
ANDREA GLANDON: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the BC. Membership meeting being held on Thursday, the 19th of January, 2023, at 16:00 UTC. Attendance will be taken by the Zoom Room. I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for recording purposes. And so please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. As a reminder, those who take part in ICANN multistakeholder process are to comply with the expected standards of behavior. With this, I will turn the mic over to Mason. You may begin.

MASON COLE: Thank you very much, Andrea. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. Mason Cole your chair of the BC. Welcome to the BC call on 19th January 2023. Happy New Year to everyone. And it's good to have you on the call. I'm hoping for a little bit better attendance this morning. Hopefully, we'll have some stragglers join on here, but we do have a regular agenda to review today, which is up on the screen. Thanks to Andrea. But before we begin, are there any updates or additions to the agenda before we begin.

Okay. Very good. No hands in the queue. And we have one hours' time for the meeting today, so we're going to dive right in with agenda item number two, which is our policy calendar review. Steve, over to you, please.

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.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thanks, Mason. Policy calendars displayed on the screen. There are no filing since our last call two weeks ago. So I'll just talk to you a little bit about what is open today. The first is a comment the BC has drafted already on the EPDP for curative rights protections. We used to call them rights protection mechanisms for intergovernmental organizations.

Think about Red Cross. Thanks to Andy, Abrams, Zak, and Marie, we actually have a draft. Tim Smith helped on out as well. It is something that was circulated to all of you about seven days ago because it was originally due earlier this week. ICANN has decided to extend the window until January the 30th.

So for that reason, I did not submit it, but kept open the comment window so that any of you who wish can suggest edits or ask questions about the draft that was pulled together. In this case, the draft's pulled together by Jay Chapman, Zak Muscovitch, and Andy Abrams. None of whom are on the call today, but it be a great opportunity to reply all of your questions or comments on that.

Let me move to number two. This is a comment on ICANN's five year all plan and budget, and next year's all plan and budget. They do them together. Those comments close on the 13th of February. We always comment on this and it's usually substantive thanks to the work of our finance administration chair to Tim Smith and the finance committee. So Tim is not on the call today. Lawrence, do you think that you and the finance committee will be able to give a look at that and circulate something before February the 6th?

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Yes, Steve. We will be able to do that.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Awesome. Fantastic. Thank you, Lawrence. All right. Number three. This is something a throwback to about 2013 when in the ICANN round of expansion of gTLDs, there arose a concern over collisions. Collisions between new TLDs and strings that were being used at the top level inside of intranets, inside of corporate infrastructure, things like dot corp, dot home, dot office, dot printer. These are domain names that would have presented potentially very disruptive consequences to a corporation if they suddenly became delegated and resolved in the route.

And that is an effort that BC led and the BC was successfully getting several collision studies done, stimulating the Securities Stability Advisory Committee to study it for years. And finally, the SSAC or Security Stability Advisory Committee came back with SSAC 113, well over two years ago. And what we have now is a board level presentation, an odd level presentation about what they want to do based on SSAC 113.

And it's a process that makes sense in the notion that you never know about the extent of this problem until we discover a strain that happens to be used pretty widely in intranets. But when that happens, it's a pretty subjective process being proposed for deciding whether to block the delegation or proposals on those TLDs as new strengths.

And maybe the BC would be a little concerned about the subjectivity of that, and whether the criteria is sufficiently defined both from the standpoint of we want to be protective of corporate infrastructure and intranets, but at the same time, we don't want to allow somebody to gain the system by blocking a new TLD because they're afraid it competes with some other TLD that they own.

So I feel like it needs a sharp look for people that understand this issue. I'll take a cue on those who are interested in exploring it. I don't really think you have to sign up to draft the BC comment, but I need help exploring the SSAC's proposal and the Board's idea. So anyone who feels they understand the issue of domains that are used in intranets, they don't resolve in the public DNS. I know this was very important to Google because they had proposals for dot office and dot mail, which I believe were pulled. Rajiv?

RAJIV PRASAD:

Steve, this is Rajiv Prasad from Google. I would be interested in this, but given my newness to this whole process, I would like to work with someone else on this.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Excellent. Well, you certainly would have me, Rajiv. And another person to think about is Jordan Buchanan.

RAJIV PRASAD:

Certainly. And I can appraise Jordan Buchanan of this. So, yeah, I'll ping you offline.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Good. And Jordan will know this issue very well. He was one who felt like the concern over collisions was a bit overblown a dozen years ago, 10 years ago. And yet, I believe he understands that process to avoid these collisions, is probably makes sense. So, Rajiv, I'll put you down as reaching out to Jordan Buchanan, and I'll work with you for sure.

RAJIV PRASAD: Fantastic. Sounds good. Thank you so much, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO: I'll look to see if there's anyone else's got their hand up. Thanks, Rajiv. Okay, NIS 2. This is not ICANN public comment opportunity. Rather, it's something I put in here every two weeks to remind us on the current status of NIS2 publication and mandatory transposition into member state law. That clock started at the 27th of December. And they have 21 months. The most discussion we've had on this over the past two BC calls was where Margie Milam and I discussed whether this NIS2 is sufficient to generate a temp spec.

And the answer is, it possibly could be. What other efforts should the BC undertake to see a few member states move forward with adopting a transposition, particularly member states for whom it would be relatively easy to apply the disclosure requirements on their ccTLD registrants to gTLD registrants serving their citizens or registrants in their countries.

So I don't really have anything in the form of an update. But I know we have Margie on the line. Marie is an expert. And Claudia, welcome to the call. I would welcome any insights or suggestions on how the BC reacts to NIS2, now that the clock is running. A number of you may have seen a write up in circle ID. I'll put that link into the chat while I turn the microphone over to Margie.

MARGIE MILAM:

Hi, everyone. It's Margie. Yeah, Steve, I was going to raise the same thing to share the Circle ID article that Dean had circulated. But I also wanted a flag for the BC. We have this unique opportunity right now with new leadership at ICANN and new direction on the Board of Directors to advocate for ICANN to go ahead and start exploring a temporary spec. You know, we've got a new CEO with Sally Castleton and a new Chairman of the Board. So I think this is a fresh opportunity for us to get in front of leadership at ICANN and see whether or not we can make some headway in the area of who is and in particular ICANN's response to the NIS2.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Right point Margie, I agree. Any other comments? Claudia, Marie, anyone? Okay. Great. Let me scroll on to the next item up. Which is GNSO Council. We're lucky left to have Marie and Mark on the line. Although Mark is self-medicated right now for sore throat. So Marie, I'm hoping to turn to you to cover Council and I'll scroll as you need.

MARIE PATTULLO:

Thanks, Steve. This will be quick. Our Council meeting is coming up shortly. And apologies for my voice. I'm medication with cold medication. So I sound very nasal. My apologies for that. Most of our meeting later is going to be about discussions. We don't have many votes. That said, we do have to give a shout out to Arinola who has been not just nominated, she's being accepted as put in place as adopted as the mentor for the fellowship program. So thank you Teranova for putting yourself forward and congrats on being adopted into that role.

We're then going to be talking about a few things. One, it has actually been bumped, although it is currently still on the agenda. It's a very silly acronym about continuous improvement, but in essence, it means that during the life of a PDP, there should be a survey that goes out to working group members to figure out, are you happy with it? Are there things going wrong? Could this be dealt with better, as well as that being a survey at the end?

The reason for that is so that as Council, the guys who manage the process can figure out if there need to be better choices, better ways of doing things. It's really just administrative thing. But as I say, that's been bumped to a meeting forthcoming.

We're then going to talk about what we talked about when we met in Los Angeles just prior to Christmas. The SPS, the strategic planning session, is a way for the Council to get together as Council without as much of the background noise that we have at most of our meetings. Part of it is trained to actually get the human beings around the table to act like human beings and get to know each other. I know that Mark

can't speak, but I know he agrees with me that we've been pretty successful in the, in particular, breaking down some barriers with the colleagues in the long contracted partiers.

We talked about a number of things such as making stuff Board ready, communicating better about what we do. There's a whole bunch of things about not necessarily being faster, but being more efficient so that we don't have to keep going in circles. You can imagine what all over this. There is a report that will come out about it. If you want it when it's approved, let us know. We'll send it on. It is not the most exciting reading. But then we've got a couple of discussions about SubPro, which, as you all know, is a yet another wonderful acronym, which in effect means next round of extensions.

One of the big bits of work on that, the operational design assessment. Yeah, I think that's what the S stands for. It has come out from ICANN org. So the guys who actually are staffing at ICANN are looking at how they want to operationalize the report, how they want to go forward. Now from the Council perspective, what we'd like them to do is actually move. They have recommendations. They've said most of them are implementable. So can we get to the IRT? That's the implementation review team? Can we actually get things started?

We do have some questions, of course, on the way that they are considering doing this. They've given, as you know, they've covered this very widely. They're looking at various options on the way this new round of extensions can be rolled out? Should it be, excuse me, should it be in one fell swoop? Should it be over different phases?

Some of the questions that we are going back to them with include, so you've come up this really cool and really complicated and all bells and whistles tool to do everything in a highly automated fashion, which is going to cost of customer to money and take ages. Is that actually necessary? Because by doing that, you're actually making the application fees higher than they were last time.

So can we just think about that? Anyway, that's still a working in progress. But next week, Board goes into retreat into a meeting. They will be discussing this, the whole SubPro thing, I believe, on the 22nd of January, which is why we need to get some initial comments to them before that.

Sorry. Just drinking lemon without rum, Mark. Anyway, we're then looking at what Council has any say over in the SubPro world. In other words, the bits, the various little bits of this ongoing development policy that we can control or at least have some kind of server. You know that we're looking applicant support, share title warrants for all your work there. Close generics. There's a small team within Council. As you know, we're pretty much there on the IDNs. Well, on some of the top level questions. But there are still a number of things that Council needs to manage tightly to ensure that if anyone holds up a process, it's not us.

And then we're going to have a big debate or discussion apparently about the transfer policy review. But from what I understand, it's mainly that they're pulling together various work streams into one. So it will take slightly longer in this phase, but we'll get a more clear response. But of course, Arinola can speak more to that with ICANN.

And then we're going to talk about what we're going to do in Cancun, an asset. And I will hand over back to you. Thanks.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thanks, Marie. For the transfer policy, Zak and Arinola had led the way for us, and the BC put in an extensive comment on that. So you'll have that at your disposal. And if you consult the last couple of my policy calendars, not necessarily today, but the last one, there was an extensive discussion on a very kind of a last-minute change that was made to transfer policy that Zak and Arinola led us through. Thanks, Marie. Mark, anything you need to add?

Okay. All right. Moving on now to other Council activities. We had some movement on the closed generic gTLDs discussion. Now, Tim is not with us today to cover his portion of the agenda. So I'll just straight jump down there real quick and give it for him. The close generic's dialogue had a little bit of progress because Tim met with Philippe, who's the representative of the CSG on this, on January the 10th. And they're not sharing any of their written deliberations. And this is a dialogue facilitated by ICANN's board where the CSG was able to have a single person on there. And the BC has a rather coherent and specific position on closed generics, which Tim has been trying to share and put it into the mix.

So it looks like it won't be till the end of January where we will see something in writing from this facilitated group. And that's an opportunity to respond. But I'd be surprised if anybody had thought it through as carefully as we did, but we can't seem to get traction from

others about the simple procedure that we had laid out. Again, what we had said on this could be summarized in just, like, one sentence with the next one expiratory example.

We said we're concerned about consumer deception and competitor exclusion. If a single competitor in the industry manages a closed TLD, well that's strenuous closely identified with the industry. And then we give an example. So I do hope that's going to pick up. We skip past transfer. On GNSO guidance, Lawrence, is there anything you want to add about GNSO guidance process?

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Yes. Thank you, Steve. So with regards the GNSO guidance process. We've had four meetings so far. The last one on the 9th of January. And the group is beginning to delve into the soft stands of matters why we are put together recommendation. So our last meeting, basically, there was a road map of how we should approach the guidance with regards to recommendation 17.3.

And the staff had prepared that we should look at areas of outreach, education, the application process, and some form of evaluation. But the committee banking on Thomas' suggestion felt that it was better that we look, we approach that from the angle of the application process itself, which will definitely involve some outreach going out, Applications being received, how they are evaluated internally by ICANN. And that will also involve looking at the business case.

So more or less, the walk is, I mean, the forecast now is basically looking at the entire process from outreach down to eventual processing of an

application and seeing what needs to be done at each of those cycles. So the walk is it's moving, and there's also going to be an outreach to all the constituencies.

Staff is to identify, I mean, outreach to each constituency to identify if there will be additional subject matter experts that they feel that the group is going to need and then can suggest such professionals. I'm sure that by our next meeting, there'll be a lot more to report, but I'm currently also working on a formal report to be shared on the CSG mailing list. That will be all from me now, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Wonderful, Lawrence. Any questions? Thank you. Next item up is DNS Abuse small team. And what I wanted to share with you is a draft letter that Mason worked on with Mark and other members of the ExCom. I'll put that up in the share right now. And this is a letter that BCIBCNA LAC would send to ICANN org and it's to help to inform them as they enter formal negotiations with the registrars and registries on specific amendments to their agreements that would address DNS abuse.

In other words, increase their obligations for complaints about DNS abuse. Since their obligations are so fuzzy in the current contracts, nothing ever happens. So I'll bring that up right now and give you the opportunity to react. Again, this was circulated with the policy calendar. Mason, I just assumed to turning this over to you to walk people through the letter if you wish.

MASON COLE:

Sure, Steve. Thanks. This is a letter to Tripti and her new capacity as Board Chair and Sally Costerton and her role as interim CEO. The objective of the letter is to inform ICANN org that we have, we, meaning the IPC, the ALAC, and the BC, have expectations of consultation in terms of input on the provisions that will be negotiated in the RA and the RAA as they relate DNS abuse. You know, ICANN has a history of falling into a black hole in terms of not informing the community and not keeping us in the loop in terms of what's happening between ICANN org and contracted parties.

And in this letter, we're calling out the president that exists during the 2013 RA negotiations that took about somewhere on the order of 12 to 18 months. And there were extensive community consultations during that time. And we just wanted to put ICANN org on the record to let them know that the BC, the IPC, the ALAC, others in the community are interested in making sure that we have a voice in the contract update process. We don't expect to be at the negotiating table. We're not demanding a place at the negotiating table, but we do expect to be able to have some input prior to and following the negotiations.

Now I've had some discussions with contracted party representatives who assure us that, yes, there will be a public comment period, which is all good and fine, but we want to make sure that we have as extensive an opportunity to comment and provide input into the contract updates as possible. So that's the objective of the letter. And in terms of status of the letter, we have ALAC sign off. We have BC sign off. We're waiting to hear from the IPC formally, but I expect that today or tomorrow, and then the letter will go off to the ICANN leadership.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Mason. I scroll down to the bottom and if ICANN org ever honored our request to solicit community input on priorities before they went into negotiations, we wouldn't need to do this. But because they will not ask, we're going to tell them anyway what we think their initiatives ought to be. I think it's really well done. The ExCom has approved the letter, because we needed to do that before circulating into IPC and ALAC. But this is an opportunity for BC members to see if there is any feedback or any objections for the BC being one of the three signers. We hope to send it by tomorrow.

Okay, fantastic. Marjorie, thanks for the compliment on that. Mason, I think it's our all steam, full steam ahead for the BC, and you're just going to press on Brian King and the IPC to add their name. Right?

MASON COLE: Correct, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Awesome. Okay. Let me go back to the policy calendar. And then I have nothing on SSAD light. And I have covered some of what Tim Smith would have covered. He's unable to join us today. Close generics and workstream2. So workstream2 recommendations is really has to do with the accountability and transparency of individual constituencies and stakeholder groups. I co-chaired that group on workstream2 with Cheryl Langdon-Orr and the BC has led the way in terms of what level of

transparency inclusion should be available to people that run a constituency.

That said, there might be a handful of items where they complained that there's a gap between the good practices we all adopted and what the BC currently has written into its charter of bylaws. So going to continue to look at that. And by the end of January, we'll do an inventory review for that.

And then finally, Board seat 14. This is one of the two seats that GNSO has on the ICANN Board. It's a voting seat. And there are one seat for seat 13 is designated by the contract parties that's currently held by Becky Byrne. And the other seat is Board seat 14, which is from the non-contract party house. For the past four years, Matthew Shears has represented the non-contract party house. That's why we often have him and Becky attend CSG meetings.

So Matthew Shears, and seat 14, are eligible for another two year term. It's a six year term limit. He's served four. The CSG itself is only one of the four groups developed to participate in this, but CSG tries to coordinate between BC and IPC and ISPCP in negotiations with the noncommercial stakeholder, the NCSG because they're the other half.

The procedure is really cumbersome because it basically requires we come to agree. That we come to consensus around one candidate that the non-commercials can live with, as well as the commercials can live with. That's no easy task. And it often results in a candidate that while acceptable to both parties is not an advocate for either. That's led us to be very concerned about trying to find candidates that would be more, I

guess, more tuned into the business community needs and their role on the Board, and yet they start to be acceptable to the NCSG team. We don't take turns. We actually have to come to agreement.

So that said, this is the time of year where we have to work on potential candidates and do the hard work of determining whether there would be support from the NCSG. I'd be happy to take a cue if anyone wants to weigh in with ideas on this. Hand up from Marie. Go ahead, please.

MARIE PATTULLO: Thanks, Steve. My apologies if you discussed this at the last meeting. But during our SPS, our meeting in LA, as you know, our two board people there, we have Becky, and I'm sorry, my cold brain has destroyed the name of our current guy. Give me his name.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yeah. Matt Shears.

MARIE PATTULLO: Matt, thank you. I was trying to say Matt and I'm thinking that's so not right. Anyway, what was really interesting with Matt is that he sat with us, he discussed with us, he made a point of reaching out to us. And both him and Paul McGrady, I'll come to that in a moment as to who he is, more or less accepted an invitation to regularly participate in this meeting. Paul McGrady is the NomCom appointed for the non-contracted party house on Council. Now, obviously, we don't want them at all of our meetings. But both Mark and I got a very good feeling that Matt is actually willing to do that.

It was interesting for me personally because I didn't realize that Matt had such a business background with some major companies and some major consultancies. I know that there are other names circulating as to who we could possibly put forward. I won't mention them because I don't know if they're confidential, but I don't think Matt is actually a negative for us.

What I do think we ought to do is proactively bring him closer to us by inviting him to meet with us, speak with us, and to talk with him more often, and not just on the occasional CSG/board appointees. I'm kind of channeling Mark here because I know that Mark can't speak, but I do know that Mark is very proactively seeking a better relationship with Board members. And I just want to throw that into the discussion. Thanks.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Marie. I'll go to Margie.

MARGIE MILAM: Hi. This is Margie. I'm sorry. I have to drop off in a second. I would be inclined to solicit other candidates for the Board seat. I haven't seen Matthew do anything that benefits the BC position over the last four years. And to me, it seems a little late to try to get commitments from him to be more active when he should have been active over the last four years. And there's a lot of important issues that need to be addressed by the Board, as it faces this new CEO selection and the next round and everything.

So I hear you, Marie, but I really feel like he's had his opportunity. It's been two terms, you know, four-year period. And I just can't point to a single instance where he's appeared to be advocating for positions that are important to the BC. So I'd like us to suggest considering other candidates. Certainly, he could be part of the mix, but I don't want to preclude someone else that might come in with a fresh perspective.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thanks, Margie. I did informal outreach to one of the leaders in the NCSG just before New Year's asking them what they were thinking. And this is not an official response, but they indicated they were quite happy with Matt Shears and inclined to support him for another two-year term for his final six year. So given that, we have to meet the bar to say, let's find a candidate that is somewhat better for us than Matt has been, but we would also have to have a candidate who is acceptable during the NCSG who by all indications is pretty happy with Matt Shears.

So Margie's right that if we can find somebody that is better for us and acceptable to them, we should be full steam ahead. But that isn't a trivial task. We need to think very specifically about names. You should probably share that correspondence on BC private. And we should do it quickly. Are there any other hands or considerations? Okay, fantastic. Mason, I'll turn it back over to you.

MASON COLE:

Thanks very much, Steve. Appreciate the review of the policy calendar. As always, we have, looks like 26 minutes left in the meeting. Lawrence, may I turn the floor over to you for item number three, please?

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Thank you very much and good day again to all BC members. I want to start my report by reminding us that registration is still open and ongoing for ICANN76. It's important for anyone that will be participating through the entire process, whether you are there physically or virtually. And the schedule for the meetings are out and hotels appear to be filling up pretty fast.

So if you're still trying to make up your mind or to walk on those logistics, it will be best to double up before the hotels are fully booked out. And for any member that has a challenge, we appreciate your prompting, Barbara. If there are members that have any particular challenge that the BC can help resolve, please let us know, especially where it's concerns logistics, travel, and call. Yes, Barbara, please, I see your hands up. You may have the floor.

BARBARA WANNER:

Thank you very much, Lawrence. I just wanted to share my experience, which was not a positive one. I tried a couple of two or three different hotels and following the instructions on the ICANN website, make your reservation by email or whatever they stipulated, and got rejection notices from every one of them, like, not promptly, like a week later. So I went ahead and I was able to get probably the last room in the Crystal Altitude, but I had to pay the full rate. The booking company that this The Crystal Hotels uses did not recognize the ICANN org rates.

So there you go. I mean, I'll be there, I have my hotel, I have my flight booked, but it was not a positive experience. And I think it all has to do

with the fact that this is being held concurrent with spring break so that the hotels are not inclined to cut anybody a break if they can get full price. Thank you. Sorry about that. Not a positive report.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: No, thank you, Barbara. It helps the BC and our members to prepare. And I'm sure Andrea from staff has also taken note, and we'll advise to kindly please check with the meeting team to know if for members who are still in the process of tying up their arrangements if there's any helpful tip that could come from the ICANN end.

So to that, I will also want to state that members of the BC who will be physically present at Cancun, we would love for you to indicate us is the usual BC practice such that we can also make logistic arrangements to ensure all members who want to be in the room physically are able to be there also at other CSG meetings planned. So please indicate by just sending the mail to bc-info@icann.org, which hits the secretariat, bc-info@icann.org. Just let us know your intention to be there and we'll take a look from there.

Also, I'd like members to know that we are making plans, we have plans to have a busy in reach event get together. Once all the arrangement for this is finalized and it's possible to have it at the ICANN76 at Cancun, we would let members know the details on the BC private list. We will share the details of when it will hold, the time, and the venue. And I'm sure that it will be very nice to have those of us who will be physically present at Cancun together in a light mood outside the serious policy discussions that we'll be having at our open meeting. Details of the BC

open meeting will be shared as we progress as well as our agenda and issues that will be discussed.

With that, I would also like members to know that, I mean, the CROP, the ICANN CROP platform, the CROP is a facility that allows members of the community for which BC is part of to be able to travel over three days with their flights and hotel for three nights covered to a location where they are able to carry out outreach for the BC.

And this particular CROP is for FY23. So it means that it will definitely expire with the current financial year. We have two slots available out of three and want to encourage that members particularly can look who have an interest to organize and outreach events, possibly at ICANN77, which will be taking place in Washington DC in June. We'll have about six weeks, even about seven weeks before that period. I have indicated interest to ExCom. And on ExCom's approval, we'll also have to secure the approval of the global stakeholder engagement for the region, which in this case would be North America, if that's where you would want to use the CROP.

And so please end member that is interested should reach out to with their outreach plan to ExCom. You can also send me a mail or reach out to me over Skype or WhatsApp if you want to discuss this further. If you need advice on how this works and you feel he's interested. Thank you, Caroline. I see your interest, and I really will encourage you to help especially having an outreach event at Washington will be a good development for the BC. You want to say something? I see your video on.

CAROLINE LUPETINI: I was just doing a little celebration emoji. But being in DC, I would love to play a role. So consider me interested.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Great, great. Thank you very much for that. All right. So the production of the BC newsletter for ICANN76. We have opened a call for application, I mean, for articles to be submitted. We're still waiting to receive your articles. The articles can be just about cover any topic of interest to BC and her members. It could be about your experience in the BC so far. It could be about what your company is doing. It could also be about end of the topics, hot topics that the BC is interested in, like, DNS abuse, the transfer policy, how you see it, NIS2 and co, and maybe how you see it evolving.

We look forward to receiving articles from members, and I will be sharing the timeline for deadlines to when we'll have the articles coming in. Basically, over the next two weeks is where we hope that we will get all the articles in and we can continue work on the design and have it ready for ICANN76 in March.

So I think that's about it. We've spoken about the outreach. We would love to have an outreach in North America. We would need members who can help mobilize a business community. It could be a very small event. The major trust is for you to be impactful and for us to be able to have new people in the room who we are discussing the prospects of joining the BC with and eventually have a few of them joining the BC. At

this point, I will yield the floor back to Mason. And if you have any questions, I'll be available to take them. Thank you all.

MASON COLE:

Thank you, Lawrence. Excellent report. Any questions or comments for Lawrence, please, before we move on to Item 4. All right. The queue is clear. Lawrence, thank you very much for the comprehensive report. Let's now move to item number 4, which is all other business. Is there any business to be brought to the BC this morning other than what's been covered on the agenda, please?

All right. I don't see any hands. All right. Very good. So we have a few follow-up items that I know Steve is going to follow-up on as well as Lawrence. So please keep an eye on the list. I believe we have our next BC call on Thursday 2 February. Andrea, do you happen to know if that's correct?

ANDREA GLANDON:

I am confirming that right now.

MASON COLE:

Thank you. Right. While Andrea is doing that, let me just issue one more call for any other business before we adjourn. Anyone? Okay. All right.

ANDREA GLANDON: I don't see anything on the calendar yet, but I will confirm that and get it taken care of.

MASON COLE: Thanks, Andrea. Appreciate it very much. Okay. All right. I will donate 15 minutes back to your day. And we thank you to Andrea for the support and to BC members for attending today. Thanks very much, and BC is now adjourned. Good day, everybody.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]