
BRENDA BREWER: Good day, everyone. This is Brenda speaking. Welcome to the Business Constituency candidates and members call, taking place on the 4th of November, 2020, at 16:00 UTC.

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

I'm happy to turn the call over to Claudia. Thank you.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Thank you very much, everybody. Welcome to our BC candidate call. I'm very happy that we have very strong candidates that stepped forward for the various officer positions. So I'm glad to have them. I'm sure you have received as well their statement that they have been sending around the past week or so.

Chantelle, without further ado ... We will start with the candidate call and then go into the policy discussion right after. With that, Chantelle, I will leave the floor to you to start the candidates' call. Thank you.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Thank you, Claudia. Hello and welcome to the officer candidate portion of today's call. As moderator for this portion, I would like to advise BC members that both the nominators and nominees qualify according to the BC charter rules as paid member of the BC and therefore all nominations are valid. Nominations for the roles of Chair, Vice Chair

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

(Policy Coordination), Vice Chair (Finance and Operations), and the [representatives] to the Commercial Stakeholder Group were received. There were five nominations total that were received via the BC private e-mail listserv, and they were acknowledged by myself as the voting officer and by Jimson Olufuye as the outgoing Vice Chair of Finance and Operations. The candidates were contacted and accepted their nominations.

For transparency purposes, please note that the nominations are as follows. Standing for the role of Chair, we have one candidate, Mason Cole. Mason was first nominated by Susan Kawaguchi and seconded by Tim Smith. For the role of Vice Chair of Policy Coordination, we have one candidate, Steve DelBianco. Steve was first nominated by Andrew Mack and first seconded by Tim Smith. For the role of Vice Chair of Finance and Operations, we have two candidates. In alphabetical order, they are Arinola Akinyemi and Lawrence Olawale-Roberts. Arinola was first nominated by Tim Smith and first seconded by Waudu Siganga. Lawrence was first nominated by Pau Mitchell and first seconded by Jay Sudowski. For the role of CSG representative, we have one candidate, Waudu Siganga. Waudu was first nominated by [Yusef Curio.]

For today's call, I will first open the floor to the candidates themselves for introductory remarks. Candidates will be called upon first by the position and then, for the Vice Chair of Finance and Operations role, by alphabetical order. The candidates will as such proceed to provide introductions in the following order: Mason Cole, Steve DelBianco, Arinola Akinyemi, Lawrence Olawale-Roberts, and Waudu Siganga.

After introductory remarks, we will then open it up to questions from BC members. BC members participating on the call may submit questions to the candidates verbally or via the Zoom chat. I will moderate this portion of the call as well. Candidates may choose to respond to the questions on the call or via e-mail after this call concludes. As a reminder, this portion is only limited to 45 minutes, and then we will transition to the usual BC members meeting.

Ballots for the election will be sent on November 5th, opening the voting period, and will close on Wednesday, November 11th. Only BC primary member representatives in good standing will receive a ballot unless they formally advise myself and Jimson before the opening of the vote. Votes will be counted by myself and Jimson on Thursday, November 12th, and submitted to ExCom for the review. Once confirmed, staff will announce the results.

As a reminder, the new terms of BC officers begin on January 1st, 2021.

With that, I would like to open the floor to the candidates themselves for further remarks. First, we will start with the position of BC Chair. Mason, please, the floor is yours.

MASON COLE: Thank you, Chantelle. Do you hear me?

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Yes, we do.

MASON COLE:

Thank you very much. Well, good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. It's good to be on this call with BC colleagues. I first want to say thank you to Susan for my nomination and to Tim and Andy for seconded. I appreciate your generosity and your confidence in me as potential Chair.

I've submitted a candidate statement, and it's now in front of you in the Zoom room. I think the statement pretty well speaks for itself. I don't want to spend too much time on this call with an opening statement, except to say that I've tried very hard to outline my ICANN experience, which is fairly extensive—going on 20 years now—including a significant amount of time on the contracted party side of the house, although, about three years ago, I joined by the BC and I've had the privilege of contributing now to BC work for that period of time. I was afforded a contributory role and was welcomed by the BC. I hope that my efforts for the BC have been effective over the past several years.

I'm looking forward to serving as Chair, should I be elected. I've outlined some priorities on Page 2 of my candidate statement. Chantelle, if you don't mind scrolling down a bit. Thank you very much. I think these priorities speak for themselves. It's certainly not an exhaustive list, but there are plenty of opportunities for the BC to raise its profile within ICANN, to strengthen its relationships with Board members and with ICANN Org itself, and to play an even greater role in ICANN policymaking.

There on the screen you see some thoughts that I contributed in my statement about looking forward for the next year or so in terms of BC priorities. Again, it's not an exhaustive list, so I encourage BC members

to contact me when they have thoughts and ideas about either these priorities or others that they would like to raise.

With that, I'll surrender the floor and say thank you again for the nomination. I look forward to serving the BC. Thank you, Chantelle.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Thank you very much, Mason. Now I would like to turn the floor over to Steve for introductory remarks. Steve, please go ahead.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Chantelle. I'm actually glad we're not on video for this Zoom call because it would be apparent that I've been up for about 35 hours, going through this insanity of the American election, which is still unknown at this point. It seems like that always happens during an ICANN meeting.

I'm pretty much a known quantity to BC members that have been around for even just a few years in terms of the way I try to conduct our coordination of the Business Constituency's policy work. In the candidate statement that I circulated, I do the usual thing of reciting the statistics. And they're outstanding. Half of you—half of our members—contributed to comments in 2020, and that's huge. That's how we build our bench. That's how we generate the level of facility with the comments that we do so that people can build on them in future comments. They can get up and speak at the public forum. And, more importantly, they can pursue the position of Vice Chair for Policy Coordination next year.

I'm only able to serve in this capacity because no one else was willing to step forward. Otherwise, the term limit would have limited my ability to do this. But I'm willing to do it but would prefer that another candidate come forth, and I can help to groom them for the job maybe next year.

I indicated at the top the style that I apply to this, which is to try to be servant leader, where I prepare like crazy with things like this policy calendar. I carefully document everything that we do.

AUTOMATED VOICE: [inaudible]

STEVE DELBIANCO: Finally, I do my best to support you, the team members here, at being able to express your preferences and views, challenging your passions in a way that we can make a productive outcome. I realize how frustrating that can be when public comments disappear into the vacuum at ICANN. It's really frustrating when we are unable to prevail at GNSO Council since we are in a very corner of the minority. That'll come up in the policy calendar to be discussed later.

Mason recited a number of priorities from the Chairman's perspective, but from the Vice Chair of Policy, I'm limited to things related to policy. So I recited in the candidate statement that registrant data, a responsible expansion of gTLDs, and more compliance enforcement are what I believe will be the three top challenges in 2021. I actually support wholeheartedly what Mason Cole put in his statement with regard to a

broader range of BC priorities. The three that I mention dovetail nicely with what Mason came up with.

I'll close by saying that, in my candidate statement, I pasted in my statement of interest from ICANN, which had only a few changes in that NetChoice added new members, such as Amazon, this year. So that's it for now. I look forward to your questions. Back to you, Chantelle.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Thank you very much, Steve. Now I'd like to turn the floor over to Arinola for opening remarks. Arinola, please go ahead.

ARINOLA AKINYEMI: Can you hear me?

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Yes, we can.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I can hear you, go ahead.

ARIONALA AKINYEMI: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, all. Like you know, my name is Arinola Akinyemi, the CEO of DigiSphere Limited, a small tech company based in Abuja, Nigeria. I'm stepping forward to serve you in the role of Vice Chair in Finance and Operations. I joined the BC through my company in 2015—September, precisely—and, over

this period, I've had the privilege to serve the BC in various subcommittees, as noted in my candidate statement.

As a member of the Finance Committee, I have actively participated in the drawing up of the BC annual budget and engaging in public comments, especially as it relates to ICANN and PTI budget, among others. Also, I have served the BC on the Outreach Committee, and I have participated in the various outreaches since my being a member of the committee.

Currently, I serve as the Chair to the Credentials Committee. Within this period, I have helped to work with other members of the committee to set up a structure for onboarding new members into the BC, which is currently on the BC website.

I'm also a member of the ICANN Budget Working Group, which I was privileged to attend during my ICANN onboarding program, where I was a mentee. From there, I piqued the interest and I have been a member of that working group [until today].

According to the BC charter, the mission of the BC is to ensure policy positions are consistent with the development of the Internet, which promotes end user confidence because it is a safe place to conduct business, it's competitive in the supply of registry, registrar, and domain-name-related services, and is technically stable and secure and also reliable. I believe it is pertinent for the internal finance and operations of the BC to be stable, secure, and reliable as it seeks to fulfill its mission. That is why I have put myself forward to serve the BC in that role.

If elected, I'm committed to working with other members of the Executive Committee, the various subcommittees, including the [inaudible] that will be [inaudible] the ExCom, the BC Secretariat, invoicing Secretariat, and the support of you all to ensure effective management of BC finance, follow up on dues, sustain the publication of the quarterly newsletters, sustain the website, oversee the work of the legal counsel, the accountant, and the Secretariat, outreach to boost diversity, and also provide leadership for the Finance Committee, and also ensure that I'll be providing oversight to all committees as a liaison of the ExCom to support and lead on a number of BC comments, especially those pertaining to the finance and budget, and also to ensure that the annual budget and financial report of the BC is generated when due and submitted to the BC private list and subsequently to the ExCom for approval. Also, I intend to ensure that I effectively work in collaboration with colleagues on the ExCom to further strengthen engagement with other constituencies, SO/ACs, the Org, and the Board.

I therefore solicit your vote in this regard, and I look forward to your questions. Thank you for listening.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Thank you very much, Arinola. Lawrence, I would like to turn the floor now over to you. Please go ahead.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Thank you, Chantelle. Good day, everybody—morning, afternoon, and evening, depending on where you're joining this meeting from today. As

you all know, my name is Lawrence, and I'm a candidate also for the position of Vice Chair of Finance and Operations. My thanks to Paul Mitchell for nominating me, and to Jay and every other member of our esteemed group here for seconding and supporting.

I'm motivated to step forward for this position at this time because there is for me a very big need to continue to grow this potential that we have as a constituency. Before joining the BC in 2015, within the ICANN community, I could tell that the BC was one constituency whose views were seriously listened to and sought after. When I joined the BC, I came to understand the reason why—because of the seriousness that members put into policy development as a constituency.

[While that is our major thrust] within ICANN, the responsibilities of the Vice Chair for Finance and Operations also goes a long way to provide the much-needed support. While I want to thank our predecessors for the great work they've done, from [inaudible] to Olufuye, the shoes that they have created definitely is one that I feel fits and I'm able to fill.

Looking at this particular role, which [inaudible] a responsibility for preparing and producing an annual report, especially since we have a status as a not-for-profit to maintain. I see this as one of the very key responsibilities as Vice Chair. Looking at my experience serving on the Nigerian Internet Registry Association Audit Committee, it has basically prepared me for this role. I have also followed the work of the ICANN Planning Committee, and I know that we also have very strong expertise within the BC to help with this aspect of putting those reports together and filing them in time such that we are able to continue to maintain our status.

Aside from this, the BC membership is also of big interest for me. I say this because, over the last two or three years, we've seen some wonderful companies come in and, for different reasons, have had to leave. My thinking is to work with the rest of the constituency to [bring] means by which we can grow our numbers. I had stated this in my candidate statement, and the first idea I have around this will be to encourage members of the BC to, at least within each financial year, get one member that they can refer for membership. Our current membership is just about 63. Not too bad, but I believe that, if each one will refer and bring in just one company into the BC, we have the potential of doubling that number over the next financial year.

What that will mean will be that we also have some additional funds, and we'll be able to offer some form of rebate to exist members. It's my thinking—and it will be my proposal if you will elect me into this particular role—to work with the ExCom to work out the possibility of even having rebates in membership dues for members who are bringing two or three other members. So it's possible that we can sustain membership and we can grow it, but this is only if one has that opportunity to serve.

There are quite a number of other things that I would like to talk about, but due to time, I would want to maybe bring them up if there's an opportunity of there's a question.

As I mentioned earlier, my experience in ICANN has spanned just about five (going to six) years. In that time, I have volunteered to serve the constituency in different role, as stated in my candidate statement here, the last one being on the Nominating Committee. I believe that, if I am

elected into this role, not only will I be able to help bring these programs and projects that I believe will be of great impact to us, but I will be applying the same dedication and strength toward improving on what the current NomCom have been able to achieve.

I would like to stop at this point and would wait for the questions. Thank you to the audience.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Thank you very much, Lawrence. Now we'd like to turn the floor over to Waudo for his remarks. Waudo, please go ahead.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Thank you, Chantelle. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone. I'll keep my presentation compact, so I'm going to divide it into three parts. The first part I'll quickly talk about myself and introduce myself to those who might not be familiar with me. The second part I will talk about a number of volunteer positions and appointed positions that I've held that may be of interest now that I'm also looking for another volunteer position here. Finally, I will give a little bit of mention to my ICANN journey and the work that I've done in ICANN and the Business Constituency.

First of all, who am I? I'm the representative of the Africa ICT Alliance—that is AfICTA—in the BC (Business Constituency). I'm from Kenya. Professionally, I'm trained as a computer person/computer programmer, and I've been in the information and communications field for over 25 years, with specialization in [inaudible] systems.

For my day-to-day work, I'm the Chief Executive Officer of an association in Kenya known as the Computer Society of Kenya, which is a member of AfICTA. AfICTA itself is a confederation of associations from over 25 African countries.

Secondly, now I can talk about the volunteer positions that I have held and also the appointed positions that could impact on the position that I'm looking for. I've been Vice President of an organization known as the World Information Technology Services Alliance. This is an organization that brings together national ICT organizations from different countries in the world and currently has over 80 members. It's headquartered in Virginia in the United States of America. So I'd been the Vice Chair for the Africa region between 2006 and 2012. That was a volunteer position.

In 2003 up until 2005, I was appointed by the U.N. Secretary General to be a member of what was known as the U.N. Working Group on Internet Governance, or WGIG. Those of you who may have been in the Internet governance scene for a period of time will have heard of this work that happened in the U.N. It was a bit of a tricky time for people, especially working at ICANN, because there was a possibility of the work of Internet numbering and Internet naming being taken over by a U.N. body. So we worked very hard. I was representing the business community in the WGIG. We worked very hard to make sure that we came up with an organization that did not interfere with the work that is being done by ICANN. I've also been a member of AfICTA as a Board member from 2010 up to today.

[Currently] my work with ICANN. I started working in ICANN and with the BC in 2007. In my first volunteer position, I represented the BC as a member of the ICANN NomCom. That was in 2007 and 2008, and also in 2008 and 2009. So that was two consecutive years. I later came back again to represent the business community in the NomCom in 2011-2012. Then, in 2016-17, I also represented the business community or Business Constituency in the CCT-RT. That was the Competition, Consumer Trust, and Consumer Choice Review Team, which was looking at the impact of the new gTLDs on aspects of consumer choice and competition. We produced a report which has been worked on and is still being implemented at the moment. As I've mentioned, I've been on the NomCom three consecutive times.

So I'm looking forward to getting your support for the position that I'm seeking and working with you in case I'm honored to be given the position of CSG representative. I'll go there to represent your views and to be a channel of the views of the business community/Business Constituency. I'll also work closely with the predecessor, Barbara, in the transition period so that I can be able to carry on the mantle from where she'll have reached with our colleagues come January. So I'll be very honored if I can get your support in this. Thank you very much. Back to you, Chantelle.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN:

Thank you, Waudu. Now I'd like to turn the floor over to BC members for questions. We will start in the queue.

I see Jimson has his hand raised. Jimson, please go ahead. Then, Mark, the floor will be yours after that.

JIMSON OLUFEYE:

Thank you very much, Chantelle. And thank you, all our candidates, for putting yourself forward to serve. We appreciate your interest.

I have a question for Mason and then one other to the other candidates. For Mason, we can see you have diverse experiences, especially with the Contracted Party House. Now you are going for the top job in the BC in the Non-Contracted Party House. So how do you think you can best relate with the contracted parties to advance BC's priorities? Thank you. That was for Mason.

For the others, based on your view of the workload that is for the Vice Chair of Finance and Operation and also CSG, what improvement to do you think you can bring to bear/bring on board that will enhance the mission of the BC? Thank you.

MASON COLE:

Chantelle, should I go first? It's Mason.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN:

Yes, Mason. Please go ahead.

MASON COLE:

Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Jimson, for the question. I think it's an important one. I do think, if the BC is going to do a better job of

advancing its interests within the ICANN sphere, it's going to be necessary to improve our relationships with the contracted parties. The contracted parties have a great deal of policy influence over ICANN outcomes, as you know, and the BC, through no fault of its membership but through difficulties with its relationship with ICANN sometimes, doesn't always carry the same weight as contracted parties do in policy outcomes.

I think it's going to be important to have an outreach effort to contracted parties and to ICANN Org as well to raise our profile in front of both audiences and find ways to work together. I hope to use my relationships with contracted parties. I know and am familiar with both the incoming Chairs of the Registrar and Registry Stakeholder Groups, and I'd like to use those relationships to improve the BC's working relationship with contracted party colleagues. I don't think we're going to be able to achieve all of our objectives unless we find a better way to cooperate with and compromise with contracted parties.

So I do hope to use my experience in the Contracted Party House to bring some weight to the BC both in front of ICANN or/and in front of contracted parties and even with the Board so that the BC's views are more emphatically represented when it's time to contribute to policy outcomes.

So I hope that answers your question well. If it doesn't, I'd welcome your follow-up or a private conversation. I yield the floor, Chantelle.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Thank you, Mason. Mark, I saw you had your hand raised, and then it went down. Did you want to go speak?

MARK DATYSGELD: I do, but did the other question get answered?

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Yes, it did.

MARK DATYSGELD: Okay.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: This is Lawrence. I would like to provide an answer for Jimson's question, if I could have the floor.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Oh, sure. Lawrence, please go ahead, and then we'll turn it over to Mark. Thank you.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Thank you, Mark, for the understanding also. So Jimson's question had to do with what improvements one will be bringing on board in the role that we're looking to step into. For me, it's the Vice Chair of Finance and Operations.

First of all, we have within ICANN the Global Stakeholder Engagement Group, which is large and spread across all ICANN regions. It will be my pleasure to consolidate the efforts that we already have going with the GSE Group. They have a lot of network and resources at their disposal that I believe the BC could utilize to grow its footprints across these different regions. As I've been a member of the Outreach Committee, I have seen instances where the Global Stakeholder Engagement leaders in some of these regions had expressed an interest to work closely with the BC. The seat for the Vice Chair is the first point of call for this. So definitely that is one place that I think we can leverage on, just like we had in the last ICANN meeting where we had a BC outreach that attracted very wide participation. I think more of those efforts can be explored.

Secondly, I also believe that we can provide more opportunities for BC members to participate within the constituency aside from the work we do in the Credentials, Outreach, and the Finance Committee. It is my belief that more working groups/working parties/small teams can be put together to take care of tasks that are very germane.

One example is that, in the past, we've had the BC conduct a study with regards to the Latin American region, [whose challenge] is also peculiar to my region. We've had that study concluded and the report placed before us.

It is my intention, if I'm elected as the Vice Chair of Finance and Operations, to have a working group/working party/small group that will sit down and serve for a short time as a recommendations committee. Their task might be to look closely at those reports and

recommend actions that the BC should take, actions that ICANN itself should take, and maybe some other things that we need to look at--- other stakeholders within the ICANN community or outside the ICANN community and have them contribute—so that it's not just having [inaudible] beautiful reports but getting actions after them. I'm hopeful that we could have something similar done with the DNS abuse study if it eventually received support from the BC.

One other way that we can also put ICANN membership to task is in terms of ICANN Learn. ICANN Learn is a program, a portal, a resource that is available, but we don't have a fast resource to serve the business community. While I was on the onboarding program, one of the tasks that we were given was to produce resources for ICANN Learn. But I don't think that that went very far. It's my thinking that we could have working parties that can contribute to subject matters that are of interest to businesses and places in ICANN Learn for the whole community to benefit from that.

I will stop at this point and yield the floor back to Chantelle and Mark. Thank you.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Thank you, Lawrence. Mark, please go ahead, and then I have—oh, hi, Akinola. Would you like to respond as well?

AKINOLA AKINYEMI: Yes. I would like to provide an answer to that question from Jimson.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Please go ahead.

AKINOLA AKINYEMI: Okay. I want you to know the improvement that one could bring on board. Well, we could look at it from this perspective. Outreach to boost diversity means looking at the weak areas where the BC is yet to have its footprint. That would be maybe Asia for now. It is conducting more outreaches. How do you do that, like creating awareness? This awareness, considering the global pandemic right now, which is COVID-19, could be done electronically. The BC currently has a Twitter handle which is not being utilized properly. Other social media platforms will be engaged to do that, wherein we'll reach out to businesses out there and get them interested and create an awareness for the BC right there.

Also, by sustaining the newsletter, this would also create further awareness, too. Thank you. I yield the floor back to you, Chantelle.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Thank you, Arinola.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Chantelle?

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Yes? Is this Waudo?

WAUDO SIGANGA:

Yeah. I would also like to respond to Jimson's question because he has thrown it to all of us. With regards to what I would think of with the CSG, first of all, I've just looked at some of the work that is being done there. I'm very impressed by this idea of forming informal groups within the CSG to pursue certain matters and certain aspects with different stakeholders. So this can be brought backwards. If we informal groupings, they can be groupings that can interact with the Business Constituency to work on some of the questions that are emanating from the Business Constituency. The way I look at this is that the CSG representative is just actually a vessel for the Business Constituency. So, if we can get the other members of the CSG also to interact with the BC using these informal groupings, I think that would be a good idea.

But, generally, I think I also have to really do some work with the outgoing Barbara in case you give me the chance to take this position so that I can come up with position about what improvements there can be. Thank you. I yield back to you, Chantelle.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN:

Thank you, Waudu. I'm going to turn the floor over to Mark. I'm also looking at the time and the queue as we have it, which is Mark, John, and then Steve. And I see Andrew has hand raised as well. After that, I think we should go ahead and close the queue in order to proceed with the BC members call. But I yield to the BC ExCom as they would like to do otherwise. With that, Mark, please go ahead. The floor is yours.

MARK DATYSGELD:

Thank you, Chantelle. I would like very much to thank all the candidates who have come forward. This is a great pool of people, if anything. My question is specifically directed towards Mason. As you know, I have been deeply involved in the multi-stakeholder reform effort. ICANN has been very, let's say, not forthcoming with it, very opaque. We raised some serious concerns with the Board over the process, and they were duly dismissed. So I definitely think we will need stronger posturing if we really want to move ahead with this if we don't want this work to go to waste. So, as somebody who has been very active in the community, in the BC's workings, I would like to know where do you generally stand? I'm not asking you, of course, to go dive deep into minutiae of the process, but how do you see us moving forward, trying to engage ICANN in this reform process and to serve the interests that we have in terms of reforming structure, in terms of making processes clearer and more transparent? How do you see us moving forward with that? Thank you.

MASON COLE:

Thank you, Mark, for the question. As I think I understand your question, let me try to reply. And, if I don't get it right, feel free to follow up.

Well, first of all, I agree with you that ICANN Org is not always as responsive as it should be, not only to us but other stakeholders as well. They pick and choose their battles. I think that constituencies have, including the BC, a difficult relationship with ... some within ICANN Org, some on the Board, and with other stakeholder groups. I think it's going to be important to try to improve those relationships.

I think, at the Board level, we have an entrée into that through our appointed representative, Matthew Shears. We should take advantage of that relationship and widen our working relationships directly with Board members themselves. Other stakeholder groups do that, and some do it very well. We should learn from that example. I definitely think there's an opportunity for us to improve our relationships with members of the ICANN Board at that level.

As far as ICANN Org goes, in my experience, ICANN Org tends to have its own agenda and tries to do what it wants unless it meets with some resistance from the community. At times, ICANN Org is more likely to bend to the will of the community if substantial pressure is brought upon them. That generally comes from more than one stakeholder group or one constituency. So it can't be the responsibility of the BC alone to try to wrench changes into ICANN Org. In order to do that, we're going to need to build and foster relationships with the GAC, with the ALAC, with the SSAC, and with other stakeholder groups within the GNSO if we're going to get results that are really meaningful.

So you hear me talking a lot in the answer to your question about relationship building, but I do think it's very, very important. I think that would be a focus of my priority, at least in the early part of my terms as a chair: to do some outreach to some of these folks to really try to build working relationships that would be productive for the BC. With that, then you can identify issues of commonality where there's compromise available or cooperation available, and policy work can get advanced, and the restructuring that you talked about can get done in a meaningful way so it serves every stakeholder group and not just selected ones.

So I hope that answers your question. Again, if not, feel free to follow up and contact me. I'm happy to have that discussion. Thanks very much.

MARK DATYSGELD: Thank you very much, Mason. That's a great answer, and it dovetails very well with what I tend to do in the GNSO Council—just bridge-building efforts. So thank you very much for your answer. Chantelle, back to you.

MASON COLE: Thank you.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: John, your hand is raised. Please go ahead.

JOHN BERARD: Thanks, Chantelle. I have a question for Steve and a question for Mason. For Steve, do you think perhaps that we offer comment on too much and, therefore, undercut the importance of our comments on those priorities that we have?

For Mason, I agree with you that your background and personality will make it more likely to have productive conversations with the Contracted Parties House, but we are just as likely to be tripped up by an argument with the NCSG or even within the CSG with the ISPC. So I guess my question is, are you prepared to end up with outreach on

multiple fronts? And what do you see as the leverage that the BC has to bring some of these groups to help us? When I look at just the discussion over access to WHOIS, the discussion about DNS abuse, the discussion about should the BC really have two seats on the Nominating Committee, it strikes me that, anecdotally, we are really holding the short end of an increasingly lengthening stick. I'm curious as to how you think we should be working to regain some balance.

STEVE DELBIANCO: I guess I'll take the first question.

JOHN BERARD: Great.

STEVE DELBIANCO: The frequency of BC commenting could diminish people's willingness to listen if we made ourselves a pain at the microphone or if we were constantly dominating CSG talk time for BC issues. But I can assure you that we have not been dominant. When the CSG works with the Board, that time is allocated carefully. And the BC itself has been much quieter at the public forums, knowing that this is not a place where much persuasion occurs. You'll notice the BC officers have been to the mic in the public forum, at most, once a meeting.

So, John, the frequency of our commenting increases our credibility. That's written comments I'm speaking of. The frequency increase our credibility, but it will not increase our effectiveness. The only thing that will increase our effectiveness right now is to find allies—allies from the

business themselves that agree with us in filing individual comments, allies from the ALAC, the IPC, and any other groups that can be persuaded to put a comment in that makes a similar point to us. Thank you, John, for your question.

JOHN BERARD: Thanks, Steve.

MASON COLE: John, it's Mason. I'll take your second question. And thank you for it. I agree with you that the BC sometimes finds itself on the short end of an ever-lengthening stick.

I agree with Steve that allies are key to what we're going to try to do if we're actually going to have leverage as the BC. I'll give you an example. We've been beating the drum on the issue of DNS abuse now for the better part of two years. We've gotten ourselves in a position where we can speak with some authority on the issue, but the contracted parties and ICANN Org itself are pushing back on that. So we find ourselves in a position where we're talking past each other. I think that's unfortunate. There's an opportunity to do better with that.

I think the only way for the BC to gain real leverage in discussions of issues of importance or in influencing policy is to develop our network of allies. There are going to be times when we're aligned with contracted parties or with GAC even with the NCSG, and there are going to be times when we're not. But it's going to be very important that we identify where those alignments exist and where they don't so that we

can orient our own efforts correctly. If we don't have correctly focused efforts, if we're all over the place, we're not going to be very effective at all. Until we understand the priorities of the other groups and find ways where we can cooperate and compromise, then I don't think we're going to have much success. I don't mean to be pessimistic about that. I think that's a realistic statement. At least in my term as Chair, I very much hope to develop the relationships that are important in order to increase our leverage within ICANN.

I hope that answers your question.

JOHN BERARD:

Yeah, I think it does. My question was designed to tap into your pessimism because I do think that it becomes difficult, for example, to ... If the opportunity presented itself to trade votes, say, on two issues that were important to us, would we be willing to do that? That's a hypothetical question. I'm not expecting an answer. But that's the kind of compromise that arises when one seeks to build a coalition.

Anyway, I'll leave it at that. Thank you, Mason.

MASON COLE:

Thank you.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN:

Thank you. Just looking at the time and the queue, after John, we have Steve, Andrew, and then Barbara for questions. And we are now over time for the candidates portion. Did we want to go ahead and have

these questions submitted, or do we want to transition to the BC members call? ExCom, do you have any guidance that you'd like to provide?

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Chantelle, it's Steve. I am submitting my question to Lawrence and Arinola by e-mail, and I will copy BC Private. I would encourage others who have questions to e-mail them to the candidates and copy your colleagues so it accomplishes the same sort of public dialogue that would have occurred had you had the time to ask that question here.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN:

Thank you very much, Steve. Andrew and Barbara, are you okay with that?

Okay, thank you so much. With that, we will now turn over to the BC members portion of this call. First up is the policy calendar with Steve DelBianco. We will promote you to give you hosting rights to share your screen.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thank you. While I'm sharing, Alex Deacon, are you with us for five more minutes? By the way, the host has disabled screensharing. I need help on that, Chantelle.

ALEX DEACON:

Yes, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Okay. The policy calendar was circulated yesterday, and then I circulated a new one this morning with a couple of updates. Alex Deacon has to leave our call in about five minutes, so I'm going to scroll very quickly to the part of the calendar I wanted Alex to speak with. It's done under Channel 2 with respect to council, and Attachment 5 to the e-mail was "dashmotion-16October." I'll open it for you in a moment. It is Alex Deacon's suggested replacement motion which would completely change the nature of council's preferred motion on what to do on Rec 7 in thick WHOIS.

Alex, I'm going to display your markup and ask you to speak to it as well as the challenge that our councilors are going to face trying to get this through. Go ahead, Alex. Thank you.

ALEX DEACON:

Thanks, Steve. Hi, everyone. It's Alex Deacon. Quickly, in the Phase 1 IRT, we've been spending a lot of time on how to deal with essentially what is two consensus policies that conflict. One is the thick WHOIS consensus policy, which we know is approved by the Board and the GNSO Council that requires the transfer of all data to registries and provides for a conflicts-of-law procedure if there are any conflicts with law.

Rec 7 within the Phase 1 policy is slightly different. There's lots of discussion about how to interrupt that, what the intent of that recommendation says, but essentially what many feel it does is make the transfer of thick WHOIS data optional and at the discretion of the

registry. That doesn't reference any of the conflicts procedure. So essentially, we have thick WHOIS that says you must transfer this data, and you have Rec 7, which many believe says makes that transfer optional.

But, in its letters and discussions that the IRT team has had with the Board, the Board make it clear that thick WHOIS policy will remain binding on contracted parties until a new consensus policy is agreed to.

They also made it clear—there's agreement on this—that the EPDP final report does not repeal explicitly or overturn consensus policy, including, in this case, the thick WHOIS policy.

Then, finally, they made it clear, per the process of the GNSO, that the IRT cannot modify existing consensus policy or that explicit policy language to do so.

So what I've done—I'm [not] going to read this draft motion to you—is I've basically tuned the motion that was very long, complicated and focused on things than other process—this is a process-oriented motion that essentially says the GNSO should kick off a new PDP on thick WHOIS to discuss whether it should change. In the meantime, it suggests something that the IRT can do while this PDP is up and running.

So my hope is that it would shift the focus away from allegations that we are not happy with[—]the Rec 1 recommendation. And are we litigating it? That's just not true. So this takes it off the table and focuses purely on issues of process, which I believe are important in the GNSO Council.

So I'll leave it at that. If you have any questions, I'm happy to answer them.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thank you, Alex. We'll be able to discuss more of this later on with Mark and Marie but let me open up the floor for BC members. You can put it in the chat or raise your hand. Do you have a question for Alex about this particular issue?

Alex, over the next couple of days, will continue to exchange e-mails between yourself and our councilors and other interested folks on this topic because we'd like to equip our councilors with the right arguments and alliances that we need to be able to have your amended motion be the one that council considers. Alex, thanks again for the drafting on that. I wish the redline had less red on it, but the work that you needed to do is what it is. I get that. So Marie will report later about what she learned in conversations with the new Chair of council. Thanks, Alex.

ALEX DEACON:

Thanks, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Any other questions?

Okay. I'm going to turn the screenshare to the policy calendar—I hope it's on the screen now—and go back to the top. The first thing I wanted to do is to thank Alex Deacon, along with Andy Abrams, Chris Wilson, Tim Smith, Mason Cole, and Statton for what we submitted back at the

end of September. We haven't done any formal public comments since then.

There are multiple public comments that are open right now. The first one is a relatively minor amendment to the .jobs registry agreement. Those comments close in about twelve days. Per their 2005 top-level domain agreement, .jobs was run as a sponsor top-level domain, or an sTLD. We don't have those anymore because new gTLDs allow you to accomplish the same thing without that sort of that [inaudible]. So under the conditions of their sponsorship agreement for that TLDs, the registry operator had to use somebody to evaluate whether a registrant for .jobs met the criteria. For years—15 years—they've used the Society for Human Resource Management. This proposal is for the registry operator to take that evaluator role on itself of retaining all of the requirements that are in there. That would make it more similar to sponsored TLDs that asia, [arrow], xxx, and coop, and it would make it more similar to new gTLDs, where a new gTLD operator, like .bank, for instance, would indicate the criteria for registrants. But they don't have to use a third-party group to vet registrants against their criteria. They are responsible to hold registrants to the criteria, and that's part of part of the compliance enforcement that ICANN does.

I gave you a long explanation because I didn't get a volunteer to draft a comment. I propose that the BC support the amendment. So it'd be a very short e-mail indicating that we support.

Now, Zak, I just saw you pop up. Thank you for that—into the comment. But, Zak, let me ask you to speak to that. Would you agree that, at this

point, we are in a position to support, or would you like to add any more to it? Go ahead, Zak.

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: Hi, Steve. Yeah, position to support. I think it takes much more than a few lines of some background and support to do this.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Zak. I would welcome your help in drafting just a very short sentence or two. The BC should hold true to our view that registrant restrictions should be enforced and they can't just be kicked to the curb. Remember .museum and what we went through with them in their intention to blow up their registrant agreement and requirements? So we want to maybe repeat and cite that, too. Thank you, Zak. I appreciate that.

The next one up is recommended early warning for the root zone scaling. This is about a ten- or eleven-page proposal that came from ICANN's Office of the Chief Technology Officer. We always call that acronym OCTO. I'm not exactly sure where this came from, but it has in it some nuggets that we can use.

Mark Svancarek, who I didn't know could be ... I don't know if Mark was able to stay on the call. I'm looking right now. I think he was unable to make this call, but he and I have exchanged in planning for this. Thank you for volunteering, Mark. We believe that there's an opportunity here to leverage what OCTO claimed. They believe that it's important to have an early warning system in case the rate of adding new gTLDs to the

root begins to be a rate that exceeds security and stability obligations. One of the reasons they cited—they only cited four or five—is that anti-DNS-abuse communities might have trouble dealing with a greatly increased number of new gTLDs as they track down where a registrant is and how to get the registrant information.

Mark and I believe that this creates an opportunity and that we should draft a comment suggesting certain metrics on DNS abuse that could be baked in. Now, why would this suddenly get everyone's attention? Well, you know there's a whole community at ICANN plus ICANN Org who is desperate to get the next round going and doesn't want to see any impediments to adding new gTLDs to the root. So we could insert DNS abuse concerns into the root expansion discussion as a result of this comment. That's where I'm going with that with Mark Svancarek.

Is there anyone else that wants to join us on that effort?

WAUDO SIGANGA: Yeah, you can put me in there, Steve. Waudu here.

STEVE DELBIANCO: [inaudible]. And that was Waudu, right?

WAUDO SIGANGA: Yeah. I'll join that.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Waudo, for helping us with that. It's a very short comment. Start by reading the comment, and then I will write to Mark Svancarek so he knows you're helping, too.

Next one up is the PTI budgets. Now, Jimson and Tim Smith and Arinola as part of the Finance Committee have already volunteered to draft the BC comment. They always do these comments for us. Jimson already drafted the first one. It's Attachment #6. I circulated it as part of the update today.

Jimson, anything particular you want to add about the draft you circulated today?

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Yeah, Steve. Well, one thing I just found interesting is that, yes, while ICANN has always been improving in regard to their budgeting, this time around I just noted that, with regard to the executive summary, there was no mention of the total amount involved for the PTI budget. That's one we have always highlighted—that, in an executive summary, an executive should be able to just, at a glance, have an idea of the totality of the cost involved. So we pointed that out. Basically, the provision for continuous improvement and then the budget allocation is stable. So we have no serious objection to the proposal. Thank you, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Jimson. And Lawrence notes in the chat that he will also review the report and offer comments on that draft. Thank you again.

Next one is a preliminary issue report on a brand-new TLD to review an old program called inter-register transfer policy, now called the transfer policy. I already want to thank Susan, who just had to drop, and Jay Chapman for volunteering to draft a BC comment. This is a new policy for transfers of a registration from one registrar to another. That's due the 30th, and Jay and Susan have already begun that.

Is there anyone else who wants to join them as a volunteer?

WAUDO SIGANGA: Hello, Steve. I think I'll do that as well.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Waudo. Waudo to help with transfer. Great. Thank you. Anyone else?

Okay. The next one up is the IANA naming function review. We need a volunteer to help with this. It's not until December the 2nd. I'm happy to bother you all about it at our meeting in two weeks, but this shouldn't be too difficult. And the BC has been very active in this area since we were key to the IANA transition that created the IANA naming functions review. We do need a volunteer that may be interested in this. It's an idea about the way in which a particular function gets revised vis-à-vis its ability to satisfy its customers. The IANA naming function review is all about the things that IANA used to do when it was under contract with the U.S. but now does, as part of its contract, ICANN.

Is there anybody with a particular interest in this area or experience who wants to jump in and volunteer right now?

I'll circle back on that in the next couple weeks. Finally, there's a brand-new registration that just came out on the root name service strategy and implementation. Those comments close the 8th of December. There's only two real goals for what they're doing. They're trying to distribute the root server instance in diverse locations around the world and protect the [confidentiality], integrity, and availability during an attack. It's another eleven-page report. So, any of you who are experts in cyber security state actor attacks on the Internet, this is a great one to jump into. Eleven-page report. It's juicy stuff, like the attacks on the root server system. And you'll get to you show your expertise and help you BC colleagues look good.

Mark Datysgeld, I knew you would jump at this one. It's a juicy one. But there must be somebody else on the BC who's a first-time contributor that would find this interesting, too.

JIMSON OLUFUYE:

Well, I will support Mark.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Great. Thank you. And Vivek, too. Thank you, Vivek. Thank you.

All right. Let me move down to the next section, which is [inaudible] to council. We have a new councilor, Mark Datysgeld—congratulations—and Marie Pattullo. So what I've done here is summarized the last council meeting/what happened and teed things up for the next council meeting, which will be the 19th of November. We don't have an agenda yet.

With that, I want to turn it over to Marie and Mark. Just tell me when to scroll.

MARIE PATTULLO:

Thanks, Steve. I'll start because, last council, we didn't have Mark with us. But now I'm very, very glad we do. I will keep this short because we don't have a lot of time.

The main parts I was happy about were to see that we now have movement on the next part of the EPDP. They're calling it Phase 2A. But what that really means is that we're kicking off the work on legal versus natural and anonymized e-mails. The councilors already sent out a message asking us to reconfirm that our reps are prepared to give up another three or four months of their lives to do this. I know that Mark has already confirmed.

Margie, I know that you've got a life. I know that you have a job. But we would be incredibly grateful if you could stay in role on this one. As far as we're concerned, keeping the same people there with the same knowledge is clearly the more practical.

The other side of that is that there will be a scoping group on accuracy—registrant data accuracy—not limited to what happened in the EPDP. Much wider. That scoping group will be looking at everything.

Thanks, Margie, for your message in the chat. Thank you very much.

When we get the call for volunteers on accuracy, we will of course let you know, but that's likely to be quite some way down the line. We keep pushing for that to be sooner rather than later, and we will keep

pushing for that to be sooner rather than later, but I'm making no promises.

They're also kicking off a new EPDP about IDNs. Now, bear in mind this doesn't mean it will be the same as the one we just had. "Expedited" in this sense only means you don't have a first issues report. It just means it'll be a bit faster. (Brackets. And hopefully closed brackets.) Mark, being an expert in IDNs, has very kindly agreed to be involved in that.

Back to Rec 7, there's going to be discussion also about this new idea from ICANN Org to have what they're calling an operational design phase. Steve, if you could scroll just a little bit so we could get the bottom of that paragraph, we talked about this, as you know, at our last meeting. A number of people picked it up from various meetings during ICANN69. The Board needs a lot of information if it's going to take a sensible decision on anything that comes out of GNSO Council. That includes, how much is it going to cost, how long is it going to take, do we have staff? That kind of stuff. So Org's idea is to formalize this helping-out-the-Board part by having what they're calling an operational design phase.

Now, they've asked for comments in quite a woolly way. There's no actual deadline. Just "soon." And "It would be nice if." There's a lot of concern in some parts of the GNSO that this is going to delay things. It will be yet another line of bureaucracy. There are others that think it makes complete sense. It can happen at the same time as things are progressing through the GNSO procedure. Either way, there should be some BC and/or CSG comments on that.

So I'd like you to put your thinking caps on about that, please. I know that some of you already have views.

Coming back, Steve, to Rec 7, well, I think Alex pretty much said it all. Pam, the Vice Chair, drafted a motion based on the "intent." She was trying to ascertain the intent of Mark and Margie and the other guys on the EPDP as to what they meant by Rec 7. We don't think it should be about intent. We think it should be straightforward procedure. According to the GNSO procedures, you cannot amend a consensus policy in an IRT. You just can't in an implementation review team. The only way you can amend a consensus policy is for the GNSO to do it via a PDP. So Alex has redrafted Pam's quite long motion into a quite shorter, much more targeted motion. It will probably be led by our colleague from the BC on the council—that's John McElwaine—the reason being he's done a lot of the legal drafting work on this before with Pam. So it would be a good way to try to put that through.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Question.

MARIE PATTULLO: Go on.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Marie, I wanted to ask if you would talk a little bit about some of the back channel you've done with other councilors to see whether they're amenable to amending that motion. And how do we respond to the statement that the Board, when it wrote to the council about Rec 7 ... It

asked, what was the intention? I'm afraid that that gives Pam and others who've drafted this the ability to say, "We have to keep the intention stuff in. It's what we were asked to do." Thanks, Marie.

MARIE PATTULLO:

Sure. On the second question, response to the Board, that will be a question of terminology in the letter, we can work that out. On the first question, I have only as yet spoken to the IPC councilors. I've spoken to the one of the ISP councilors as well. My impression at the moment is it's not so much what it says in the motion. It's just, "Get this damn thing done" because the IRT is being held up. Let's be blunt about this, Steve. Thick WHOIS is about to die a million deaths. It's going to fall on a very large spike and die. I would like to tell you that that's not going to be the case. It is going to be the case. However, if we get a proper PDP, we can scope it out correctly, we can have it done properly, and, most importantly, we comply with GNSO procedures. That part of it—the process point and the scoping point for the charter—has to be the important.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Mark, anything to add? And anyone have questions for Mark and Marie?

MARK DATYSGELD:

I do have some points to add, but, please, if anybody has questions for Marie, that would be the priority now.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

I don't see questions yes, so, please, Mark. And welcome.

MARK DATYSGELD:

Thank you very much, Steve. Thank you very much, Marie, as well. I continue to rely on your counsel in this journey into the GNSO. I will be stepping into the IDN policy track, which I think is something interesting that I can try to bring to the table, trying to bring some technical aspects to the representation of the BC, [Marie's] such as champion in policy. And I think that I can start picking up some slack in other areas so that we are pretty much everywhere.

I also think very positively about how the council is shaping up. We do have five LAC representatives this time around. I have prior relationships with all but one of them, which I think is very good in terms of trying to galvanize them from a regional perspective. The new NCSG Chair, Bruna, also happens to be somebody I've worked with for several years. She's Brazilian. So I do see a bridge there for us to try to start working better with the NCSG, at least on some matters.

So, during this month, we have a training month right now since we don't get to do the GNSO Summit that would be taking place among the different councilors. But I'm trying to use this month as best as I can to find the allies that we need to get this strategy going that we were discussing and that Mason pointed out and that I think is the best bet forward for the BC, which is trying to consolidate alliances and trying to find creative ways to further our policymaking.

So this is what I have been concentrating on. I will keep, through the month of November, doing that. I'm very happy to serve the

constituency and look forward to everybody's feedback on what's going on. Thank you very much.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Mark. That's fantastic. Marie, did you want to add something for your colleagues about the strategic planning session?

MARIE PATTULLO: Not at all. I was just translating the summit in case anybody didn't know what Mark meant. We get together. The new guys get to know each other. We learn about fun stuff like the picket fence, which Mark will love. More seriously, we start to work as a collegiate entity. That's the whole point of the SPS. Not quite so easy [inaudible] but we do our best. And, Mark, it's fantastic to have you on board. Absolutely fantastic.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Marie, let's do this. Let's have a call with Mark to explain and get him up to speed on this whole Rec 7 IRT thing. It's not something Mark has followed that closely. And the rest of us that've been working on it for years should walk through this strategy of getting it through council or fighting the good fight in council. Okay?

MARIE PATTULLO: I'd love to, Steve, but my agenda is completely blacked out until Friday afternoon. I've got back-to-backs. I just can't get out.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Let's do it next week then. Would that be all right?

MARIE PATTULLO: With pleasure.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you. All right. Let me turn to Channel 3, which is the Commercial Stakeholders Group, which is ably managed by Barbara Wanner. Barbara, I'd like to turn it over to you. And I've highlighted items that, I think, you wanted to focus on.

BARBARA WANNER: Right. Thank you, Steve, very much. The first probably most important thing—it's a carryover from ICANN69—is I don't want people to forget that our meeting with our Board members, Becky Burr and Matthew Shears, is scheduled now for the 17th of November at 21:00 UTC. Chantelle sent around a calendar invitation maybe last week or something. So, if you check your inbox, it should be there. She sent it to CSG Private, so that means it went to everybody.

As we discussed on earlier calls, the topics that will raise with them are aimed at following up on our meeting with the Board—specifically the evolution of the EPDP to the centralized model and Alex's presentation on using the Salesforce software as a very practical and economical way to take that forward. We'd also want to ask for a status report on ICANN Org's outreach to the EU for legal clarity concerning GDPR and the

implications of ICANN serving as the ... main controller? Joint controller, I guess, technically. Again, our interest in data accuracy ... Perhaps Marie can talk a little bit about what's happening in council on that. And then just to review with them again, even though the Board, in my view, kept kicking the can down the road, saying, "This will be a long, drawn-out process involving the Empowered Community," and so on and so forth—but our concerns about how the NomCom is approaching implementation of the RIWG changes to the [end], which would require a bylaws amendment and our concerns about that—about having stakeholders that are not members of the GNSO having a say in how our participation in the NomCom is weighted. So those are the topics that we'll focus on with Matthew and Becky.

The second item is Attachment 2 that Steve has included regarding the upcoming GNSO review mandated by the ICANN bylaws and Mart[in's] request for our consideration of that matter and whether this delay should be reviewed. We will probably be discussing this on our next CSG ExCom call and how we want to take that forward. So I really would appreciate, if members have very firm views on what they'd like to see happen, that they notify me via e-mail. That next meeting of the CSG ExCom probably will be in the next couple of weeks. Brenda sent out a Doodle poll, so we're getting that firmed up.

As you know, Dean Marks and Mason have led the charge, convening informally, to discuss how we can take forward and realize progress in terms of improvements to enforcement of DNS abuse. I have requested that Dean and Mason brief the CSG ExCom on their progress to date at our next meeting when we have that date firmed up and what they feel a good strategy would be in terms of taking that forward as was

discussed during the candidates call. A lot of this will entail building alliances, building new alliances, not only within the CSG, because the ISPC quite frankly is a bit not adverse to this but they haven't waxed a lot of enthusiasm about it. So we have to bring them on board as well as understand how best to reach out to other potential allies.

I already talked about the NomCom review and our concerns about that. We'll see what Matthew and Becky have to say about that and our concerns about taking this forward, involving the Empowered Community consideration of a bylaws revision and so forth and so on.

As I said earlier, a lot of the follow-up items from ICANN69 we will address at our next CSG ExCom call. People should understand that the ISPCP will assume the CSG coordinate a role going forward for the next two ICANN meetings. So Waudo will be a very important participant in the CSG ExCom and I'm sure will be soliciting your input CSG priorities for the next two ICANN meetings.

That's it for me, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thanks, Barbara. I really appreciate it. While you were speaking, in chat Marie Pattullo and I at least think that we ought to support the ATRT3 recommendation to delay the GNSO review. We are not in a position to really get much out of a GNSO review right now since it will not look at the comprehensive structure of GNSO.

BARBARA WANNER:

Okay.

STEVE DELBIANCO: So I'm inviting other BC members to weigh in because we want to give Barbara as much support as we can to make a decision that reflects the BC preferences. But, unless we see some objections, the BC will lean towards supporting the request to delay the GNSO review.

BARBARA WANNER: Sounds good.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Any questions for Barbara?

Okay. Fantastic. I'm going to go back to Claudia to conclude the meeting. I'll close down my share.

Claudia?

Claudia is off mute but I don't hear her.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Okay. Steve. So maybe I could take it from here.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Great.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Very quickly, thank you so much, Steve and Barbara, for excellent reporting.

In regard to finance and operations, a major part of the operation has been handled. That is the election. We'll continue with the election process with ballots being sent shortly.

I would like to report to you that, following the annual report that was produced that the ExCom approved that you also consented to at the close of the FY19, the report has been filed with [Aris] by general counsel, and we are fully in compliance.

Also, with regards to payment issues, we are still around 85.5%. Just to urge members who are yet to pay you to please check with your finance department or accounts payable and expedite the process. But, unfortunately, members who are not fully paid up will not receive a ballot, regrettably. So, if you don't receive the ballot, it means that you have to be in financial compliance with regards to your dues.

So that is all from me. Thank you very much.

It appears we still can't reach Claudia. Claudia is yet to be back.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Hello? Can you hear me?

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Yes, we can hear you.

CLAUDIA SELLI:

Yeah? Okay. Sorry. I think I was double-muted. I don't know what happened. But I just wanted to thank everybody for participating into the call and for all the candidates who stepped forward. If there are no other comments or any other business from the members, I think we can end the call and stop the recording.

I see no questions or no points to be raised in the chat or from the participants list. So, with that, I think we can close the call. Thank you, everybody.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]