BRENDA BREWER:	Good morning. Good afternoon. Good evening. This is Brenda speaking. Welcome to the business constituency membership call on 20 July 2023 at 15:00 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, and I'll turn the meeting over to BC chair Mason Cole. Thank you.
MASON COLE:	Thank you very much Brenda. Good morning. Good afternoon. Good evening, everyone. Mason Cole here, chair of the BC. Welcome to our call on July 20, it's good to see that we have a good complement of members on the call today. We had lots of productive discussions in Washington DC. Those of you who were there remember that we also conducted very successful outreach meeting. Thanks to Lawrence and Caroline, Caroline especially who put it together for us. And we've got some follow up work to do following the DC meetings.
	But today is our regular scheduled meeting with our usual agenda. Are there any updates or corrections to the agenda as you see it on the screen please?
CAROLINE LUPETINI:	I'm happy to share my screen in all other business. I attended the ICANN 78 planning session the other day and they showed the block schedule which I have a screenshot of, if helpful.

MASON COLE: That'd be very helpful Caroline. I'll call on you on AOB. Thank you very much. Okay, thanks. Okay. No hands up, and Steve, over to you for the policy counter you please.

MASON COLE: Thanks, Mason. All right, everyone. We have only two comments that we filed since the last time the BC met two weeks ago, and that was on July the 15th, we commented on the draft framework for closed generic TLDs. I want to thank Tim Smith for pulling together the original. I worked with him on that and then Marie came in and helped out too. We didn't get a lot of interest in this one. And I think it's because it's been 11 or 12 years since we did closed generics and in some respects it was much ado about nothing. And yet, here's an opportunity to put down some guardrails, so that if an applicant wants to propose a generic word for their TLD, and that applicant happens to be in the industry related to that word like if you're a travel agency, and you want .hotels, maybe there ought to be some guardrails and how you handle second level domains and whether your competitors are allowed to buy names and whether consumers could be confused. I mean the BC has the most reasonable position on this. And yet, I think ICANN is over complicating it in an extraordinary way. Their framework is so complicated we're not likely to see anybody propose a close generic if they're a player in an industry, and I'm not sure anybody will do a close generic of any kind, even if they're not a competitor because you have to show public interest.

So our comment reiterated what the BC is worried about, and at the end we said look, we would ask the team, are you just trying to kill the

idea of a generic TLD? If you're not trying to kill it you should revisit your proposal because your process is too complicated. So I just want to explain that so BC members review the comment, they'll understand the sort of two approaches we took to it. Are there any questions on that, Tim, anything to add?

TIM SMITH: Hi Steve. Thanks. No, not too much. I think people can read it for themselves. I think the closing comment which was the one that you added which is, you know, what's the purpose of this? Is the intention by the facilitated group to actually grant closed generics? I'm not sure. I think the facilitated group was actually doing what the board asked which is to come back with a proposal. And toss it back to the board for the board to make a decision. I think you're right that it's a very complicated process that they've laid out. And it's unlikely that it'll move forward.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Any other comments on that? Well, Tim, thank you especially. On July, the 5th, we had proposed some support for amendments on the PTA IANA governance proposal and Rajiv Prasad of Google, fantastic work on that. I appreciate you stepping up again, the way you have on things related to PTA and IANA.

So we have one open public comment right now that closes today. This is the one on amendments to the base agreements for registrars and registries to address DNS abuse, where Mark and Mason, members of the BC, have been really instrumental driving the conversation about

fixing contracts on DNS abuse, and honestly was the BC that made this so top of mind at the meeting in the Netherlands and we really beat up on Göran to allow contract amendments to address DNS abuse, because Göran said no way are we going to do that. So, we've come full circle now, we have a handful of amendments that are proposed that do in fact obligate more than just having an abuse contact. They do obligate mitigation, but they're not perfect. And the question for us was do we let the perfect be the enemy of the good on this one. And how do we live to fight another day on having PDPs that would address certain other obligations on DNS abuse. And I want to particularly applaud the work by Margie Milam, the original drafter, and Mark Datysgeld working together with Mason's help to work in what Crystal Ondo came up with, because we had a lot of different perspectives on what the BC should say on the RAA and registry agreement.

Now the current draft, which I will file today, still has still has a little bit of cleanup. And I want to try to get some resolution to this one. So Mark, take a look at the comment on the right side of the screen. Do you believe that comment has been addressed in what you have or does it need something more?

MARK DATYSGELD: Yeah, I believe so, Steve. The main thing on that one, just to clarify to the rest of theBC, is that this was pretty much, let's say, it took six months of the small team for DNS abuse work, and the fact that they did not come up with replacement language in this case leads me to believe that at this point is not exactly malice on their part. I think they just can't come to a language that they think will pass. That's my vision

based on the fact that we had the CPH there. And they were also interested in changing this. So how do we approach this, which I think we should. I think it's a key issue. But how do we approach this in a way that brings this up. But at the same time doesn't look like hey we're taking a second stab at this thing that we spent six months working. So, that's what needs to be conveyed there, but we definitely should approach it that way and, you know, as policy chair I leave it to you to frame that in the best way possible.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Mark, so I can resolve this comment. I'm going to ask whether there's anything else that's left from Mason, Crystal, Margie. Anything else or can I put this in final form for submission today? Looking for hands. Anyone? Mason?

MASON COLE: No hand from me. Margie may have comments since she took the initial pen.

MARGIE MILAM: No, I think this is great. I appreciate all the hard work in getting language that is acceptable to everybody. So I'm fine with the version you shared.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Margie, thank you again. Crystal, Mark, and Mason. So the second half of this comment is we have an opportunity to comment on ICANN

Compliance's advisory. This is something that doesn't have to be voted on by the registrars and registries, it's not a contract amendment. It's an advisory that can change anytime. And in this case, ICANN Compliance can address it. So what I'd like to do is bring that up for a moment. And here's the advisory, and in the advisory which was 20 pages long, mason and Margie took a stab at—and I circulated this several days ago—so took a stab at making comments on it. So Mason and Margie I would ask you what's the right way for us to convey our suggested edits to the advisory. And should we combine it with the comment we are filing on the contract amendments? Or should I file two separate comments, one on the contract amendments and one on compliance advisory? What are you thinking?

MARGIE MILAM: I think we just combine it and put it at the end of the other one we just saw. Because in that way we know it's in, it's not broken up. And also if you look at the comments, it refers back to the comments we made earlier, so it won't make sense if you separate it. The idea was we made some language changes. But given the state of the current negotiations, it may not be possible to make some of the changes that we requested. So our thought is the things that we asked to put into the contract that can't be incorporated, that still means it could still be incorporated in the advisory and that that would be a big win for us. So that's why I think you have to combine it together into one document.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Okay, as far as I'm concerned, that's the right answer. Because there's many places we say the proposed amendments as discussed in comments. So happy to do it that way. And then the final question would be, given that we have comments to the right, it's not a format we've used in the past. But I think I could probably do a PDF that looks pretty much like what you have on the screen, where our comments would be sitting just alongside of the doc, we could submit them another word doc that has the comments in it, we could give them two or three different formats. But it's really just a markup without a lot of narrative. Agreed?

MARGIE MILAM: Yep.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Again, it's an awfully long compliance advisory. And our comments are contained over here on the right. Are there any other BC members who've had an opportunity to review what I've circulated in the last several days? And have any other further edits? Or can I package this up for submission today? Okay, that was our last opportunity. And at this point, I'll go back to the policy calendar. Go ahead, Crystal.

CRYSTAL ONDO: Thanks, Steve. And I agree with Margie. We should go with a comment. And I think [inaudible] comments against the advisory is the right way to go about it. I will just say as regards to the no SLA response time, I think the advisory is ultimately where we'll get that in. But I will say, I don't

know if that's going to come—I doubt it will come in the first iteration. My understanding is that ICANN Compliance is going to try to get a lay of the land and then start issuing changes to the advisory first. So I would be surprised if they make any changes before this goes to vote to the advisory, but they do understand that it's a living document. So making comments on it now kind of gets us in front of it. And I think speaking with ICANN directly once the amendments are out about the advisory is definitely where we're going to get the win because otherwise the contract itself, I don't see those such things being incorporated into it immediately.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Crystal. And a number of you may have noticed the same thing in the BC comment. That was a compromise that we worked out. We note with concern that there's no timeframe on the obligations in the contract, but we don't propose that they should change the contract. But in the advisory, we talk about the need to move that up. But it is my view that the registrars and registries, they don't get to vote on the advisory. They get to tell ICANN whether it's workable and enforceable, but I don't think they are going to vote on the advisory. Crystal, correct me on that if it's wrong.

CRYSTAL ONDO: Yep, that's right. So the advisory was issued as kind of an explanation, not just to the community about their language, but also to registries and registrars who might not be paying attention to the whole amendment process. So it will accompany all the, for lack of better

language, PR to registrars and registries about, okay, here are the contract changes. Please vote yes. Here's the advisory to explain to you more what it's about. So while it is a compliance document, there was some understanding that it's also a PR document for not just the whole community, but also registries and registrars to vote on, which is why I don't expect it changing a huge amount before the vote. But we all understand, whether we say it out loud, that ICANN can change this after the fact.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Go ahead, Mark.

MARK DATYSGELD: Thank you. Thank you, Crystal, for the clarification. Yeah, from my understanding from the conversations we've had with ICANN, the expectation is that this would be a living document. And what I have surmised from that is that right now they intend to change very little, but depending on how the flux goes, depending on how people react to certain things or how certain things develop, they will be willing to implement changes and take this in a different direction. So making our suggestions right now is as good time as any. We will get early on this, and I don't expect things to change, to be very honest. At least we can get a BC position started, we can signal where we want to go with this, and eventually when they feel like it's the time to start moving these things around, we already have a head start. So let's keep low expectations, but the time is as good as any.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Mark, and see no other hands. So thanks again to Mark, Margie, Crystal, Mason. Next item up, there's no other public comments, but we always invite Marie or Andrew to comment on the current NIS 2 transposition that's underway, in particular we have interest in the Czech Republic and in what the Danes are doing. Are there any BC members that have an update on NIS 2? Go ahead, Marie, please.

MARIE PATTULLO: Hi, Steve. Hi everyone, this is Marie. It's not really an update, it's just to let you know that not a lot is happening. I've had various conversations with various members of my association in different countries, and the response I'm getting back from everywhere is not a lot is happening with this right now, but I don't want the BC to think that we're not watching it, we are. It's just that at member state level, it's not being prioritized.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Marie. We're going to pick up on that thread in a moment because one of the agenda items for the council meeting today is NIS 2 accuracy requirements. So let me turn to council next. So Mark and Marie are both on the line. We'll be able to discuss what's happening at council. I noted in here things that are on the agenda themselves that need some follow-up, and item four on there is the NIS 2 accuracy requirements. So Margie and Mark, why don't you take over and I'll scroll the screen through all the different things that council's doing in channel two.

MARGIE MILAM: Thanks, Steve. I'll kick off and then hand over to Mark. Not a lot has happened since our last BC meeting because council is at 11:00 this evening. That's your 21:00 UTC, so I don't know what that is where you are. We are going to defer the work on accuracy for another six months. Why? Because it depends on there being a DPA, and there's no DPA, which surprises exactly nobody, but you never know. One day we might have a DPA.

The NIS 2, that was raised by Thomas Rickert, who is one of the councilors for the ISPs. Now, in essence, what Thomas seems to think we should do is put together a current state of play on what the registrars, registries already do in the accuracy field, in the complying with article 28 of NIS 2 field. I'm not quite sure where this conversation is going to go. I can't put money on this because I don't know. I think Thomas seems to believe that if ICANN can come up with a document saying, look at all these wonderful things our contracting parties already do, that somehow that will persuade the 27 member states of the European Union that there is nothing further that they need to do to comply with NIS 2. I don't believe that's the case, but I honestly don't know what he's trying to achieve with this, but I'm sure that Mark can have thoughts on it too.

The SubPro is just, as you know, there was a whole bunch, 38 different recommendations that Board either didn't approve or wanted more info on or wanted some more work on at council level, so that's been going through a small team, a lot of work being done there, and an update on what's happening with the IDNs EPDP.

We will let you know what happens after council. Before I hand over to Mark, the only other thing I will add is some of you have been following the infamous statement of Interest, SOI. We've had back and forth on this and we seem to be walking in a circle inside a circle inside a circle. You start with everybody needs to say who they work for unless you're a lawyer because you can't, and we've had all sorts of iterations. If anybody wants details, I'll happily send them to you, but at the moment we've come down to, we worked out some language we thought everybody would be happy with, and then the registrar said we haven't had time to look at it. We'll come back and let you know, as did the ISPs, as did the registries, so I don't actually know where we are on that. At the moment we're not anywhere, but we've had a lot of nice conversations. Happy to take any questions and more than happy to pass over to Mark.

MARK DATYSGELD: Thank you, Margie. I will complement that by saying that the SOI situation is ballooning into something way bigger than it was supposed to be because it's become existential in a lot of ways. The chair of the group now apparently feels like they have something to prove because of all the pressure that's been put on this, and I don't know exactly where this will land because, as Margie said, the language keeps changing all the time. Since Margie's directly involved, she would know better, but from the updates we get on the list, it doesn't seem like something is built towards it. It seems like they just keep changing direction.

We know this is something of interest to the BC, but right now we don't know precisely how this is going to go.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Mark, who's driving the proposed transparency and SOI improvements? Who's the constituency or staff member that really wants to see some improvements here?

MARK DATYSGELD: From everything that has been discussed so far, I would say it's between NCSG, the ISPCP, and the CPH. If I had to point more clearly towards a party, I would say there's been a lot of action coming from the CPH side on this, and it doesn't seem to be targeted at us. It seems to be very targeted at the IPC specifically. It seems that we are just a casualty. This is meant for the IPC specifically, and this is my personal understanding. This is not any official position. This is what I picked up from the ground. I bet this will keep evolving, and it wouldn't surprise me if it just dies, because it looks like this is one of the potential outcomes. Let's wait and see if something comes up during this Council meeting, and we'll keep you all to date.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Okay. Thank you, Mark. Appreciate that. There are several other elements that are under play on council. I always list the agenda for your council meeting, but below that, we list these other council activities. One of them is Zak and Arenola working on transfer policy. Do you have any updates for us, Arenola or Zak?

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: Thank you, Steve. This is Zak. The transfer policy working group has one more meeting [inaudible] the rest of August. There's nothing to report at this moment. Thank you very much.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Zak. Lawrence, anything on GNSO guidance process?

LAWRENCE OLAWALE ROBERTS: Yes. The working group is working towards a public comment. The modalities for that is being arranged. As soon as that is good to go, I will be reporting back with details around that. That's basically the next phase of the work.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you. We've already covered DNS abuse. RDRS is something I cover for us. It's a continued struggle to try to figure out why our community, the requester community, sees value in submitting requests to the new RDRS when it goes live in November. We do calls every two weeks on a Monday. Steve Crocker and I are constantly discussing ways in which you can enhance the value proposition so that we will have a good reason to use it. At every turn, we are pushed back, mostly by Sarah at the registrar, Sarah Wyld, who really wants to limit very tightly what it is that the system can do.

The latest discussion was about, if I have a batch of requests, we asked staff to allow me to submit them in batch. The answer, no, not going to

do it. The GAC asked for something and we made that change, but they're not going to give us batch upload. Steve Crocker and I have mostly been leading the effort to say that industry can create an upload app that will take from a file and upload them into the RDRS. That gave rise to the discussion of what happens when I'm uploading a record for a registrar who's not participating. Steve Crocker and I believe it should be loaded. Paul McGrady has been backing me up on that. We should still load those into the system so we can track registrars that are not participating and if they decide to participate, they suddenly get a download of all the requests for them to disclose and we will be able to point to the number of times we've asked for disclosure, but the registrar hasn't even bothered to join the system. Well, I think we're going to fail on them. Even the chair of the council, Sebastien Ducos, who chairs this committee, says that he doesn't believe there will be any way to continue to store requests if the registrar is not participating. They actually make the excuse that it might have a privacy problem and ICANN Legal might not be happy with it. And of course, the registrar community is scared to death of looking bad if there are a lot of data requests that are ignored because registrars don't even participate.

So this is not going well and my frustration is probably obvious. I don't really know what we can do and every turn I remind them that the BC ended up voting no on the system because we felt it was not really going to be helpful on the SSAD. Are there any questions or suggestions to me on the RDRS? That's what Mason just put in, information about service to request non-public data. Mason, what else is in that announcement July 13th?

MASON COLE: Not a lot, Steve. There's going to be two webinars later this month and apparently ICANN is going to review progress on the RDRS where it stands right now and answer questions from the community. There was, if I may add this, there was some discussion in DC in the CSG meeting with contracted parties about collaborating somehow on, marketing isn't the right word, but raising awareness of the RDRS so that there would be an opportunity for people to use it and we could actually get some decent measurement of demand for the RDRS. I'm not sure that's really going to help but it's probably worth doing and if there's somebody in the BC or the wider CSG who's willing to take up that torch with the Contracting Party House, I know it would be welcomed. Let me follow up on that separately. I just rotated to the CSG chair so I'm happy to raise that with the CSG.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Mason. I've been carrying that flag and was the one who tried to articulate the way in which you deliver messages to the potential requester community, separating it out into different categories, commercial, security, and law enforcement, but within each category, realizing you're speaking to some people that are very experienced, do it all the time, and people that have never done requests for disclosure so that you have to have a slightly different message. That is what brought my frustration to a head because I articulated that the requester community will really appreciate that if they have a lot of requests, they can upload them. If they have a request for a registrar that they've never worked with before, put it into the RDRS. Mason, the

answer? Well, no, you can only put it in if it's a participating registrar. ICANN will do nothing with a request of existential security threat or fraud occurring in a domain if the registrar responsible for the domain has decided to close their eyes and not participate. The value proposition that we wanted to pitch, the marketing, is suddenly becoming less valuable and maybe non-valuable. I am not confident that any amount of marketing is going to work if the product doesn't deliver. That's ridiculous. It really is, Margie. Okay, anything on SubPro? Imran, Ching?

CHING CHIAO: Hi, Steve. This is Ching. Actually, I think the status right now is that for both of us, I'm not sure if Imran is on the call, but for both of us as primary and alternate to be introduced to the group because we haven't been really added to the mailing list, so it will be appreciated if the leadership of BC or actually Brenda can send our names to the IRT group.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yeah, Brenda, Mason, we made this decision months ago. Imran is the BC rep and Ching is our alternate. They should both be on the list. Is that something we need to do something, Brenda, to make it happen?

BRENDA BREWER: I'll reach out to that group and see what the requirements are.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you. Thanks, Brenda. Appreciate that. Okay, I wanted to turn it over to Tim to walk us through channel three on CSG.

TIM SMITH: Hi, Steve. Thanks very much. I guess the first note that you see here has already been referenced, is that Mason Cole is now taking over the chair of CSG until the end of this calendar year. Mason, I hope you're not starting your countdown already. It's going to be a busy few months.

I guess the top priority at the moment is addressing board seat 14. You'll recall we had a meeting at ICANN 77 that Paul McGrady facilitated. That was a good first step in bringing NCSG and CSG together. That process continues and Paul McGrady continues to assist in overcoming the impasse.

The latest, I think, is that we have presented an idea of a joint mini NomCom for NCSG and CSG in order to evaluate candidates. The candidates would be ranked and the highest ranked candidate would be the successful board seat. That's a proposal that has been presented, but I don't think there's been any feedback on it at this point.

I guess the other issue as it relates to CSG is that we really do need to bring the parties back together. I think both NCSG and CSG believe that there was value impasse to the intersessionals. Therefore, Mason has now asked if we can have an intersessional just prior to ICANN 78. I think what's being referred to as a day zero event. That could be October 20th, I guess, would be the date, which would be the Friday before ICANN 78 kicks off. We're waiting to hear about that. Mason, anything more that you can share on any of the discussions so far?

MASON COLE: No, thanks, Tim. I made an outreach to Jul yesterday, Julf Helsingius, who's the chair of the NCSG, with whom I have a good relationship and proposed the idea of an intersessional. I heard back from him just before our BC meeting. There is interest on the NCSG's part. The objective of the entire exercise would be number one, to improve our working relationship because we're polarized in separate camps and to identify joint priorities to make sure that we have a good working together model going forward.

We're never going to agree with the NCSG on everything, but we can certainly do something to improve the relationship because right now it's pretty full of friction. Brenda has been very helpful in helping organize the idea of putting together an intersessional.

I went ahead and put in a request for day zero because we needed 90 days in advance, noticed ICANN staff to facilitate, and we only had until tomorrow to make the request. I went ahead and put it in with the idea that we could cancel it if we needed to, but that's where we stand. I will speak with Julf either tomorrow or the first part of next week about what we might accomplish together for an intersessional. I'm hoping it's fruitful. I'm cautiously optimistic, so that's where we stand right now, Tim.

STEVE DELBIANCO: If I may ask a board seat 14 question and then turn it over to Mark. Mason, have you determined whether it makes sense for you to take

over the board seat 14 discussions, or is that something that Lori Schulman will retain?

MASON COLE: We're discussing next steps broadly about where we go with board seat 14 like Tim just described. There are lots of proposals up in the air, including this new NomCom idea, including whether or not the CSG chair should automatically rotate into the negotiating position for board seat 14. We haven't resolved that yet, and I want to be considerate of Lori because she's been working awfully hard on this issue. So no, there's no decision made yet, but I think things are moving forward.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks. Mark's got his hand up. Go ahead.

MARK DATYSGELD: So if Tim wants, I would like Tim to finish, but I would like to comment on the things that are being raised, but please, Tim, go ahead, and I'll pick it up after that.

TIM SMITH: Thanks, Mark. I guess the only other item really that remains is we have been requested to have a participant—CSG has been asked to have a participant in the IANA naming function review, the IFR, and that's something that was supposed to have been responded to and a person confirmed by June 30th, and that deadline passed and has now been extended until the end of July. And from what I understand, this is not

just an ask, but apparently it's in the bylaws that CSG needs to be represented.

So I've mentioned this a couple of times on past calls, but we really do need a participant from CSG, and I'll let you know, as of, I guess, yesterday, it seems so far nobody from ISPs have come forward and nobody from IPC has come forward. So hopefully somebody will, but if there's anybody on the Business Constituency who feels an interest or feels qualified to participate in this proceeding, please let me know. And that's it.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Tim. Mark?

MARK DATYSGELD: Thank you. So on the NCSG relationship matter, so first thing is that I was recently in an event with Milton Mueller and take this as, you know, his perspective, but as one of the leaders of the whole thing, he has been saying that they want to move towards formalizing this NCSG structure and moving away from this caste state in which they theoretically have two constituencies but end up acting under just one body. So this appears to be a project that's ongoing from his side, which seems mostly rooted on the changes that are taking place in NPOC right now. And so all of the discussions that we're having around seat distribution and all of that, we might as well be mindful that when it is, for example, claimed that NPOC might want a seat at something, it might end up being subsumed in the NCSG anyway, at least if he gets his

way. So something to watch out for, nothing confirmed, but something to watch out for.

And in parallel to that, I've been talking with Benjamin, who is currently the chair of the NCUC, and we intend to try to organize a bit of a webinar in which we will be talking about something neutral and technical to get some conversation started in that sense. This is something still incipient, but we intend to touch on things that are not overly political and talk directly about more technical aspects of ICANN past the no Contracted Party House. So if this project picks up steam, I will let you all know, but just wanted to make it clear that it's something that I'm pursuing as one of the strategies to try to bring some more stability to the house. So that's all for now. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Mark. No other hands up. Over to you, Mason.

MASON COLE: Thank you very much, Steve. Anyone, any follow-up questions for Steve, please? All right. Thank you, Steve. Lawrence, the floor is yours. Please go ahead.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE ROBERTS:Thank you, Chair. So to start with some open ICANN community announcements, basically, our next policy meeting is designed to be in Kigali, Rwanda, in June of 2024. That will be ICANN 80, so we are happy to have everybody coming in this direction if and when that meeting would take place. Aside from the fact that Kigali has been selected for

the next policy forum, also, we wanted to bring to members' attention that we've seen quite a number of transition, or we're seeing quite a number of transition within the ICANN staff body. There was an announcement out about the ombudsman, Herb, leaving in September, and particularly brought this up because one fantastic talent that we've had serving the BC, in person of Chantelle, has also moved on to do other things outside the ICANN environment. Just thought that for the stellar work that she's put into the BC, that members get to know that she's transitioned, also, and we wish her and have extended our good wishes to her in her new role. So that said, many thanks again to Caroline and NetChoice and Amazon for helping with a very wonderful outreach event. We will definitely be following up on again for this, and hope that we will be able to attract some new members into the Business Constituency.

As it's traditional, we see with every financial year, we see that there's a few members retire and some new ones joining the BC, and already we get the feeling that some of our members might not be renewing their membership for FY24. We're wishing all these wonderful contributors to the BC's work very well in their future endeavors, and also want to let the same know that our doors as the BC still remain open. So to these regards, we're encouraging all BC members to kindly help with coordinated outreaches to commercial business users. It's the start of a new financial year, and we would love to have new members joining our fold. The process for joining the BC is seamless in the sense that you have to come to the website, icannbc.org, and fill out a form, and the Credentials Committee will take it from there. So we want to encourage

members to help reach out to one or two other colleagues in the industry, and have them consider actively joining the BC.

With that said, let me start with an apology, especially to members who had paid up their FY24 invoices and still got reminders for payment. The system is automated to send out such reminders until we have removed such names from the list. That we have done now. But if you have paid your FY24 invoice and you still receive a reminder of some sort from us, please don't feel shy to get across to us so that we can update the system and the records that we have.

MASON COLE: Lawrence, I may have been one of the dummies that paid the second notice not remembering that I paid the first one, so please keep an eye on that, and if any of us paid twice, you can just issue a credit card refund.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE ROBERTS:Okay, that's noted. Thank you, and sorry that we caused that to happen, so we'll keep our eyes out for that. But for anyone who normally would pay with a credit card, the system will automatically validate that such payments have been made, and so those who normally would pay with the check or other means are the ones that we normally have to do a manual process of verifying. But if your payment has been through a credit card, it's most likely that the system will have recognized that initial payment and removed such names from the block list of those who we're supposed to reach out to. But we will definitely, based on the information provided now, we'll look at those details again to

ensure that members get value for every payment that is made, and where there are double payments, we will make a refund where possible or just extend the life of the membership into the coming year.

So moving on, by October, I will be moving into the BC's council role, and at that point, we will also be conducting elections for BC officer positions. So the position of vice chair of finance and operations definitely will be one that will be open to be filled by membership. I'm bringing up this notice so that those who might be interested in serving the BC in this capacity can begin to ask and make inquiries around what the job entails, what the office entails, and basically prepare their minds towards moving, stepping into this position or not. There's still an ample time between now and October, but the notice for my end is basically released for people who are interested to consider this. And with that, I will say that I would want to take any questions that we might have, otherwise we'll yield the floor back to Mason. All right, Mason, back to you then.

MASON COLE: Thank you, Lawrence. No follow-up questions for Lawrence? All right, Lawrence, thank you for that report. All right, we have 10 minutes to go. Looks like we're doing fine on time. Let's go to item four, which is all over the business, and we will go to Caroline. Caroline, the floor is yours.

CAROLINE LUPETINI: Yes, Steve, do you want me to pull up the... Oh, you've got it already, no worries. Yeah, the only thing is I attended the planning session for

ICANN 78, I think it was last Thursday, and they displayed the block schedule that they had drafted so far. There was some feedback on it, lots of appetite for continuing the hour and a half lunch break, so that was one thing in this block schedule that people raised some concerns with, but here is where the draft block schedule stands as of now.

MASON COLE: Caroline, if I may. So the block, and Brenda, Caroline, you and Brenda can clarify this, but my understanding is that Tuesday has been formally reassigned as constituency day, and where stakeholder groups and constituencies will meet. As you can see on the block schedule, those are all 60-minute increments for the meeting. I've put in a note via Brenda to ICANN staff asking for additional time. We've got an opportunity to meet as a BC face-to-face. We don't get that opportunity very often. It's an opportunity for us to build our own relationships and talk in depth about particular issues. We won't really have time to do that if we have only an hour. And I fully recognize that ICANN Org really does a stellar job with organizing meetings. They've got requests coming in left and right about time assignments and everything else, but I'm hopeful that'll be a fruitful request because an hour really doesn't quite do it. And I'm not sure when the CSG membership meeting has been scheduled, but we've asked for additional time for that as well. So there you go, and Caroline, it looks like Tim is asking if you could send a copy to the BC of the draft.

CAROLINE LUPETINI: I'm happy to send this around to our BC listserv.

MASON COLE: Thank you. Okay, any questions on this for Caroline?

BRENDA BREWER: This is Brenda, real quick. I think you just mentioned CSG and the board. It is already blocked in for the first session on Tuesday for one hour.

MASON COLE: No, I meant the CSG membership meeting.

BRENDA BREWER: Oh, membership. Sorry, sorry. Okay. No, that hasn't opened for me yet, so I don't have that.

MASON COLE: Thanks. Okay, gotcha. So what we're looking at, Brenda, is just the preliminary block schedule, right?

BRENDA BREWER: Yes, this is the draft.

MASON COLE: Okay, gotcha. Okay, and there's another production call on Thursday, I believe, right, Caroline? Or maybe it's next week. I don't remember.

CAROLINE LUPETINI: Today is Thursday. It might be next week.

MASON COLE: Yeah, it must be because you're right. Today is Thursday. I lost track of my calendar for a minute. Okay. All right. Thank you, Caroline. All right. Any other business for the BC this morning? I see no hands. All right. Very productive call, everybody. Thanks very much. I'm going to give you back seven minutes of your day. Brenda, the next meeting is August 5. Is that right? Did I get it wrong?

BRENDA BREWER: Yep, right there.

MASON COLE: All right. I haven't lost complete control of my calendar. Okay. All right. August 5th. We'll see you all again. Brenda, thank you for the support, and the BC is adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]