
BRENDA BREWER: Good day, everyone. This is Brenda speaking. Welcome to the BC Membership meeting on the 2nd of March, 2023 at 16 UTC. Today's call is recorded. Please state your name before speaking and have your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking. Attendance is taken from Zoom participation. I'll turn the meeting over to BC Chair, Mason Cole. Thank you.

MASON COLE: Thank you, Brenda. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. This Mason Cole here chair of the BC. Good to have you all on our call on the 2nd of March, 2023. This is our last BC meeting before the ICANN76 sessions in Cancun. So I appreciate everybody joining today. It looks like we've got a really good turnout, which is good because we have several things to discuss before we all start getting on airplanes to head to Mexico. So I know that a few of us are time challenged today, so we're going to dive right in. We're going to go to item number 20 with Steve, who I believe is going to lead off with Tim, and then we'll go to Lawrence as per our usual flow. So Steve, over to you, please. Go ahead.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Mason. Can you hear me?

MASON COLE: Yes, sir.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Okay. Great. Coming to you all from an airport in Omaha, Nebraska. I'm really looking forward to seeing everybody in person in Cancun. But in the walk up to that, I'll talk about one comment we filed and then I'm going to turn it over to Tim to get on. The one comment we filed since our last meeting was on the 28th earlier this week. We commented on ICANN's public procedure. We're trying to come up with a top level domain string that would be reserved for private use, based on SSAC set of comments back in September of 2020. So a big thank you to Rajiv Prasad of Google, who came up with a draft comment that generally endorses the proposal, but points out that we have some concerns about an extremely subjective nature of the way two of the evaluation steps are done. And we are asking for a greater transparency about how they do it. So Rajiv, thank you for following that comment, drafting that comment, and we got it in on time. I'm now going to bounce to channel three, which is the discussion of our CSG liaison. Over to you, Tim.

TIM SMITH:

Thanks, Steve, and thanks for flipping the agenda around for me. I've provided a report and I think it's here. I guess a few things that have emerged, and I've got a few updates since I issued this. But there was a call just a couple of days ago for the transfer policy review, policy development process working group to have input on their group two topics. So I don't have much more to report on that other than to say that there is that call. I know Zak has been involved in that in past. So I

guess we will be looking for input to that, but I have not had any discussion on that at this point.

Moving along to the group or the Board seat 14. We've sort of narrowed down our slate in the CSG to two candidates which we presented to the NCSG. And as of yesterday or today, they are evaluating that and intend to interview the candidates. I also plan to go back and interview four or three of the original five candidates that we put together in order for them to do a full review, NCSG to do a full review of the candidates that CSG presented. Plus, there is a potential for them to have alternates, other candidates as well. So that's very much work in progress, and hopefully by the time we get a week from now to ICANN 76, we'll have an update on that. I see a note from Chris on our candidates. And the candidates which CSG presented are Damon Ashcraft and Mark Datysgeld. So thanks to both of them for letting their names stand. And wish him the best of luck as we move forward.

So moving along, I had also notified you, I think, on our last meeting that we have our meeting with the ICANN Board, CSG and ICANN Board, and that the Board chair had presented a question to us which we haven't collaborated on an answer on, but you see it there in my report. I'd like to explore how to combine the efficiencies of an agile approach to problem solving like the small teams with the accountability and transparency to make progress on policy conversations. When would this be appropriate without circumventing the PDP? So that's something that we will be engaging on.

But we were also asked to contribute questions to the meeting. And we have four questions that we have just finalized. One, and I'll just summarize them, and this is just since the report came out. What is the Board doing or will it do to prompt org leadership to address years of work stagnation that threatens the viability of the multistakeholder model. So that's one question. Then there's ask for a response to the letter that CSG and ALAC put forward in January to seek input into the contracted parties negotiations, amendment negotiations for the RA and the RAA. So we want an update on that from the Board. What are the Board's plans to have ICANN implement approved policies for thick WHOIS and privacy proxy?

MASON COLE: Tim?

TIM SMITH: Yes.

MASON COLE: Tim, you froze you froze up there after you talked about an update from the Board.

TIM SMITH: Yeah, so we're looking for an update from the Board on the letter that we sent in January, where we're seeking input to the contract negotiations for the RA and the RAA. So that was question number two. Question number three is, what are the Board's plans to have ICANN

implement approved policies for thick WHOIS and privacy proxy? So that's our third question. And the fourth would be with the passage of the NIS2, how does the Board envision ICANN amending its policies to comply with that? So those are sort of the scope of that meeting that we'll have with the Board on Tuesday, March 14th.

And other than that, I guess, I have the additional meetings. The GAC PSWG meeting, that just took place just concluded. And I know many people who are on this call were also on that one. And I guess the one takeaway is that there seems to be some real interest in the input that I was just talking about to the RA and the RAA. And so we're going to try to coordinate a meeting during ICANN76, where we can put together a draft of suggestions, recommendations inputs for the negotiation. So that's a takeaway. So, we'll be looking for an additional meeting during ICANN76 where we can have a discussion, and that'll be with the PSWG or GAC and CHG. And then you see the other meetings that are scheduled to upcoming. So that's that.

Oh, Steve says he understands the ICANN is very close to concluding the negotiations. Well, then that will be an interesting twist to the meeting we're trying to organize, I guess, during ICANN. And with that, I'll turn back to you, Steve, unless there are any questions.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Any questions for Tim? Speak up, please. Thank you. Appreciate it Tim. We don't have any open public comments that I flag for us to respond to. As a number of you know, ICANN org tends to pull back on public comment openings in the week preceding an ICANN meeting. In other

words, they don't want to force us to both attend meeting as well as be drafting comments. And I appreciate that. So there's nothing open right now. But on NIS2, I'd like to turn to Andrew, Nick, Marie, Margie, and anyone else who has something to say about NIS2. Where are we now and did it come up at all on the PSWG call? It ought to be obvious that I'm at an airport, so not able to done that background noise. Is there anybody has anything to tell us on NIS2?

MARIE PATTULLO: Sure, Steve. This is Marie. Can you hear me okay?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yes.

MARIE PATTULLO: Great. Not too much more to report after the last conversation the BC had two weeks ago. As you know, the law has now been adopted at European level. And as it's a directive, that means it now has to be turned into national legislation by the 27 member states of the European Union. So there are a lot of conversations happening at national level. We know that our dear friend, the contracted parties are out lobbying at national level. And we are starting to gather our own horses to be able to do the same.

So a call that we've made a number of times, if you have an office in one of the European countries, if you have an association, you've got contacts, if you have any inroads to the national governments, not the European Union, but the national governments of the members who

make up the union, please let us know and by us, me, Mason, Nick, Andrew, Steve. Thank you.

A couple of points that are happening internally at the mission, one is they, as you know, asked for somebody to write them a study about domain name data and accuracy verification methods. We don't yet know who's going to write that. When we know, we'll let you know. But one point that as yet, I've only shared with ExCom, but I can now share with all of you, the European Commission is basically the civil service of the European Union. And the bit of it that you all know the best is called DG Connect because they're the technical guys who turn up ICANN. But one of its other departments goes by the name of DG GROW. And one of their jobs is writing and enforcing substantive intellectual property law. I've had a number of conversations with that relevant unit about our concerns that IP investigators or people asking for nonpublic registrant data based upon an IP reason may be turned away because NIS2 does not specifically refer to us.

Now, while it doesn't say it in the law, the commission has a number of things it can do. And one of them is called a recommendation which in essence is soft law. It's what the commission, you've guessed it, recommends. And this part of the commissioner referred to DG GROW is considering drafting up a recommendation to close the gap for intellectual property within NIS2. In other words, explaining why IP should be a valid risk for logistical access to data. They came to me not as ICANN. They came to me in my day job. And on behalf of my day job, we submitted to them quite a lengthy background paper explaining our needs. And I used that open doors to say, is it okay if the BC of ICANN come forward with more concrete examples. They've said yes.

So our appeal to you now if you have a case example, a concrete case example, explaining the difficulties you currently have, in accessing the domain name data for your business, basically for an intellectual property reason because this will go to counterfeiting. But if it also goes to consumer protection and all the protection with small and medium, sorry, small or medium sized company, that was certainly be useful. That you are prepared to share with the commission, please send that to me and to Mason. I hope that makes sense. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thank you, Marie. Any questions for Marie regarding NIS2? That's pretty enlightening. And I have a feeling we'll be talking a lot about it next week. Also, Marie, anyone else aware of any national government member state, who is working quickly and maybe the first past the post.

MARIE PATTULLO:

No information on May at Steve. Sorry.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Okay. Thank you, Marie. I'm going to move now to our Councilors. So Marie and Mark, you have the mic. I have a brief summary of what you adopted at 16th of February, but I don't have an agenda yet for your meeting in Cancun. So walk us through what you think we will need to know about Council.

MARK DATYSGELD:

Hello, all. Thank you. We are entering SubPro and this seems to be consuming pretty much all of our bandwidth. Also the four of our communications to Board, we wanted to discuss plenty of things, but it's turned into SubPro test. I think there is a lot of interest at least from part of the Council in discussing this. So this seems to be where we are headed because other topics are taking definitely a backseat to this.

As no SubPro expert, I've been best to catch up, but the things that they're discussing are very minute intricate and specific provisions of SubPro. Based on what they expect the Board to do or what they think, I don't know who among us is a super expert in this, but this might be the right time, if we have one, to start having a look at what our interests are or what's our position. Because this seems to be something that we also buy a lot of time.

Other than that, we have been in a few very technical meetings where we are trying to get our best in a row. And yeah, we're looking forward to seeing what the next big step is. On my side, I'm waiting to see what goes down in terms of DNS abuse before making another move. Because in Cancun, the CPH has set for themselves a closed meeting to start negotiating the terms of the changes that they plan to implement. And from what I've heard informally, this is to be very focused on exactly our main recommendation, which is shifting the needs to report and be mindful towards an interaction. This needs to be very much what's in there. And it is what we asked for at the end of the day.

We did we did start getting some letters back from the letter we sent about [00:17:16 -inaudible] registration. And so far, what this letter seems to indicate is that no act or in the space knows the actual impact

of both registrations. We've heard from Jamie, he said IDK. We've heard from Graham, and he said IDK, but this might be relevant. So he is potentially looking into including this as a consideration in his reports. And this is something that I'm looking towards. We would want to attempt to commission a study or if we want to engage with any outside experts. It is something that I think we will want to discuss more further on, but we have to wait for the CPH's formal answer before we consider anything.

So a lot of things in movements right now, but I'm expecting that by the time Cancun wraps up, a lot of these things should clear or at least very defined. So for now, this is what I have.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thank you, Mark. Marie, anything to add on the upcoming Council agenda for Cancun?

MARIE PATTULLO:

No. Nothing from me, but just a reminder that they are organizing what they call in town hall, which we used to call an open mic session. Will be on Sunday afternoon. It's going to be quite a long one. I think we're all on the side of Council feeling a bit guilty that conversations were overrun in the last meetings so we couldn't really have an open mic session. So if you've got something you want to get off your chest, then, rock up on a Sunday afternoon and talk to the microphone.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Marie. Tim is already dropped, but Lawrence do you have anything you want to add on the GGP, the guidance process on applicants?

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Nothing much to add other than we are working with the schedule that have already been adopted. We had our last call early this week, precisely on Monday working of a Google documents, and trying to build understanding amongst the group on what kind of outreach should be done in terms of attracting more applicants to using the applicant support for the next rounds. So work is in progress. And when there is something concrete to share, I would revert back by email. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Lawrence. And finally, Zak and Arinola, do you have any need to update on transfer policy working group?

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: Thank you, Steve. This is Zak. I just sent around the BC private list the document that Tim had mentioned earlier in the call which is a request from the working group for early input on four issues that are going to be discussed and are in the process of being discussed by the working group. And in that email, I offer to anyone to have a discussion with Arinola and myself, or to share your thoughts via the BC private list. So that's all for now, and look forward to seeing whosoever attending ICANN Cancun shortly. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: And so, Zak, I see there, and we can have some of this discussion at the BC Open Meeting. I hope so. Great. That concludes policy calendar, and I could throw it back to you, Mason.

MASON COLE: Thank you, Steve. Appreciate the overview very much. Safe travels from Omaha, and we'll see you in Cancun. Any other updates or questions for Steve, please? Or for our counselors? Okay. The queue is clear. All right. Very good. We're running ahead of time today. So let's go to item three on the agenda, which is Lawrence's update. Lawrence, I understand you have some good news on our banking situation.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Yes. Thank you, Mason. Definitely we have all the teething issues that we had suffered prior to now already cleared up, can print out the statements and do a wire transfers ourselves. And so we basically are good to go at the end of the Wells Fargo Bank. I've seen a mail by a member, Doctor Jimson, sent in yesterday. And I saw another follow-up this morning that I've not been able to digest because of the other meeting we were in. But since Dr. Jimson is here in the meeting, I would want to yield the floor to him to voice his concerns and then possibly be able to address them. Doctor Jimson?

DR JIMSON OLUFUYE: Okay. Greeting, everybody. And thank you all for the work you're doing in ExCom. Well, in that response, I really prefer that we take our time,

members can read it through to understand the point I try to make. But let me quickly just summarize. It's just to correct. You know, it's maybe a figure, error figure that was mentioned or that were mentioned by our vice chair in previous meeting. For example, like, we had spent it up to 8500. And I couldn't recall that we even spend up to 4000 on our accountant. I couldn't recall. So I just wanted to correct that. And then concerned that we had a gap of that eight months.

And because when I was handing over, I actually did the thorough handover note. And I also made a recommendation that the process be managed properly because the accountant we're dealing with is a professional. Okay? She knows our stuff. And the entire period was period of COVID, even though we have agreement, but COVID changed a lot of things. That she had to make the bookings, and then I saw emails that when she gets there to do transaction, maybe they would tell her that the information provided were not complete. Well, actually, I was also taken aback at first because I saw some mail. And when I also query, I found out that our system in Nigeria is different from us, or from that in US. Maybe a third party can still confirm that.

Because once we receive an account information, we can keep it and then use it repeatedly for that client. But she is saying that according to US requirement, all clients accounting information once it's done with you dispose of it. So whenever you make an online request, maybe for transfers, then it must be supported with detailed information again about who is fit to receive the funding. So I think there was a miscommunication around that place. And I pleaded at Lawrence to be patient. That he should be patient with the process. Just follow the

process. If that's what you want. There's nothing wrong. Just provide detailed financial information.

So I thought there were delays. And I raised concern at that time weighing on the call, one of the call. You said, we have a new accounting firm. I was surprised. And then I tried to make inquiry from the accountant I was using. And she said, she never got that notice. And, truly, the contract was not terminated until 2022. And I handled over in 2020, December 2020, and a new officer started 2021 January. So I just saw that there was a communication issue, and I fairly could be handled better. Because the gap of eight months is no good. A management is not a good or healthy feedback. So that's why I was concerned. I know Vice Chair is doing a lot, Lawrence I've seen a lot of effort, but I just felt when I heard that, if I got the feedback, I felt I needed to intervene.

And that's why I communicated privately. Hoping okay, we can just chat it over and then forget about it. But when there was no response, that's when I had to at least push it to the group because it's on record. You know, that was on record. So if it is resolved, it's okay. We have our officers as signatories. But my concern also is that, how about if, like, we have an election in October, November, and we have new officers from India or Latin America, would they have to travel to US to affect our account. You know, that's my also concern.

And I prefer in that mail I send, I will prefer that we still of course, ExCom [00:27:26 -inaudible] finally, I will prefer that we have two officers, like the legal Council and an accountant. We can negotiate whatever we are discussing with our accountant, but we have two

people. We had one first because Stephan had just start BC for us. Stefan also opened the account at Wells Fargo, he set up a Mula for us, the online payment which had made live easy for our members to pay online since 2015 or thereabout.

So the work has been moving smoothly until Stephan too was uncooperative. So we had to make a change. The fact, I wanted to be a signatory the time of Stephan. But when I saw the requirement, I need to know work. For somebody based in Nigeria or somewhere else, okay, to be a signatory in the US, they have to see you, they need to sign some documents. You know, all these new customer requirements and things like that. And Nigeria have been a flag country due to abuse challenge and things like that. So I just recognize its best that whoever it would be our account officer or be a signatory to be done inside in the US. So maybe somebody like, yes, Mason is okay. Maybe, yes, Steve too be okay. But it must be done inside in the US, not outside. So those are the challenges that I felt that as alternative.

So having say the vice chairman is not based in US being the signatory, then you can have officers that are based in the US. But the challenge that we'll still have is that once they leave office, then we have to be doing handing over of officer. How about we change officer every year. So that's the challenge I also looked at. And I felt it's the best to assess the process. Maybe getting a new account and a new legal officer. But last budget was too fine. And then if you want to even change the bank, if you want to change the bank from Wells Fargo to another one that can use online payment instead, good, it's okay. But I just looking at the best practices so that when we have a long gap like that, if somebody

has stepped over as the vice chair disrupting financial commitment to our service provider.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: All right. Thank you, Dr. Jimson. So I will just address a few points that you've raised and really will wait to hear some of the ExCom members chime in on this issue. So first of all, a major concern raised is that we haven't expanded up to \$6000 in payments to [00:30:17 - inaudible] in the last financial year. The information she's provided you with, even the documents I've seen you attach, already puts her figures over the 3000 mark that she claims. But being the accounting officer, I can very much tell you that we've spend that up to 6000. If we haven't it will basically be maybe a few dollars below that mark. But her dues, her payments, the payments she received did rise to that level.

Understandably, talking about the contract termination, it was a difficult process to terminate the contract of the previous accountant because she was the sole, she remained the sole signatory to the BC's account. So as much as we wanted her, I mean, as much as I wanted her yanked off the job, there was that concern about how we're going to fulfill our payments. So even at the point where the financial year was ending, and I had to send her a notice, the notice basically clearly outlined the fact that she was no longer to provide accounting services, she was no longer to provide a filing for the IRS. Those were basically the things she was doing. But that when we needed how to make payments for us, that could be billed on a case by case basis. She was already billing us for every time she goes to the bank. So we could as well just continue to maintain that relationship and have her fulfil our obligations of

having to see payments through. Unfortunately, that also fell through the cracks.

With regards traveling to the U.S, the arrangement we have right now with Wells Fargo's Bank puts me in a position where I no longer would want to perform these duties to be able to submit the details of someone else who is authorized by the BC to cater for our accounts. And so to that point where we have a new officer stepping into this room who should be able to perform the functions that I'm currently performing, it's not going to be difficult having them enroll that new signatory to the account. So in other words, when we want to enroll new signatories to the account right now, it's not difficult at all.

And at any rate, I remain even where I will not want to continue to serve the BC as the Vice chair for Finance and operations, I still remain a member of the BC. And the BC can still depend on me to help see these payments through. My being in the US, as I speak, primary to do other things, but to also take care of this pitting issue that we have is not of the BC. The BC has not received an invoice for me. I do not intend to send an invoice in, except if for other reasons, ExCom is particular about that. But to the point where we are having sorted out all the issues that we have, it hasn't cost the BC a dime. I'm doing this because it's my responsibility to take care of the funds that are left in my care.

Talking about information not being complete for [00:33:55 -inaudible], there is no points, there is no mail sent by [00:33:59 -inaudible], there's no payment request that I sent to her that did not go with the information required. And when she is asking for additional information, that's information she already has in kitty. There were

times when we will provide information and she will still be requesting for the same information. Please don't forget that this role is voluntary. I have other things I'm doing talking about my day job. And so if I provided all the information for you to work with and you're not careful enough to check for that information or you say you missed a mail or whatever it is, it's understandable when it happens once or twice, but when it becomes a practice then definitely, there's a limit to how far one can go with that.

So the concept of the gap that you talked about. Definitely, what you have proposed it's good. But I don't see the BC needing to retain a lawyer. We've gone through our legal formation. Yes, the only task for a lawyer as I speak to you is to be able to file for our trade name to remain relevant. We need a lawyer to do that. But then that can be done on a pro bono, not on a pro bono, that can be done on a one off basis. We need a lawyer. We look for a lawyer. I mean, we're looking to resolve that. And what I'm told is we need to get a lawyer from the DC to be able to file for our trade name to be current. That's the only thing we need a lawyer for. So I would not advise that we go the route of getting a lawyer to do our banking, to help us with our banking financial responsibilities.

The bottom line is, this goes beyond one person. And as much as I have every reason to be adaptive and lenient with the former accountant [00:36:04 -inaudible], don't forget, that we come from, I mean, she's a national of the same country of myself. So if there's anybody I should be very biased about, and keeping that relationship, she should be the first person. But her inaptitude, definitely imparts on my own job. I spend more hours having to deal with issues that I have no power or

control over. I couldn't make the payments. I had to depend on her. And I literally had to be begging while we are also receiving all kinds of financial payments that should be done. And so in order to see those payments through, you definitely have to [00:36:44 -inaudible]. But I wouldn't want to stress this point further. For me, the issue of [00:36:55 -inaudible] is one that we have been able to put behind us, grateful for the efforts that she has put in, but it appeared that the management of the account was becoming a burden for her. And it was good that, I mean, it was just efficient that we had to relieve her of those responsibilities.

To how we had ended up in eight months not being able to pay out of our accounts. In the first one, two months of stepping in office, we asked for a change of signatories. So when you say that you saw mails where we as ExCom didn't respond to whatever it is that was provided, that is not true. I would like to hear other ExCom members. I would like to have a view of our ExCom members on this. I don't know if Mason, Marie, Steve might want to take the floor. Mark also is here.

MASON COLE:

I'll reply, Jimson. I mean, Lawrence. First Jimson, thank you for raising the issue. I know it's been a matter of concern for you for some time now. I just want to back up Lawrence on this because Lawrence has done a tremendous amount of work to get our finances in order. We had some difficulties with our previous accountant. We had difficulties with our previous bank. Lawrence has done a wonderful job in getting those straightened out to where the BC now has a functioning relationship with its bank. And we're in the process of transitioning to a

new accountant. And this is no offense toward [00:38:36 -inaudible] or anyone else who has helped out the BC before. It just became a situation where a change was necessitated.

So I want to back up Lawrence on this point because Lawrence really is, he spent a fair amount of time, of his time here in the US dealing with this on his own time, and I know that the ExCom appreciates it. Lawrence, I might suggest just in the interest of time we wrap this up and maybe take the issue to email so that you can finish your report and we can conclude on time.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Thank you, Mason. So to the key points that I would like to bring before members. In the week ahead, we are in Cancun for the next ICANN meeting, ICANN76. And I believe that all BC members are already registered, otherwise registration will close on the 8th of March. Their process for filled in members, I mean, BC representatives both for the big seat on the small, I mean, yeah for the big seat on the small seat on NomCom, we'll commence in a bit and members should kindly watch out for the notice on that. So our members currently serving. Vivek and J, our first timers on this particular round, so they qualify to be reelected. It would be nice to have a good idea of what their performance is right now to help the BC make informed decisions in this regard.

We have a new member who has joined us. I don't know if [00:40:32 -inaudible] is on the call. If he's on the call, I would want to give maybe a few minutes for him to say something. But the company is WHOIS API.

And we look forward definitely to working with them going forward. We are still looking to have our inreach for ICANN76. And we will feed you with details on this. Please look out for details on the venue and the time in your emails for those of us who will physically be at the Cancun. And basically, there's going to be a BC open meeting on Monday. While we're at Cancun. I'm sure that members who are not physically attending will also be able to join us at that meeting. At this point, I will yield the floor back to Mason, except if anyone has a question that needs following up on. Thank you.

MASON COLE:

Thank you, Lawrence. Jimson quickly, please.

DR JIMSON OLUFUYE:

Okay. Thank you, Mason. Yes, no doubt I appreciate all the work being done. It's just that we are rated by transparency internationally as the number one most transparent organization in the world. And as you also mentioned, Lawrence, so it makes sense for us to interact. Well, of course, the point is also noted that maybe it was up to 5000 or 6000, but it'd be good to provide details. It went up to 8500 that was mentioned. You know, 8500. So please go through where I respond, and I will be happy to get formal feedback. And I hope with the information provided, she can be paid off fully so that that could be out of it. Especially the IRS filing, which she has been doing since 2017. Okay? And for which, I have no issue working with her at all. No issue whatsoever. So she's a professional. I want to put that on the record. She's a professional, and I've deal with her. I know I'm also a

professional. And I know I put a word when I was handing over what I should kindly deal with her professionally. So thank you for all that you do. I appreciate it. So back to you, chair. Thank you.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Sorry, Mason. Just to address this, because I missed this earlier. So they continuously, so [00:43:17 -inaudible] has done a good job filing because we are not contributing anything at the IRS end. But especially in the last case where the filing was done before the financial report of the year was even adopted and presented to have. Normally, the process is you give the account and the reports, the financial reports and then she takes that to file. But in this case, she filed even before the report was approved, prepared and approved, and I guess that was because I had indicated that we were no longer needing her services. And for whatever reason, she went ahead to do that.

Now it's a concern for me because I mean, in other cases, I've always asked for the submissions made to the IRS. So before you generate what it was that you sent to us, Jimson, in the certificates, before you are able to generate that, you will have to put certain figures into the IRS system. And for me, I'm keen to know what has gone into those records because it's possible, it's never happened, but it's possible that the IRS reverse back to say XYZ. It means that if we don't have those records, we will have to go back to this same person to be able to answer to those questions. So it might not be a challenge for me, but where we don't have those records, it could be a challenge for an officer from six, seven years down the line.

So in this particular instance, where she went ahead to file at the IRS before even receiving a financial report, I'm keen to know what she filed. I'm interested in knowing what went into the IRS. Is an external system outside ICANN? They have to do with excuse me, you have to do with the organization that controls whether we remain a not for profit or not. And so I just don't want to see the certificate that I filed something. I'm interested in seeing the figures that were filed. And at any cost, we are paying for this service, so I don't even know why we should continue to beg for that information. That's an information that we never received in the years that I've being vice chair despite the fact I've been asking for day one. So even where we are able to gloss over others, in this particular instance, I really need to see what it is that she has filed for us. ExCom is interested in that. So when she provides that, for me, that's when I think she should be paid for that service. But if ExCom directs otherwise, I definitely will comply because we have the funds. I would like it to be written out of our book so that our accounts for the coming year is in perfect order. But it's also important that we get her. I mean, if she puts in figures for the BC, why is it difficult for us to assess those figures? Doctor Jimson, I think that is one thing you can help us get. But, Mason, I yield the floor back to you. Thank you.

DR JIMSON OLUFUYE: Okay. Let me just comment.

MASON COLE: Okay. Jimson, I'm sorry, we're running out of time, and we've got a couple other issues to cover. I really suggest we follow-up on email on

this rather than use the member's time for it. If that's alright with you. I think it's important that we move on. I know this is an issue of concern for you. I'm sure that we can address it. I want to make sure we don't get bogged down in this discussion. So I don't mean to cut you off, Jimson, but I want to respect everyone's time. So is there any other follow-up or questions for Lawrence at this point on item number three on the agenda?

Okay. All right. So let me just address a couple of housekeeping issues before we get to AOB. We have our membership meeting in Cancun on Monday, the 13th of March. Brenda, that's correct. Right? And we've got a change in time. So, Brenda, can you confirm our new time, please?

BRENDA BREWER: I can. Let me bring it up on my screen. BC call. Here it is.

MASON COLE: I want to say it's 15 local time in Cancun.

BRENDA BREWER: Monday. Here we go. Here it is. I'm just going to put the link in case. 15 to 16 Cancun time. Correct.

MASON COLE: Okay. All right. And immediately preceding that is an outreach on the part of the contracted parties for a discussion on their efforts on DNS

abuse. And I recommend that everyone join that meeting if you're on the ground in Cancun. That'll be very informative. And it's an issue that as you know, the BC has been very active on for the past several years. And this is an opportunity for us to engage with our colleagues in the contracted party house to have a healthy discussion about their issues on DNS abuse. So if you're in Cancun, I really encourage you to make time for that session.

There also is a, I know Tim's not on the call. He probably would have this information handy. Brenda I might lean on you again if I may, but there's a CSG open meeting and then a CSG meeting as well with contracted parties. Correct?

BRENDA BREWER:

Yes. And CSG membership meeting is Tuesday, March 14th, at 10:30 local Cancun time. If it helps, I'll just add the link to those who've registered and have access to the schedule. And the next one is, let's see. Sorry, I don't have these printed out. I'm on the schedule. A joint session is Wednesday, 16:30, which is 4:30 Cancun time.

MASON COLE:

Okay. Very good. All right. Thank you Brenda. The BC has a pretty full dance card for the meetings in Cancun. Actually, we are in the process of trying to see if we can get a senior ICANN org executive to join our BC membership meeting on Monday. So if you're in Cancun and you can make that meeting, it'd be very much appreciated if you would make time. It seems to be one of the things that I wanted to raise, and now I don't seem to remember it.

Oh, I just wanted to emphasize what Lawrence said a moment ago, and that is if you've not registered for Cancun and you plan to be there, you need to do so by March 8th because there is no on-site registration. So I'd hate to see you travel all the way to Cancun and not be able to get into the venue. So if you are attending, be sure to take care of that housekeeping step. Okay. Brenda, did I miss anything there that's important about Cancun?

BRENDA BREWER:

I highly recommend everyone read the health and safety. If you are traveling to Cancun, please read the health and safety blog on the meetings page. There's some great information regarding taxis and Uber and just traveling around the city. So that's very important. It's all I got.

MASON COLE:

Thank you, Brenda. It is important to take note of that because I understand there have been some issues with taxis versus Uber's down there. So yeah, do take a look at that information in advance and be sure to register by March 8th. Okay. All right. I believe that's all I had for housekeeping. And then Brenda has helpfully put up here that our next BC meeting after ICANN76 is on 6 April. So we'll have a short break between Cancun and the end of March, and then we'll reconvene on April 6, at 15 UTC. All right. Any other business for the BC this morning?

DR JIMSON OLUFUYE: Yeah. Chair, thank you so much. Just less than one minute. Just to indicate that I sent a response by email, so I will look forward to response. And if it is something that, yes, it's a most requirement, then surely is she has to provide those information. But one thing is sure is that she has always told me that our report, financial income has always been below \$50000. Once it's below \$50000, then we are good to go, it'll never change. And what we're consistent since 2015 when members reduce membership fees that our income has never been beyond \$50000. And she said it was on that basis she went ahead to process the IRS because of time factor. For the same, let's get a response and we'll just we should do a closure. Thank you very much, chair.

MASON COLE: Thank you, Dr. Jimson. Much appreciated. And I appreciate you raising this issue before the BC. And, Lawrence, thank you for your input on where we stand on our financial obligations. All right. Any other business for the BC? Okay. I see no hands. All right. Well, I look forward to seeing many of you in Cancun. Safe travels to everyone, and we will see you either in Cancun next week or on our call on 6th April. So thanks everybody. BC is adjourned.

BRENDA BREWER: Thank you all for joining. Enjoy the rest of your day. Bye now.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]