BRENDA BREWER:	Good day, all. Welcome to the Business Constituency members' call on the 2nd of September, 2020, at 15:00 UTC. This meeting is being recorded. Kindly state your name when speaking for the transcript and keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid background noise. Attendance will be recorded via Zoom. I would like to turn the call over to Claudia Selli. Thank you very much.
CLAUDIA SELLI:	Thank you very much, everybody, for attending today's call. You have the agenda in front of you. As usual, we'll start with the policy discussion, to continue with the council update, and the CSG report, and operation and finance. Under AOB, if you have any points, please let us know. We can eventually take that space for anything you would like to discuss farther. With that, I will pass the floor over to Steve for the policy discussion.
STEVE DELBIANCO:	Morning, Claudia. Thank you for that. Hey, everyone. I sent a policy calendar around yesterday, so that's on the screen right now. You should have it in your inbox. If you don't, I can resend it, or Brenda can.
	We found no new comments in the last two weeks, so I can scroll immediately to the currently open public comment. It is on the final report of the New GTLD Subsequent Procedures. We call it "SubPro," which is a strange name, but it really is about, what will be the process to solicit, submit, evaluate applications for new top-level domains, new gTLDs? There is no assumption, here.

There will be a single round, like there was in 2012. It might well be a continuous update. There is so much in here. It is a long report, at 360 pages. What I would refer you to is the summary of changes, and all of this is linked in my policy calendar. It's only 13 pages. It shows the summary of changes since the initial report, and we did file on the initial report.

Next week, the working group itself is hosting a webinar—that's the [14th] of September, I have a link to that—where they will walk through their final report. So, for the volunteers that we get between now and the 14th, that would be a great call to tune in on. They walk through key elements in that final report.

Now, the BC has done a lot of work on the Subsequent Procedures over the past four years. Most recently, one year ago, we commented on assumptions that ICANN Org wanted to make to drive it. Marie, Mark, [inaudible], Jimson, Lars did a great job on that. So, I'm looking at you as most recent interactors with the SubPro.

And then, in January 2019, we did Work Track 5. We've gone on work tracks one and four. And then, we did comments back in 2017 and 2018. So, practically a dozen BC members have worked on the Subsequent Procedures, and there are BC members with companies who might well be interested in applying for either brand or other Generic Top-Level Domains in the future. And that's fine, to represented their perspective on there, as well.

Our perspective is that of registrants and users and not registry operators. We have business-focused people in the BC that can comment

on this, as well. Do I have any volunteers I can add to the list right now who will help us work on this?

MASON COLE: Steve, I'll volunteer.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Mason, fantastic. Thank you. Any other BC members? I'm looking at the chat. Trying to keep track of this.

TIM SMITH: Hi, Steve. I'd be happy to help out, as well.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Great. Tim and Mason. Fantastic. [Statin], you too? Great. So, [Statin], Tim, and Mason, would you please mark your calendar for the 14th of September? It will be important to attend that webinar. We'll all be on there together. Maybe you can get a group chat or Skype chat going. That will be an opportunity to see where we're going to focus things.

Vivek, are you on the call today? I don't see Vivek, but I will ping him to see if he can help, as well. He's really good at this. All right. Thank you. Let me go onto the topic of modifying WHOIS policies for GDPR. In here, in the policy calendar, I do a recap for anybody who wants to catch up. I have a couple of updates.

If you remember, back in May, the BC decided to tentatively allocate $20,000 from our 2021 outreach budget, knowing that we wouldn't do a

lot of in-person outreach this year. That was to cover a study that Interisle Consulting will do on WHOIS data accuracy: how much is still available, how much it's redacted under the temporary spec, and then this key distinction between who is a natural person versus a legal entity. These are distinctions that are being studied in, potentially, Phase 3 of the ePDP. We have maintained all along that they're really important distinctions.

So, as of two weeks ago, Interisle say that they have got two additional participants. So, they believe they will have the funding and will begin their commitments shortly. I'll keep you updated on that.

With respect to the ePDP, back on the 23rd of August, which was between the last call and this one, the GAC, Government Advisory Committee, put in a minority statement. It included, right up top, that the GAC was interested in having our support.

So, we quickly did a weekend, or I asked if any BC members had objections to the BC supporting the GAC statement. There were no objections. And so, the GAC has suggested that the BC, IPC, and the ALAC and SSAC support the statement that they put in.

Now, the GAC objected to recommendations of the ePDP. They came up with five that they objected to, and the BC also objected to the very same ones. This is pretty significant, because the GAC is pretty much the sole beneficiary of the SSAD system, the automated system, that was designed in Phase 2, since law enforcement and governments would be the only ones who could be accredited entities.

So, it's actually quite gratifying that the GAC took a look at that system that gives them some benefit and said, "Look, this system isn't good

enough. It doesn't give businesses the ability to protect their consumers. It doesn't evolve over time." They had several other specific complaints about it.

So, the GAC is likely to withhold their support and convey that to the board. Again, the GAC doesn't vote on council, nor does SSAC or ALAC. So, it'll end up coming down to a vote on council. I still believe that, when council meets, September the 24th, council will likely approve this with the voting of the contracted parties on one side of the house.

And then, in the other house, we'll see the NCSG support it, and the ISPs are likely to support. They have said in writing that it would not object to anything in the report. But again, I would leave it to Marie and Scott to share what they're hearing from the ISPs.

Now, I wanted to let you know that they issued a brand new Phase 2 final report, which was updated to include all of the different minority statements. I attached that to the policy calendar and I have a link to it. that came out on the 25th of August.

I've included a link to Matt Serlin's blog. GoDaddy owns the company that Matt is part of called Brandsight, and his blog lamented the hard work that went into it and considers that maybe those who are objecting to the SSAD are being shortsighted. He believes that it creates a path for progress, and we respectfully disagree.

Again, we're grateful to Margie and Mark for the work you did, and, Alex Deacon, for your help, as well. So, unless there are any comments on the ePDP, I'll turn things over to Marie and Scott. I'll look for hands. Again, this is a great time for Margie and Mark, if there is anything you two

would like to add, or Alex. Great. Not seeing any hands, it's over to Marie and Scott for council.

MARIE PATTULLO: Hi, Steve. Am I coming through okay?

STEVE DELBIANCO: You are.

MARIE PATTULLO: Great. Thank you. Thank you for putting the latest info from council into the policy calendar. There isn't really too much more I can say. You've already seen the notes of council that I circulated just after the last meeting on the 20th. We don't yet have the agenda for the next one.

There were three items that went through on the consent agenda, as expected. Nothing remotely controversial there. Naturally, most of the discussion was about the EPDP. By that point, we didn't have the minority statements from the GAC or the SSAC, but we do have ours.

Naturally, they were received in the way that we expected—i.e., badly. We had a lot of hyperbole from the registrars. We're used to that. We had some soul-beating from the non-contractuals. We're used to that.

As Steve said, when it comes to the point of voting, if it is to be this month, which we still believe it will be, we assume/presume that you, the BC members, will give Scott and I clear instructions to vote against. I'd

find it very odd if you didn't, bearing in mind our minority statement, but we're not in charge of this process. The membership is.

I also assume the IPC will vote against. But as Steve said, that doesn't give us the votes. It's still going to go through. This is now … Well, I assume it's still going to go through. My crystal ball needs a good polish. This is now going to be in the hands of those outside the council.

As you know, when the council adopts something, it goes to the board, but the board doesn't rubber stamp. It then takes advice from the advisory committees, so including GAC, SSAC, ALAC, all of whom are more on our side of the table than our dear friends in the contracted party and Non-Commercial Stakeholders Groups.

So, there is still a possibility. There is still time, as Steve was outlining, for something to happen. There is going to be a webinar that council is holding about the ePDP, Phase 2. It's going to be tomorrow evening. Well, my evening. It's at 21:00 UTC.

I would invite all of you who can to attend—not that I think we're going to be able to have any influence, but because I think it's important that we gather intelligence so we know what the council is saying to the outside world because, although this is a council webinar, observers are welcome. This—

STEVE DELBIANCO: Marie?

MARIE PATTULLO: Yes?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Marie, real quick. On that point of tomorrow's council webinar, you and Scott will be allowed to do comments, do chat, and ask questions.

MARIE PATTULLO: Absolutely.

STEVE DELBIANCO: So, why don't we open up the BC-EPDP Skype channel during the council session tomorrow, and we can feed questions and considerations that you and Scott can put into the mix. Would that be okay?

MARIE PATTULLO: That would be not just okay—that would be welcome, Steve. I would go further. If any members are not on that Skype channel that we have, you've all got my e-mail address, you've all got Scott's e-mail address. Feel free to ping us at any point during the meeting if we're letting any balls drop.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yeah. And Mark Datysgeld, as our incoming councilor, who will have to deal with so much of the post-ePDP, you should definitely be on that council webinar tomorrow, as well. Thank you, Mark. Back to you, Marie. Sorry for the interruption.

MARIE PATTULLO: No, no. Please. It was a welcome interruption. You also know there are a few bits that were so-called "remaining" from the Phase 2 report. I say "so-called" because, in the view of the BC and our colleagues in the IPC, we thought/believed that they would actually be dealt with in Phase 2, and they were not.

It's not that they weren't looked at. They were brushed aside, brushed under the table—very entrenched positions of our colleagues refusing to discuss them further. You see them there: legal against natural persons.

As you will all know, the GDPR does not apply to legal persons' data— that is, data of companies. The contracted parties believe it's too difficult to make that separation, and/or they simply don't want to. And the feasibility of unique and anonymized e-mail addresses.

Now, what we have been pushing for in council is for these issues to be dealt with as soon as possible. As you saw earlier in the policy calendar, the GAC agrees with us. We are in a very small minority of people that want this to happen as soon as possible. We're pushing hard.

I'm not going to tell you we're winning, because we're not. I remain concerned that nothing will happen on this before the ICANN AGM in October, whether that is on purpose. Whether they are deliberately kicking it into the long grass, well, I'll let you guys decide that for yourself, but it's certainly my impression.

However, there is a parallel but separate track on data accuracy, which of course goes far wider than the ePDP because, as you all know, there is

an awful lot of registrant data out there that is simply fictitious/made-up/incorrect, apart from the stuff that is simply inaccurate.

There does seem to be—we have it in writing in the chat and comments in the last meeting—support that we can start work on that quite soon. Now, again, don't get excited because they're talking about a full-blown PDP.

We will all be in retirement homes by the time anything happens, but we're not letting this go. This is something that does have to happen. You know my personal opinion, that I think it's somewhere between laughable and absurd that we're building a system based upon data we all know is inaccurate.

Now, the starting phase for that would be a scoping team, and I am pushing hard for that scoping team to start work as soon as is feasible, and I mean what we mean by data accuracy. What should this working group look at? What are the different things we need to consider? I firmly believe that scoping team should not be councilors only: underlined, underlined. You'll be hearing more from me about that. There are only a couple of the other topics, Steve, if you could scroll down a bit. Or Brenda, I'm sorry. I think you're in charge of the screen.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yep. And Marie, there's a question in the chat.

MARIE PATTULLO: Oh, I'm sorry.

EN

STEVE DELBIANCO: "Is it agreed that on the [23rd] of September—

MARIE PATTULLO: Nope.

STEVE DELBIANCO: There will be two packages voted?

MARIE PATTULLO: Don't know.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Wow. Okay.

MARIE PATTULLO: Do you know?

STEVE DELBIANCO: And, "Is there any work we need to do between now and the 24th to help make that happen?"

MARIE PATTULLO: We know, as you remember, just before our last meeting, as in about ten minutes before our last meeting, we got an e-mail from council leadership suggesting that it should be in two packages, which we all

agree with because … Package two would be something that we could agree with. That could go up to the board. It would help with the implementation of the first phase.

And I didn't see any objection to that in council. I heard a lot of noises about timing, and beating of chests, and weeping, but I didn't see anything objecting to that going through in two packages.

However, Steve, you picked up on a comment that I put into my notes to council, which was—I'm just scrolling up—actually a comment that Marika, who, as you all know, is staff, made in the chat to council, where she said, "It may mean voting on individual resolved clauses or having separate motions." We're still figuring that one out.

Now, Steve, I know that you believe we should not go into individual clauses and it should be in two separate packages, but this is the only thing I've seen about that, and it was in the chat during council.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Got it. And I worry that NCSG will push for some other voting, because they don't want us to get package two if [everybody] has package one, which would potentially lead them to say, "Let's just vote on the whole thing as a single package," and then we get nothing.

So, let's be on our guard against that. We might even say that we agreed not to ask for a deferral because, at the August meeting, it was made clear we have two packages. If NCSG is going to turn that over and dump it all into a single up-or-down vote, then we will ask for a deferral. Something like that.

EN

MARIE PATTULLO: That's interesting. I haven't seen anything at all out of the NCSG. Would I ask if Mark or Margie have any details on what might be happening there? Not with the NCSG, I mean. I mean with the entire voting package. Margie has got her hand up.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Go ahead, Margie.

MARGIE MILAM: Hi. No, I don't have any visibility into that. I haven't heard a thing about it. Our ePDP list has been very quiet since all the minority statements were submitted.

[MARK DATYSGELD:]   Yeah. Likewise, I haven't heard anything.

MARIE PATTULLO: Thanks, guys. If you do, can you make sure to give me a heads up/give us a heads up, please?

[MARK DATYSGELD:]   Okay.

MARIE PATTULLO: Thank you. So, to your original question, Steve, I don't know. Maybe we can get some more out of this on tomorrow evening's webinar. I assume that that would at least have to be raised, bearing in mind leadership themselves suggested the two-package approach.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yep, and I would advocate that, somewhere early in the discussion, you and Scott ask that question, in a way that just confirms what you discussed in the August council meeting, just to confirm we're going to do a two-package vote the way that leadership laid it out. That way, it's stated as an assumption, and we can get it confirmed on the webinar.

MARIE PATTULLO: Got it. Noted. I'll make sure that we get that in. Thank you. Is there anything else on the ePDP, Steve, or can I move on?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Not from me. Anyone else? Okay. Marie?

MARIE PATTULLO: Great. Thank you. You see a list of other issues. The only one that I'd like to raise today is something we've talked about before, but just in case. I wouldn't say we've hit an impasse in council. That's not true. But we are going around in a circle.

You remember that, under the new bylaws, there is an independent review process. Under that new Independent Review Process, there is

going to be what's called a "standing panel." So, any time there is an Independent Review Process, IRP, dispute, panelists will be chosen from that standing panel. So, good so far. Problem is, how do we choose who's going to go on the standing panel?

Now, this has been going around the community for a long time. It has been batted back and forth, with the board pointing out it's not for them to choose, it's for the community to choose, which is true.

There was a suggestion that the guys who are trying to work on the implementation—it's yet another acronym, the Implementation Oversight Team—should also serve as this committee, selection committee, for want of a better term, who would choose who is going to be on the panel.

The problem with that is they haven't got the bandwidth, it's really technical, it's really complex. And then, it was batted around as to whether council should choose. We and most other people don't think we should, because it's not actually a council function.

So, as you see that Steve has put in the policy calendar, what we agreed in council is that we're probably—not definitely, but probably—going to ask us, ask the stakeholder groups and constituencies to put forward appropriate experts.

But how? How many experts? Does anybody have any views on this? If they do, they don't have to raise their hand now, although it would be great if you did. But I really don't know which way the BC wants to jump on this, so I'd be very grateful if anyone does have any views. And it is important, you know?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yeah. Marie, I'll just share this with you.

MARIE PATTULLO: Please.

STEVE DELBIANCO: When we did the transition, we designed a mechanism for the ACs and SOs to put forth members of review teams, like the ATRT review team. If you recall, there was a specific process. There were seven ACs and SOs, and they had three each for a total of 21. What is the quantity of people that are going to be on the standing panel?

MARIE PATTULLO: Don't know. This was one of the questions: "How many experts?"

STEVE DELBIANCO: Well, consider that it's possible that you could get to that—something like the same bylaws' documented process by which the ACs and SOs designate people to be on the review teams, the specific reviews.

So, even if the specific reviews get juggled a little bit, that came up with a workable process to get 21 people, that is three from each of the ACs and SOs … You recall, though, that if one AC—like, let's suppose, the Root Server Security Advisory Commission –didn't give you three, then there were openings in the 21, and then others could nominate alternates and

extras that could be selected. So, there is still some selection process there. But all that is written about in the bylaws. Thanks.

MARIE PATTULLO: Okay. Thank you. I don't think there is anything else I can raise. I don't know if Scott wants to bring anything forward?

SCOTT MCCORMICK: Nope. Thanks, Marie.

MARIE PATTULLO: Okay. I'm out. Thanks.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Scott and Marie. Next up is channel three, which was the Commercial Stakeholders Group. Barbara leads this area for us and has been doing a lot of work, but I don't think Barbara was able to make today's call. Unless you're dialing in?

CLAUDIA SELLI: No, Steve, Barbara is not here today because she had a conflicted call. I don't know how you want to do …

STEVE DELBIANCO: Why don't you [do this]?

EN

CLAUDIA SELLI: Sure, sure, sure.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Claudia, you were on it. Go ahead.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Yeah. I just wanted to update, first of all, on the ICANN69 topics for the plenary. The three topics have been approved in the order: "The Domain Name System Abuse Practical Solution;" "Domain Name Service Marketplace, Market Dynamics, Business Model, and Commercial Driver;" and the third one is "Consumer Protection Post-WHOIS." So, these are the three plenaries that are going to take place. Then, also, we had a—

STEVE DELBIANCO: Claudia, as it says in the policy calendar, though, we need to come up with the agenda, text, and then possible speakers for number one and three—

CLAUDIA SELLI: Yes.

STEVE DELBIANCO: [Since those are] among the BC PICs.

EN

CLAUDIA SELLI: Yes, absolutely. Absolutely. We need the people that propose the three topics to help us, basically, construct the panel, that we can then propose in the different calls that are being organized.

So, if Mason and the others … Sorry, Steve. I don't recall all the names of people that volunteered or proposed those topics, I think. Is it Fred that, also, for the ePDP, for the WHOIS, proposed the team? If they can help us come up with a title, description, and possible speakers for those three, then we would be happy, also, to push them.

STEVE DELBIANCO: And Mason has said in the chat he would help with number one.

CLAUDIA SELLI: That's great. Fantastic. Thank you so much.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Fred? Is Fred on the call today? Because Fred is interested in number three.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Indeed.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Okay. Thank you. And then, you jumped right to that, but, at the beginning of the policy calendar for this segment, I was hoping you could describe the call that we held on the [inaudible].

EN

CLAUDIA SELLI: Absolutely. Yeah. That was my … I started with that, but certainly I think the most important update for the BC is the call that we had on 31st of August with the board and Göran. So, this was a follow-up call, just to clarify, to the one that we had in ICANN68. So, it was driven by the IPC that say that, in the end … Let's say that they conducted the majority of the call.

The idea: initially, we put together some questions for the board on the ePDP when we asked, basically … They talked about the [SSAD] model where three ACs are not supporting it. But basically, the board didn't want to discuss the topic. They thought that we should stick to the topics that were coming from the previous call. And so, ePDP, I thought, was covered during the last call, so they didn't want to respond. They simply said that they didn't want to prevent any type of outcome.

We also ask a question about the Strawberry Team and the work, whether this could be reinvigorated to make sure that we could obtain legal clearance, but also, there, it was taken up.

Basically, they asked to stick again to the topics, so all the rest of the conversation went into PPSAI, where Becky also suggested that we should move forward with the implementation, and the staff is also looking at recommendation and implementation. Also, some important areas will need to be revisited in light of the GDPR and ePDP. And also, I think there is [this analysis] paper being done that will be shared with IRT members.

The rest of the conversation was about DNS abuse, which was quite extensive. Becky said that the board was taking this issue very seriously and that the CSG and law enforcement were frustrated. Compliance was doing a comprehensive audit and I think, also, that, if I'm not mistaken, ICANN is putting together a paper to make everyone understand all the things that they are doing concerning DNS abuse. Yeah. And WHOIS accuracy is certainly within the remit.

Also, Becky made an important point that she thought that, sometimes, overlooked is a registry take-down, and that she knew that for personal reasons, and that many do take direct action and put names on servers on hold if they don't think that the registrars are responding quickly enough.

The conversation on DNS was quite, I think, appreciated by the different people. So, the idea was also to continue the conversation. On NomCom review implementation, well, the ISPCP just brought their view, which is that the CSG does not support the NomCom review recommendation, and that we support a holistic review of NomCom.

Then one question for the BC, which is quite important, is that the IPC put forward the idea of continuing the engagement with the board with just one topic, rather than having more than one topic discussed, according to the constituencies, in order to have an extensive discussion. Barbara is thinking that it's better to have more topics, rather than just one, but it's really up to the constituency to decide. So, I would really welcome thoughts and inputs on that one, on what we should either push back, or align with anyone.

STEVE DELBIANCO: And nothing further, Claudia? Nothing further from [me.]

CLAUDIA SELLI: Of course. Absolutely, Steve. Please jump in.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Oh, no. Nothing further from me. I'll bring it back to the full policy calendar, [inaudible] can continue with Barbara's [inaudible].

CLAUDIA SELLI: Sure.

STEVE DELBIANCO: After the call yesterday, Barbara commented that [inaudible] [comfortable] with the degree to which a single constituency dominated that session with the board, and at the end that, in future, the CSG [inaudible] do a single topic instead of multiple topics.

                          Barbara, [inaudible], Marie, Claudia, to some extent, and myself, are very concerned about that. If you end up with a single topic, it could exclude one of the constituencies in the CSG. So I, for one, believe we should continue to allow each constituency to suggest a topic, and that nobody gets locked out if we pick a single topic that doesn't include them.

                          So, I believe multiple topics is the way to go, at least for Barbara, Marie, and myself. I think that is it, except for one small update for GNSO Council

leadership. As you probably all know, we had supported Fouquart of the ISPs as chair. Well, just the other day, the NCSG said they would also support Philippe. And then, the NCSG, according to our agreement, will get to nominate the NCSG Non-Commercial Vice-Chair for council.

Does anyone on the call have any intelligence as to which of the councilors from NCSG would be the vice-chair? They've got a couple of new councilors coming on: Stephanie Perrin, Wisdom Donkor, and Tomslin. Mark Datysgeld said in the chat that it's not clear which of them would be the vice-chair. Rafik of the NCSG serves as vice-chair today. Yes, and we still have time. Yeah, that's right. Tatiana, right? Tatiana. Okay. Thanks, everyone. Claudia, that's it for the policy calendar. I'll go back to the rest of the agenda.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Thank you so much. With that, I will leave the floor to Jimson for the finance and operation update.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Okay. Thank you very much, Claudia. Greetings, everyone. I trust we are all keeping well with the pandemic still around. We are very trustful that a reliable vaccine rolls out shortly and we can see ourselves again very soon.

As I mentioned at the last meeting, concerning our account status, yeah, the transition of account management from Stevan Lieberman of Greenberg & Lieberman to Marylenny Iglesias of I & O Law is completed. We have just one account now, and that is with Wells Fargo. The account

we used to have with CaixaBank in Malaga, Spain, has been closed, as many of us are aware. I would like to use this opportunity to thank my predecessor, Chris Chaplow, who is based in Malaga, Spain, who had diligently managed the account since it was opened about ten years ago.

I believe I'll be speaking on our behalf to also thank CaixaBank, while being a member, for their cooperation, commitment, and understanding. They are still a reliable member in good standing [inaudible]. So, we thank CaixaBank.

Membership payment compliance is still at about 76%. While I thank all the members that have responded positively, I would like to use this opportunity to encourage all member reps to please check if they are in compliance.

As you know, a BC officers election is approaching, and only those members in good standing will be able to vote. Your votes really count, please. So, do feel free to reach me or do invoice the secretariat if yet to see your invoice or you're having one issue or the other.

Talking about our upcoming officers and BC credentials and Finance Committee elections from next month, I do expect the process [notification] this week. The offices open, that of the chair, the BC, the vice-chair policy coordination, vice-chair finance and operations, and, of course, all of the CSG reps.

A number of us, me in particular, are time-limited. And so, looking forward to handshaking with the new vice-chair by the end of the election in January next year.

As you know, we do kind of publish newsletters consistently for every ICANN meeting. And so, for the upcoming ICANN69, the process is on. Please submit any article you may have to either myself, Brenda, or Chantelle.

There shortly will be an advisory on CROP leadership support opportunity for FY 2021, but we know COVID is still a major challenge in travels until next year, but it would be good for us to be fully aware of what we have. After all, we can still do virtual outreach, just as we are publishing our newsletter. Well, this is what I have on my table now, and I will be turning back to you, Claudia. Thank you.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Thank you so much, Jimson. I just wanted to check if there is other business that any member wants to bring up, or questions. I can't see anyone and anything. So, if there are no other issues, then the next meeting is going to be on 16th of September, 3:00 UTC. With that, we can resume the meeting and [I'll give you back] 20 minutes of your time.

ARINOLA AKINYEMI: My hand is raised, Claudia.

CLAUDIA SELLI: We can stop the recordings.

ARINOLA AKINYEMI: Yes.

EN

CLAUDIA SELLI:	Sorry?
ARINOLA AKINYEMI:	Wait a minute, Claudia. There is a hand up.
CLAUDIA SELLI:	Sure.
ARINOLA AKINYEMI:	Arinola's hand is up.
CLAUDIA SELLI:	I didn't see it. Apologies. Apologies. Who is this? Who is the hand …? For some reason, I cannot see it. I'm sorry. Please go ahead.
ARINOLA AKINYEMI:	All right. Okay. I just wanted to chip in on the NomCom Review Implementation Working Group discussion of the Recommendation 10. So far, we have had … The last meeting was on the [23rd]of August. We have received objections only from the IPC, which was the [CROP], and [inaudible] [GNSO].
	The working group might be moving ahead with the proposal for the bylaw change. So far, the Review Working Group has mostly ALAC, and it's populated mostly by ALAC and [NPOC] members. The few BC members, with myself, Zahid Jamil and Jay Sudowski, I have been the only

one person attending most of the meetings which leaves me as a lone voice. So, we have another call tomorrow the 3rd of September. If the BC could also submit its objections, it will be advisable. That's what I have to say.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Thank you, Arinola. Anyone that would like …? I don't know. Steve, do you have any comment to Arinola's remark?

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Yeah.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Oh, Jimson. Sure.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: I thought we submitted statements through them. We responded, didn't we?

STEVE DELBIANCO: That's right, Jimson. We have responded that we did not support the reallocation, and we supported a holistic review. That's in the policy calendar, as well.

CLAUDIA SELLI: And it's also the CSG review.

EN

STEVE DELBIANCO: That's right. And the registry has backed us up on that, as well.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: So, I was just wondering why the feedback that [inaudible]—

ARINOLA AKINYEMI: Maybe it came in after the last call. Our last call was last Thursday. The only e-mail that was received was the one from [Heather Forrest, that's the one from IPC.] So, presently, at least as of the last call, there was nothing from the BC.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Interesting. Because two weeks ago, Barbara Wanner submitted the statement. Yeah. Two weeks ago, Barbara submitted the e-mail, basically saying that we supported the IPC's position, and then we were aware that the ISPs did the same, and then the registries did the same. So, you don't even have the registry e-mail, Arinola?

ARINOLA AKINYEMI: No, we do not. I think I submitted to the GNSO Council is the [inaudible] a place to submit to. It should be … Go to the implementation review working group directly. That's the [inaudible]. We should reply on the thread with which we reference the proposal. [It might go better].

EN

STEVE DELBIANCO:	I'm glad to hear you say that. I will write back to Barbara and council leadership to be sure that they put it into that list. Where is that e-mail list? Is it on the Wiki for the NomCom Review Working Group?

ARINOLA AKINYEMI:	I believe it should be, yes.

STEVE DELBIANCO:	And will we be allowed to submit to that list? Because we're not members of your working group. Do we need you to do that for us, for instance?

ARINOLA AKINYEMI:	I think [the link with which Barbara sent the mail], so it could be [replied from] that link.

STEVE DELBIANCO:	So, Arinola, if we send the e-mails to you, can you put them into the list? Is that the right way to proceed?

ARINOLA AKINYEMI:	No, it will not be to me because I am not [sitting there] as a representative of the BC. However, I could make an enquiry from the secretariat and then get back to you after the call.

STEVE DELBIANCO:	Because I do have a link to the NomCom review, but I don't have a link to the e-mail address that gets it into the review. So, I guess—

ARINOLA AKINYEMI: Yeah. [inaudible].

STEVE DELBIANCO: It would be helpful to me. Is there a Wiki?

ARINOLA AKINYEMI: Yes, there is a Wiki. Yes, there is.

STEVE DELBIANCO: All right. Could you e-mail me the address for the Wiki? Because I don't have it.

ARINOLA AKINYEMI: I will do. I will do that.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Great. Thank you very much. I'm really glad that you pointed that out, Arinola. Thank you.

ARINOLA AKINYEMI: Yeah, no problem.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Indeed. Thank you so much, Arinola. I also wanted to read out loud what Steve put in the chat, which we have BC officer election coming up. So,

please consider running for chair in the three vice-chair roles that will be coming up very soon. Any other question? No hands up. Yes?

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Since we have … We actually welcomed a new member a fortnight ago, but he had to drop out, Nikul Sanghvi, you are most welcome. We also have an alternate of [inaudible] for the meeting, [inaudible]. So, gentlemen, you are welcome.

NIKUL SANGHVI: Hi. Thank you, Jimson.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Hi, this is [inaudible].

CLAUDIA SELLI: Thank you so much, Jimson. Welcome to both of you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Okay. With that, I will adjourn the meeting. We will speak again on 16th of September, and we can stop the recording. Thank you so much, everybody.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]