
BRENDA BREWER: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the BC Membership meeting on 15 December 2022 at 16:00 UTC.

Today's call is recorded. Kindly state your name before speaking and have your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking. Attendance is taken from Zoom participation. I do have apologies today from Barbara Wanner, Mark Datysgeld, Marie Pattullo, and Tola Sogbesan. I'll turn the meeting over to our BC chair, Mason Cole. Thank you.

MASON COLE: Thank you, Brenda. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everybody. It's Mason, chair of the BC. It is three past the hour. Welcome to the BC call on 15 December. Happy holidays to everyone. I hope everything's going well.

We have a bit of a lighter meeting today because the policy calendar is a little shorter and we need to rejigger the order of our policy calendar review to accommodate some early departures from the meeting today. So we'll do that. But before we start, are there any updates or additions to the agenda as you see it on the screen? Okay. Seeing none, we'll proceed with meeting. Let's go to item number two. Steve, the floor is yours. Please go ahead.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Mason. So, Tim, I have you channel three for the CSG liaison. Why don't you take it first?

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.

TIM SMITH:

Thanks very much, Steve. Thanks for flipping the agenda around to accommodate my early departure. I've not very much to report. I think the one piece of business that we're watching right at the moment within CSG land is the Board-facilitated dialogue on closed generics. I've been staying in touch with Philippe Fouquart who represents us on that. I shared with him the great summary that Steve provided a few weeks back, and Philippe has received that and he finds it useful in their discussions.

So that work continues. I believe they're hoping to have it all wrapped up by the end of January when there is a face-to-face meeting plan for Washington D.C. Originally, that was in November, and then it was in December, and now it's at the end of January. So hopefully they can stick to that timeline. He couldn't share too much other than good progress is being made, and that they've removed edge cases, and are proceeding along to try to fulfill what the Board wanted which is to have a path forward for closed generics.

So I think it's a worthwhile process. I'm meeting again with Philippe on January 10 to see what progress they have made in the three meetings that will have taken place from now until then. So it looks fairly encouraging. But I guess the devil is in the details, and we'll have to see what gets presented to the Board at the end. And that's not a predetermined outcome from what I understand.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Tim, did you share what we shared with Philippe? Did you share with the IPC's liaison to Commercial Stakeholders Group?

TIM SMITH: I did not.

STEVE DELBIANCO: I think we should because you want them to know what we're suggesting to Philippe. Philippe is the liaison from the ISPs. Do we think he shared it with ISPCP leadership?

TIM SMITH: That I am not sure of either. So I will reach out to him and ask him that question. When he and I spoke, he said that he was going to reach out to IPC to share with them, really, more of where the process was at.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Well, that's not the same as sharing our position to see ... Who's the IPC liaison?

TIM SMITH: They really don't have a liaison. It's really, I guess, the people who speak up the most, Lori and Brian King, right? But there's no CSG liaison per se for IPC.

STEVE DELBIANCO: I would say that it's essential that we share it with their leadership. And if you're comfortable doing that, by all means, do. And if not, then Mason could share.

TIM SMITH: I'm comfortable doing that. That's easy to do. I'll also touch base with Philippe and see whether that's been shared with his exec as well.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Great, because there's an opportunity here, Tim, is that we have a relatively coherent position, and it's one that is a balancing of the equities and we could invite the leadership of our other two CSG partners to simply embrace that. It's going to make it a lot easier than fighting. Because to the extent that this stands in the way of the next round, there are members of the IPC who desperately want another round for brands, they might love the idea, I guess, of expeditiously solving this problem.

TIM SMITH: Right. Okay. I will do that, for sure. Thank you for that suggestion. I'll share that later today with them.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Any questions for Tim? Tim, anything else to give us on CSG?

TIM SMITH: No. That's it. We haven't scheduled another ExCom meeting. We don't have any other things that we're discussing at the moment. So that's everything.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you so much. I appreciate it. So we'll go back to the top of the regular policy calendar. We only have one comment filed since we had our last meeting and that was a comment on the implementation of EPDP Phase 1 and Phase 2 priority items. It was an extremely long comment where we had to answer a series of questions about whether the implementation of purpose proposed matched the recommendations that came out of Council. In a few cases, we answered yes or no, but in almost all of the cases, we beg to differ about whether the policy itself was appropriate, especially in light of NIS2, something we have been saying over and over again.

So I want to shout out a big thank you to Margie, to David Sneed, Alex Deacon, who helped me to get all of those comments compiled and submitted on the 4th of December. The comment itself is best looked at in the PDF because if you look on it online, when you paste our answers into the online forum that ICANN Org uses, there are no line breaks, there's no bullets, there's no hyperlinks, there's no underlines, no bold, no italic. In other words, a whole long multiple indentation cited paragraph almost just turns into a massive block of unreadable text. So the PDF is the way to go. Margie, thanks again for that.

I'm going to quickly segue to a portion of the discussion because I want to discuss whether we think we can really suggest that a Temp Spec is

necessary. But first, let me ask if we have volunteers on the two open public comments right now. There's a final report on Curative Rights Protections for Inter-governmental Organizations. Think of the Red Cross, for example.

We first comment on this a little over a year ago and it was a very legalistic comment led by Andy and Zak. Jimson, Marie helped as well. It's legalistic because it gets into this notion of courts of jurisdiction when it comes to somebody like the Red Cross wanting to use Curative Rights Protections. Andy and Zak would be the perfect ones to pick it up and see how we want to comment on the final report. But I'm not entirely positive that these guys are going to have the time, considering it closes 16th of Jan. What do we have in the way of volunteers who might help with that?

MASON COLE:

Steve, check the chat. Zak is volunteering.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Oh, you're the best, Zak. Thank you. Zak, I'm going to reach out to Andy because if you can reprise your tag team on that. Okay. I'll ask Andy Abrams. Thank you, Zak. And Jay Sudowski too? Great.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

Pardon me, Steve. I'll ping Andy Abrams as well about this.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Oh, great. Please do. Just copy and paste the item one, which is right here on the screen, and tell him Zak has agreed. If Andy could pitch in with Zak, it'd be awesome.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Fantastic. Will do. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you. Oh, it's Jay Chapman, not Jay Sudowski. Got it. Okay. Thank you. Then at the initial report on the ccNSO, look, I get that BC members have registrations in some of the ccTLDs, and I get that you're probably combating DNS abuse, fraud, and cybersquatting originating from fraudulent registrations in ccns, and yet, that's not what this comment is about. It's a comment on the process changes that the ccNSO is making to its PDP. So it feels like it's really process-oriented and not necessarily something that's about substance. Nonetheless, I wanted to ask if BC members are sufficiently interested to draft a BC comment on this, and if not, we will be silent on number two. Anyone? Margie, I'm turning to you in particular, whether you're battling a lot of ccTLD items and does the cc community do a good enough job on PDPs to address abuse?

MARGIE MILAM: Hi. I am battling a lot of ccTLD issues as it relates to enforcement. But I can't imagine they would do a PDP on abuse in a way that would affect it the way that the gTLD would. So I don't really have any more insight than that.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thanks, Margie. If there's a failing to hear any other interests, we will probably not comment on number two. It's a process matter for the ccNSO, we'll stay out of it. And number three is not an open public comment but it's the tee up of a discussion that I'd like to have right now. Margie and I have been going back and forth about whether the differences between ICANN policy contracts and the NIS2 language will eventually arise to a sufficient difference, a sufficient conflict or gap that we could begin to rally for another Temporary Spec, known as a Temp Spec. These are rarely used, and it might be premature unless and until a few European member states transpose NIS2 into law. But that's an opportunity, not a problem. Because if, say, Denmark were to transpose it strongly into law, that a lot of the weasel words that are in NIS2 like should ensure there's not a lot of must in NIS2. So it could be that first transposition by a country could be strong and that would provide a better opportunity for us to show there are conflicts.

So I've done some research into this Temporary Specification. Both the Registrar and Registry contracts provide for a Temporary Spec or Temporary Specification based on the Board determining in the public interest that they make a temporary change to the contracts and the Registrar Accreditation Agreement. And yet the only time in my memory that it was used was on GDPR 2018 when the rationale that was used by the Board went to a different place. Their rationale was that the ICANN contracts requiring who is transferring publication would cause our contracted parties to be in violation of GDPR and expose them to fines. So the way the Board justified it was that we

don't want to make our registrars subject to fines. So we're going to do a Temp Spec so the contract doesn't require them to break the law.

But that is not what's in the contracts. What's in the contracts is a very different test, a public interest test. So there may be an opportunity for us to claim that it's in the public interest for ICANN's contracts to require more of the same things that are in NIS2. Margie, you and I have been through this a few times. We think one of them is the differentiation between legal and natural, the obligation on publication of the legal persons, an obligation on accuracy and verification. So I want to turn it over to Margie next. My objective is to just discuss with BC members whether we think we should begin to head down the road of justifying a Temporary Specification. Margie?

MARGIE MILAM:

Sure. Thanks, Steve. Thanks for teeing that up and doing that research. It had been a while since I've looked at the ICANN Bylaws, and I just took a look at the RAA, I guess, as it relates to the Temporary Specifications. So that's an interesting perspective that as long as it's in the public interest, that gives them the ability to do that.

What I outlined in the document that I've shared with the BC are just initial observations when I read the NIS2 language and thought about what it meant from an ICANN policy perspective. If you recall, when the Temp Spec was started back in 2018, the goal was to modify the WHOIS policy to the greatest extent possible to keep it as close to the old policy as possible as long as you were complying with GDPR. Clearly, what we saw in the implementation of the Phase 1, even then we just

commented on and in the Phase 1, Phase 2 report was a very large departure from the WHOIS policy, at least from the BC perspective, that it went far beyond what was necessary to comply with the privacy laws, GDPR that prompted the analysis.

So we're at this unique opportunity where we can go back and say the circumstances have changed. The European Commission has said it's in the public interest to have WHOIS, and then use that as the springboard for asking for a Temp Spec. In my e-mail—thanks for putting that up—I outlined the areas where I saw the biggest gaps between the current policy and what's going to come from NIS2, including the administrative contact. I noticed that that the NIS2 specifically talks about collecting administrative contacts when the administrative contract differs from the registrant. We see that a lot in WHOIS records even today, especially when there's, for example, a proxy service or a privacy service involved. So that's one direct conflict, even under the standard that the ICANN Board used when it started the Temp Spec, they looked at conflicts with the policy—

STEVE DELBIANCO: Can I ask you question on that?

MARGIE MILAM: Sure.

STEVE DELBIANCO: The Board's rationale for the Temp Spec in 2018 said that we cannot have our policies and contracts require you to do something that would

break the law. On the other hand, if our contracts and policies allow you to do more in compliance with local law, that does not arise to a Temp Spec. This is the language that JJ and ICANN Legal used four years ago, and they're the same people that are still in charge. So it is not even close to the same kind of a conflict that they rationalized Temp Spec on in 2018. Let me give me a chance to respond to that.

MARGIE MILAM:

Well, sure. There's a difference between what a registrar can do voluntarily and what a registrar is required to do. If you think about how compliance has to happen with NIS2, if there's certain information that has to go to the registry because the law requires it, that's where the conflict arises. If there's a registrar that says, "I'm not going to collect admin contacts and I'm not going to give it to the registry," and then there's a law that requires the registry to have it and publish it when it relates to, for example, legal person's data, there you go. That's the conflict we're talking about. So even under the narrow standard that ICANN applied when they did the first Temp Spec, I think we could easily make the argument that there are those types of conflicts.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

But, Margie, we're obviously talking past each other. The Board's rationale said, "We can't require you to do something that would break the law. We can't prevent you from doing something that would mean you would break the law." ICANN will say that the contracts that are in place now allow but do not require a registrar to publish the administrative contact and make a legal/natural distinction. So it is not

sufficient under the Board's latest rationale to simply say that they are different. The conflict that they used for the Temp Spec was a different test. It said that ICANN's contracts and policies are going to cause you guys, registrars and registries, to break GDPR. We have not met that test. I'm no lawyer, you are. But I don't see that we've met that test yet.

Now, before I got too wrapped around the axle about that test, I started this off by acknowledging your whole point that that's not the test. It's in the agreements. The agreements don't say anything about this conflict that causes you to break the law. The agreements just say the Board reasonably determines the modifications are justified on the subject to necessary to maintain the stability and security of services. So the test that's in the contracts is a lot lower than the test the Board adopted in 2018. But they're going to throw the 2018 standard into our face and we haven't discovered anything that meets that standard yet. Back to you.

MARGIE MILAM:

I think that's semantics. Honestly, I think we can easily get around those arguments, especially when you think about the thick WHOIS dilemma, right? Because, essentially, if you've got a situation where a registrar doesn't want to give the information to a registry and the policy doesn't require it, that's where you end up putting the registry at a place where they will be violating the law if they don't have the information that they need to comply with their obligations under NIS2. So I do see the conflict as being one that is that direct. I just think we have to come up with sufficient examples and talking points to be able to walk people through that.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Margie, I highlighted that the thick WHOIS point you made here and then it's a two-step process to get there. You have to suggest that NIS2 as transposed by, say, Denmark is going to require all registries to be thick. And if it makes that requirement, the registries could potentially fall out of compliance if ICANN policy doesn't force the registrars to give them the data they're supposed to have. Do I have that right?

MARGIE MILAM: That's right. That's right.

STEVE DELBIANCO: I can see working that out. The assumption is that somebody is going to require thick WHOIS as opposed to just allowing the registries to use RDAP to get the data from a registry?

MARGIE MILAM: Right. And the way I read the language in NIS2, I read it as requiring the registries to have the database themselves and not merely doing an RDAP look up somewhere else. But that's in the details that would probably happen as it gets transposed.

The other point that I think is relevant is that—and obviously this is subject to the publication in the European Journal—but when it gets published in the European Journal, then it is law. It's not correct to say that it's not law in Europe, it still has to be transposed, but the directive itself actually has the effect of law at that point, which is why I would

encourage us to work on either asking the Board to do it or working with our colleagues and the other stakeholder groups and advisory committees like the IPC, some of our allies, ALAC, GAC, to see if they'll join us if the BC agrees to pushing for a Temporary Spec on the NIS2.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Yeah. I think that over the break would be a great time for us to start to fashion the arguments. When we try to enlist others, they'll be better allies if we equip them with what the other side will say and what our answer is, right? So we lay out the contracts, what they require in the low standard, we discussed what the Board said in 2018 on GDPR Temp Spec, and that we provide people with the rebuttal points they'll need. So that when they are in a discussion, it will presumably be something we'll talk about in Cancún, too, that everybody will be armed. So we've got some time on that. When do you think we'll see a publication of the NIS2 official text?

MARGIE MILAM:

I don't know. I don't know if Nick's on the call. Maybe someone else knows. Marie might know. But I can't imagine it's going to be very long. But I'm expecting it, say, by January we should have it.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Caroline, I know you're pretty familiar with the European Commission procedures European Parliament. Would you do some research while we're on the call to see if you can dig up the publication date?

CAROLINE LUPETINI:

Sure.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Register publication. Thank you. Margie, was there anything else in your memo you wanted to highlight before we lose you? Anything else that meets the conflicts tested I described?

MARGIE MILAM:

Yeah, the one area when I really dug in that surprised me was the privacy/proxy and reseller angle, because if you think about it, there's all the obligations that I've listed up there apply to them as well. Currently, we don't have policy that requires the kind of disclosure and collection of data for privacy/proxy providers and for resellers. So that's probably another area where it'll be more clear that there needs to be some sort of policy developed for that.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Yes. I love the idea that says that if they simply implemented the privacy/proxy services accreditation, that wouldn't solve this. Because they could get accredited without having to do with NIS2 may require them to do.

MARGIE MILAM:

Right, because that policy was adopted in a way years ago, that it was a very lightweight approach. It didn't require disclosures or those sorts of things. So the kind of specific requirements of accuracy and disclosure

and publication, all of that is not covered by the old policy that hasn't been implemented.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Okay. So I could do this colloquy all day long. I really could. But let me give the rest of the BC members a chance to ask Margie any questions before she disappears in three minutes. Okay, great. Thanks, everyone. This will be a very hot topic for us in 2023 as predicted, and NIS2 provides the catalyst for us to talk about rectifying the overinterpretation of GDPR that resulted in the destruction of WHOIS. Thanks, Margie.

MARGIE MILAM:

Thank you, everybody.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Let me go back to policy calendar here. Great. Okay. I wanted to let you know that both Marie and Mark are in Los Angeles for GNSO Council session that includes the GNSO Council meeting today at 21:00. I did want to point out right here is that Göran replied to the Council letter regarding the WHOIS Disclosure System. That is not the same thing as Board approval, but at least there's correspondence back and forth that you can look at.

Finally, the Council meeting today, I put in four items on there that will be discussed. There's only one vote, and the vote is on a more process-oriented improvements for Work Stream 2. Mason, the rest of us on ExCom recommended that the BC reps vote yes, those are process and

not policy items. Then the discussions are pretty important because they talk about the policy for domain names, they're deleted or expired and how they can be recovered. So there's no action on that, just a discussion.

SubPro continues to move along because ICANN Org finally delivered the Operational Design Assessment. We often call those ODAs. There was one of them on SSAD, if you recall, that drove the whole consideration of an SSAD Light. Now the Subsequent Procedures for the next round of gTLD expansion has its own ODA. I've yet to read it. It just came out but it's linked right here in item six, and they're discussing it today.

Finally, the DNS abuse recommendations and the community reviews that recommended them are being discussed because the Board has allocated about six million U.S. dollars to implement community review recommendations, recommendations that are already done, not new recommendations to be developed.

That's all I have for Council. We don't have Marie and Mark today. We've already covered closed generics, thanks to Tim. Zak, I'm going to turn it over to you to see if you want to update your colleagues on where we are on the Transfer Policy that you and Arinola are working on.

ZAK MUSCOVITCH:

Sure, Steve. Where we left off with this working group, there was a public comment opportunity to BC made public comments on, and then the working groups have been going through public comments with a

view to revisiting those proposals that attracted criticism. So the working group is reconsidering some proposals. A few of those have some positive aspects for the BC, some little negative aspects. So one of the positive aspects is the BC's position was that we wanted the working group to consider that a registrant should always have the ability to cancel a pending transfer. So that's something that other commenters also emphasized. It looks like the working group has moved in that direction, and so that's good.

Second thing is—and this was expressed in the BC private mailing list recently—there was another concern about registrars retaining the power to refuse to transfer out a domain name based upon what could be by a bad actor registrar—capricious use policies, for example, stifling freedom of speech or uncompetitive practices, etc. So there was serious reconsideration within the working group on that aspect. I joined a small group on this topic as well to try to make some progress on it within the working group. It looks like that's going to be rolled back and now a registrar will only be able to withhold transfer in the case of fraud or in the case of an active DNS threat.

So, that is some progress on that in that aspect. However, Mike Rodenbaugh from IPC with my support also tried to argue that rather than provide registrars with any residual discretion when notified an active DNS threat that the registrar should be required rather than may disable. Well, they can disable regardless of whether they must prohibit the transfer out of the registry.

So Mike Rodenbaugh from IPC with my support stated that, "Listen, if there's a credible notification of an active DNS threat, there's no

question that a registrar should prohibit the transfer out so that it can be dealt with that existing registrar.” Registrars really pushed back on this. I’m not really clear on what their arguments are, to be frank. But that’s something that looks like the Registrars are going to push through, at least for the time being. So I imagine the BC will be making a comment about that once it gets put out for public comment again, which I suspect that it will.

So just to give you a little bit of flavor, this working group is very much stacked in favor of Registrars, given the nature of the topic of the working group. Any kind of frictions or disagreements that you may have seen in the original EPDP on DNS abuse, etc., those kinds of things still exist here, the only difference is that we’re outnumbered, 25 to 1 or 2. So that’s something to keep an eye out for in the future.

Also, I joined a small group where there was a discussion on a third new consideration from the working group, and that’s whether when there’s a change of registrar or a new domain name created, there’s going to be a 30-day lock. That’s down from a permissive 60-day lock. So that 30-day lock, the BC has said that 60 is better but 30 is a reasonable compromise, the question that arose through some public comments is whether the working group should reconsider whether there should be a carve out for registrars who have an existing and established client relationship. So you could think about it in a couple of ways. In the case of boutique registrar catering to corporations and trademark owners, then if there’s a closing that’s happening and the parties want to consolidate domain names, and in a particular registrar, there’s been a recent change of registrar, where there’s been a newly created domain name. The general rule would be that there’s still going to be a 30-day

lock, which could put off the closing and delay a final closing. Or there could just be regular business reasons that you want to change registrars. So by allowing registrars to put on a lock, it's a good idea, because as we've discussed, it allows trademark owners to deal with a trademark infringement or fraud situation at existing registrar without hopping and hopping and hopping. But there is a possible reason for allowing a carve out to that, that's currently being discussed in the small group. That will probably go out for public comment again, and the BC will have an opportunity to comment on that.

Lastly, I can't speak for Arinola. But in 18 months of this working group, I can say I'm finally beginning to understand it. So if anybody wants to discuss it with me offline, I'd be happy to. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

That's a great update, Zak. Arinola, I know you're on the call. Anything to add? All right, BC members, any questions for Zak and Arinola on the Transfer Policy? All right. Thank you very much.

The next item up, Lawrence is handling our representation on the Applicant Support Group Guidance Process. I know they met in late November. Anything to add to that, Lawrence? Any kind of an update?

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS:

Yes. Thank you, Steve. Pardon me, members. I'm on the audio bridge only for today. They group have a meeting scheduled for Monday, where we will basically be reviewing and agreeing on sending on a letter

that should be sent out to the community with regards to getting subject matter experts to join the group at this point.

So at our last meeting, we concluded on our calendar, and we're working with a timeline that takes us until December 2023, where we hope to have a report returned back to the GNSO Council. We have an agile calendar that should take us up to September, but where we do not meet up with that, we will be working with a December timeline. At this point, the idea is to identify subject matter experts that might be required for the work ahead and to have them onboarded into the group. That's about where we are. I believe that after we get through this phase, after the December meeting, the next meeting is supposed to be about the first week in January where work actively starts. That's about it.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Any questions from BC members? Great. The only thing on DNS abuse is that Göran acknowledged the contracted parties' requests to start contract negotiations to amend the Registrar/Registry Agreements toward explicitly create obligations for addressing DNS abuse. So that's a win. Presumably, the contracted parties will begin to work with Org on that. That is all I have and I wanted to turn it back over to Mason.

MASON COLE:

Thanks very much, Steve. Good update. Thanks, everybody, for your participation on the policy calendar. Any other questions for Steve before we move over to the next item on the agenda? Okay. All right,

Lawrence, over to you, please, for Finance and Operations update. The floor is yours.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Thank you, chair. Registration has now opened for the next ICANN public meeting, which is the Cancún meeting ICANN76. Members can go to the [icann.org](https://www.icann.org) website to start the process of registering and getting letters that could aid with visa applications and all that. The Cancún meeting is a community forum and is built for the 11th through to the 16th of March 2023.

Also, we have the Additional Budget Request process still ongoing. I will be sharing on the private list three proposals that I have drafted for your edits and concurrence. One is the proposal that we've always pushed forward for communication prints. The second proposal is to have some improvements down to our ICANN Learn platform in terms of having video content added to the course. The third is another proposal on leadership development and [inaudible] business leaders' roundtable. I'm hoping that we could leverage on the stakeholder engagement for business division of ICANN to see how we could have more business leaders brought to a roundtable for us to have some form of interaction and discussion with them as a BC possibly during the AGM, which should be ICANN78, if I'm correct. But those proposals will be shared with members. We should have them ready for submission in time to meet the deadline later in January 2023.

We had a beautiful session on DNS Abuse during the Global IGF, courtesy of Mark and the BC ExCom, out here to give some further

updates on the session. But it was a session—I think it held on the second to the last day of the IGF. It had Mason Cole, the chair, myself, vice chair, and Mark discussing the issues around DNS abuse. I recall that there were a few persons in the hall, including Edmon Chung of the ICANN Board. Quite a number of positive feedbacks were received with regards to this particular session. I'm sure if Mason has anything to add, he would chip it in right after now.

We have the Credentials Committee has advanced the application of a new member. We have joining the BC today Mr. Ajijola. I'm not able to see. I'm not in the Zoom Room to see if he is present. But this is an active member of the community in my region. He is also rated one of the top global experts in cybersecurity. Is Mr. Ajijola on the call? If he is, maybe he will want to take a few minutes to just introduce himself to the rest of the BC.

BRENDA BREWER: Lawrence, this is Brenda. He was on earlier but he is no longer connected.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Thank you.

BRENDA BREWER: You're welcome.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Thank you, Brenda. We also have some strict timelines to produce the next edition of the BC newsletter for ICANN76. I again want to encourage members to please turn in their applications. Luckily, we have a different process outside ICANN in producing and designing the newsletter, but we have to meet up with a deadline for around the 14th of January if we want to have the newsletter translated into the Mexican lingua. Otherwise, we would have until about the 28th thereabout to have ICANN help with the physical prints. So whichever way it is, I want to encourage a few of us to help walk through just before the holidays to put together articles that could be of interest to the BC and BC members. It could be an article around what you have done or the impact the BC membership has had on your business. We had one such in the last newsletter from June and it was very well received. Aside from sharing your experience, you could also talk about topics that are of interest to the BC which cover a wide variety of subjects. So for those who are also just joining the BC, this is a big opportunity to also have some of your intellectual work reflecting in BC's publications. Please note that we have until about the first week in January to collate all these, to put them and have the design ready for printing for us to have physical copies circulated at Cancún.

We have almost all membership dues in except for a few members who we're working with. We want to encourage that we quickly close out any open invoice you might have, not to put your membership at risk. And with that, I will yield the floor back to Mason. I mean, I will give room for us to ask any questions if we have any questions. Otherwise, I will yield the floor back to Mason, the chair, to continue with the meeting.

MASON COLE: Thank you very much, Lawrence. Anyone have questions or comments for Lawrence's report, please? Okay. I don't see any hands.

I wanted to follow up on Lawrence's introduction of Abdul who has rejoined the call. Abdul, welcome to the BC. It's good to have you as a member. Would you like to introduce yourself or otherwise send your greetings to the BC?

ABDUL-HAKEEM AIJOLA: Yes, I'd like to say hello. As you know, my name is Abdul-Hakeem Ajjola. I have a bald head but I wear a couple of caps. One of them is that I'm chair of the African Union Cybersecurity Expert Group. I've also chaired the Nigerian Cybersecurity Policy Drafting Committee. Also, I'm the chair of a group that has put together the roadmap for our data protection and data privacy, among other things. So that's me. Thank you.

MASON COLE: Thank you very much for that introduction. We welcome you to the BC and we look forward to your contributions. I understand you're traveling today. Safe travels and welcome to the BC.

ABDUL-HAKEEM AIJOLA: Thank you very much.

MASON COLE: Jimson, your hand is up. Go ahead, please.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Yes. Thank you very much, Mason. Greetings, everyone. Nice to be back. Sorry for being early indisposed for a number of reasons. We'll just also use the opportunity to welcome Abdul-Hakeem Ajjola. Abdul-Hakeem, you're most welcome.

ABDUL-HAKEEM AIJOLA: Thank you very much.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: The process has been pending for quite a while. So we trust that as you usually do in your tradition, you watch great value to what we do here. And also to use the opportunity to thank Lawrence. Lawrence was around to represent the ExCom at the recently concluded AfICTA Summit, 10th Anniversary Summit. There was an outreach. So he represented the ExCom and Mason, our chair. So thank you very much. All right. So that's it for me.

MASON COLE: Thank you very much, Jimson. It's good to have you back on the call. Thank you for your contribution just there.

All right, ladies and gentlemen, we are at item number four on the agenda which is All Other Business. Is there any other business to bring before the BC this morning? Arinola?

ARINOLA AKINYEMI: Thank you, Mason. Just as a bit of follow up on the GNSO SSC for Expression of Interest as a Fellowship mentor or Fellowship Selection Committee. It's six days to the close of submission, and to let you know that the committee will be meeting on 20th to try to collate the Expression of Interest.

MASON COLE: Thank you. I'm making a note to follow up on that. I will do so today on your behalf. Thank you very much for raising that.

ARINOLA AKINYEMI: You're welcome.

MASON COLE: All right. Thank you, Arinola. Any other business for the BC this morning? All right, with that, then I see no hands. I will offer you 10 minutes of your day back. But first, I want to wish everyone happy holidays. I hope your holiday season is safe, and if you're traveling to see relatives, that you travel safely. Brenda, I believe we don't have a meeting before the end of the year but we do have one on 5 January, is that correct?

BRENDA BREWER: Hi, Mason. Yes, that is correct. I just got the calendar invites out today for January of 2023. So the next meeting is January 5 at 16:00 UTC.

MASON COLE: All right, very good. Yes. Thank you very much, Steve. Yes, my first Christmas is a newlywed. So I'm enjoying that very much.

All right, members, thank you very much for joining on today. Again, happy holidays to everyone, and we will see you on January 5, if not sooner. So happy holidays. The BC is adjourned. Bye, everybody.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Happy holidays. Merry Christmas. Thanks, everybody.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]