
ICANN80 | PF – GNSO: BC Membership Work Session
Tuesday, June 11, 2024 – 15:30 to 17:00 KGL

DEVAN REED:

Hello and welcome to the BC Membership Work Session. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior. If you would like to speak during this session, please raise your hand in Zoom. When called upon, virtual participants will be given permission to unmute in Zoom. Onsite participants will use a physical microphone to speak. Please state your name for the record and speak at a reasonable pace. And now I will hand the floor over to Mason Cole.

MASON COLE:

Thank you, Devan. Good afternoon, everyone. Mason Cole here, Chair of the BC. It's a pleasure to be here in Kigali with everyone. Nice to see some faces in, so thank you for making time for the BC. I'll remind you please to log into the Zoom room so that if you need to raise your hand, we'll manage the queue from your Zoom participation. So please do that. On the screen, I'll point out item number two because we have Chris Mondini from ICANN Org with us today for a brief presentation, and then we'll proceed with our normal agenda after that. Are there any updates or suggestions for the agenda other than what you see on the screen, 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.

Okay. All right, thank you very much. All right, so in order, we'll have the presentation on IGFSAs from Chris, policy calendar review from Steve, Tim's finance and administration update, and then item number five, we can cover carefully. Lawrence may have a little bit of color on that from the private meeting with the GNSO earlier today. Probably have a lot to cover on item five. But we do have an hour and a half today, so we have the luxury of a little extra time, which is good. So please go ahead, and welcome to the BC.

CHRIS MONDINI:

Thank you. Mondini from ICANN Org. And I'm really delighted to be here at the BC, which I feel in many ways is like my spiritual home. I've been at ICANN now over 11 years, and I'm delighted to be with you and really grateful for the opportunity to present this topic to you. I'm based in Brussels, I am leading the Europe region and the Stakeholder Engagement Team there ICANN. Today, I'm here in my capacity as a member of the Executive Committee of the Internet Governance Forum Support Association, IGFSAs. Before I proceed though, I would like to have my fellow executive committee members introduce themselves, starting with you, please.

FIONA ASONGA:

Good afternoon, everyone. My name's Fiona Asonga. I'm an executive council member of IGFSAs. Thank you.

AMRITA CHOUDHARY: Hi everyone. My name is Amrita, I'm also in the executive committee of IGfSA, I chair it, and thank you for having us here and hearing us out.

CHRIS MONDINI: So as a little bit of a heads up, there will be an ask at the end, and to give some indication of what the ask is. I will start with the question. So the first is, how many of you have heard of the IGfSA already? Okay. Okay. And how many are members? Okay, that might tip you off to one of the asks at the end. How many of you have attended a global IGF? And has anybody attended a local, a national, or a regional IGF? And I suspect some of you have been involved in organizing them as well, so I invite you to give your feedback as we go through some of the points here.

As we hear in many sessions across these recent ICANN meetings, the intergovernmental discussions about internet governance and the months leading up to the WSIS+20, we hear a repeated refrain of the importance of the IGF and of preserving the IGF. And really this is an opportunity to really concretely support it. And really, also today I'd like to point out some of the ways in which supporting the IGfSA is also beneficial to the ICANN community itself. So if I can proceed to the next slide, please.

The IGF as many of you know, emerged out of the WSIS process and has been meeting annually since 2006. During a particularly rocky period of its finances, the IGF Support Association was founded by

luminaries including Marilyn Cade, who will be well-known to many of you, Tarek Camel, neither of whom are with us anymore.

But really it was an opportunity to gather around a collection of stakeholders as individual members and as organizations to support really the IGF as a movement and an ecosystem. It's not just simply a once-a-year global meeting, it's really a movement and an ecosystem that benefits this ICANN model directly. And importantly, the main focus of my colleagues and I who are here today is to support the local, national, and regional IGFs known by the acronym NRIs, and do so in a very concrete and, we think, cost effective way.

So on the next slide, we have really some of the I would say high level theoretical aspects of why it's important to support these local IGFs. For those of you that have participated, you know that it is, for many people, their first experience in a multi-stakeholder environment where the stakeholders are there equally.

You also know that they do attract influential government stakeholders, leaders of business, CEOs, civil society leaders, and they almost always include important information about the technical operations of the internet and its global governance system. And importantly, as we'll come to again later, there's a very clear and important distinction that is made between a lot of the top headline digital issues that make it onto the agendas of these IGFs, and that they are wholly different and distinct from the underlying infrastructure protocols. And DNS as an example, which we are

responsible for making policies for. Oops, sorry, I thought I gave myself more time.

So on the next slide, you'll see in the 10 years that we've been around, we're now actually up to-- where are we? The next one? No, I think we're two back. To the one with a map. Back, please. Just before this one.

All right, thank you very much. So we're actually now up to 170 countries and regions that have had local, national, or regional IGFs. An important point on this slide is that the grants, from the point of view of many organizations you might work with or represent, are not huge amounts. They range from 500 to 3,500 US dollars, and that amount is determined by the different components that they offer, whether there is a youth component or a school component. And importantly also, these are all pre-certified by the IGF Secretariat.

So they are certified as following bottom up processes for developing agendas, being open, transparent, the various reporting requirements, participation metrics, and so forth. On the next slide is really just a sample of topics which come up regularly. We see agendas, we see budgets, we review on the application process, how the planning is going for these NRIs. And this is just a sampling that we've gathered over several dozen recent events, and they are also people interested in things like abuse, data protection, internet fragmentation, DNS operations, and so forth. On the next slide, we just have a list of again, the benefits of the IGF.

So I get so many of you have participated and you've heard so many times in the public forums of ICANN recent meetings of its importance if you would like us to go into any detail of some of the benefits here. But in terms of generating a pipeline of new participants in policymaking models, giving education, talent, the vocabulary, the confidence, and again, as I mentioned before, demonstrating that there's a distinction between some of the issues that are the headline issues and some of the globally governed technical aspects of internet interoperability. And next, please.

I would just say on the next slide, the IGFSAs, we do have this quality assurance function where we do probe and require through the rigorous application process that we see, how they're organizing their agendas, how they're spending the grant money. There is some level of consistency across the approach, and in terms of the quality, just beyond what the IGF Secretariat certifies. Increasingly we are asked informally to see if we can provide speakers, content, ideas, and this is an opportunity to hear also where either the BC or your member organizations would like to participate in supporting on an institutional level.

And then we get feedback, they give us reports, they talk about who all the VIPs that turned up were and what they discussed and what they learned. So the ask is on the next slide, please. Firstly, you can become a member. A membership costs \$25 per year. It's pretty easy to sign up quickly in other presentations. I paused here and invited people to call up the link on the phone, but I will make sure that everybody gets it as a follow-up.

But if you think about it, if you look at the size of the grants that we're making, and you think that a \$25 membership is an annual application fee for membership, for your membership, this room is already in a position to fund more than one event somewhere in the world where people are eager to learn more about internet governance. We welcome volunteers for speakers or panelists, content producers, if you have networks in some of these countries, all of which are published on our website, you might propose them as speakers, the organizers are often very eager for those kind of suggestions, and sign up for our newsletters.

And finally, we do have institutional supporters. At one point in the heyday of the organization, we really had dozens of them, including the BC itself, including many individual BC members. We're down to about half a dozen institutional members, and we'd like to rebuild that.

We don't have, I would say, sponsorship levels at this stage, so something in the range of \$1000 would be enough to get your logo visible on the website and put on various sort of clearing houses as a resource of information and speakers and content. I'll conclude on the next slide by giving you a look at the other members of our executive committee. About half of us are here today this week in Kigali, and any of us is always very pleased and eager to talk more about our work. And I'll put in the chat the feedback email address where you can give us feedback.

If you have a lead for us, for an organization, you'd like us to come talk to somebody that you work with or work for, if you'd like to propose speakers, topics or content, I'll put in the link, of course, so you can join as a member. And with that, I will conclude and say thank you and open it up for questions, ideas, and feedback as time may allow. Thank you very much.

MASON COLE: Chris. Thank you. Good presentation and very informative. Questions for Chris, please? Any follow-ups?

STEVE DELBIANCO: One quick question, Chris. The NETmundial+10, which wrapped up several weeks ago, do you feel that that was positive or negative towards the objectives that you've articulated here for IGF?

CHRIS MONDINI: I am gonna pass that to my chair, Amrita.

AMRITA CHOUDHARY: I think it was positive because it also reiterated to people in the community at large that everyone is important when decisions related to internet and internet governance is made because it is used by all of us today, and even if you're talking about content or digital governance, everyone is involved. Even if governments ultimately take the decision, our voices need to be heard so that nuanced aspects could be looked at.

And perhaps we also have been motivated to some extent by the concerns the communities are having with the recent discussions, which are happening everywhere. And even, the revival of NETmundial+10 which reiterated that the multi-stakeholder movement is important. And that's why we all thought we would come to this community who believes in multi-stakeholder and ask for your support. I hope I've been able to answer your question.

MASON COLE:

All right. Thank you for the question, Steve. We have a question from Jimson. Jimson, go ahead.

JIMSON OLUFUYE:

Hi. Greetings everybody. It's a joy to see the chair and Chris talking about IGFSA. For information, I was in the room in 2012 when the idea of IGFSA was conceived, and I was a treasurer at the point, and I'm happy to say that at that time, BC actually gave funding in support of IGFSA. So the question is this, there have been discussion with regard to the Global Digital Compact, and a great reference is made to IGF maybe using this as part of the structure going forward on the GDC. So is IGFSA planning or warming up to take more responsibility in terms of coordinating the GDC agreement with the regular IGF mandate? Thank you.

CHRIS MONDINI: I apologize because I thought it was a comment at the beginning, and then I didn't hear the end because I was organizing passing out brochures. So Jimso, I'm very, very sorry.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Do you want me to repeat the question?

CHRIS MONDINI: My apologies.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Okay. There's a discussion on the Global Digital Compact going on at the United Nations, and so far, IGF has been the most successful part of the structure of the United Nations in regard to the WSIS, IGF, then enhanced corporation. So IGF has been very successful, and the role of IGFSA has been instrumental in this regard, the promotion of NRIs. So the question is, are we already thinking ahead in terms of enhancing the NRIs, that is national and regional IGF in anticipation of the outcome of the GDC, that is the Global Digital Compact? I don't know if you got the message now, the question.

CHRIS MONDINI: Again, thank you so much for repeating it. This is Chris Mondini. So yes, quite precisely. I believe that one of the proof points which will demonstrate the robustness of this movement, that is the IGF, will be, by the time that we arrive at future milestones along this timeline, this UN timeline, that the IGFSA has grown its membership and has added

to its roster of institutional members. So already, we are a proof point that there is a groundswell around the world of organizers of events and members of the IGFSAs themselves. And we, we aim to increase that to arm all of you who are participating with the data point about how important this is in a very broad-based way.

And Jimson also, thank you for your elemental role a decade ago in getting the BC and your fellow members on board to be supportive. And we're delighted to have this opportunity to really reinvigorate the conversation because exactly as you say, we think the calendar tells us that the time is ripe. And I need to also indicate that we have an esteemed executive committee member, Nigel Hickson who's joined us, and we have brochures if you'd like one. Thank you.

MASON COLE: Thank you, Chris, and thank you Jimson for the question. Lawrence.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Thank you. My name's Lawrence Olawale-Roberts. I'm a member of IGFSAs, but I just wanted to say that what the IGFSAs do, especially in Africa, has been critical to growth and participation of internet governance. I know of a lot of NIRs that speak about the funding that they get from IGFSAs, not just Nigeria, and I know that you also go to the point of supporting the schools of internet governance. So a lot of the funding from the membership dues and donations go back to developing and help to improving participation within Africa it's very novel. Just wanted to say thank you and to encourage our members

even in individual capacities as businesses to support this because it's a very noble initiative. Thank you.

AMRITA CHOUDHARY:

Thank you, Lawrence. And we would be happy to have more conversations with you also, because even for your organizations, many of you, it may be win-win. Many of the NRIs, obviously, they're looking for more funds, IGF at this point of time is not being able to support the NRIs to the extent they can. Rather, this year they have not been able to, because they're not having funds and we try our level best. We would like to support them more, it's just that we need more funds for it.

And also, if there are some topics which you think needs to be discussed at the national or regional or even youth level, we could kind of work out certain things. Like with SSAC when we were having a conversation, they gave us some topics where they have specific speakers who could speak apart from, the sponsorship, et cetera. So in case you have some ideas, we are open to ideas because even we are looking at things which we can work out creatively. Thank you.

MASON COLE:

Thank you. I think we have one more comment. [Inaudible – 00:21:12], go ahead, please.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: All right. Thank you for the opportunity, and I must say that in previous years I've also been involved with NIGF in my country, which is Nigerian Internet Governance Forum. But my question, or I need further clarification as regards how we are regulating content because you mentioned in your presentation that content regulations. I realize that Africa generally, it's growing in terms of content creators, and one of the particular challenges we go through in Africa in terms of content regulation is impersonation. On major of our social media platforms, we face these challenges every day.

This man can actually use another person's name to do business online and scam others without no solution. In our capacity as [00:22:10 - inaudible], which is a small business in Nigeria, we've tried reporting all of this to these platforms, but it's not coming forth. So my question is, in what capacity can we get involved or how can we partner with this initiative to drive this? Because we interact with small businesses directly, we interact with content creators directly, and these are their cries every day, these are their pain point. Is there any way we can actually help to promote content regulations? Thank you.

CHRIS MONDINI: Hi. Thanks. This is Chris. I thank you for your work in the Nigeria IGF. The topic that you proposed to me seems ideal to introduce in that forum and even in the regional West Africa IGF, to bring those different stakeholder parties that you mentioned together to discuss the issue if

you believe that additional expertise subject matter, looking around the table, you have many people that are very well versed in this topic.

We can work with organizations to help you get that topic on the agenda. But it's precisely those kind of challenges that are drawing people together in a multi-stakeholder way to address them and come to better solutions. So, I don't have the answer to the problem, but I think you're really well positioned to get to a group that could get you better answers.

AMRITA CHOUDHARY:

What I would also suggest is we don't get directly into the content of the NRIs, but we look at what the program is. If they want some help, we give them advice because at the end of the day, the national, regional, or youth initiatives are bottom-up processes, they decide upon it.

But if there is a specific topic they are discussing and you think that, okay, these are the regulators, but if there could be some experts in this or some best practices some other places have done, in case you reach out to us, we can reach out to our networks or even to the NRI networks of the IGF or even the best practice forums, find out things and give you guidance. But we don't dictate, that would be too much of regulation getting in, we don't want to become-

CHRIS MONDINI:

It's bottom up.

AMRITA CHOUDHARY: Yeah, it's bottom up. We don't want to be the ones cutting, you will not discuss it and you will discuss that.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: That's okay. Thank you.

MASON COLE: Okay. Thank you. We've got a question in the room, and then a follow up by Jimson, and then I think we need to cut the queue there, we're gonna start running short on time. So Robert, please.

ROBERT FORD: Thank you very much. My name is Robert Ford, and I happen to belong to the Rwanda IGF firm as a member and the chair of that team. I have two major points I want to bring here. One, how can the IGFSAs support strategies to circumvent censorship, specifically censorship where you have certain areas of internet not being allowed to be consumed by society. Not in Rwanda, but in countries around the region, you find that this is a prevalent challenge where because of political situations in those countries, internet has been constrained. That's one.

Two, I wanted also to ask on the mostly in Africa, especially the IGFs in Africa, and I think this issue was also at the Global Internet Governance Forum last year in October in Kyoto where we have found out that the internet governance has been for the urban few. You find that people

who participate in decisions on how internet is governed is not grassroots built up to the top. So it's usually issues of the few, and you find that the rural communities who are also citizens of our globe are not having a very clear say in decisions that are being made in terms of internet governance. If we can see how the two can be addressed in this meeting, I'll be more than happy. I submit it to the chair.

FIONA ASONGA:

This is Fiona from IGFA, I'll take the first question, Robert. Basically, what we do as IGF-A is we facilitate the conversations. There are a lot of issues happening in the internet space that need to be brought to the table and that need to be discussed. So even the issue of content within our region, yes, we have politicians and political powers trying to constrain and manage the content and how it can be accessed regardless of how relevant it may be.

You find entire platforms are blocked or shut, but for that to change, we need to continue what we do as multi-stakeholder facilitators, having those conversations and bringing these topics to the fore of our internet governance discussions at the local level so that at the local level, there is a clear understanding on why it is important to still have access to this content and the platforms. When that happens, it's a gradual process, but there's best practices that have been documented that eventually, it does open up and the content is then accessible, and then there are clear mechanisms and structures of being able to manage inappropriate or wrong or content that would be harmful on those platforms. Thank you.

NIGEL HICKSON:

Okay. Just to add and for the second question. I mean, this is essentially why we exist. The UN IGF when it started in 2006 was one discussion, it was a UN discussion. Now in 2024, we have 160 or national and regional IGFs and Youth IGFs. Many of these meet in countries where there is censorship in countries where the government is not particularly friendly to civil society or to business or whatever, but these people meet and come together and gradually form relationships with the government.

I recognize it's not easy, it's very easy for me to say so in the UK, but for many countries it's not easy. But it is this dialogue, it is this dialogue which eventually ensures that people understand the role that ICANN plays and the role that many other institutions play. And it's only when those countries engage in this dialogue that they have their say in internet governance, the people around the room in the GAC room, it's only when they engage that they can fully take part in the ICANN community, so engage.

MASON COLE:

Okay. Thank you, Robert. Thank you, Nigel. Thank you, Fiona. Jimson, you get the last question. Please hurry, we're a little behind on time.

JIMSON OLUFUYE:

Yes. Just to provide some information to my brother from Nigeria that expresses need for solution with regard to tackling the issues he

expressed. So just that maybe someone in the room can give him my contacts, I have some ideas that will help him which are based on the experience I've had, and that is the essence of the IGFSAs, providing funding, little, little funding to ensure that there's conversation all around the globe and we value the work of IGFSAs. So I recommend the BC to fully also support them. Thank you very much.

MASON COLE: Okay, Jimson. Thank you. All right, any last-minute requests for interventions on IGFSAs, please?

AMRITA CHOUDHARY: Nothing much. Hope you can join us or ask your organizations to sponsor us. Thank you.

MASON COLE: All right. Thank you all for joining the BC today.

AMRITA CHOUDHARY: We can leave some flyers just in case you want.

MASON COLE: Right, left them around on the tables. Thank you very much. Thank you for joining the BC today, thank you for your overview and best of luck to all of you. Thank you. All right, we will proceed with the

agenda. We're gonna go to the next item, which is the policy calendar review. And the floor is yours Steve, please take it away.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thank you, Mason. Steve DelBianco here, your vice chair for Policy Coordination. Yesterday I sent the policy calendar for today. It's significantly more streamlined than our typical one for our biweekly calls because the times at ICANN meetings when we convene, it is an open meeting, and so we typically don't deep dive as much into the policy strategies and tactics that we have in mind, we tend to preserve that for our biweekly BC member calls.

But nonetheless, there's plenty happening in ICANN that's relevant to us in terms of threats and opportunities. I'll start by summarizing what we call channel one, which is our participation in prior public comments. On the 21st of May, we commented on the phase two report of the EPDP and IDNs, and Ching Chiao who's not in the room but is online right now was the drafter of that. And I hope that that will begin to move the needle and Ching will monitor the work of the working group to see whether our comments are taken on board.

Moving down to selected comments, we have one publicly open comment period which closes at 2nd of July and it is within council, so it's tightly constrained within council to where the council would like to know how have we improved the performance of several processes that happen inside of GNSO, things like the EPDP or Expedited Policy Development Process. A few of these we've only used once or twice.

Margie, you probably were on staff when these were all developed a decade ago. So some of them have not been used extensively. Others have adapted over time to get more effective as we use them. And one of them we're in the middle of right now, at the beginning is an Implementation Review Team or IRT. It'll look at the privacy and proxy services accreditation initiative.

Margie, I believe you volunteered to be a BC member on there. Any other BC member who's interested in serving as an alternate, it can be on that Implementation Review Team as well. Tola, anything to alternate there? Great, thank you. And you, you are meeting this week, right?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: On Thursday.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Good. All right. Then, I wanted to thank Marie as a former counselor for several years as well as Lawrence for volunteering to help draft a BC comment, and it's really from the perspective of the BC commenting on whether these processes really work for us. And it may well be that the processes suffer from technical shortfalls even if they were technically correct. The BC is outvoted at council when it comes to adopting the recommendations and reports that emerged from these processes, particularly into the dual house structure and in the non-contract party house.

We try to have consensus with our fellow Commercial Stakeholder's Group members, but inevitably we are sometimes canceled out by the Non-commercial Stakeholders Group. So let's try to confine ourselves to commenting on the processes themselves and how they could be improved and not necessarily how unhappy or happy we are with the outcomes of the processes because they won't be able to address that here. Any other volunteers who'd like to help Marie and Lawrence? Thank you. Go ahead.

MARIE PATTULLO:

Just to let you know that I'm about half-ish way through the first draft. So Lawrence, hopefully I'll get it to you this week. But I do know you've got one or two other things to do with council this week, but it's on its way, don't worry.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thank you, Marie. Appreciate that. You've got a lot on your plate as well. We have one other comment in the policy calendar, which is the general process of following the transposition of NIS2 from the European Commission, European Parliament, and follow that transposition into the regulations and laws of the 27 European Union member states. And we talk about it at every meeting, and as recently as two years ago, we all thought it would be the Czech Republic, Denmark that might get their first, but it looks as if Belgium in late April adopted its implementation of NIS2 and published on May 17th, the actual language.

And we've been discussing it here at the meeting because we're delighted to note that Belgium treated the NIS2 as a floor and not a ceiling on its regulation and imposed additional requirements that weren't necessarily explicit in this to such as a requirement that registries and registrars that are serving Europeans would have to take down a domain if they were shown sufficient proof that the registrant information was inaccurate.

That's a first. I have only looked at the English and sorry, the French and German translations of this, and we're waiting on an official translation to languages that some of us here use because we're gonna need to understand better what else it required.

But they did their best to implement the requirement that registries maintain in some form, maintain the ability to access the registrant data, that legal and natural persons be treated distinctly as opposed to lumping them all together the way RDRS does today. And that'll be helpful as well. There are a number of you who follow NIS2 process well and I would happily yield the floor. Marie, Sven is online as well, who can speak to where Germany is in their process. But what has been the discussions in Europe with regard to Belgium taking the lead this way?

MARIE PATTULLO:

Yeah, Marie Pattullo for the record. Yay, Belgium, I live in Belgium, I like Belgium. We do have an unofficial translation, which we're happy to share with you on the premise that you understand. It's based on two things. One, Mr. Google, and two, me. So please do not quote me

in court because you'll look a bit of a fool. But it really is the Belgian text, which will come into effect in October when NIS2 itself comes into effect is excellent. And Steve's just run through some of the points. It says, of course the access to the data is free, which may not please some of the people in this building.

It does talk about if the data are incorrect, inaccurate, or incomplete, then the domain name shall be taken down immediately, shall be blocked. A blocked domain name cannot be transferred to another provider. If the domain name registrant fails to correct things within the time period, the domain name is canceled. And from a specific point that will interest many here, and I know certainly will interest Paul, it talks about who legitimate access seekers are, which you know has been an issue the entire time. And the first one it mentions is, "Any person in the context of violations of intellectual property rights or related rights." So it is huge.

Also a lovely part is that registries may not inform the holder of a domain name when a request is made. In other words, if you're investigating somebody, they're not allowed to tip off the person that you are investigating. So I will do whatever Steve tells me to do. If you want me to circulate this text or not, but there'll be a great big disclaimer on the top saying, do not take as official, the official versions are in French and in Flemish and in German, these three languages above.

What we also have at EU level, and you've heard me talk about this before, is a recommendation that the European Commission came out

within March. A recommendation within the EU legal framework is persuasive. You can quote it in court, you can use it to say this is what the commission thinks.

And this came out of a department in the commission that deals with intellectual property, so not the digital people. And part of that recommendation talks about domain names, and the part that's relevant for us right now also talks about encouraging registries, registrars, to accept as a legitimate access seeker, anyone seeking information under all union law, including a specific piece of union law called the Intellectual Property Rights Enforcement Directive.

So there are lots of little strands coming together here. And another thing that Margie and I have kind of been battling around, but I'm gonna give this back to Steve, you will all know that the ICANN policy on data access is based on a certain part of the union's GDPR, which includes a balancing test.

So the registrar has to decide if your request and the rights of the registrant are, which one wins in the balance. But NIS2 is not based on that, it is based on another part of the GDPR, which says that you, the registrar registry, collect the data on the basis of a legal obligation, no balancing test. So what we've been thinking, registrar, okay, I've got a legal reason to collect the data, I'm using Margie there, Margie comes with a request saying, basis on union law for request X. I legally give you the data. Why would the registrar have a fear of being fined? But Mason also has some more about this too, I think, in Sweden.

MASON COLE: Yeah, thank you. So just as context, different jurisdictions within European member states take different approaches to the implementation of Article 28 of NIS2. Some like Belgium, like Marie just talked about, are very strong implementations, some are relatively weaker. Sweden's was relatively weak. For example, Sweden recognized only law enforcement officials as legitimate seekers of information from registration data. The BC occasionally puts in comments to governments on this when we are concerned about the direction that the transposition is taking.

We did so with Sweden, notified the BC of this, and we have yet to see where this is gonna net out. But we put in a fairly strong statement that Sweden was misguided on its transposition direction. So we are looking jurisdiction by jurisdiction, member state by member state to make sure that NIS2 is implemented as robustly as possible as it deals with Article 28. And Margie may have a little more color. Did you want to say something, Margie?

MARGIE MILAM: Hi, this is Margie. I think the Swedish thing was not an actual act, but a discussion paper. So it's a little bit in the early stages which means perhaps there's opportunity to really make it more robust. And thank you for submitting comments on behalf of the BC.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you. I'm looking for hands. And Marie, if I can prevail upon you to educate us on one more thing. So please do circulate both the

translation, the underlying link to the document on the Belgian government site, and potentially the recommendations of the commission, if you don't mind. Thank you very much.

Marie, the Belgian transposition, is it final, number one? And number two, are there explicit discussions of when a registrant is using privacy or proxy? Is it inaccurate to say privacy@godaddy.com or are they permitted to simply redact all the other information and display the proxy information?

MARIE PATTULLO:

Question, when is it final? Yes, the law's been adopted to come into effect on the 18th of October. On privacy proxy, it isn't as specific. Give me one second while-- it's got the word May something. After consulting the relevant authority, the king, we've got a king. We do, he's called Philippe. The king may order supplies from resellers of anonymous-- well, the translation comes out with it is privacy proxy. So the king may order privacy proxy suppliers, resellers to share domain name registration data with the registrars and define the terms and conditions. So in other words, there's gonna be a consultation on that.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Consultation would result in a rulemaking and a clarification that would emerge months later if possible.

MARIE PATTULLO: Okay. But it won't change the rest of the article. Yeah, it's a separate part of it.

STEVE DELBIANCO: That's fantastic. And so there's further work to be done on privacy proxy. Those of you that have attended the event we went to this morning hosted by the registrars that were kind enough to invite us, quite a bit of the discussion was on privacy services offered by the registrar themselves and proxy services offered by sometimes third parties or affiliates. And roughly half, I think, half of the registrations in the gTLD space today are covered by privacy or proxy, and they are very different, those two services. This emerged prior to GDPR, we were at as much as 33% prior to the 2018, but it has gone up significantly.

And we had quite a debate today with the registrars about if it's a privacy service listed as the registrant for contact information, they claim that it's disclosed, and that is all they need to do under an RDRS. At our table, Margie kept me from losing my mind because the registrar at our table was suggesting that's all they need to do despite what they felt was compelling evidence, they don't need to disclose and reveal the name behind it.

And Marie, you would've been fascinated by the discussion because we discussed whether is it the European law with regard to transfers of data or disclosures of data, which is the governing standard for revealing the name of a registrant pursuant to an RDRS request. No agreement at all, we're gonna need to figure that out, and it might

require the kind of legal research that we are not allowed to do on the standing committee that Steve Crocker and I serve on. We are only looking at system issues and the ability to make the system better, and we look at the data it produces, but we are constantly cut off when we're inquiring about, well, what basis did you use for your balancing test? What portion of law did you look at?

And that inconsistency and the inability to discuss it there means that the BC is having to take those conversations to other places because we can't get any satisfaction there. Any other questions for Marie? And Sven, I'd like to see whether you'd like to be in the queue to talk about Germany.

SVEN ECHTERNACH:

Yes. Let me just add a few sentences. So Germany has made a draft on May the seventh, and then ask over a hundred business associations to submit comments basically to the interior ministry, which is responsible for the implementation law. And so we expect a new draft to be coming out in, yeah, possibly one month. So the German version is pretty much according to the EU directive.

So it's not really going any further, it mandates to keep a database of valid information, especially the name of the domain registrant, email address, phone number, and also it should be releasing information to a valid requester, not specifically saying who is the requester, who not. So I think Germany is pretty much according to the EU.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Sven. Paul McGrady.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thanks. Paul McGrady. First of all, thanks for letting me stop by. I went to see the NCSG for a bit, I'm here for a bit, and then off to see those IPC types in a minute. So when I walk out, I'm not angry, I just ran out of time. First a joke, and what could only be deemed a surprise coincidence, my firm will be opening a Belgium office and we're running a sale on Benelux registration. It actually sounds like there's real progress in Belgium, so that's great. I just wanted to ask that as you guys circulate the things that Marie's talking about, when we talk about the RDRS, there's sometimes a movement to say, it's not making the progress that it needs, we should cut off the experiment, whatever. I do think that when the Belgium law comes into effect, we should measure the effect that it has on disclosures coming out of that jurisdiction.

And so for anybody who's anxious to wind down the RDRS, I would say at least give it a few months past the Belgium law to see if this changes. Because if that changes, then that's an important consideration as we think about how the rest of Europe might follow Belgium. And so that could be a significant shift in the quality of responses.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Are you aware of who the large Belgian registrars are and registries, so that they would be at the very least subject to the jurisdiction of Belgium?

PAUL MCGRADY: Not off the top of my head, but that's certainly something that could be put together. When it comes to this, if there's a Belgian right, and that's why my half joke about Benelux registrations, if there's a Belgian trademark that's in effect, and as we all know unless you're geofencing off Belgium, the website resolves in Belgium, the MX records produce emails that go into Belgium. And so when I think about jurisdiction, I don't think about the location of the registrar, I think about where the rights are cited.

STEVE DELBIANCO: With your indulgence, just another minute, Marie. If a registrar in Germany has a registrant whose website is visible to Belgian citizens, would it be Belgian transposition or German transposition that governs the behavior of that registrar who's based in Germany? And if Marie can dig that up, that would be helpful. Not too many of us are schooled enough in European Union law. The home jurisdiction ends up being the one who's supposed to enforce it, even though the rules are developed by the jurisdiction of the user who needed the data.

PAUL MCGRADY: But most importantly, it's not about threatening anybody, it's about giving them comfort. Like Marie said, that now they don't have to do

the balancing test, they can just disclose it for a lawful purpose. And so it's not a hammer, it's a bulldozer to clear the boulders out of the way.

STEVE DELBIANCO: But the only boulders that are in the way are the participating registrars. RDRS is completely voluntary, ICANN has no policy, so if we found a few Belgian registrars, they could choose to participate or not, and they might not be in the RDRS at all. But I'll take your point that we should watch to see whether there's a difference in behavior of these registrars after October.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thanks.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Paul. All right, we'll move on to the next topic, which is other council-related elements that are still moving. And one is, there's a council meeting coming up tomorrow at 1:45 PM here. Now, the agenda highlights, I just included a few of them here for you, voting on the policy status report, the expiration policies. And at this point, we'd love to turn things over to the counselors, to the VC who service there. So Mark Datysgeld is online, Lawrence Olawale-Roberts is here, who's our counselor, Vivek Goyal, congratulations to you as our counselor elect and will take your place at the annual meeting. So Lawrence, I'll defer to you as the one at the table.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Thank you, Steve. So the expiration policy is due for the discussion and hopefully might end up with a vote, tomorrow will tell. From what we gather, IPC's concern, which was brought to council, might not be covered within the current process that we have. And so, it is likely that possibly after the discussion, this will pass.

And another mechanism started or made to evolve to raise the concerns that were raised by IPC. The IPC's concerns, again, were basically around domains that drop and are not being able to be registered because they go straight into an aftermarket. We definitely will be discussing the spirit draft charter. This is supposed to kick in after the AGB, the Applicant Guidebook comes into play.

Something important that has been brought to our fore is, so the process right now is the development of the framework that we guide the operations of the team, of the spirit team. After the AGB is launched, the spirit team definitely will be constituted.

But in their composition, there is a proposal that anyone who will be participating will have to fully disclose certain details, the SOI discussions that we've had to deal with. This is gonna be formed part of the discussions tomorrow at council. I'm sure that after that, we will have a firm idea on what direction we might be going. But as the BC, I know the business position has been that that level of disclosure being desired might not be necessary for our participation. But if that is not so, please kindly guide me.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Can I ask a question quickly on the yellow highlighted item, skipped over that item five? That discussion has a whole new color to it today because of what the Belgian transposition of NIS2 has done with respect to data accuracy. And so I would invite you at council that if the discussion gets to the notion of how do we consider what legal requirements for accuracy are, you would simply note to people that the requirements for accuracy are a moving target as the member states implement NIS2. And I don't necessarily have to call out Belgium in particular, but I think that accuracy is gonna get a lot more attention tomorrow than it would've before Belgium came up with that.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: That's noted. Thank you. Yeah, so I think item six is covered. Seven: IGO protections. I'm not so versed with that, but we'll see how that goes. So yeah, so I think that's about it for all council. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Lawrence.

MARK DATYSGELD: Mark here.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Mark.

MARK DATYSGELD: Can you hear me?

STEVE DELBIANCO: We do. Go ahead.

MARK DATYSGELD: Thank you so much. So first of all, congratulations to Vivek. He'll be taking over my chair. You'll be delighted by what awaits you in the council, I'm sure.

VIVEK GOYAL: Look forward to it.

MARK DATYSGELD: Thank you so much for taking this on. So something of note is that we'll be discussing one of the outcomes of the SPS, which has been circulated to the BC, we have discussed this in the past which is that public comments are basically not taken in by the working groups. This is something that will be taken on as council work starting from soon.

Let's say staff has compiled the defense that the mechanisms are in place to make a review of this public comments, but the idea is that we do an investigation of how this is being conducted and whether the public comments are really being considered and how do they affect

the processes. Because as you're aware, public comments are one of the things that take a lot of time to get done. They the processes several months further than they would otherwise. So if the comments are not actually being implemented, this is not exactly helpful.

So this is an upcoming thing to be aware. We also have an interesting opportunity to meet with the ccNSO Council, which is something that doesn't happen exactly often. That will be exactly within a month on the 11th of July, so heads up on that. If there are any issues that you would like us to bring up with the ccNSO, that would be a good opportunity. I'm thinking we'll discuss a lot of DNS abuse, but please do guide us if you have any particular concerns you would like to raise over there.

We also have the question of IGOs as Lawrence was saying. It's basically overdue, I've been in an eternal cycle of trying to determine why this doesn't get solved. Hopefully, we are headed somewhere with this because as it stands, ICANN Org should be in a process of being able to solve this. So no idea why, we'll find out what potentially what is the current the current explanation for it. So that will be a general highlight of the rest of the calendar, it's a relatively light meeting. Otherwise, we are more setting up for the workers to come in the next few months. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

No, thank you, Mark. I know it's not on the written agenda, but are you likely to discuss at council tomorrow the IPC's request for

reconsideration over the board's proposed bylaws, amendment on the use of auction grant funds to challenge? If that was not on the agenda at all-- go ahead.

MARK DATYSGELD: Yeah, on that matter, we took that toward recently instituted closed council meeting that happens. It took place a few hours ago, my morning, your afternoon, I think. And the question over there, let me be generalistic about this, it might not be ideal to discuss this right this second. It's better that we continue-

STEVE DELBIANCO: I think wan leave it at that because the Board, they took it off the front burner by saying that they were gonna withdraw the bylaws amendment that became the subject of the request for reconsideration. We may still have things to say about the criteria used by ICANN Legal when they denied the request for reconsideration saying that we didn't have any standing. And that should certainly be a discussion, but it may or may not happen tomorrow.

MARK DATYSGELD: That is precisely right, Steve. So for now, let's take this to the back burner and discuss this on our next policy meeting. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you. Any questions for our counselors?

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Sorry. Steve, just before we roll that off that. Judging by the fact that we have Steve Crocker here, just wanted to get some advice. If the Board as it is were to backtrack, is there any process required for that in terms of maybe a public comment or a mechanism within the Board?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Is the Board allowed to withdraw a vote he had taken on a policy earlier or hold a new vote deciding to reverse itself?

STEVE CROCKER: I guess I'm obliged to start my response by saying I'm not a lawyer, and I haven't been on the Board for several years, so I appreciate the question. I'm not gonna duck it, but whatever I say is just my guess and from memory and so forth. I think the short answer is yes, they could do that. They took a vote and they can take another vote. I don't think there's any formal process that requires that having made the vote, they can't take another vote, but with the caveats that I said.

More to the point of the issue at hand, I was in an SSAC meeting this morning, and there was a presentation on this subject by Sam Eisner and somebody else, three people actually. Anyway, the substance was explanation about they're gonna run through a bylaws change and implement, this is my take on it, implement precisely what was in the CCWG recommendation, and by putting that into the bylaws, it removes the issue that has come up in this meeting, in this group.

Since I sit in both SSAC and the business constituency, it's been interesting to me to see where the hot button issues are. For your amusement, the SSAC's hot button issue was why are you bothering us with something legal? We don't like to opine on legal things. So you're asking us, is this okay? We'd like to abstain. No, you're not allowed to abstain. Oh, now we got a whole new problem. Anyway, I think we'll work through all that. And my take on this whole issue is, yeah, you could pull that thread and get some inconsistencies.

But in this case, I think everybody is actually trying to make the right thing happen. One other comment on this and I listened to all that and I said, so the ordinary person who's listening to all this probably has one question on their mind, is this going to slow down or change the timeframe on when I can get the money that I'm asked for to put it rather straightforwardly? And the answer was, well, if things go through smoothly, we are within the timeframes that we talked about. And my reply to that is, please keep people informed about that, nevermind how many individual steps and what the negotiations are and all that. Anyway, thank you for asking.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Great, thank you. We now turn to a brief summary on other activities managed by council to which BC members participate and are concerned. The first item up is on the transfer policy working group. Zak and Arinola represent the BC on that group and have done an amazing job incorporating the feedback of your constituents and

colleagues. But keeping in mind, it's an open meeting, what would you like to cover in terms of where we are?

ZAK MUSCOVITCH:

How come you only said brief for me, Steve. All right, so my name is Zak Muscovitch, and Arinola Akinyemi and I have been the BC's representative in the transfer policy working group. We joined that when we were 18. I think it's been about three years and it's coming to a conclusion. What that means is that there's gonna be a set of proposals that the working group has reached in principle that will be put out for public comment towards the end of August. And the BC's role in that is one of several stakeholder groups that have all contributed to it.

And overall, we let the working group know last week that we could live with the draft proposals as they were currently drafted, but we will have an opportunity to provide public comment and we even have the right to change our mind. So we look forward to working with the BC as the public comment process unfolds. Thank you. Too brief, I could go on Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thank you again, both of you for being so diligent about informing all of the BC members and getting input. Before you go back to the working group, you're a real model for working group representatives from the BC, you really are.

The second item up is the RDRS or registrant data request system. For this one, Steve Crocker and I serve on that and it's been a frustrating experience. Also begun when Steve and I were 18. And at this point, I did want to show that the presentation employed these sanky charts, which Steve and I are enamored with them. But it helps to show that if you did 1400 lookups in a given month, you know right away half of them aren't supported because the registrars don't participate or it's for a TLD that's not participating. So of the ones that are supported, the 441 there in green, of them, there were 235 requests at which 35 were approved to disclose the information that was requested.

And so a big subject of Monday's meetings and today's meetings was trying to figure out why. Are we asking questions the wrong way, failing to provide the adequate information, or is it the balancing tests that are being employed by the registrars? Are they using the right basis to do it? Marie told us earlier the balancing test was between the interest of the data subject, which is the registrant and the interests of the party requesting the information.

But we learned today in the workshop with the registrars that a key out, they've added another element to the balancing test, which is what is the risk to the registrar that would be held out of compliance with GDPR? I don't suppose that's a surprise, but we heard an awful lot today that said that when they do the balancing test, they want to understand what are the risks that if they give you this data, Marie, are you gonna safeguard it enough? Because if you don't, then they believe they're accountable. And that was a fascinating discussion.

Privacy and proxy, you can see how many times they simply point to privacy and proxy on this. And the outcome of it is, well, there haven't been a lot of approved disclosures, 35 out of an initial set of 1435. But the key to think about is that 35 is roughly 10%, 9% of the number that were supported by the RDRS. So we're gonna need to do better for RDRS to actually provide value to the requesting community. Are there any questions on that? Steve, did you want to add anything?

STEVE CROCKER:

Your opening statement was that the ballot test is supposed to be between the registrant's interest and the requester's interest. It seems obvious that the registrar, if they claim that they're trying to do that, it'd be natural to ask them how do they know what the registrant's interests are? Unless they go and ask the registrant, do you want to participate in this? But that is not part of them. So there's a common sense element that is just missing in addition to everything that you said.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

We'll continue to pull the OR and update all of you. In our closed meetings, we can go into more of the strategic decisions that we need to make. Another one on here, and I skipped over, let me see. The Continuous Improvement Program. And Nenad, any updates for the BC?

NENAD ORLIC: Nothing in particular. Basically, we are very good. Joking aside, basically, process is ongoing. I spoke to Mason about providing some feedback that I should have provided already, but I didn't. I wanna consult on them to do that. Otherwise, with the experience that the problems that I heard from other constituencies, we're good.

STEVE DELBIANCO: It's so helpful if you're able to help your counselors as well as the whole BC by coming up with recommendations before they have to vote. So for instance, tomorrow, Mark and Lawrence have to vote. No, it's a discussion, not a vote tomorrow, right? So it's a discussion and that's where it's so important to get that. If you can even circulate your draft thoughts by email to bc.private before tomorrow afternoon would be much appreciated. Thank you.

All right, the only other item is subsequent rounds. Ching is not here, he's the alternate. Imran Hassan, anything to tell us about the SubPro? I know Imran is at the meeting. I think I saw him earlier. No, not here. Okay. Let me turn it over to Marie as the liaison for the BC to the CSG.

MARIE PATTULLO: Thanks, Steve. Marie again. This will be very short. You know that we are trying to work with our colleagues from the non-commercial side on a better way to ensure that when we appoint our next board member, it works properly and within time.

So there's an ongoing working group between the commercials and the non commercials to talk about that. Apart from the two documents that you see linked in the policy calendar, there's nothing concrete. We were hoping to have a full meeting between the non commercials and us. That's the NCSG is the Non Commercial Stakeholder Group, which together with the CSG, the Commercial Stakeholder Group sits in the NCPH, which is the Non Contracted Party House because ICANN loves its acronym. Now, we were hoping to have a decent long meeting, the commercials and the non commercials.

Unfortunately, ICANN decided not to allow us to do that, so we've got an hour and 15 minutes tomorrow. I hope you all come. I'd like to point out we're not at all bitter that we get an hour and a quarter while the contracted party house, that's the registries and the registrars got three days in Paris. I hope they had a lovely time. We are hoping there's gonna be at least a day prior to the meeting in Istanbul where we can have a fuller discussion. But unless Mason has heard anything from the powers that be.

MASON COLE: Not yet.

MARIE PATTULLO: That's all I've got right now. Sorry.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Questions for Marie and interactions with CSG. Okay. None there, Mason, and that's the end of the policy calendar. Back to you.

MASON COLE: Thank you very much, Steve. Follow up questions for Steve, anyone? Chris.

CHRIS LEWIS-EVANS: Sorry I missed the RDRS point. Just to highlight one thing we heard from James Bladel in the earlier session is they are considering putting their privacy proxy requests into the RDRS. So I think from a PPASAI point, I think that could be quite interesting and hopefully good for us for requesting. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Agreed, Chris, let's encourage that experimentation, not as if the other registrars have to follow suit, consider it an experiment. We learned there's one person that evaluates all of the RDRS requests. The same person evaluates privacy proxy reveal requests, so that makes sense for them to consolidate.

MASON COLE: All right, thank you, Chris. Any other follow ups? Okay, the queue is clear. All right, let's quickly move to item four on the agenda, which is the finance and administration update.

Before Tim takes the floor, I just want to say a particular thank you to Tim and to Lawrence and to everyone else who contributed to the outreach session that we had this morning. It was well put together, it came off very nicely, we had good attendance, and we spread the message about what the BC does. With any luck, we'll get a couple of new members out of this or some broader participation on the part of the BC. But I just wanted to say thank you both for all your hard work, it was a good event and it came off very nicely. Thank you.

TIM SMITH:

Thanks very much, Mason. Tim Smith, for the record. This morning you were saying that I was covering some of your material and now you're covering my material. So I'm gonna do a little bit of name dropping. We did have a great outreach this morning. There was pre-registration, and as a matter of fact, there were 70 people, about 70 people who had pre-registered for this event. When it actually came together, there are 45 or 50 people, I think, over the course of the morning that were there including 11 BC members. So it was great to have everybody there. Excuse me. MC for the event was Segunfunmi Olajide who did a great job of guiding us through the morning. Presentations were made by Tola who encouraged membership in BC.

Segun Omoloshos was tied together the relevance of the BC and AfICTA, which was very effective I thought. And we had presentations from Rwanda ICT, and Robert Ford who's here with us today was part of that, and also from ICANN. So big thanks to Mason speaking on the priorities, and especially to Lawrence Olawale-Roberts for an amazing

sales pitch. Did a great job and even walked the attendees through how to fill out the membership form to become a member of the BC. So that was really great. When we came back in the bus, we did bring some of the attendees back with us. And we actually already have three applicants who are being cleared through the process through the credential committee.

So, [01:15:10 - inaudible] and Nehemiah [ph] from Cyber Stream, I don't think he's here, Asteway Negash from Enable ET and Nanayaa Prempeh from Tin Ifa in Ghana, and she just left a few minutes ago. So there, in the process of being reviewed for membership. And we did speak to a few other people, and I think there may be a few more, so I thought that was really good for us.

So moving on from there, as some of you know, we did get some crop funding to enable our participants to come to the event and to help organize this, so that was great. And it's now time to start looking at FY25, so we have to put together the outreach and strategic plan for the coming year to be able to apply for crop funding.

So that's something that I'll be working on in the next little while. We've already been given deadlines, and if we want to do a outreach in Istanbul in November, which is something we might be able to do, and we'll think more about, we have to submit our crop funding. If we need crop funding, we need to do that by September. So we'll be working on that over the next little while. And speaking of September, we don't have exact dates, but in September, we will be opening an election period for the BC chair, vice chair policy, vice chair of finance

and operations, NCH CSG liaison, and those will be four seats to take place in January of 2025. So be watching for that.

And those of you who are interested in running for an office in the Business Constituency, you can start thinking about that now. We did just conclude elections, of course, for the GNSO council representative and for NomCom delegates to take their seat rate at the end of the Istanbul meeting, ICANN81.

So thanks to everyone who exercised their right to vote. And congratulations to Vivek as we've already heard, who is your new GNSO counselor, and to Arinola for accepting the NomCom for small business roles, and for Ching Chia as NomCom large business delegates. And thanks to Vivek and Mia Brickhouse for having served on the NomCom for the past while.

Almost done. We're heading into the end of FY24, of course, that comes up at the end of June. So we're sort of looking at the books for year end. We have a couple more expenses coming in, but we're pretty well finished through the year.

And then we'll be working on FY25 very soon. I've already started working on FY25, but we'll be actually pulling it all together in the next few days. And I guess the other thing is, FY25 membership invoices went out and I've been seeing them come back in with payments, so that's terrific. We are currently at 62 members and it seems like everybody is returning. So that's all good news for the Business Constituency. And I guess the last thing I would just comment on is you all would've received a notice of the BC newsletter that was just

put out several days ago, and invite you all to take a look at it. It's a pretty good read, and thanks to Mason and Tola and Segunfunmi for all contributing to that. And that's it for me. I'll take questions if you have.

MASON COLE: Thank you, Tim. Follow-ups for Tim, please? Jimson. Oh, I'm sorry, you'll be next after Jimson. Jimson, go ahead, please.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Yes, congratulations in regard to the outreach. I believe a lot of work was put into that. Just a question. We heard about the expectation for FY25, but just to remind the vice chair that we still have some things pending, FY23 is pending with a little detail, and FY 24. Thank you very much.

TIM SMITH: Noted. Thank you.

MASON COLE: Thank you, Jimson. Vivek, please.

VIVEK GOYAL: I want to congratulate Tim on the newsletter. I think it has improved quite a lot and has definitely come out well. And I request everybody else to also contribute for the content on this to make teams life much

easier. And use the newsletter as part of our outreach as well, because it definitely shows what BC brings to the table and the kind of content we put on it and people contribute. So it can become a defacto outreach marketing material as well. Thank you, congratulations, Tim. Thank you so much.

MASON COLE: Thank you, Vivek. All right, the floor is open for any other last minute comments for Tim, please.

ARINOLA AKINYEMI: I would like to go, chair.

MASON COLE: Please, Arinola.

ARINOLA AKINYEMI: Yeah, Tim, I think that was an excellent outreach. I want to thank everyone that participated in putting it together. And my joy is that it really spoke to the African businesses and it's really the way to go with the African businesses. We say thank you to you.

MASON COLE: Thank you, Arinola. All right, if there are no other comments, we will go to AOB. We've covered item five under Steve's policy calendar

review pretty extensively. So any other business for the BC? All right, it appears the queue is clear. Oh, Arinola, please. Sorry.

ARINOLA AKINYEMI:

Yeah, I think the BC has matured now at the fellowship level. We have three fellows here who are intending to join the BC. They're actually my mentees and I think two of them are in the hall. One has been the one covering the event during the outreach, and he's been here taking pictures. So they're joining up. One has signed up already. That's Asteway, Tracy and Adebunmi. So they will be coming on board. And thank you for the time.

MASON COLE:

Wonderful. That's great news. Thank you, Arinola. Good. All right. Steve, would you care to say something about the photo?

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Yeah, if you haven't done it already, try while you're in Rwanda to do the Gorilla Trek. They take really good care of you, you'll see an, entire family and you'll be within four to six feet of the most magnificent creatures you've ever seen, so try it.

MASON COLE:

All right. I can't think of a better note to end on on that. So Devan, thank you very much for the support and thanks for everybody who's in the room today and online for joining us for the BC today. We'll

meet again in a couple of weeks' time online, and BC's adjourned.
Thanks everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]