
BRENDA BREWER: Good day, everyone. Welcome to the Business Constituency Membership Call on the 2nd of December 2021 at 16:00 UTC. This meeting is recorded. Please state your name before speaking, for the record, and have your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking.

Attendance is taken from Zoom participation. We do have apologies from Steve DelBianco and Marie Pattullo.

And with that, I'll turn the meeting over to chair, Mason Cole. Thank you.

MASON COLE: Thank you, Brenda. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. Mason Cole here, chair of the BC. Good to have you all on the call today. And I note that we have a couple of new members in the room today which is good to see. Lawrence is going to speak about new members in Item #3 on the agenda.

So we have an hour today for our meeting, and we need to make that a hard stop because I know several of us have commitments at the top of the hour. So we're going to need to be efficient.

Steve is not available today, so lucky you. You have me running the policy calendar today, and we'll get to that in just a moment. Does anyone have any updates or suggestions for the agenda other than what's presented on the screen?

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: Hi, Mason. I just don't know where to put it on the agenda, but I know there has been a call for plenary sessions for ICANN73. So that's something that perhaps we can have a discussion about at the appropriate time.

MASON COLE: Thanks, Tim. Let's raise that under AOB on Item 4. Could you raise that at that point? Is that okay?

TIM SMITH: I will do that. Thank you.

MASON COLE: Thank you. All right, ladies and gentlemen. Let's begin. Brenda, would you put the policy calendar up, please? We're going to start with Item #2 on the agenda. Okay, thanks very much.

All right. You'll forgive me for not being as smooth and practiced as Steve is on presentation of the policy calendar or hosting a discussion. But bear with me and I'm going to do my best, so here we go. Yeah. Top of the screen there, Brenda. Please. Thank you.

We're going to open with Channel 1 in regard to the public comment process. So it looks like we filed comments, thank to Tim and Lawrence, on the Draft PTI and IANA FY23 Operating Plan and Budget. So gentlemen, thank you for handling that.

At the end of October, we also commented on the initial report from the EPDP on Curative Rights Protections for IGOs with help from ... We had a lot of drafters on that: Jay, Andy, Zak, Marie, and Jimson.

Let's see, Jay, Zak, Andy. Anybody have an update they'd like to share on this? Looks like there's [inaudible].

JAY CHAPMAN:

Sure, thanks. I think we've pretty well resolved it. Basically, the EPDP for IGOs had suggested and requested that the BC provide more background and color for one of its suggestions in its comment, specifically with regard to the preliminary report's Recommendation 3 which sought to remove the mutual jurisdiction requirement for IGOs prior to filing a UDRP.

Andy—and Andy's on the call, so, Andy, feel free to fill in the gaps—basically just gave some background for trying to come up with a compromise position that balanced the IGOs' desires to protect or at least to be able to claim protection by nature of their privileges and immunities against the ability of a Losing Registrant in a UDRP case to be able to take that before a court. Thanks.

MASON COLE:

Thanks, Jay, for that update. Any other discussion this? Zak or Andy, anything you'd like to add?

ANDY ABRAMS:

Hi. Basically, the IPC had the same position with regard to a compromise. Interestingly, the EPDP [apparently] obtained legal advice that said the mutual jurisdiction clause as it stands right now probably does not violate an IGO's sovereign immunity.

That said, I understand their position that they're uncomfortable with it being sort of a blanket waiver, potentially. So our idea was to have an explicit caveat in Section [3B-12] essentially stating that IGOs are not broadly waiving their privileges but saying that they will agree for this narrow context to [agree to] at least jurisdictional—to appear in court should a registrant try to appeal the UDRP decision. At that point, they could still claim immunity. Right? So they're not waiting that.

And the registrant still has its right of appeal in court, and the IGO still has its right to claim immunity. But then they can still bring the UDRP. So that was thought of as a compromise from the BC. And so hopefully that provides sufficient explanation for the EPDP.

MASON COLE:

Sounds like it, Andy. Thank you very much, and it looks like Zak is confirming your explanation. So we're all good to go on that, I think. So thank you, gentlemen, for handling that and for explain to the BC where our position came down. If there's anything else you need on that, please raise it. Feel free to raise it here or in an e-mail. Whatever's easier for you.

Thank you very much. Brenda, can you scroll down to #1 there, please? There you go, thank you.

Proposed Revisions to the ICANN DIDP. Comments close on December 6th on this, which is four days away. It looks like John Berard is leading the comment. And as Steve notes, "John cuts right to the core on this draft."

So John, I know you're on the call. Is there anything you'd like to add in terms of BC review and this comment?

JOHN BERARD:

Thank you, Mason. The only thing is that within the document that's attached is a plea for help in sorting out where the review that I have suggested we are calling for should be held. I have no particular point of view on that and would ask that other BC members weigh in on where a review should be best directed. And that's about it.

MASON COLE:

Thanks, John. What I might suggest, if you're looking for BC input on that is to just open an e-mail thread to the BC with your draft and solicit feedback that way.

JOHN BERARD:

Sure, I'll do that. In fact, I'll do it while you're talking, Mason.

MASON COLE:

All right. Thank you, John. Anything else from BC members on that issue? Okay, no hands.

All right. Next one, Brenda. #2, please. ccNSO Proposed Policy on the Retirement of ccTLDs. We have some time on this. comments don't close until almost the middle part of January of 2022. And it looks like it's probably—not a minor comment, but not a heavily involved one either.

As Steve notes in the description here, "This is relevant to BC members with domains in the retiring ccTLD and for the prevention of abuse in the DNS that arises from defunct ccTLDs."

So we commented on this back in April, which Lawrence drafted. Can we have some volunteers to draft the next round of comments for this issue, please?

Okay, Lawrence volunteered. Thank you very much. Okay, anyone else? All right. Lawrence, thanks for heading that up. If you would like to recruit some fellow BC members, feel free to do that. And thank you for leading the charge on that.

Item #3: EPDP Phase 2A Policy Recommendations for the Board's Consideration. So as you know, we filed a minority report back in September. We gave the explanation that was drafted by Margie that you see on the screen here. Go ahead and scroll down a bit more, Brenda, please. Okay.

It would be useful for us to learn what the ALAC, GAC, SSAC are going to say in their advice to the Board, but we do need some volunteers to draft a note. I know, Margie, you're on the call. I don't mean to put you on the spot, but is there anything you'd like to add here?

MARGIE MILAM: Hi. No, but I'll be happy to participate in drafting a note to the Board. I think it's interesting to keep re-emphasizing the messages that we've put in the minority report, so I'd be happy to take a stab at that.

MASON COLE: Okay, Margie. Thank you very much. Anyone want to join with Margie on that effort? Okay. I don't see any hands there. I do see in chat that Roger is supporting Lawrence on the previous item. Thank you very much, Roger.

Okay, Margie. Thank you for heading up this effort. Is there any other discussion on that issue before we move forward? Oh, and Margie says she'll work with Mark SV, too. Okay, excellent. Thank you, Margie. Okay.

All right. Item #4: BC Advocacy on the NIS 2 Proposal Coming from the European Parliament. Let me, if I may, turn over the discussion on this issue for a moment to Drew Bennett who's been heading up the charge for the BC on this issue. Drew, over to you, please.

DREW BENNETT: Hi, everyone. The big development since the last meeting was that the Council of the EU, which you can kind of think about as the third house involved in legislation, proposed what will be called their general approach which is kind of a first proposal that will stand perhaps in contrast to what we got out of the Parliament about a month ago that was very positive. And it's looking like what the Council is going to

produce for this first shot at a new directive is not as positive on the specific provisions they were interested in.

But still, the spirit of the directive which we already thought was going to be a big gain in terms of a statement from the EU about transparency of the WHOIS as well as just some clarity on how GDPR impacts access to it. That's still there, but we do have a little more work as a result. We are now drafting ...

And I want to open up to anyone else interested in joining our drafting team which has about a dozen dc members. But honestly, only about six people are kind of active. And we're kind of keeping it a little bit locked in a Google Doc. But I think anyone can contact myself or Mason to join that drafting group and get in on what's going to be just a general statement kind of introducing ourselves to the Council and expressing that positive support like I said about the spirit of both proposals and the proposed directive in general.

And then we'll have some specific points that are going to need some advocacy as this thing goes. And basically, we're trying to kind of pull all of the parties closer toward the version that came out of Parliament a month ago. I've also got a resource link document that can give you more background, and links to all of these different proposals and hopefully [spare] us some confusion. So I'm happy to share that with people as well.

And into the new year, we'll be looking for engagement from, in particular, representative members who are Europe-based, whose companies would be Europe-based with specific national delegations

that they could engage on the issue. The presidency of the Council starting in January will be French, so we'll be looking to engage and move this. I'm sure people like Marie would know much better, but it seems to me that this could be through the tripartite negotiations in the first half of next year. So there'll be a lot more movement on it.

And again, overall positive. But we are starting to kind of clarify on some of the key points that we're going to push on.

MASON COLE:

Okay, Drew. Thanks very much for that update. That's helpful. And members, this is an important issue, you'll recall, because the NIS 2 Directive helps clarify some of the issues around GDPR in terms of who has access. It's an issue that we've been active on for the better part of a year, if not a little bit longer.

So it is important that the BC continue to weigh in on this because the European Parliament, European Commission, and lawmakers in Europe need to understand the importance of access to WHOIS records and why it's important for responsible business online, as Steve notes in the calendar.

So Drew, thanks for the update. Any other discussion on this issue?

DREW BENNETT:

No, not at this time. Please reach out to myself or Mason if you want to get involved in the drafting. And then we'll have that letter. We want to have the final draft early next week and being sent late next week.

MASON COLE: Okay. Thanks, Drew. Yes, please do raise your hand either here or offline with Drew or me if you'd like to join that drafting team.

Brenda, go ahead and scroll down, please. We're onto Channel 2. Mark Datysgeld, can I please turn the call over to you for an update on GNSO work?

MARK DATYSGELD: Thank you very much, Mason. So we're currently very much in between meetings. We do not have an agenda for the next meeting. In spite of a link being there, the link is empty. So a lot of the discussion that has been going on is pretty much iterative on the discussion we've had before. There are some event opportunities that I would like to highlight that may help our discussions further along, some of the final events of the year.

ICANN is intending to discuss their FY23 plans very soon. This could be an interesting opportunity for us to have an update on what they're expecting. There are two different sessions. I'm posting both links on the chat for you all to have a look. This would likely be an opportunity to engage with them and see what's up, maybe raise some questions.

And we also have an upcoming ICANN Resolver Operator Forum. Don't know how much interest it is of you all as well, but still interesting to see different perspectives.

In terms of upcoming GNSO Council actions, we are still a little bit stuck on the question of the updated definition for the NomCom appointed

representatives. That one is taking a surprisingly longer amount of time that initially expected, as mentioned. It was complicated by some interventions by other constituencies that were not exactly very productive, but we're trying to move along with that one.

And otherwise, on EPDP matters, as you know I'm not exactly too on top of that, so that would be better clarified by another member who's further involved.

So in summary, not much. Some new events, and very soon we'll have an agenda and we'll be able to discuss more about what's coming.

MASON COLE:

Thanks very much, Mark. Brenda, hold it right there please for just a minute. Mark, did you also want to raise the issue on Trusted Notifier Framework?

MARK DATYSGELD:

Yes. I didn't know if you wanted this to be a separate feature, let's call it.

MASON COLE:

No, go ahead. Now is great.

MARK DATYSGELD:

Thank you very much. So another document, another fun link for you all. This one, I don't know if you've had the opportunity to engage with yet. This is the official CPH Trusted Notifier Framework. It was released

last ICANN meeting during one of their engagement sessions. This is interesting because it's something that has been in the works for quite a while within the Internet & Jurisdiction Network, as you know, headed by Bertrand de La Chapelle.

This is an opportunity for us, the way I see it. From one angle, you might think ... Well, you know a trusted notifier is only good for the registries and registrars that already want to do good work. And sure, that's a good argument. But at the same time, we have to start somewhere. Clearly, the CPH is in a defensive position. Even getting them to agree on releasing this was an uphill battle. A lot of us had to work a lot to get them to open themselves up enough for [this to be a thing]. So definitely something worth studying.

I'll go very quickly over the expectations and the logic behind this document. I don't know if you want to have it on the screen or if you would rather just open it individually on your browsers. Your call.

MASON COLE: No, it's up to you, Mark. Whatever's easiest.

MARK DATYSGELD: I'll just go over it. It's fine. Whoever wants to open it can have a look. So basically, just to review very quick what is a trusted notifier. A trusted notifier is somebody who has the ability, a special relationship with a registry or registrar and gets priority in the notifications that they provide to this contracted party. And this priority is very beneficial because what we have learned this past year or two of discussion with

them is that they get a mountain of reports. A lot of them unactionable. A lot of them are poor quality. And therefore, your request, no matter how legitimate it is, ends up lost in that pile.

If you manage to establish a trusted notifier relationship or be in a relationship with somebody who's a trusted notifier that you can forward this to, then suddenly you get elevated out of this [pool] of inadequate reports and you get promoted to a priority position in which your complaint will receive a more serious look. So this is pretty good, I would say.

So how do you become a trusted notifier or how can we help or boost companies that we trust or NGOs that we trust to become trusted notifiers or extent this role? For those of you following through the document, the third section called [Role] and Expectations [Point 1].

Something that stands out to me a lot is actually Point 3 of this that says that the trusted notifier must stand behind its reporting and is committed in writing to a low false-positive rate in the accuracy of its notices. So clearly this reflects what we have been hearing a lot from them that they feel very skeptical of shotgun approaches of just companies trying to notify them en masse of just about anything. Clearly, they're looking for a more curated approach. Therefore, this stands out as an opportunity to really flag those domains, those website that are really being harmful in a particular process.

This goes on to be clarified further by them stating that not all notifiers are trusted notifiers. They want to outline that and specify that. If you want to have a notifier relation, that's good, but they will be selective of

trusted notifiers. And further, that the final action is their decision. You can [inaudible] as much as you want, but if they do not agree, they will not take action.

The reason why I still find this beneficial is that you have to remember, at the end of the day they were barely willing to discuss, in the discussion on DNS abuse ... Before people like Mason were banging on their door about this since the very beginning—some of us from the BC were very insistent; some people from the IPC—they were barely willing to discuss this. And for them to become flexible to the point of actually releasing this document, this is a pretty good advancement, all things considered.

So basically what they're requesting is that the person exerts—well, it could be a person, it could be an institution—a high amount of due diligence, that's rather important, that they are able to justify their notifications and the purposes that they have. And this is not, again, something that's a wide net approach. This is a very tailored thing.

So if your main concern is cybersecurity, then it's about establishing or partnering with a cybersecurity trusted notifier. If your concern is CSAM, if your concern is intellectual property and so on, you should be focused on that. And we have somebody on the call, on the constituency who's experienced it in the matter of pharmacies. We have Tim Smith here, so you can reach out to him to better coordinate information and to better understand how to act.

As a reminder, we are still very much within the scope of what they define as DNS abuse, so it's the technical concerns plus, for the

signatories of the Trusted Notifier Framework, we have some additional categories, including opioids, human trafficking, and CSAM, of course. So worth mentioning. But still, with that remit there's a lot that can be done. You know, we cannot force right now the people who are not willing to collaborate to collaborate, but if we manage to establish good, healthy relationships with the registries and registrars that are willing to collaborate, if we make that into a systemic thing, if we make this into something workable—we produce studies around that—yeah, we could very much, in the future, try to make this more binding. We could try to push the ones that don't want to collaborate to be involved in this.

So I see this as a step that instead of us endlessly trying to pressure ICANN Org to take action, this is more about building an intercommunity relationship for us to be able to push this forward that eventually can be elevated to the Org, that we can then say, "You know, this is the way to go. This is how this works. This is better for the DNS. You have to enforce this in your next contract amendment or whatever." You lawyers tell me.

But in terms of just to explain how much we've progressed in this matter, they went from not being able—not being willing, actually—to talk anything to actually publishing this document and opening themselves up in this way. I see that as progress, and if anybody has any further ideas on how to engage with this, please feel free to engage. Talk to me. Talk to Mason. Talk to Tim. Whoever else is very interested in this subject.

So just a quick tour to update you on this. If you're interested, it's a very short document. It's like four or five pages long, so I tried to take a little

bit of the intent out of it to show to you all. And that's about it for now.
Thank you, Mason.

MASON COLE:

Thank you, Mark. We appreciate that update very much. Interested members should get in touch with Mark directly on this. Mark, I just wanted, on behalf of the BC, applaud your work on this because you're right. We have been beating the drum with contracted parties and with ICANN Org on DNS abuse, and this is a step forward. So thank you for driving this as hard as you have.

All right, any questions or thoughts for Mark? All right, I just have one other issue on Channel 2, and that is that we are looking for a couple of volunteers on the Committee for Overseeing and Implementing Continuous Improvement. This is an ICANN committee that is designed for continuous improvement of ICANN process and procedures. This is a working group that's expected to take about 9-12 months. It should not be terribly time consuming.

We've been offered two BC slots for representatives from the BC to participate in this working group. So I'll just ask now if anyone is willing to or interested in serving on this working group? If so, feel free to raise your hand. If you'd rather just e-mail me separately, we'll get you put onto the working group. Anyone want to raise a hand at this point, though? All right, we'll come back to that.

All right, let's go to Channel 3, Brenda, please. Time for the CSG liaison report. Waudo, over to you, please.

WAUDO SIGANGA:

Thank you, Mason. So this is the current report. The CSG regularly holds their meetings with a subset of the Board which is composed of the GNSO appointed and affiliated members. There are actually four active members that we meet with. The purpose of this type of meeting with these four Board members is to have a more informal and candid discussion about some of the issues that we can later on bring out when we discuss with the full Board because there are Board members that are closer to us. They have an affiliation to the GNSO.

So the four current ones are Matthew Shears and Becky Burr who are representing the Contracted and Non-Contracted Parties, respectively. And the other two are nominated by the NomCom. That's Avri Doria and Sarah Deutsch. Those of you who have been on the BC for some time will remember that Sarah Deutsch was an active member of the BC some years back. So we have, I think, a good chance with these four people to discuss some issues.

And one of these meetings was on the 23rd of November, which also happened to be a post-ICANN72 meeting with this particular group of the select Board. Because it was an informal meeting, we didn't have a specific agenda. We just discussed some issues generally, but I managed to pick out maybe three issues that could be of interest to the BC.

The first issue is an issue that is of high priority to the BC because it's on our medium-term priority list. That means it's an issue that whenever we're engaging with the stakeholders, we bring up this issue to see the

current status and also just to propagate some kind of overall solution to the issue. And this is the issue DNS abuse.

So we brought up this issue in this meeting with the select Board. And what is happening with the Board is that the Board has actually set up what is known as a Caucus to deal with the issue of DNS abuse. And this just indicates that the Board is taking this issue very, very seriously. So right now, the status of the Caucus is that they are working on a strategy and matrix for monitoring DNS abuse DNS abuse-mitigating activity. And thereafter, they'll come up with a program, perhaps also to interact with the community dealing with this issue of DNS abuse.

A second issue was the engagement with governments. ICANN has actually come up with a Government & IGO (intergovernmental organization) Engagement Team that is actually spread out all over the world to deal with the issue of engaging with the governments.

One issue is that is important to ICANN is that it has to remain fairly impartial. It has to be very neutral in issues dealing with the policy when it is engaging with governments. This is because the charter for ICANN just gives it a mandate to deal with the technical issues relating to the stability and the security of the Internet. So it's very important.

I think last time we had a BC meeting I mentioned that there was the issue of an ITU meeting that is going to happen, plenipotentiary next year. And there are some issues that may be of interest to ICANN because there's an election going to be done for the Secretary General, and it might have some impact on the work of ICANN. But it is important for ICANN in that area to look impartial.

So ICANN relies on the community, actually, to propagate its messages in terms of how to protect the technical and secure operation of the Internet. So that is the current situation with the engagement with the government.

One important thing to note is that ICANN actually has not come up with any standards to give to the community about how the engagement should be done. So we have requested this Board, or this selection of the Board to look into this issue whereby we can have something like a blueprint for the community to use so that the messaging can be standardized as we engage with the governmental delegations in the different sessions that may occur, for example, in the upcoming IGF.

The third issue that was raised was the ATRT3 Holistic Review. And this question was actually asked by [our own Steve] because we had discussed this issue in our meeting at ICANN72 that was called by the ALAC. And there's a specific issue that keeps coming up about how the GNSO is structured.

So this is a structuring issue for the GNSO because, the way the voting is arranged, it's such that some of the stakeholders within the GNSO feel that their voice when it comes to voting is not as strong as it should be. And then we also have other stakeholders such as the ALAC, the GAC, as well as the SSAC that would like to have their influence more strongly felt on the decisions of the GNSO.

So this issue was put to the select Board, and the select Board said that they would be willing to support the community's recommendations

regarding the Holistic Review and specifically anything to do with the GNSO structure.

We were also reassured that the Board takes seriously the advice that comes from ALAC, the GAC, as well as the SSAC. And I think we have seen this also when we're looking at our policy calendar. Just the first item that we had when we were talking about the EPDP Phase 2 policy recommendations. The Board is looking seriously at the minority statements of the ALAC, the GAC, and the SSAC.

So it was just a very informal, candid discussion. Not something so formalized. And those are the three points that I thought would be of interest to the BC. We don't have a date set yet for our next CSG meeting, so once I have such a date, I'll advise. And in case the meeting is requiring attendance by the BC members, I'll also advise on that.

So I think that's my report for now. Thank you very much. Back to you, Mason.

MASON COLE:

Thank you, Waudo. Any questions or comments for Waudo, please? All right, thank you. We've got 20 minutes left and we need to be expedient because we have to stop right at the top of the hour.

Brenda, I think that's the entirety of the calendar. Is it not? Okay, this is some background on DNS abuse. Keep scrolling, please. Yep, I think we're pretty much done. Okay, great. All right. Thank you, Brenda. If you can go back to the regular agenda, please. All right, thanks very much.

Let's move to Item #3. Lawrence, over to you. And let's be fairly quick today if we can. I know I always put pressure on you to do that, but we do have one issue under AOB that we need to raise. And we need to stop at the top of the hour. So please go ahead. Thanks, Lawrence.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Thank you, chair. Good day, everyone. I would want to start with welcoming new members that have recently joined the Business Constituency. Since our last meeting, we've had four new companies join the BC.

EyHost is promoted by Imran Hossen from Pakistan. If you're here, please signify your presence. We would like to just specially recognize you. We've also had Grit, Inc., promoted with a primary representative, Brian Harbin. It's a U.S. company. Also joining the BC, we had American Business Capital Corporation. The primary representative is [inaudible]. And the fourth company is Premium Traffic Limited promoted by Gregg McNair, and also a U.S. company.

We want to welcome you all to the Business Constituency. If any one of you is here, please, you can kindly ... I see Imran here. You're welcome to the BC. I was also going to say please kindly use the chat to introduce yourself because of our time today. Subsequently, we will definitely offer you to say something about yourselves. But please, just introduce yourself, tell us a bit about what you do and what you're into and what your expectations are with regard to how the BC can also help play a role.

We have also concluded our committee elections. For the onboarding and committee, we currently have Roger Baah and Samuel Dada as members in the coming year. And ExCom has approved my recommendation that Roger Baah continue to head the Onboarding Committee. We also have, for Communications, Vivek, and Yusuf of AfICTA. And ExCom has also approved my recommendations that Vivek should chair the Communications Committee in the coming year.

We want to thank members that are [rolling] off, particularly Tim Smith who's been an active member of the Finance Committee. We will definitely miss your contributions, but we know that you'll stay engaged especially with regards to all thing finance. Thanks for the service put into this portion of the work of the BC.

We have a few members who ... So just before then, ExCom has also agreed that we add an additional \$5,000 to the BC's reserve funds. The reserve funds has been sitting at \$60,000 U.S. Right now we've grown it to \$65,000, and this action will not in any way affect BC's operational finances for the current financial year.

We have a few members who will be actively engaged at the IGF starting next week from the 6th through the 10th. And some members, Mark particularly, have volunteered to also provide some detailed advisory as to what sessions members should look out for and stuff like that. We have a matrix. I'm going to be sharing that in the chat, and we want to encourage those of us who have some particular sessions you would like members to follow to please put in the details in the matrix so that members of the BC can be more direct in the sessions that they go to.

With this, I will yield the floor back to Mason, the chair, except if there are any questions for me. Thank you.

MASON COLE: Thank you, Lawrence. Any updates or comments or questions for Lawrence, please?

WAUDO SIGANGA: Yes.

MASON COLE: Waudu.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Sorry. I haven't put up my hand, but just a quick one. Do we have some idea of the members of the BC that will be attending the IGF? Lawrence?

MELINA STROUNGI: Yeah, Lawrence. Can you answer that?

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: With regards to members who'll be [inaudible]. I hope my connection is still holding. The IGF this year is hybrid. There are going to be people attending physically, and also there's going to be participation remotely. So I'm sure that in between the physical and remote participation, the BC will have some very good representation. But I'm not sure. I see

some members indicating in the chat, but I'm sure that we will be adequately represented between the physical and the virtual appearances.

MASON COLE:

Indeed, that's the case. Thank you, Lawrence. And thanks, Waudo, for the question. Any other questions or comments for Lawrence, please? All right. Thanks, everybody.

Yeah, I see that Mark has volunteered to send a guide for BC members to follow the IGF. That would be extremely helpful, Mark, if you would do that. And it looks like Chris Wilson is also attending virtually, so we do have some good representation. That'll be good. Oh, and Tim Smith, too. Excellent.

All right. Any other issues for Item #3 on the agenda? All right, let's move to Item 4 which is issues to raise in AOB. Tim Smith, I know you have something under AOB, so could you go ahead and raise that now? And then we'll move on.

TIM SMITH:

Sure. Hi. Thanks, everyone. There was a call, I think just the other day, for recommendations or suggestions for plenary sessions for ICANN73. So there is an opportunity for the Business Constituency to propose one of two plenaries, I think, that are going to be in place for ICANN73. And the deadline, I believe, is December 13th. So it's a fairly short window for us to come up with some ideas if we have ideas that we want to present.

So I guess that's the first part of this. There has been a suggestion made that perhaps we pursue something about DNS abuse. And while that is a topic that was well covered off in the past few months and through ICANN72, it's also issue that's not going away. So there is a possibility that we could propose something like that.

And as a matter of fact, I want to thank Mark Datysgeld, actually, for his comments on the Trusted Notifier Framework because—this is must my thought—I was thinking if there's some way that we can bring a positive presence to the whole issue of DNS abuse, that might be positive. And that might be good. So if we could pick up on what Mark was talking about which is the benefits of relationships with CPH and with the Trusted Notifier program, there might be a way to shape a positive view and showing that there could be intercommunity relationships as Mark described.

So I'll leave it there. It's something we can look at whether that idea or another idea. But it is something we need to move fairly quickly on if we want to do anything, if we want to propose anything. Thanks.

MASON COLE:

Thank you, Tim. Anybody have a comment or a thought on this? Either in reply to what Tim just said or in general about the idea of raising DNS abuse or another issue as a topic for plenaries for the ICANN73 meeting? Any hands? No hands, okay.

All right. Tim, maybe if you don't mind, would you mind raising this issue and the possibility of a plenary of abuse to the BC and see if there's anyone else who would like to contribute? Or if we decide we

want to go in a different direction, we can always do that as well. But if you don't mind doing that, that would be helpful.

TIM SMITH: Happy to do that, Mason.

MASON COLE: Thank you, sir. All right. Okay, we have another couple of minutes. Is there any other business to raise for the BC today? All right. I see no hands the queue is clear. So in that instance, I will give you ten minutes of your day back. I know we had a hard stop at the top of the hour for many of the member today.

Thank you, everybody, for being efficient and expedient today, and we'll see you at our next meeting in two weeks' time. And I think that's our last meeting of the year before the holidays. So I hope everybody can make time for that meeting and we can have a full compliment of members because there's still a lot of work to do, even before the end of the year.

All right, ladies and gentlemen. Thank you for your time. And thanks to Brenda for her support. And the BC is adjourned. Take care.

BRENDA BREWER: Thank you all for participating today.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]