ICANN74 | Policy Forum – GNSO: BC Membership Meeting
Thursday, June 16, 2022 – 15:00 to 16:00 AMS

ANDREA GLANDON: Hello and welcome to the BC membership meeting. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN expected standards of behavior. During this session, questions or comments submitted in the chat will be read aloud, if put in the proper format, which I will note shortly in the chat.

Taking part via audio, if you are remote, please wait until you are called upon and unmute your zoom microphone. For those of you in the main room, please raise your hand and Zoom and when called upon, unmute your table mic. If we have anyone in the secondary room, please raise your hand in Zoom and go to the standalone mic when called upon. For the benefit of other participants, please state your name for the record and speak at a reasonable pace. You may access all available features for this session in the Zoom toolbar. With that, I will hand the floor over to Mason Cole. You may begin.

MASON COLE: Thank you very much, Andrea. Good afternoon, everyone. This is Mason Cole, chair of the BC. I'm joined here by Tim Smith, who is our CSG liaison. The rest of our ExCom is spread out all over the place. Steve DelBianco had to leave early. Lawrence Olawale

EN

Roberts is at his home in Africa. And our GNSO Councilors are at a GNSO wrap up meeting right now. So it's just Tim and me. So there you go. So it's good to have everybody here. Thank you for joining us. If you're participating remotely, it's good to have you here as well. It'd be nice to have some others in the room. But we're glad for the members that we do have here. So thank you for joining us.

The agenda is up on the screen. You can see that we have several items to cover today. But before we begin, let me ask if there are any additions or updates to the agenda that anybody would like to request.

Okay, no hands. First order of business today is that we have a presentation on the work that ICANN, the community has been doing on subsequent procedures for new gTLDs. And Karen Lentz and her team are here to give us a quick update. So Karen, let me welcome you and Chris and Lars. And let me just turn the floor over to you. So please go ahead.

KAREN LENTZ: Thank you. This is Karen Lentz. I work in the Global Domains and Strategy function of ICANN. And I'm joined by a couple of team members, Chris Bare here and also Lars Hoffman who's on Zoom.

We don't have a long presentation, but we thought we would cover sort of the high points of what the ODP is and what we're

ICANN|74
THE HAGUE

EN

working on currently. And I thank you for the invitation. When we put out the note that we were available to come to speak to any groups who were interested, we weren't sure if anyone would take us up on it. But thank you, appreciate the invitation from the BC.

So if we can go to the second slide. I think most people know but the ODP is the operational design phase. That work is to assess the impact of a set of policy recommendations that have gone through the bottom up policy development process. The ODP work provides information on the impact in terms of resources, risk, timeline, and other aspects. And the output of that is a report is called the operational design assessment, or ODA, which includes all of the analysis that we've done as far as resources that would be required to implement the recommendations should they be accepted.

And the purpose of all of this work is to help inform the ICANN Board's decision on moving forward with those policy recommendations. In this case, the policy recommendations are around subsequent procedures for new gTLDs, meaning and application period for—application round and associated processes for adding new generic top level domains. So this is the work of the ODP.

The next slide is a graphic of our timeline, which is also posted on our webpage. This includes sort of some of the milestones and

ICANN|74
THE HAGUE

also the ongoing work. So Chris and Lars are going to talk a little bit about this one.

CHRIS BARE: Thank you, Karen. My name is Chris Bare. I'm also in the GDS group as well. As you recall or you know, the Board in their resolution to us told us that we had 10 months to do the ODP, and that's reflected here in this timeline. We started in January. And the little red arrow you see on the bottom there says we are here. Well, that's where we are today.

The items in blue that you see on this timeline are the ICANN meetings. You see that we've had the ICANN 73, of course, and 74, and 75 is coming up in September. And we had presentations at 73. And we also had a press station earlier this week, on Monday, that went into one of the topics in a little more detail. But if you go back to prep week a couple of weeks ago, we also had a more detailed update that talks a little bit more about both the approach that we're doing the work in, but also gave some information about how we're doing as far as resourcing and the like.

The items in green on this chart are the community updates that we do. They are actually reports that we published. We published two of them so far. We'll have another one coming up in August. And this is where again, it'll be similar type of information. It'll be the kind of the resources that we spent to date and also some of

the key milestones we've done. We talk a lot about some of the blogs we've been sharing to let the community understand what the work is we're doing and how we're approaching it, as well as to understand how we've structured some of what's happening.

The one item you see in red in here, that is our pens down date for the ODA, that's when we intend to have the content of what we're creating pretty much solidified, and then actually get that in the state to be ready for the Board. So that's an important date for us because we're aiming towards that. And it is the one change we did make in this timeline recently. We had it before ICANN 75 in our prior chart, but we realized that as with everything, getting ready for ICANN 75 takes effort. So it made more sense for us to actually have our pens down right after that date. So that's what's reflected here. With that, I'm going to hand it over to Lars who's online.

LARS HOFFMANN: Thanks, Chris. Hi, everyone. Yeah, joining online. There's no slide. I want to talk just a couple of items that came up during the Council call and also during our presentation and the plenary on Monday. I think part of the ODP, as obviously Karen and Chris elaborated on, is to give the Board the information on the operational impact of designing the next round or the subsequent rounds of new gTLDs based obviously on the outputs

of the final report and also experiences, lessons learned as well as the policy recommendations from the last round.

And reviewing the final report, and looking at the recommendations and helping providing the Board with relevant information, two kinds of issues or things maybe came up. One is things that we refer to as policy questions that we submitted to Jeff Neuman, the GNSO Council liaison to the ODP team. And those questions are usually around clarification of the meaning of the recommendations to be sure that when we look at this on the design impacts or on other relevant information that may be of interest or importance to the Board, that we are clear on that.

Some of those are maybe more complex than others. But we feel it's really helpful for us to make sure that we understand the recommendations the way that they're meant, and the way that the Council approved them so we can not only give the Board appropriate information but also write and design the operational design phase and the operational design assessment, the final report, if you want, in a way that is going to be a useful resource for future implementation work when we work with the community as part of the IRT when we implement the recommendations if and when the Board accepts them.

And the questions on the—so there's the policy questions, and then there's a couple of other issues that came up during the review of the report. And the Council is currently considering

these to address these maybe under the GNSO guidance process, the GGP process, and those items were—there were recommendations or implementation guidance in the report that essentially requested what we felt in parts were substantial design requests during implementation directed at the IRT. And obviously, I don't have to tell you the IRT is really a resource to help support ICANN Org's work. But it's not designed according to the CPIF as a process development body or group.

And so it seemed very much that the working group wanted the community to design these processes. And we're very supportive of that. But we felt that an IRT may not be the appropriate body according to the processes. In some cases, that may be the case and in other cases, may not. So we wanted to make sure that the Council is aware of these and said, "Look, on these items, maybe you want to provide more guidance at this point so that then the IRT has an easier time to work with ICANN Org when ICANN Org implement this." And I believe the Council will discuss those items over the next few weeks. I think there might be even a call that was talking about that yesterday during the Council call to go in more details here.

Applicant support is one of the topics. There are a couple of other topics that we brought to the Council where we thought more information would not only be helpful to us and to the Board, but really will be helpful to get the community input now to make the implementation process as efficient and as effective as intended.

And I think that's all I have on those two items. Obviously very happy to answer any other questions or go into details on the any of the topic areas that may be of interest to the BC. But I'll pass it on to Mason for now. Thank you.

KAREN LENTZ:

Thank you, Lars. Before we go to questions, I'll maybe mention one other point since we're looking at the timeline. One of the other items that was discussed at the GNSO Council is potential sort of follow-up work from a different operational design phase that had to do with a data access and disclosure system. And the sort of estimate that we gave after coming together with looking at our resources within the Org was that if this follow up work would be done, it would take some—some, not all, but some of the resources that we are using for this ODP work. We estimated that there would be probably around a six-week impact if that work is pursued. And if that occurs, that will affect this timeline, obviously, and we would produce and publish an updated timeline from what you see.

So on the next slide is just the resources. There's our webpage, you can always contact us. There's an e-mail address and all of the communications are archived on the page. We do continue to be available to discuss and engage with any community groups that are interested. So with that, I will turn it back to Mason for any questions. Thanks.

MASON COLE: Thank you, Karen. Thanks, Chris. And thank you, Lars, as well. Appreciate the update very much. Any questions from the BC for Karen and her team? I'll keep an eye on the queue online as well. Tim has question.

TIM SMITH: Just on the sliding date that you just referenced in the event that there is a delay. Will you know that by the time of August, middle of August when you have your next update for the community?

KAREN LENTZ: I certainly hope so. The Board, I think, has been interested in hearing from the community as far as their relative priority of work. We continue to estimate and look for ways to sort of streamline where we think things will happen. But I certainly hope we can wrap up that discussion so everybody's clear on what we're working on and when very shortly after the meeting.

MASON COLE: Okay, thank you for your question. Other questions or comments for Karen and her team? Okay, the queue is clear. So, Karen, I think you're off the hook for now. Thank you. Thank you all very much for bringing the update to the BC. Much appreciated. And you're welcome back at our meeting anytime.

KAREN LENTZ: Thank you.

MASON COLE: Thank you. Okay. Let's move for item number three, which is the policy calendar review. Brenda, do you have that available? Could you put that up on the screen, please?

BRENDA BREWER: Yep. Give me one moment, please.

MASON COLE: Thank you.

BRENDA BREWER: You're welcome.

MASON COLE: And colleagues, Steve is much more adept at handling the policy calendar. But since he's not here, you have to deal with me today. So my apologies in advance for what may be a little bit of a bumpy ride.

Okay. So channel one. On public comments, you see here that in April—well, for quite a while now we've been active on the NIS2 legislation coming from the European Parliament. And we had a

drafting team, Drew, myself, Marie, [inaudible] and Margie, all of whom contributed to the input that we had for the European Parliament.

And that work has been ongoing. You may have seen or heard that there was some developments coming out of Europe. We haven't seen the final language of the NIS2 directive, but it should be arriving soon. So that'll be updated as soon as we have an opportunity to see what the directive looks like.

We commented in April on the policy status report for the UDRP policy development process. Andy, Zak, Marie, Vivek and John Berard were all active on that. So thank you for your participation on that important piece of work.

In terms of opportunities to comment, there's nothing apparently right now although Zak Muscovitch says that the transfer policy working group's initial report is going to be published for comment next week. And there are some details in the policy calendar that Steve sent out below this note.

So there are going to be some recommendations, creating a post creation lock and a change of registrar lock. So if you are interested in this piece of policy development, and you'd like to comment, please get a hold of Steve or Arinola or Zak and they'll be glad to have your help on that.

ICANN|74
THE HAGUE

We continue our work on advocacy for NIS2 and any other regulatory developments that are coming out of the EU. Drew Bennett is our lead on this. And he's done an outstanding job. Drew and in particular also Nik Lagergren. So we had a response for the European Parliament back in March. We had a letter to the European Parliament on April 20 about the Article 23, which was the specific part of the directive that deals with domain names.

And then earlier this month, there was a final negotiation session for the European Parliament, the Council and the Commission for them to work out the language of what NIS2 is actually going to look like and then a few days ago, Marie circulated the text that it looks like is going to be finalized in the next week or so. So that should be attached to Steve's e-mail if you'd like to have a look at that. Okay, questions so far? Comments? Looking in the queue. Okay.

All right, channel two. As I mentioned, Marie and Mark are in a Council wrap up session right now. So they're not available for this meeting. But there was a Council meeting back in May. You can see the agenda and documents associated with that meeting there. There was another meeting yesterday where there was a pretty ambitious agenda. I'm not sure they got through everything during the Council meeting.

But item four of their agenda was a final report on the EPDP for specific curative rights protections for IGOs, and I believe that

matter has come to conclusion. Jay Chapman represented us on that EPDP with some help from Zak and Andy Abrams, and Jay is recommending that the BC Councilors approve the final report. And I believe that vote was taken yesterday, if I'm not mistake. Tim, do you know? Okay, all right.

Okay. This may be a very short meeting, folks, we're flying through the policy calendar. Okay, item five. The impact of SSAD Lite on other work and ICANN Org resources. Steve is serving on a small Council team that is reviewing the ODA. And back in February, he submitted a response on behalf of the BC drawing on our previous joint minority statement on the EPDP Phase Two final report where the BC voted no.

So the small team has gathered to recommend a proof of concept for a centralized ticketing system. As we know, ICANN Org sees that it could be a six-week effort to produce a design concept paper. Resources are needed to produce that document that are responsible for other areas of work. So this will delay timelines by about a month and a half for SubPro ODP and the EBERO and the DEA improvements. So this is an ongoing piece of policy work. And if you're interested in this, I encourage you to get a hold of Steve because there's still quite a bit of work to be done on this.

The small team again met back in May to consider next steps. Steve brought out the idea of emulating the .music approach with a Cypriot DPA. Michael Palage is working on this as well, maybe

too soon to know if there's a proposal that could be approved that could make progress in that area.

Okay. Steve also sent out a note about Monday's session on EPDP Phase Two. There's a Zoom webinar archive available for you if you missed the meeting. Let's go to item six there, Brenda, please. We just heard from Karen and her team on SubPro. So we're up to speed on that.

On item eight, there's a discussion on closed generics. And it looks like the small team has provided its recommendation to the Council earlier or a deal looks like last week. Item nine is discussion of GNSO PDP improvements based on a discussion paper by staff and Council is going to review those potential improvements. I think it was discussed yesterday, but I'm not exactly sure.

Okay. Let's go down to other Council activity. So Zak Muscovitch and Arinola are on the Transfer Policy Review Working Group. You can see that there was an initial report that will be published for public comment on June 20th. So if Steve and Arinola and Zak are going to be authoring the comment on behalf of the BECAUSE, if you're interested in the transfer report, you should contact one of them to see if you can lend a hand with that comment.

Next phase of that working group has just commenced and it'll include a review of one of the most important aspects of the transfer policy which is the change of registrant lock. If you're

active on domain name ownership, this is important to you because it will impact the way that you can transfer a name between registrars. So, again, if you're interested in that, Steve, Arinola and Zak are your contacts. Let me stop there for a minute and see if anybody has any comment or question. This is a very quiet meeting, friends.

Okay, Brenda, let's go down to item two, please. So the GNSO Council is working on some improvements to the Statement of Interest process where this is part of the GNSO operating procedures where participants in the ICANN process have to disclose via a statement of interest where their interests lie. And it looks like Susan and Imran have volunteered to participate on that task force. So thank you to both of them.

And then item number three, this is actually what's occupied quite a bit of time here at ICANN 74. There's the issue of DNS abuse. And as you know, the BC has been extremely active on DNS abuse. There's been several updates, plenaries, community outreaches on DNS abuse, including we just left a meeting just a little while ago on DNS abuse.

There's a small group on the GNSO Council that is looking at ways to improve DNS abuse either through contract amendments for the registrars and registries or via policy development. So as you can see, there's a draft work plan that includes outreach to the community to ensure that there's an understanding of the

current landscape on abuse. They're considering which elements of abuse tend to appear and are inadequately mitigated and are in scope for GNSO policymaking. And then they'll make some recommendations to the Council on how to proceed.

As Brenda scrolls down there, you can see that there's been quite a bit of discussion, as I mentioned, on DNS abuse here at ICANN 74. The ExCom had a private one on one meeting with Göran a day before yesterday where he highlighted—here's a new acronym for you, put this one down on paper because it's going to last for a while—DNS security facilitation initiative technical study group, DSFITSG. That's a good one.

They're going to produce a final report and there'll be some additional activity on DNS abuse, probably both within the GNSO and between ICANN staff and contracted parties. So I can report to the BC that we've had some discussions as well with contracted parties on the issue of abuse. And I'm very pleased to say that contracted parties are engaging on the issue of abuse. There's probably going to be an effort to update contracts, again, either in a negotiated way, and/or through the development of policy. So we're making real strides on DNS abuse. And that's outstanding.

The GAC had a briefing on DNS abuse on Tuesday. You can see the link to the slides there that Steve has included in the policy calendar. And then on item number four, you can also see that

Steve represents the BC on this Council small team that I just mentioned. And oh, no, I'm sorry. This is on modifying consensus policies.

So there's a discussion draft that suggests a number of ways to change GNSO procedures regarding policy development. And we sent a letter to the Org and Board earlier this year. Apparently, there was a call back in May where Steve suggested that Org put together implementation of some suggested improvements to PDP templates. If you're interested in that, there's another link that has more information for you.

On Item five, registration data accuracy scoping, this is another big piece of policy work going on inside of ICANN right now. Susan Kawaguchi and Toba are representing the BC on that working group. I know there was a session on that earlier this week as well. This is important because as you know, WHOIS is not entirely accurate all the time. And there's an effort underway to make sure that there are methods in place where WHOIS can be kept up to speed and accurate. So policy work continues on that as well.

All right, the IRT for registration data EPDP Phase One. As you know, the EPDP dealing with WHOIS under the new realm of GDPR has been ongoing now for coming up on four years and Alex Deacon represents us on the implementation team. Nothing has been implemented as of yet, even after three years of work.

So there's finally been a date set for August to publish the Phase One implementation spec, which apparently is called OneDoc. But in order to do that, there have to be some data processing agreements put in place, including some of the ICANN realm. And it's going to be important that we understand that. Now, assuming the IRT does publish its work for public comment in August, as you can see from Steve's e-mail, the BC is going to need to spin up a comment team pretty quickly.

Alex Deacon has said he's willing to lead the effort, but it's going to be important to have additional help on the part of the BC to review, understand and draft our comments, because there are going to be numerous documents involved, including a lot of updates to consensus policy docs in the form of redlines. So if you're interested in that—let me see if Alex is on the call.

ALEX DEACON: I'm here, Mason, but at an airport. So it may be loud. But yeah, I think you summarized it well. I just wanted to plant the seed that we will need help on reviewing all these documents and forming a BC comment. So if you have interest and cycles, just reach out to me. And then when the time comes, we'll put a plan together to get that.

MASON COLE: Okay, thanks, Alex. Is there an update that you'd like to provide to the BC other than that, or are you good for now?

ALEX DEACON: Just to note that there is this open issue about the DPAs and what impact a lack of a negotiated and entered into DPA between the contracted parties and ICANN may be. They're still negotiating. And we don't know when or even if that will end. So I just wanted to flag that as an issue. I have concerns about that. But I think it's a little bit too early to kind of dive in and understand any impacts. But again, just a heads up that this important dependency is still outstanding and we'll need to understand the impact depending on if the DPA finishes negotiations and both parties sign or if that does not happen.

MASON COLE: Okay, thanks very much, Alex. While we have Alex on the phone, any questions or updates for Alex on this issue? We're 35 minutes into the meeting and we're flying through the agenda. So we have room for comments or input if anybody would like to speak up.

Okay, all right. I'm sure you're all tired of hearing me talk. So I'm going to turn this over to Tim for an update from the CSG liaison to the BC and on CSG activity. So Tim, take it away.

TIM SMITH: Thanks, Mason, very much. Take a little break. Good report, by the way. Thank you. And I won't be able to stretch this meeting out too much longer, because my report is not very long. I represent the Business Constituency on the Commercial Stakeholders Group. And I guess, because this is an open meeting, and if people aren't aware of who CSG is, it's a combination of the Business Constituency, the Intellectual Property Constituency, and the Internet Service Providers and Connectivity Providers Constituency. And we sort of collaborate and discuss issues of common concern or common interest.

And so what I've provided for you here today is just an example of what we have discussed as being our priorities for 2022. So that included having coordinated action with the GNSO on areas of common interest, improving access to registration data and helping to successfully mitigate DNS abuse. And I think we're progressing on all of those fronts, actually, quite well.

We haven't met since May 10 so I really don't have too much of an update, although all of those issues and the things that we're concerned about continue to be addressed and certainly have been addressed this week at ICANN 74. But during that meeting, we did get updates. The May 10th meeting, we did get updates on potential abuse related Ra amendments. Or it wasn't an update, but we did have a discussion about it. Accuracy scoping project, ICANN prioritization framework, and ongoing Board-Council small team conversations and discussions related to SSAD.

So there was no meeting of the CSG, either the ExCom or the full CSG membership during ICANN 74. But we are planning for one in the weeks to come. So that's basically it. Just at the bottom, if you have the policy calendar highlighted, it's just a few links to the planning prioritization framework project pilot. And there have been a couple of sessions over the past days regarding—actually, it was last week. And of course, there was the plenary the other day as well.

But what we're waiting for at this point, now with all of those Board recommendations having been prioritized by the community, we're now waiting for a report from Org, from staff on sort of costs and dependencies and human resources related to implementing the priorities. And I'm told that should be coming in the next couple of weeks. So then we'll have another chance to review that and look at it.

Other than that, as I say, we are hoping to have a CSG meeting in the coming weeks. And I'll keep everybody informed about that. Thank you.

MASON COLE: Thank you, Tim. Any comments or updates for Tim? This is the quietest BC meeting I've ever been to. All right. Okay, that should take care of it for the policy calendar. Brenda, could we go back to the agenda, please? Thank you very much.

All right. item four. Lawrence, are you with us?

LAWRENCE OLAWALE ROBERTS: Yes, I'm here. Loud and alive.

MASON COLE: Well, it's good to see you. We're sorry you're not here with us today.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE ROBERTS: No problem. Soaking it in. It's been quite an eventful week of meetings. And good to know that even though we are not able to make it physically, we are still able to join the discussions and deliberations. But definitely, this can't be compared to be in the meeting physically.

Good day, ladies and gentlemen. So my name is Lawrence Olawale Robnerts. I happen to be the vice chair for finance and operations for the Business Constituency. Sorry, I appear to be going too fast. So I will slow down a bit.

So I would like to welcome, again, everyone who is joining us in the room today and those joining us remotely to another ICANN meeting. And I would want to use this opportunity to invite those of us in the room and who might be joining in remotely, especially those of us who are commercial users of the Internet, to not only sit with us—thank you for coming to sit with us today—but we

want to ask that you also use this opportunity to join the Business Constituency.

As you can see, the Business Constituency of ICANN is a very active group. And we would love to have more members join in our fold. Where [inaudible] join, consider joining the BC, please go to our website, which you can find at www.icannbc.org, and on the top menu, click on "Join the BC." If you are able to get there, you will be prompted to create an account and also fill out the form.

Right after you have done this, the credential committee will evaluate your applications. And if they need some additional information, they will definitely reach back to you. But we would love to have you join us. Thank you, Brenda, for sharing the link in the chat.

So moving on, I would like for members to also know that the BC has—for members and visitors joining us, to know that the BC has two travel slots for business executives willing to join the BC before, during or after ICANN 75. So between now and the next public meeting, seeing that we are gradually going back to hybrid and physical meetings, the BC has had a tradition of sponsoring two business executives with a potential to join the BC to a physical ICANN meeting. And being that the next meeting will be the AGM, it will definitely be a good opportunity to have more business leaders joining our fold.

We particularly would want to encourage business executives who reside within the Kuala Lumpur region which is the meeting venue for the next meeting or within Kuala Lumpur itself to make use of this opportunity to be sponsored to the BC meeting, for we want to encourage BC members to help reach out to colleagues within their network [inaudible] and help spread out this information.

We expect that prospective candidates will reach out to the Onboarding Committee. And with their application, I'll share the e-mail address to the Onboarding Committee's mailing list. We expect that interested participants, nominees will send their applications to an e-mail to the Onboarding Committee and after they do a collation, that the Onboarding Committee will forward this to ExCom for ExCom to evaluate and make a decision on at least two business leaders that will be sponsored to the next ICANN meeting.

As I said, this is a BC tradition that we intend to keep going. If there is any information that you would require regarding this particular opportunity, please feel free to reach myself, Lawrence, or the BC staff and secretariat, Brenda and Chantelle, for further information on what I just shared.

I'm happy to let us know that we have the ICANN 74 BC newsletter already out and posted on our website. The ICANN 74 newsletter can be found on the BC's website when we go to

communications. And clicking on the newsletter, members and participants here today will see a list of all the BC newsletters that have been curated. The current edition for this June meeting is posted right here.

I want to thank everyone who had volunteered an article to make this possible. In this edition of the BC newsletter, which has been beautifully done, you will find a welcome message by our chair, Mason right there before you [in the hall,] and some information with regards a new course on ICANN Learn.

The new BC course, getting to know the Business Constituency, is now live. And we want to encourage members and participants [in the hall] who would want to know more about the BC to visit ICANN Learn and make themselves [cognizant] with the course that we have already posted live.

Aside from the new BC newsletter that we have and the ICANN Learn course, we want to encourage members of the BC to consider joining the Onboarding Committee. We still have about two open slots for membership of the Onboarding Committee.

What we've seen done with regards the course on ICANN Learn is a product of the Onboarding Committee and there are other jobs, other assignments falling within their remit. So I would want to encourage at least two more BC members. You could be a member just joining the BC and it will be a good way for you to jump in and get to know more about out the BC, interact more

closely with members, and also get yourself up to speed with what is going on within the constituency. So we still have about two available slots for volunteers for the Onboarding Committee. And we have one slot open for the Communications Committee.

Moving ahead, I would want to use this opportunity to thank Scott and Tola for a wonderful two-year run on the Nominating Committee. Scott and Tola had to put in dozens of their time and resources, sitting through the process that the Nominating Committee engages to be able to place directors on the ICANN Board, on the PTI Board, within the GNSO Council, the ccNSO, and other parts of the community, including At-Large.

And from the reports they gave yesterday, the critical part of the assignments are already through. And we want to say a big thank you for the time and resources that you have devoted to this assignment.

Taking over from Tola will be Vivek by ICANN 75. That's the next public meeting. And also taking over from Scott will be [inaudible] taking over the large business seat for the Nominating Committee. I'm sure that both [inaudible] and Vivek will do an excellent job in keeping up with the beautiful tradition that's the legacy which the Business Constituency has left within the Nominating Committee.

To this effect, I would also want to bring to the members' attention the fact that there is going to be an upcoming

opportunity for BC members to comment on the NomCom review working group's proposed changes to bylaws and standing committee charter. This is an open comment. This is an upcoming comment. I'm sure Steve will bring us up to speed on this when it's opened in August. But as we all know, it is of particular interest to the Business Constituency.

With that said, I would want to also chip in that at this point, all members should have received their invoices for FY 23. Please, if you haven't seen your invoice yet, reach out to me or to invoicing@icannbc.org so that we can help resolve any issues that we might have. We remain financially stable. And I'm hoping that as we begin to make arrangements to return back to our different bases that we will travel safe and keep the fire, keep things going well as the Business Constituency. If you have any questions for me, I'll be happy to take them. Otherwise, I will gladly yield the floor back to Mason for the rest of the meeting.

MASON COLE: Thank you for the update, Lawrence. Questions or comments for Lawrence, please. Okay, all right, Lawrence, thank you for the update. Very thorough as always, and we'll see you at ICANN 75, I hope.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE ROBERTS: I hope so too. Thank you.

ICANN|74
THE HAGUE

MASON COLE: Okay. All right, folks, we've reached the end of our agenda. Is there any other business to cover today? Andrea, Brenda, anything from the staff side that needs to be talked about?

ANDREA GLANDON: Nothing for me.

BRENDA BREWER: Me neither. Thank you.

MASON COLE: Okay, then we will end nine minutes early. So thanks, everybody, for joining up. The BC is adjourned.

ANDREA GLANDON: Thank you. You may stop the recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]

ICANN|74
THE HAGUE