
BRENDA BREWER: Good day everyone. This is Brandon speaking. Welcome to the BC membership call on 5 May 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 that speaking. Attendance is taken from Zoom participation.

We do have apologies today from Tola Sogbesan and Toba Obaniyi. And with that, I will turn the meeting over to chair Mason Cole. Thank you.

MASON COLE: Thank you, Brenda. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everybody, it's good to have you on our call on the 5th of May. We have our usual agenda up on the screen. And I'm advised that our policy calendar review is a bit shorter today. So we may have a bit more time for Lawrence's update, and then we'll move to AOB. But before I begin, are there any updates or additions to the agenda before we dive into item number one, which includes a couple of introductions? Any other additions?

Okay, very good. So we have a couple of new folks on the call today. Steve, I believe you're going to introduce one, and Andy as well. So Steve, go ahead, please.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks Mason. I wanted to introduce one of NetChoice's newest hires, Caroline Lupetini who's on the call today, will be my number two in the BC assisting with Internet governance matters and ICANN matters and

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.

will also be joining us at the meeting in The Hague. Caroline, would you say a word or two about yourself?

CAROLINE LUPETINI:

Sure. It's great to meet everyone. My name is Caroline. I joined NetChoice earlier this week. I come from a public affairs firm where I worked particularly on Internet-related issues. And in 2020, I graduated from the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies here in DC, focusing on European Eurasian Studies. And I'm looking forward to working with you all.

MASON COLE:

Welcome, Caroline. Very good to have you. Thanks for joining the call. And we look forward to seeing you in The Hague. All right, very good. Thank you, Steve. Andy, please go ahead.

ANDY ABRAMS:

Sure. Thanks, Mason. I'm very happy to announce that Google, we have an additional new BC member up. And that's Rajiv and he'll be attending meetings going forward. And he'll also be attending The Hague live. So Rajiv, if you want to say a few words about yourself.

RAJIV PRASAD:

Certainly. Thank you so much, Andy. My name is Rajiv Prasad. I recently joined the Google BC group working with Andy Abrams. I've been at Google for about 11 years, and I manage the corporate domain name portfolio.

My DNS experience goes back to the mid-'90s. when I started setting up DNS servers for a small ISP in New Zealand. I managed the root name servers and registrar registry backends for the .nu ccTLD.

In addition to doing DNS at Google, I also do security tooling in support of Google's M&A functions. And I will be at ICANN in the next month and look forward to meeting some or all of you perhaps. Very nice to be here. Thank you.

MASON COLE:

Rajiv, thank you very much. Good to meet you. And thanks for joining the call today. We look forward to meeting you in The Hague as well. So thanks and welcome to the BC. Alright, Andy, thank you very much. Any other items for the agenda before we dive into Steve's policy review? All right, very good. Steve, the floor is yours.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thanks, Mason. I'll share the policy calendar which was sent out yesterday. The only item we've done since the last time we met is on the 20th of April, we sent a three-page letter to members of the European Parliament and the EC, and it reiterated some previously approved BC positions on suggested tweaks to article 23 of NIS2, the amendments. A big shoutout to Drew Bennett, to Mason, Marie, [inaudible] and Margie Milan for drafting that. So this continues this notion of whenever there's a point at which the trialog are considering amendments, we put something in just in time that draws upon the earlier position. So I think it's a great strategy.

As far as public comments that are open right now, there aren't any BC public comments that I feel that we should jump on right now. There's only one open and it isn't related to something we usually comment on. So I'll take this opportunity to pick up on Andrew Bennett's report to the group. Andrew could not join the call today but he has this update as of the 5th of May.

He said the final meeting of the EU's trialog on NIS2 is going to be held next week on May the 12th. This will be the last working session and that's where they'll develop their compromise text for a final version of the directive. And that should be out by June, then they'll make some further minor adjustments approved for the European Union, likely in time for their August recess.

So Andrew Bennett and the team will continue to update the BC on the progress there. There will still be the work that remains, which is to transpose that directive into individual member state law, which can occur over a period of multiple years after that's done, and that transposition are opportunities to seek clarifications, but don't ordinarily differ too much from the directive itself. Mason, Maria and those of you who are more familiar with the European processes, what would you do to clarify what I've just given from Drew?

MASON COLE:

Thanks, Steve, I'll go. Not much to clarify, just that there has been a long process where the BC has weighed in on what's happening with the NIS2 directive. We've seen progress in terms of the language that's been

developed for the NIS2 directive, particularly in article 23, which deals with the Domain Name System.

As you point out, the trialog is going to meet one more time to hammer out additional language. I don't think we're going to get every single thing that we wanted. But we did make significant progress in helping NIS2 clarify GDPR and impose some reasonable responsibilities on a contracted party. So all in all, it's been a really good effort. Looks like Marie's hand's up. She may have some additional color to add there. Back to you, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Yeah, go ahead, Marie.

MARIE PATTULLO:

Thank you. I just wanted to add some info from the other side, meaning the coalition that many of you know, we've been working together, not as the BC but as some of our members together with Dean from the Coalition for Online Accountability, some cybersecurity, patient safety, more on the consumer protection and that side.

Now, we wrote to the rapporteur yesterday, and specifically on one point, that the commission put in what they called a compromise in paragraph three of article 23, which we didn't like. I'm paraphrasing the beginning, but member state shall require that etc. etc. to ensure that databases include accurate and complete information, including verification procedures, new bit, where there is a suspicion of domain name abuse.

Now, we wrote about saying, no, that's not going to work. This is why that's not going to work. We really don't like it. We sent out the message, my time about midday, I got a response from him about 9:00 PM last night saying I agree, which is great news.

So we're working also with our French colleagues, in particular, the French anticounterfeiting group. And with our members, like Xavier [inaudible], based in Paris, they're getting the same message into the French presidency.

So that's really just for info. I'll forward on that latest letter, if anybody's interested in seeing it. Apart from that on the process, yes, you're completely right. The 12th should be the last one. When it goes through the agreements, we'll get what's called a political agreement. It then disappears into the black hole of the lawyers who tighten things up, cross T's, dot i's, then when it's adopted, because it's a directive, yes, it then has to be transposed into 27 legal systems. But we're an awful lot further down the line than we were before they started this drafting process. So a massive shout out to Drew for leadership. It's been great. Thanks.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thank you, Marie, looking for any other hands up? Not seeing any, I will surface this suggestion I made earlier this week. When I looked at the letter that drew, Marie and the team drafted, we made requests to tighten up the obligations. And I asked the question of the drafting team of whether the obligations were too narrowly focused on registries and entities providing registration services. And you'll see that phrase

continually in the NIS2 language, not language that we suggested. It's part of what they have suggested.

And what I asked is, if ICANN Org were somehow to move towards the primary controller role and become a centralized service, a centralized system for answering disclosure requests, then I would want to be sure that NIS2's obligations would extend to ICANN Org, not just registries and those who provide domain name registration services, registries and registrars. Margie, you and Mark SV felt otherwise, that we shouldn't amend that. And I wonder if you could just explain the reasoning towards leaving it just to registries and registrars, if you don't mind.

MARGIE MILAM:

Sure. Given where the legislation is, I just don't see how you introduce it and also, I worry that it'll just provoke ICANN to lobby against NIS2 if it were to do that. I think as it's currently written, with the references to the various contracted parties and other companies that are associated with them, it gets us where we need to be.

We can still go back to ICANN, even as is—and I think that's part of the strategy for the BC to consider—to ask for amendments to the policy because now we're going to have conflicts with the current WHOIS policy to be consistent with NIS2.

And I think that that can still happen, even if ICANN's not mentioned in the legislation. And certainly, ICANN can provide some of these services. It's just that they're not bound by the regulation itself in the way that

contracted parties are. So I'm fairly comfortable that we're in a good place, given where the negotiations have moved.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thanks, Margie. It's mostly for the benefit of making sure the members know that the drafting team and your executive committee, we're always looking at different ways we can tweak things. And we'll often do internal debates before we roll something out to the rest of you. So that's been discussed and Margie's conclusion is where we ended up.

I'm going to reshare the policy calendar, and move along through this. So moving down into Council, so Marie, and Mark—and congratulations, Mark, on reelection. We haven't had a Council meeting since we last had a discussion here. So I can skip right past, I think, the meaning of the 14th and move ahead to what you expect to see on the agenda for the Council meeting coming up on the 19th of May.

The agenda is not out yet. So I just put in what I expect to see as some topics. So I'll turn it over to Marie and Mark.

MARIE PATTULLO:

Thanks. I don't know, is the easy answer. I know that we are going to be having a discussion on the modifying consensus policies idea. We had a call about that yesterday, as you know, Steve, you were there, as was Mason, which I don't really have a lot to say about. The basic premise is that sometimes after the Council adopts something from a working group, and it then goes up to the Board, sometimes things need to be amended.

Either it turns up in the IRT and it doesn't make sense or something has intervened, or it has an impact, effect on another consensus policy that the group hasn't considered. So they're looking to formalize that. I wasn't at the last Council, unfortunately, as you know, but my wonderful colleague, Mark, was.

So Steve, I'd suggest if there's anything you want to say about consensus policies, go ahead. Hand it over to Mark, of course, but one thing I would say is we might see something about the UDRP. You know that we put in a comment about that, but I honestly don't know, I really don't know. Mark.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Marie, I'll just quickly suggest this though. I represent the BC on that team. And in the last three calls, I've really tried to focus on very practical things, the six or seven ideas that staff had come up with. And I was quite surprised that we burned an hour and a half yesterday, as a debate ensued on what did or did not happen on the EPDP and the effect on other policies.

So sometimes it's better to look ahead at how you want to make things better in the future instead of dwelling on disagreements over what actually went wrong in the past. But we fell into that hole, didn't we, on that call? And I hope that you can avoid the same trap when the Council brings this up on the 19th. Try to focus positively, look ahead at what looked to me like really simple improvements that don't endanger the consensus policies and the picket fence. I don't know where Jeff

Neuman got any of that paranoia about consensus policies. Would you agree with that?

MARIE PATTULLO:

Never quite sure where Jeff gets any of his paranoia. I like the word practical. That's what we're here for. We're businesspeople, we want results. So we understand. Thanks, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

So I won't be able to speak on the Council meeting. But hopefully you and Mark can channel what I was talking about yesterday. There were several who agreed with me on the call, but Jeff took up all the airtime on the remaining hour. Mark, anything you want to add on curative rights or anything else that's on the agenda expected to be on your agenda?

MARK DATYSGELD:

Thank you, Marie. Thank you, Steve. So, basically, not on that subject in particular, but few relevant updates I pushed to the list I would just like to highlight here. So we have Flip leaving the Council and being substituted by Susan Payne. That is one relevant change. But more importantly, we have Philippe finishing his mandate unfortunately, and, of course, subsequently leaving the leadership of the Council. He will be replaced by Oswaldo Novoa, who has been the Council in the past. But this consequently means that we will be handing over the leadership to the noncommercial side, just as a broad reminder.

And on the NCSG, they are having chair elections, which I mentioned in passing, that Bruna might be leaving, and she is. So we expect there are two candidates currently. We have [inaudible] from the RIPE network as one of the candidates. The other is David Morar. He's an academic from the US.

So that's good news in the sense that there is someone who is clearly not there in the ballots, which is good in that sense. But they are unknowns. Bruna has been a very neutral NCSG leader in general. So we should be on the lookout for what does that mean for our relationship with them and how we try to build things moving forward. So a few changes in relationships and leaderships that we should be on the lookout for moving into the next meeting. So that's my general update in that sense.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thank you. Mark, when you and Marie see the new—the official Council agenda, feel free to push that around to the BC list when it comes out on the 9th, please. I also wanted to give Zak Muscovitch and Arinola an opportunity to update us on the Transfer Policy Working Group. Zak has provided an update here. I'll scroll down to the updated section and, Zak, turn it over to you.

ZAK MUSCOVITCH:

Thank you very much Steve. So there's going to be an initial report from the Transfer Policy Working Group published for public comment shortly. And that's when the BC will submit its public comments. We are given an opportunity ask kind of an early bird special to provide some

early input prior to the finalization of the interim report. So if anyone cares to spend an afternoon reading that report and submitting some thoughts or feedback or suggestions to Arinola, we'd be more than happy to receive those and take those to the working group. But rest assured there will still be an opportunity, as per usual, when the public comment opportunity commences. Thanks very much, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Any questions for Zak or Arinola? Again, this is transfer policy. What did we used to call this? The IRTP. Thanks, Zak. We also have a brief update from Arinola. He wanted to update us on the Standing Selection Committee I have highlighted in yellow.

ARINOLA AKINYEMI:

Yes, Steve. Thank you. The call for inputs from members of the review team, the SSC is currently closed. We have had edits from quite a number of members. And currently, what we're doing is to have a consensus call. The SSC must have a full consensus before anything can be submitted to the Council. So that should close by tomorrow, which is the 6th of May, and bearing no objection, it will be deemed that full consensus has been reached as the charter requires and then it will be sent to the GNSO Council for approval. So that will be it for now.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thanks, Arinola. And that Standing Selection Committee, you're on it for a full year. And this charter work was just something you took on early on. But there will be three or four opportunities to appoint positions

over the remainder of your term. Thanks for all you're doing there. Tim Smith, want to turn it over to you for the CSG section.

TIM SMITH:

Hi, thanks, Steve. Hi, everyone. Not too much to report, just a few highlights from my report. And as I noted last time, the planning prioritization framework project still had 26 recommendations to review coming out of April 19.

On May 3, they held their fifth meeting, and I think they've gone through all of the recommendations, but still had 13 that were open for more discussion. And I don't have an update on how that came out. I didn't have a chance to watch the video afterwards. But that process should be wrapping up and there should be something to report in the next little while.

One of the things that Steve raised actually on our last call was whether there were any future reviews that would not be considered until all of these recommendations had been addressed and implemented. And I was informed that that is the case. And that's according to the ATRT3, that other reviews are on hold, pending the holistic review.

However, all ATRT3 recommendations were placed on the Phase one, highest priority list by the review team. So more to come on that. And hopefully, we'll be able to see a good progress and be able to see a lot of these recommendations implemented soon.

And so with that said, there will be a CSG membership meeting on Tuesday, May 10th at 16:00 UTC and of course, everybody on this call

and everybody from CSG is welcome to attend. And as it relates to the prioritization framework project, I think we have asked for a representative of Org, probably Becky Nash, to attend and to give us an update on that in the May 10th meeting.

Other items that have been discussed by the CSG ExCom are potential abuse related RAA amendments, update on accuracy scoping. That should be ICANN prioritization, we just talked about that, SSAD, and the ongoing Board-Council small team conversations.

And then we also had a conversation about possibly having somebody from DNS AI, particularly Graeme Bunton, give us a demo or an update on the NetBeacon, central abuse reporting tool, but we're still reviewing an agenda on that. So standby in the coming days. Again, that meeting is May 10th, next Tuesday at 16:00.

And I guess the only other final thing going into ICANN 74 is that we also had a discussion about having an informal meeting with ICANN leadership, somewhere around or during ICANN 74. And I don't believe that's yet been confirmed. But should know more about that in the coming couple of weeks, I would think. And that is really it from CSG at this point. Thanks very much.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Tim. We'll take a queue for questions starting with Mason.

MASON COLE: Thanks, Steve. Thanks, Tim. Appreciate the report. Just a clarification on the CSG meeting next week. Graeme Bunton is not available. So he

won't be giving a demo for the NetBeacon. However, Graeme will be a guest of the BC at our 19 May meeting. So if you're not able to make the CSG meeting, which I hope you are, don't worry about missing that part of it because it'll be on our agenda for the 19th of May. So I just wanted to clarify that.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Mason. Any other questions for Tim? Clarifications? Alright, that's it for the policy calendar. Mason, back to you.

MASON COLE: Thank you, Steve. Appreciate the quick review of the policy calendar. Lawrence. Let me turn the floor over to you for the Finance and Operations update please.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE ROBERTS: Thank you very much, chair, and Good Day to everyone. So as usual, I will be starting my reports with some open ICANN announcements. Basically, the registration for ICANN 74 is still open and members who will be there physically or virtually are encouraged to register.

The BC will also like to know, those of us [interest early on the call will learn] about some of us who are planning to be at The Hague physically, it will be nice to have more details about members who plan to attend so that aside from using that opportunity to have BC members meet, maybe over a few drinks, we are also able to plan for members and ensure that however restrictive the meeting halls might be, we are able to put our members into the room as a priority. So we would like to

know if we plan to be at ICANN 74 physically so that we can also put some planning into this.

There are quite a number of interesting ICANN announcements open. Please, I want to encourage members to review the icann.org announcement page. There is also some audits with regards contractual compliance and co and it's an interesting place to watch for developments.

So moving on, we have currently, the BC membership stands at 65. And we not too long ago concluded the process of elections for Council and the NomCom elections. It was noticed that about 16 ballots were not cast from members who are financially paid off and ballots were sent out.

I would like to use this opportunity to find out what the difficulties might be. Maybe we need to update the records of primary representatives, because primary representatives are the ones we send the ballots to, just in case you didn't get the mails and all that, or if there happens to be any other challenge that we can mitigate in the course of future elections.

I would like to give about two or three minutes for members to be able to catch members' views on this. This is 16 ballots from the numbers that we had is quite high. And we should be working on ensuring that everybody's ballot counts. So do we have members here that had some challenges and want to share what those challenges are, so that we can cover them up in future election rounds? I'm watching the queue in case any member's hand's up. Please help or we can also use the email

channel, the mailing list channel to send in your views. Yes, Mark, I see your hand's up.

MARK DATYSGELD:

Thank you, Lawrence no particular problem from my side. But one thing that is true is that the ballot itself should probably have something like uppercase letters saying important first or something like that. Something to help it stand out in the mailboxes of members anyway, because it is sort of one of the duties of any paying member.

So maybe we should try in the future to really reinforce the importance of the email. And that's potentially one way of helping this. But your idea of making sure that the primary contacts are correct is a very good one. Since we're coming out of the pandemic, probably there was a lot of shuffling and maybe the situation isn't the same. So two ideas to maybe look forward to. Thank you.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE ROBERTS:

Thank you, Mark. That's very, very good feedback. It's taken. I think we will work towards changing the heading of ballots, tallies that go out as [maybe we'll place] them high priority, get them marked in red and stated as important, that feedback is very helpful and taken. Thanks a lot for that.

We have about nine members who have their invoices for FY 22—that's for the current financial year that is going to be drawing to an end next month—still unattended to. And by the coming week, to have resolved that working with the secretariat, we will have to pull out all alternate

members of such companies. And before the close of FY 22 will also delist the primary representatives of these nine companies.

I will personally be—the invoicing secretariat reached out to these members severally. I will personally be reaching out to them also, before we take these actions. We would love to keep everybody in. But we feel that the members not paying their dues continues to stand as a disservice to the entire BC.

So, for these companies, please, we would like to walk through any difficulties you might be having. And we are appealing that you understand with us why we need to have your financial status closed out and rectified. Thank you for that. Thank you for complying, because I believe in the short time that we have, we've been able to rectify whatever issues that we have outstanding.

We are still encouraging members to reach out to colleagues that could benefit from the membership of the BC and we'll be happy to have new members join our fold. And again, I want to use this opportunity to welcome the alternate members from NetChoice, Google, and there is also another request that has come in from AFICTA. I'm sure that in the next meeting, we shall have another alternate joining us from AFICTA:

For the ICANN 74 newsletter, we have been trying to work with a tight schedule to get our newsletter printed by ICANN. Today is the close for submission. And we still have need for about three, four articles. So we definitely would continue to work towards curating the ICANN 74 newsletter for the BC.

And at this point, if we are going to have a hard copy of the newsletter, it will mean that we might need to source funds from within the BC's [inaudible] to print that newsletter. So all hope is not lost that we might still have hard copies of our newsletter. We just would use this opportunity to encourage members, especially members who have written something interesting within the remit of ICANN's work and your company, you might want to use the platform of the BC's newsletter to share that information. We are open to reviewing this information. And we still have room for about three to four articles in the current newsletter that we're proposing to curate for ICANN 74.

The chair of the communications committee shared on the members list the social media handles for the BC. We encourage all BC members to subscribe to all these channels so that they can peek information that is sent out from the links and so that we can also be in a position to follow what's happening in companies and retweet those information that we find aligned with the BC position and help with a wider outreach of not just what the BC is doing but what are member companies are also doing. Work on the BC ICANN Learn course is ongoing and I believe that in the next meeting, we might have some information to share from the staff end.

Over to finance reports. I'm happy to announce that the BC has appointed a new accounting firm, the firm of McDonald Jacobs, to take care of bookkeeping needs, IRS filing requirements and everything with regards our accounting going forward.

The firm of McDonald Jacobs is a very professional firm that, in a short period of engagement, have proven that we have made a very good

decision in engaging them. This is going to help bring a lot of improvements to our financial practice as the BECAUSE. We will be getting monthly reports with regards to financial states. And they will also be actively involved in the process of preparing our reports and accounts that finally go to the IRS.

So this takes away a lot of responsibility, if I may use that word, and overload on the vice chair for finance and administration in terms of preparing the financial reports that eventually will go to the IRS. So the previous practice has been that the vice chair will provide this report, will put all the financials together, generate a report and that report is basically submitted by the accountant that we had before to the IRS for filing.

Right now the practice that has been engaged will see the BC accountant involved in preparing this report and eventually helping to file that with the IRS. So even when we don't have a vice chair that understands financial accounting, so to say, or is able to prepare account records such that the IRS can understand it, we won't have any problems whatsoever, because we have a professional firm that is providing that service to us.

Also, a lot of our operations will be going online. And we will have a lot of [inaudible] in terms of reporting to ExCom and eventually to membership. So this is a huge reform for the BC. And we believe that at the end of the coming financial year, after fully evaluating this process, we might have so much in terms—we expect to have so much in terms of gains, to be able to report back to the BC and to continue to secure their membership.

The current BC accounting firm that we have would have their services run till the end of this current financial year, FY 22, and thereafter, their services will be fully disengaged and maintaining just the current firm that we have. So right now we have these two firms working side by side. And we'll expect to have the old accounting firm disengaged at the end of the current financial year.

I don't know if there are members that might have any questions or I just move on. I'm watching in case there's any hands up. I would not mind stopping to take your questions or you have clarifications, taking those clarifications as we move on.

Okay, so our members by now should have also received new invoices for FY 23. Sorry, my report reads 22. It's supposed to be FY 23 invoices. So all the invoices for FY 23 have gone out. Please, if you have yet to see an invoice, then I would like to receive a feedback from you with regards this.

All the companies that also have outstandings from FY 22, what we have done is to merge your invoice for FY 22 and the invoice for FY 23 together. So if for instance your company is a category one and you pay 1000 US dollars and you still have an outstanding invoice for last year, you will have received from us an invoice for \$2,000 which is an invoice for last here and for FY 23. So the bank charges and payment fees will not be duplicated.

So if your invoice happens to be over what is expected, it's because the payments for two financial years were merged into one invoice. If there's any question you have regarding your invoice, please feel free to

send me a mail or to send a mail to invoice@icannbc.org. I will also get a copy of that mail.

But all invoices have been sent out. And a few members have started paying the invoice for FY 23. Want to thank you for doing this, because it goes a long way to support the activities of the BC.

I want to again say congratulations to everyone, not just to the elected representatives for NomCom and Council but for everyone also who participated in this process, for those who nominated candidates and those who searched through the candidates call and also cast their ballots for the elections. A big thank you for the time and efforts put into this.

So at the end of the election, we had Mark reelected as a GNSO councilor and I agree that he's been doing a very wonderful job. And so we are happy to see him return back into this particular seat. Also, we have elected Vivek, who is going to be taking the small seat on NomCom. And Jordyn, who is elected into the large business seat. I was particularly impressed at Jordyn's understanding of the NomCom and his operations on the candidates call. And I'm sure he will make a very excellent addition to the NomCom if not NomCom leadership in the years ahead.

The next BC meeting is scheduled for the 19th of May at 15:00 UTC, and the meeting details will be recirculated to members on the BC private list. That is all with regards my report. And I will be standing by for questions from members. Otherwise, I will yield the floor back to our chair for the rest of the meeting.

MASON COLE: Thank you, Lawrence. Any questions or comments for Lawrence please? Okay, it appears the queue is clear. All right. Very good. All right, everybody, we are now at item four on the agenda, which is all other business. So is there any other business to raise for the BC today? Go ahead, Mark.

MARK DATYSGELD: So thank you, everyone. Thank you, Lawrence, for the kind words. It would be very, let's say, frustrating not to continue on this role. So thank you for the BC for entrusting me for another term.

We have a very interesting update from the small team on DNS abuse. I'm posting it on the chat. I didn't have the chance to circulate to the list yet because it's very new, which is our official response from ICANN Compliance.

As I may have mentioned several meetings ago, we inquired them via letter and asked them for an official answer to our concerns. And we finally got it. So while this is not a revelation, at the same time, it is finally a document we can look towards and actually work with them or criticize them or really get to the point of what they may be missing, what we think might be the problem. So yes, this came out literally I think a few hours ago. But I'll be sending it to the list ASAP.

And what I would like to invite our BC members to do is help me find inconsistencies, ideas, sticking points, or anything else that you see in this document that we could engage directly with Compliance now that

we have a pathway. Now that this avenue is open, we get to actually answer to them formally via this small team.

So yeah, please don't edit the document or anything like that. But do send my way any comments you might have, any ideas of how we can continue to have this discussion with them, because at the end of the day, this is one of the first times that we actually get this kind of official in writing response from them. And it's a new and unique opportunity for all of us. So, yep, if you can take the time to sift through their answer, and see if there are relevant points, please do bring them up.

And finally, there has been confirmation from staff that this group will have a session during the next ICANN meeting. So that's also an interesting opportunity to bring any outstanding concerns about DNS abuse. That one is more in the future, this is more in the present. But two things to keep in mind about the DNS abuse small team at the GNSO Council. Thank you, everyone.

MASON COLE:

Mark, thanks very much for raising that. I know that's going to be very much of interest to the BC and everybody who's been active on the issue of DNS abuse, it looks like it's about a 10-page document. And it looks like it's brand new, as you say, it just came out a few hours ago. So thank you for circulating that to the BC membership. So if you would do that, that'd be very much appreciated. Okay. Jimson, your hand is up.

JIMSON OLOFUYE: Thank you very much, Chair. And greetings, everybody. And thank you, Steve, for that wonderful report, as usual. And of course, Lawrence, thank you very much for your excellent and consistent reporting. And also congratulations to Marie and Mark, for your elections.

Well, I just want to just raise something with regard to the issue of an accountant taking care of our books. Well, to be frank, as he says, it's a lot of work. And I really appreciate the effort Lawrence has put in. Not that I disagree, that maybe we can get somebody to do it. But that means this has to lead to a charter review. Because the vice chair, and as our operation is actually by charter required to do this work, ensure the books are kept and then provide the report.

So if it is going to be delegated, then we have to put it in mind that we need to review the charter, just like we had legal person in the charter, we need to have someone in the accountant to also be incorporated. So I think it's not a bad idea. Because really, the work is a lot of work to be frank and sincere. It's a lot of work. And if we're professionalizing it, then we could be looking in that direction. Thank you very much.

MASON COLE: Jimson, thank you. Lawrence, would you like to chime in on that?

LAWRENCE OLAWALE ROBERTS: Yes. Thank you very much. So thanks, Dr. Jimson, for the points that you raised. I don't agree that we need to update our charter. We have practically operated with an accountant over the last couple of years.

And we had never had to review our charter or update our charter to include an accounting service up to this particular point.

The new accountant that have been engaged is not doing anything out of the ordinary than what has been done before. We have only gone ahead to improve the process by ensuring that we have proper accounting and professional guidance in the way we run the accounts on a monthly basis leading up to how the accounts are filed.

So currently, like I have mentioned before, we have an accountant who pays out all our invoices and all that, and isn't in any way whatsoever involved in preparing the accounts that eventually goes to the IRS.

What we have done by engaging another firm who sits with the vice chair, so I still have oversights and responsibilities over everything with regards my role as vice chair. That is not in any way [inaudible]. But then I'm also giving the BC's accountant an overview of everything with regards our financial records, and they are going to be sitting and working with me to ensure that the report that is produced at the end of the month, and eventually at the end of the year, is in every way financially compliant with the accounting standards or accounting standards that are operational, if I may use that word.

And secondly, they won't have any issues taking these financial reports or records to the IRS, defending and presenting them. So based on this, the new BC accountant's going to be providing accounting—financial summaries, let me use that word, financial summaries to the entire ExCom and helping to do the same things that the current accountant is doing.

What we are also doing is just ensuring that they have the liberty to help us file and have full oversight to our accounting records. So nothing has changed from what I used to obtain. No part of the function of the vice chair of finance administration is being passed on to the accountants, for instance.

So all the directions, guidance on all that is required is still going to be received from the office of the vice chair. So I can very well say at this point, I'm sure that no updates or changes is required to the BC charter. But if you feel differently, that a change might be required, please point out the sections of the charter and we will take a second look at that. I see your hand up, so please, [inaudible], you have the floor.

JIMSON OLOFUYE:

Okay. Thank you very much. So I will just do a review and send it across to you and ExCom. It's not to say it's not a nice process. It's a good process, really, because the work OF Vice chair finance and operation is a lot of work. But what we have any charter is the legal officer. [inaudible] it was a legal counsel that was to handle things that had do with legal and our IRS filing and this will include some of the accounting processes.

But since the legal counsel failed to do that properly, we brought in the accountant. Now the accountant is going to have a real standing in the BC. So we need to have a reflection on that status as accountant in the charter. So we could [inaudible] brainstorm. I will send something to ExCom. Thank you.

MASON COLE:

Okay, thank you for raising that, Jimson. Yes, if there's an issue to raise, feel free to raise that to the ExCom. And I'm sure that we can handle it at the ExCom level. Or if it's serious enough, bring it to the attention of the BC. But Lawrence has done an excellent job of migrating all our functions over to the new accounting firm. And it has been a lot of work. You're right. So if there is a procedural issue to raise, feel free to raise that to the ExCom. Otherwise, I think we're going to proceed.

All right, any other business, ladies and gentlemen, before we adjourn? Okay, a couple of housekeeping items. Our next meeting is May 19th. Our guest at that point will be the DNS Abuse Institute's Graeme Bunton who will give us a demonstration of the new centralized abuse reporting tool that they're building.

Reminder, following up on what Tim said, the CSG is meeting on May 10th. That's next week. Everybody here on that call is welcome. And once again, welcome to Caroline and Rajiv. It's good to have you both in the BC now. And we've got some preparations to make for ICANN in The Hague, which is coming up rapidly. So we hope to see many of you there.

All right. If there's no other business, then the BC stands adjourned, and we'll talk to you in two weeks. Thanks, everybody.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]