair of the BC. I know the other members of the [accreditations committee] have been asked to show that the members are purposeful members. They really know what they want to do in the BC. They're qualified and their qualifications are in line with our charter. Thank you,

the [accreditations committee] for your great work. We really appreciate what you do. On this note, I will hand it back to Claudia. Claudia, back to you. Thank you.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Thank you, Jimson. Thank you, everybody. I also wanted to join the echo on the great success of the enriched activities in Montréal. Thank you, everybody, for putting effort in on that. I don't know if other members …

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Yes, Claudia. Claudia, I really want to be able [everyone was] Chantelle. Chantelle has been so [superlative]. You all know, coordinating the election pretty well. Chantelle, thank you. As secretariat, we really appreciate you. Thank you.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Indeed. Indeed. I don't know if anyone else would like to jump in or to share any points? Okay. If no, I will give you back ten minutes of your time and we will speak, I think, in two weeks' time. Thank you very much, everybody, for participating in the call.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Thank you, bye.

BARBARA WANNER: Thank you, bye-bye.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Thank you. The meeting is adjourned and we can stop the record.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]