

---

BRENDA BREWER: Good day, everyone. Welcome to the Business Constituency Candidate and Membership call on 17 November 2022 at 15:00 UTC.

This meeting is recorded. Please state your name when speaking for the record, and have your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking. Attendance is taken from Zoom participation. Apologies are received from Marie. Please note that the first 30 minutes of today's meeting is dedicated to the Candidates call. When finished, the BC Membership call will begin. I will now turn the meeting over to Mason Cole for opening remarks. Thank you.

MASON COLE: Thank you, Brenda. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. Mason Cole here, chair of the BC. Welcome to our call on 17 November where we will have a candidates forum for the first 30 minutes of our call, followed by our usual BC agenda, which you see on the screen in front of you now. Before we begin, are there any updates or suggestions for the agenda?

Okay. All right. I think we may have a situation where some of our members were confused about the meeting time. I hope that we have some additional participation before we conclude the call. But nonetheless, your ExCom is mostly on the call, except for, I believe, Marie. We are prepared for statements and Q&A for candidates for office. The format that we've agreed to is that Brenda will manage the queue for the next 30 minutes, and we'll have some opening statements from officer candidates. Then we'll have Q&A before we

---

*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.*

---

revert to our regular agenda. So with that, if there's nothing else to add to the agenda, we will begin. Brenda, over to you, please.

BRENDA BREWER:

Thank you very much, Mason. Welcome to the Officer Candidate portion of today's call. As moderator, I would like to advise BC members that both the nominators and the nominees qualify according to the BC charter rules as paid members of the Business Constituency and therefore all nominations are valid. Nominations for the role of chair and vice chair of Policy Coordination, vice chair of Finance and Operations, and the representative to the Commercial Stakeholder Group were received.

For the role of chair, we have one candidate, Mason Cole. For the role of vice chair of Finance and Operations, we have one candidate, Lawrence Olawale-Roberts. For role of vice chair of Policy Coordination, we have one candidate, Steve DelBianco. For the role of CSG representative, we have one candidate, Tim Smith.

On today's call, I will first open the floor to candidates themselves for introductory remarks. The candidates will proceed in the following order: Mason, Lawrence, Steve, and Tim. After remarks, we will then open it up to questions from the BC members. BC members participating on the call may submit their questions verbally or via the Zoom chat and I will moderate this portion. As a reminder, this Candidates portion is limited to 30 minutes, and we will transition to the usual Business Constituency members' meeting.

---

Ballots for election will be sent on Friday, 18 November at 0:00 UTC. Opening the voting period. On Thursday, 24 November at 23:59 UTC, the voting period will close. Only BC primary member representatives in good standing will receive a ballot. The results will be submitted to the BC Executive Committee for review. Once confirmed, staff will announce the results on approximately 28 November 2022. The new term begins for the BC officers on January 1, 2023.

With that, I would like to open the floor to the candidates themselves for further remarks. I would like to remind each candidate to have your video on when presenting. So we will start with the BC chair position. Mason Cole, the floor is yours.

MASON COLE:

Thank you very much, Brenda. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening again, everyone, Mason Cole here. First, I'd like to say thank you for the nomination from Barbara and the second from Arinola for the position of chair. It is my privilege to serve the BC and has been for the past two years. I look forward to the potential for serving the BC for an additional year as chair.

I've submitted my Candidate Statement. I actually did so several days ago. But in that Candidate Statement, I outlined where I thought that we had made strides in 2022 and provided a look ahead for 2023 in terms of where the BC's activities will focus and on what our priorities should be. So just in the way of priorities, I would suggest that we focus on areas where we've had some success over the past several years and have an opportunity for future success, and that would be in five

---

particular areas. One is continuing our focus on decreasing the incidence of DNS abuse, improving the ICANN Compliance function, improving legitimate access to domain name registration data, rebalancing levels of influence within the GNSO in overall improving the multistakeholder model, and actively participating in remaining policy work that is interest to the BC and its members. These are all areas in which we've focused our attention for the past several months, and particularly in the area of DNS abuse we've made some progress. So the BC has been active not only in the ICANN sphere but also in international policymaking, specifically in regard to NIS2 legislation and in increasing our profile with U.S. governmental representatives.

So we've made some strides. I'm very pleased about that. But as I mentioned in my Candidate Statement, we have lots of work in front of us to do. As I've said, we've made some progress but we have quite a bit more to do. I look forward to focusing the BC's work on where we have opportunities for progress. So I'm very happy to answer any questions from members. I look forward to the Candidate Statements, and I look forward to another year as chair if you so return me to that role. Brenda, back to you. Thank you.

BRENDA BREWER:

Thank you very much, Mason. We will now have Lawrence Olawale-Roberts, candidate for vice chair of Finance and Operations. Lawrence, the floor is yours.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS:

Thank you, Brenda. Please confirm that you can hear me okay.

BRENDA BREWER: Yes, we certainly can. Thank you.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Thank you. Good day, everyone. So my name is remain Lawrence Olawale-Roberts, and I have had the privilege of serving as the vice chair for Finance and Operation in the current and over the last year. Many thanks to Vivek and Yusuph, as well as others who seconded my nomination. I'm very pleased at this and I will definitely continue to yield my efforts into serving the BC in every way possible.

The Office of Vice Chair of Finance and Operation is one that I presumed to be a very important office and dedicated that much to ensure that it remains the powerhouse that it should be within the BC. In terms of our finances over the last year and right from when I stepped into this office, we have witnessed some level of growth and increase. ICANN's annual contribution to the BC had increased and improved, especially with the Additional Budget Request windows. Because we've had a few members join the BC also, this has to an extent also improved the BC's finances.

I must say that our finances are as good as they are because of the time, the period, where we went into virtual mode, our expenses were capped. But now that we are gradually returning back to physical meetings, I will I look forward to working with the rest of the BC if reelected back into this Office of Vice Chair of Finance and Operations to see how we can continue to grow our Membership, because the Membership growth definitely comes increased funding for the BC, and

---

BC definitely needs a good level of funding. In the past year, we've been able to grow our strategic reserves to \$65,000, an increase of \$5000. As we speak, I can say that we have a healthy balance, all due to the prudence of the current Executive Committee that we have in the BC for now.

In terms of our operations, I try to take the lead to strive to be as transparent as possible, not just to ExCom but to Membership. This effort, I hope, will help increase not just engagement and participation for members, which we really will be focusing on in the coming year. We have a good number of members, but we would love to have more member engagement and participation. We've opened up two additional committees to the Standing Committees that we had in terms of the Onboarding Committee that delivered the ICANN Learn course, which is there evergreen. It's going to remain for a long time to come until it's revised by the BC. The Communications Committee has also been doing a great job trying to promote us across different social mediums. I also really encourage members. I'm looking forward to a year where we'll have more members actively engaged across different committees doing a lot of work for the BC. And hopefully, if we have the resources, we're really looking forward to having more members join in, I mean, three more members in the next physical meetings, possibly maybe the AGM, where we're hoping that we can really pull off at least one major outreach program for the BC.

Other items are listed in my Candidate Statement. I will yield the floor back to Brenda so that the other candidates can have your time. Thank you.

BRENDA BREWER: Thank you very much, Lawrence. Next, we have Steve DelBianco, candidate for vice chair of Policy Coordination. Steve, the floor is yours.

STEVE DELBIANCO: This is Steve DelBianco. I'm president and CEO of NetChoice, trade association based in the United States, representing the big tech companies that have both U.S. and global reach. I want to thank Mason, Zak, Tola, and Arinola for making the nomination for vice chair of Policy Coordination. This is a nomination that is only an order for our charter if no other candidates step forward, because I would be otherwise term-limited. This would be 12 years that I've been the vice chair for Policy Coordination, and frankly, I'd be the only vice chair for Policy Coordination we'd ever have since we created that role in our charter. That's not a good thing. It would be better if we had multiple candidates for all of the officer positions indicating a varied interest, maybe not competing, but varied interests in serving. I feel proud of the record that BC has amassed in the last four years under the coordination that I've led, but I'm not complacent about the fact that we need to cultivate future leaders that will step up and take this over. Because it's probably not appropriate to have someone serve this long, and yet I am perfectly willing to do it, if it's the will of the BC that I continue to do that. Because NetChoice members have been very willing to have me dedicate the time that I do to serving in the BC.

The Candidate Statement that I circulated was slightly different than the ones in previous years, because think about it, the last year there were

---

only about 17 open public comments that were available for us to comment on in the last year. Now, some of them, we don't bother to comment on. Maybe they're too arcane, something like the alternative scripts available for IDNs at the root. But we did file 10 specific comments and statements so far in 2022 and there's several more that are coming up in the next eight weeks. So we'll finish the year with very active participation from the BC.

But I will say that new members who participated at drafting comments have been gratifying. I think about Rajiv and Crystal who worked on the RDAP comment, especially Olajidi and Samuel working on the NPOC comment, a situation where neither had ever participated in a comment or able to contribute based on a little bit of a guidance and setup that I provided, and then I take care of the administrative problems of formatting, submitting, filing, and posting it to the website, circulating it for BC member review. So as long as I play that coordination role, I'm hoping that that demonstrates that it makes it fairly easy to jump into a single BC public comment. Some of them are a lot harder than others. But my role is to coordinate so that your job is easy and you don't feel intimidated contributing.

I realized, though, that getting someone to step up to the role of coordinator is going to take a little more encouragement. I'll continue to make myself available to anybody that wants to even be considered grooming for that role and taking over this time next year. I'm happy to have that happen.

During the year, while there was only 10 public comments we filed so far, I found it to be a busier year than most largely due to the



---

participation on working groups like the small team for SSAD, the small team for the WHOIS Disclosure System. And therein lies where participation is really needed. The BC has to have someone on each and every working group that affects policy development or implementation on issues that affect business users and registrants. Lately, it seems as if the same group of people are the ones who participate and we need others to step up to that. Arinola and Tola have stepped up on a few, Zak, and I'm really grateful for that. And yet, we need more. We do need more who have a better orientation towards the topic at hand. Somebody, for instance, is really familiar with the use of WHOIS, should be somebody that assists us on things like the small team.

All right, looking ahead for 2023, I really see two top priorities for the role that I played for you. The first is that trying to restore, let's say, [inaudible] inaccurate access to registrant data. We're not going to recover the old WHOIS, that's not the point. But that matters to the Business Constituency. Our members are the registrants and our customers are the users who are the victims of malware fraud, DNS abuse that we often start with WHOIS to figure out how to track it down. So GDPR changed everything when ICANN really overreacted to GDPR. It's been a long, slow, and frustrating slog as we've tried to get the European Parliament and member states to, I think, swing the pendulum back, correct the overinterpretation of GDPR when it comes to something like WHOIS. As all of you know, on November the 10<sup>th</sup>, we actually had a significant breakthrough on that as the European Parliament approved the NIS2 text. Now, over the next year or so, member countries, member states in Europe will begin to transpose or implement that into their own law. That is an opportunity, not a threat

---

but an opportunity for us. As the first few countries take the lead—and I hope it's Denmark and the Czech Republic—they will be able to create legal requirements for legal persons as opposed to natural persons, they'll be able to impose legal requirements from the maintenance of accuracy with respect to the data that is collected and maintained. That's going to change the game a little bit. It's three years later that I wish it had been because it would have made a huge difference. But it's going to change the orientation and I believe it's going to put things on the right track.

Mark brought it up this morning on the GNSO call when he discussed the vote we took on the Accuracy Scoping Team is that NIS2 is going to change what obligations are when it comes to accuracy. We also brought up the same thing about NIST2 with regard to the WHOIS Disclosure System. So during the next year, we're going to have to work outside of ICANN by assisting member states that want to be in to transpose. You can bet that the contracted parties will do the same, right, so we need to be there to counter that effect.

The second is mitigating DNS abuse. I want to give a big shout out to Mason, who over 18 months ago tried to organize the DNS abuse focus group within the BC. And then Mark Datysgeld has really taken that baton and run with it at Council where Mark was co-chair of the DNS Abuse Small Team. Only six hours ago, Mark was able to get unanimous approval at the Council for the recommendations that came out of a small team that Mark has led when it comes to DNS abuse. Oh, and at the same time, the contracted parties have sent a letter to ICANN asking for a formal process of amending the RAA and the RyA. So I think we've had a couple of wins there.

---

---

I'll close just by saying that I know that in 2023, we're going to pay a lot of attention to the holistic review that is going to be done on ICANN. We're going to need somebody to stand up and be on that team representing the BC and also the further progress on the next round of gTLD expansion. I don't really know for sure if that'll happen in '23. I have a feeling it won't. But we're going to have to stay attentive to make sure that business is protected in the next round. That's all I have for now. I look forward to your questions.

BRENDA BREWER:

Thank you very much, Steve. And for the next role of CSG representative, we have candidate Tim Smith. The floor is yours, Tim.

TIM SMITH:

Hi. Thanks very much, Brenda. Tim Smith for the record. Thanks very much for the nomination to Zak, seconded by Arinola. I had been in the role of CSG rep and liaison for this past year and really got involved for two reasons. One was that I've been involved with the Business Constituency since 2012. I really found that I needed an opportunity in order to become more engaged in the issues of the Business Constituency. So I felt that this would be a good vantage point for me to be able to do that. In addition to that—and I think this is perhaps significant and perhaps reflecting on some of Steve's words—is that I do feel an obligation to actually have a leadership role and contribute to the Business Constituency.

I run a small trade association in Canada called the Canadian International Pharmacy Association. I don't have a ton of bandwidth to

---

be able to make contributions beyond my day job, but I felt this was an opportunity to be able to do that. I've certainly enjoyed the work that I've done. I've enjoyed meeting the people that I've met and contributing to the efforts of the Business Constituency. So it's my pleasure to accept the nomination for the coming year. And if approved by you, the members, I would like to continue to make those priorities and to continue the work that I've been doing.

I mentioned priorities. Of course, the CSG is kind of a cobbled together group. We are the Business Constituency, IPC, and the ISPCP. So not everything that we believe in the Business Constituency is reflected in the other two constituencies, but we do find common ground on issues as we have this past year. We've been talking a lot about DNS abuse and access to WHOIS. And those of course are common themes and common issues that all three of these constituencies share. I think the efforts within the Business Constituency and within CSG and the amount of socializing and advancing of those discussions are really paying dividends. So that's the work that I feel we need to continue.

Of course, as we go into 2023, CSG will perhaps reconsider some of the priorities that they have, the common priorities, and that will be our opportunity or the opportunity of the CSG liaison and the ExCom of BC to be able to bring issues for that we think that are important to pursue. But I think the two that I just mentioned earlier and have been mentioned by other people are going to continue to be around for a while. So I think we have ongoing work there.

I think that pretty well covers what I wanted to say. You have my Candidate Statement which I hope you've all had a chance to review. I

---

guess one of the things, as I become more comfortable in the role or have become more comfortable in the role over the past year, is to try to keep the Membership up to date on the issues that are common, again, to the CSG. So I hope that I have been doing that and that would be my goal to continue to do that in the year ahead, if elected.

So, thanks very much. I'll, I guess, go back to Brenda. But I welcome any questions people have.

BRENDA BREWER:

Thank you very much, Tim. Now we will open the floor for questions. So I ask that you please raise your hand, and when called upon, state your name and you may continue to ask your question. One moment please. I do not see any hands raised. Does anyone wish to ask a question of our candidates? There we go. Mark, you may ask your question. Unmute your line, please. There you go.

MARK DATYSGELD:

Thank you, everyone, for your statements. I have a curiosity I would like to ask from all of you. I personally see that, particularly since we came back to having in-person meetings, but also following changes to GNSO Council and the progress of different policies, that we have been able to integrate better with other constituents with other units of the GNSO. I feel that we have been making progress towards being able to do better policy as a community. It is my hope that we will continue to do that, that we will continue to be able to reach out to the CPH, that we'll be able to continue working alongside our peers in different areas. So I would just like to—it doesn't need to be everyone—but if you have any

---

insights into what we could be doing to continue strengthening that? What would be a good decision for us to continue integrating better with the GNSO and exerting progressively more leadership and progressively being able to affect the decisions better through partnerships, being able to do the soft connections? Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

I can take a crack at that, Mark. On situations where we are trying to preserve the status quo, we have a completely different strategy than when we are trying to change the status quo. In ICANN, it's much easier to preserve something that's baked into the policy, just the same way it is in national law. But lately, you've been leading us on an effort to change the status quo with regard to Registrar/Registry obligations of DNS abuse. We've been trying to change the status quo on the overinterpretation of GDPR. And when that happens, it calls for a completely different set of skills. We have to, at the same time, cultivate alliances with the people whose votes could matter in a working group that included GAC, ALAC, SSAC, but in GNSO, it doesn't. In GNSO we have to cultivate the other constituency.

The second thing we have to do is work on the outside to generate pressure. So working on the outside to generate pressure is like getting NIS2 language over the finish line. Because that's external pressure so that we can internally work with others to guide things in the right direction. So you've been you've been personally exercising on the difficulty of changing the status quo, and I think it takes a completely twofold approach working from the outside to generate pressure and work from the inside to achieve consensus. I think you did it last night,

---

we did it on accuracy, we did it on the WHOIS Disclosure System, and you did it on DNS abuse. Because you cannot stand on a soapbox and make speeches that have symbolic value if they alienate the people whose votes that you need, if you alienate the people who are interested in taking an initiative, and yet they're probably not going to do so if we treat them badly.

So it's a big balancing act. I love that the BC has both kinds of attitudes. Some of us in the BC want to hold the line, have a symbolic vote. Some of us in the BC are inclined to cooperate. Mark, I think the answer is always a little bit of both, and both sides help us to achieve the event we're looking for. So I hope that's responsive.

MASON COLE:

I'll take another shot at that. I want to echo what Steve just said because I think it's very important that the BC understands where its points of pressure are within the ICANN sphere and outside the ICANN sphere. Steve is correct that at times we have the ability to influence outcomes within ICANN. But in the instances that we don't, we've not hesitated to bring pressure from the outside, and NIS2 is a very good example of that. We've also had building and lasting relationships with U.S. governmental representatives, and that's going to be increasingly important as governments increase their oversight or their interest in ICANN outcomes.

So as I said in my Candidate Statement, it's important that we build alliances where we can and we bring to bear the BC's weight in influencing policy outcomes. Where that's difficult within the ICANN

---

sphere, we should not hesitate to move outside the ICANN sphere. So it is, as Steve correctly said, a delicate balancing act and one we're going to have to maintain for some time now until we have an opportunity inside ICANN to rebalance the power that is now disproportionately favoring the Contracted Party House. So we've still got some work to do and I'm optimistic about our outcomes. But we can't let up on where we have points of influence inside and outside the ICANN sphere.

Brenda, I'm thinking maybe back to you unless anyone else wants to respond to Mark's question.

TIM SMITH:

Let me just jump in. Everything that Steve and Mason have said I think is all very accurate. I'm just thinking from within ICANN, I guess. We're at an interesting point where—and I thought our final meeting at ICANN75 with the Registrars and Registries was a very positive meeting. I think the leadership of the Contracted Party House has sort of a spirit of collegiality. And I think wherever we see that within ICANN and elsewhere, we need to capitalize on that. While we're talking about specific issues, there may be other issues that arise over the time, and I think we can build on the relationships that we are developing and have developed in order to create more of a positive and a collegial atmosphere over time. So that's what I like to see happen.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: To add to what everybody had said, without trying to sound like a broken record, within the GNSO, which has about eight constituencies, we can comfortably maybe depend on the CSG that have three out of



---

eight, and it's not in every situation that we see, it's not on every topic that we see eye to eye. So it's definitely very important that we will have to have external alliances to help push points and positions of the interest to the BC. But while we are that, the BC also has honed for itself an image where in whatever it is that we are pushing behind something gets the attention of the wider community. I think that is one route we shouldn't be indifferent to work on, whatever the community and even ICANN Org feels about DNS abuse. It's something that we have strongly opposition, we have strongly held, and we have no apologies for that. But definitely in terms of getting some form of community cooperation and reaching consensus on issues, we definitely will need to forge those alliances, which will definitely mean that in some cases, we'll have to give on some positions that are harder. Back to you, Brenda.

BRENDA BREWER:

Thank you all very much. I see no other hands at this time. So we will now conclude the Candidates portion of today's call. Thank you all very much. We will move into the Membership portion of the call, and I will turn the meeting over to Steve. Steve, I'm going to give you host rights here momentarily. There you go.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Great. You should be seeing the policy calendar up. Looking at the time, we ought to be able to get to Zak Muscovitch who wants to give an update on Transfer Policy before he drops for another call that he has to lead. I think it's the top of the hour for Zak. So plenty of time I think to

---

get Zak first, and then we'll go to Tim Smith to do the CSG liaison before I dive into the Council and the open public comments.

All right, so first up, I wanted to acknowledge the fact that in the last seven days, we've submitted three public comments to ICANN and we have two more coming up in the next couple of days. I'll be able to speak to those a little bit later. But I wanted to make sure I thanked Crystal and Rajiv for the help they did on the RDAP comment, and then Margie added some additional points and I did some editing on that. We also did the NCSG charter, and that's where Arinola and Samuel did the work on that, and I appreciate what you've done there.

Barbara Wanner did a great job drafting our comments on the Terms of Reference for a holistic review. Initially, Barbara had really beefed up the kinds of structural changes that we're looking for. Apologies to Barbara, we decided to pull back on some of that and not reveal it at this early stage but save it for when the team actually comes together, given that we think the Terms of Reference were broad enough to accommodate restructuring. So thanks again for that, Barbara.

Okay. So at this point, what I'd love to do is to slide all the way down to an opportunity for Zak Muscovitch and Arinola, who are serving on the Transfer Policy Working Group, and have you discuss the current developments and see what other input you need to gather from us. So it's on the screen right now. Zak, over to you.

ZAK MUSCOVITCH:

Thank you very much, Steve. As you mentioned, Steve, Arinola and I have been participating in the Transfer Policy Working Group on behalf

of the BC. Just the other day, the working group provided what they're calling a strawman proposal. There's a link to it in the policy calendar for you to review.

The gist of it is based upon public comments received, the working group is reconsidering one particular change, amongst others, to their initial proposals. Essentially, what this is that the way transfers currently work is that once there's a notification of a pending transfer, the registrant has the ability to cancel that pending transfer. In other words, I didn't request that transfer so I'm canceling it, which is called the NACK. Apparently, you're NACKing it.

So the proposal that the working group came up with originally as per its initial report was that we're going to do away with that ability to cancel transfer because it's no longer going to be necessary. As soon as someone requests an Auth Code through their registrar, that Auth Code can be immediately used. So, some of the concerns raised by stakeholders were that that deprives the registrant the ability to cancel an unauthorized transfer. The argument on the other side was that if someone penetrates your registrar account, then they're going to be able to get away with pretty much anything they want anyhow, so this is kind of security fear.

In any event, it looks like the working group is moving towards reinstating the ability of a registrant to NACK or cancel a pending transaction. This probably doesn't directly affect most of the BC members because we would tend to be using registrar lock and other security add-ons provided by a registrar to prevent unauthorized transfers. But as far as general registrants and domain owners across

---

---

the board, this is an issue of potential concern. The BC flagged this issue in its public comment to the working group initially.

So now at this point, Arinola and I are here for your feedback on this issue. We don't have to discuss it today, of course, because there's other things to discuss, but please contact Arinola and I, Steve, privately or to discuss this or please, even better, put your comments on the list. Steve, perhaps with your commission, I'll send an e-mail out to the BC private just flagging this request for feedback in case there's people who aren't on the call today. Thank you very much.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thank you, Zak. I displayed the strawman. Do I have the right element? It shows the option to cancel. That's part of the strawman that you're advocating for, is that correct? I'm not hearing you, Zak, if you're still there.

ZAK MUSCOVITCH:

Right. Thanks, Steve. Yes. In order to appreciate the strawman, it's actually about a page and a half long, including the recitals below about the deliberations. But yeah, this is it. I'm not particularly advocating for directives. I see both sides of this issue. But it's something worth getting feedback on from the BC.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Appreciating the fact that December the 1<sup>st</sup> is your opportunity to share views. That's a tight timeframe. We won't have another call between now and then. You and Arinola are in a truly trusted role here to give us.

---

Given that you are well aware of the BC's concerns, do you think that we would prefer that that revocation or cancellation of transfers should be preserved in the new policy? Give us your feeling about what you would recommend, given what you know about BC interests.

ZAK MUSCOVITCH:

Sure. Well, I think the BC sense of this issue was encapsulated in its original public comment, which is excerpted in the in the policy calendar, and says that the BC encourages the working group to further explore this issue of depriving registrants of the ability to cancel a pending transfer. We'll go on to state that the BC wants to ensure that registered name holders always have an opportunity to effectively invalidate attack prior to transfer.

So I think barring any change, of course, that's probably the position that the BC should maintain. The trade-off with reinstating this ability to NACK or to cancel a pending transfer is that it slows down the transfer process. This would have been instantaneous to be able to transfer a domain name. Now you're probably looking at a five-day waiting period, which is currently how it is, unless the working group further refines its proposal to make a shorter window.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

So I would just ask you to present it that way in the e-mail that you and Arinola send to the BC private. You would suggest that, given our previous comments and what you understand about BC interests, that we would probably prefer the opportunity to cancel, the trade-off is that it means that a transfer that takes more than one day could take up

---

to five. And if you just lay out that trade-off, I would include your recommendations so that you could ask BC members who don't agree with your draft recommendation could reply all on e-mail with perhaps different from the point of view. But at this point, I think you're putting forth what you think is the best reflection what the BC wants. You're showing us the downside of getting the cancellation capability, and then ask BC members, if anyone has an objection for you and Arinola and continue to pursue that. Would that be okay?

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: Very good. Thank you very much, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO: That's excellent. And it's really just a matter of making it as explicit as we can. Because just asking for general input is a higher bar for people's involvement. Thank you very much, Zak. Any questions for Zak from BC members? Looking for hands. Okay. I don't see any. Thank you Zak and Arinola.

Tim, because of your tight timeframe, we're going to go next to the CSG liaison section.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: I just wanted to ask Zak and Arinola what the alternatives to the cancellation will be. If the cancellation remains, definitely I see a lot of value for that for business. But what's the alternative to this? If this is going to be kicked off, what else do we have as alternative to the cancellation log?

ZAK MUSCOVITCH:

Thank you, Lawrence. So really, there's been three kinds of options before the working group. The first one is the status quo, and that's reflected in the strawman. So that means that there remains the current status quo of a registrant being able to cancel a pending transfer.

The second option is what was included in the original proposals of the working group, which was to eliminate the opportunity to cancel a pending transfer because it was deemed no longer necessary because the process was replaced with a method where the registrant goes and obtains the Auth Code directly from its registrar. And then that is essentially a key that they can provide the transferee and it can be used immediately.

The third option, which got a little bit of traction initially but ultimately received negative reviews by and large from the working group, was a proposal made by George Kirikos from Leap of Faith, which was to, as they say in Hollywood, do a page one rewrite of the Transfer Policy so that we rebuild the whole thing from the ground up with much greater security provisions embedded into the policy, etc. That was ultimately deemed to be too heavy of a lift for Registrars in terms of coding and educating the public and it was also deemed not necessary considering that the limited data that the working group has suggests that unauthorized transfers are really just a small drop in the bucket compared to the number of transfers that occur regularly on a daily basis. I hope that answers your question, Lawrence.

---

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Yes, it does. Thanks a lot.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Lawrence. Thanks, Zak. Over to you, Tim, to talk about channel three before we lose you.

TIM SMITH: Thanks very much, Steve. As indicated in the report, CSG has representation in three GNSO small teams at present. One of those is the GNSO Guidance Process work on Applicant Support. I know you're going to talk about that elsewhere so I won't talk about that one. But we have representation from Susan Payne of IPC on the Planning Prioritization group. Actually, since I wrote this report, I now understood that the FY24 prioritization work has now concluded. They had three meetings on October 19-25 and November 15. I guess the first meeting was sort of a kick-off. Second one was doing the actual evaluation or prioritization. And the third one was sort of a review and brainstorming session in order to determine what next steps may be. So I hope to have a more fulsome report for you in future. We'll be coordinating with Susan in order to get more information on what was accomplished at that. I say, speaking directly to Susan, because while I've given you the link to the Finance and Planning wiki, I don't think it's completely up to date on the work that has been done. So I need to talk to Susan or talk to Becky Nash, I guess, at staff. But that process is underway or has concluded. Again, talking about FY24, which commences of course midway through 2023—you know, July 1, 2023 is when that year starts.



---

The other process underway is the Board facilitated dialogue on closed generics. Philippe Fouquart from my ISPCP is representing us on that. I've had a meeting with Philippe just three days ago and have another meeting with him in two weeks to discuss the matter further. I guess there had been three meetings sort of, again, kick-off meeting so far. There is a plan for there to be a face-to-face meeting in Washington, D.C. in the first week or two of December. I don't have the dates for that. But of course, the purpose of the process or the Board directed this group in order to find a solution to be able to pave the way for closed generics in the next round of applications. So that's what they're trying to accomplish. But Philippe said that there still seem to be some members, particularly NCSG, who don't agree with moving forward on closed generics. So much more discussion to take place on that.

One of the things that he did say is that there had been discussions within that small group for there to be a liaison to the Board between the Board and the working group. So when I hear that, I sort of think this is longer than a process that's going to culminate during a two-day meeting in Washington, D.C. in December. So I'll keep you posted on that. But Philippe is very open to hearing from us, from BC, on what our position on closed generics is. So that's something that I think that I reach out to all of you to give me your impression so that when I meet with him in two weeks, I can give him a view from the Business Constituency on that.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Tim, before you jump to the next one, I wanted to speak to that because it was in the 2012 round of expansion when it turned out that some of

---

the generic dictionary words were being proposed by a single competitor in that industry, and they were proposing that it would be closed. Despegar, one of the largest travel companies Booking proposed to run .hotels in a way that they would control it completely. The BC said that when you're a competitor in the industry, it is served by the generic word, it could be very deceptive to consumers if that competitor was able to sort of manage what consumers see.

So the example I bring up is if you went to search .hotels and it was managed by booking.com, they have the opportunity to favor their own property's top, and that's just fine. Everybody can favor their own stuff in a search. But would it be apparent or would it be deceptive to the traveler who's gone to the screen? Competitors, travel agents, and other hotels, would they end up claiming that it was a violation of antitrust or unfair and deceptive trade practices to do that? What we endeavored to do was to tell ICANN that if some single competitor wanted to run a generic word enclosed in an industry that they participate in, that ICANN is going to look terrible if later on multiple nations bring antitrust action or consumer enforcement against them. So ICANN should force applicants to explain their policies as part of their application.

So the BC is looking out for consumer deception and confusion. And we're looking out for competitors, which are business registrants who won't be able to get their content onto the page. So if booking.com ran search .hotels, pet-friendly .hotels, eco .hotels, family-friendly .hotels, that they ran all those second level domains and control them completely, that content has a high probability to deceive consumers if they run it in a closed fashion. That is our position. I can find out some

---

---

of those in writing but it was over a decade ago. I would ask now if any BC member feels like the BC position is confusing or out of date, speak now, please. I see Zak basically agreeing. Tim, is that understandable, what I just laid out?

TIM SMITH: It certainly is. Great explanation. If I could get a link to the public comment or intervention at the time, that'd be great. But your explanation was very good and very clear. I agree with it. So thank you for that.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Good. Okay. I will reach back into the archives to see what I can find. We put it in writing. Thanks, Tim. Back to you to finish up.

TIM SMITH: I guess the next thing on our agenda is meeting next Monday, this coming Monday, with the GNSO-appointed Board members. And that's of course, the CSG meeting. I know there has been an invitation gone out for that, a notice of that. Brenda, again, sent that out. So thanks for that, Brenda. I guess the two things that we will be talking about—we've notified the Board members of these—are the WHOIS request system and DNS abuse and related contract amendments. So, a couple of things to be talking about and interesting to hear their views.

---

STEVE DELBIANCO: May I make a suggestion, Tim? It's late breaking news, but on November the 10<sup>th</sup>, the European Parliament approved NIS2. We have final text. Caroline circulated the two-column comparison. If you can get consent from your other CSG chairs, I'd love to tell or ask Matt Shears, Avri Doria, Becky Burr, and Sarah to be prepared to discuss what they think will be the outcome of the brand new final approved NIS2 text.

TIM SMITH: I'll go back to them, Steve. I did pose that as we were talking about the agenda. I did suggest this might be something to talk about and didn't get any pick up on it. But it was kind of an open question. Maybe it was the way I phrased it. So I'll go back and suggest that again.

STEVE DELBIANCO: When you do so, you can just reach up here at the top of the policy calendar. You can grab, for instance, right here the NIS2 adoption. So you include some text, you can include the fact that NIS2 final text was voted and approved on the 10<sup>th</sup>. You can include the attachment. You feel free to share the attachment that Caroline did, it's called the NIS2 Triologue. So give them some material so that they can review the material and be prepared to discuss it.

TIM SMITH: Right. Okay. Thanks for that.

---

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you. Any questions for Tim? Thanks, Tim. I'm glad we were able to get you done before the top of the hour.

TIM SMITH: Yeah. Thanks very much. I appreciate it, that I can take off a little bit early and go get ready for my next meeting. So thanks very much. Thanks all. Have a good rest of the meeting.

STEVE DELBIANCO: All right. I think we can get through the rest of it fairly quickly. There are three open public comments. The first one I have on top of the screen is the draft budgets for IANA and PTI, the technical identifiers. I want to thank Lawrence and Tim who drafted the comment. I circulated it to BC for review last week. We are waiting, the due date is today. So I have seen no written comments back to Lawrence and Tim, and I will probably then submit it after the call today. This is the last call. Any BC members have any changes to the draft? Okay, great. Thank you.

The policy for gTLD Registration Data, this is a really hard one that David and Margie and I have been working on. We're maybe two thirds of the way done. In each of the last two BC meetings, I've circulated what we have adopted so far. It's under here where it says "draft responses". So you'll see it's a Google Doc, a very extensive Google Doc. We are now into the part of yes/no questions near the end. So Margie and David and I ought to be able to finish that. But we are going to ask ICANN to extend once again because NIS2's adoption really casts a lot of these recommendations into a different light. Why would we implement a recommendation when NIS2 makes that recommendation, probably

---

against the new NIS2? So we're going to try but I don't think they'll grant us another extension. In which case, our answers will seem a little snarky because our answers will say, "Well, yes, you could implement it this way. But that is not reflective of the new obligations under NIS2. Arinola, your hand is up.

ARINOLA AKINYEMI: It has to do with the draft comment by Lawrence and on the PTI and IANA budgets. There are some syntax errors which I have worked on and will be sending in the mail shortly.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Fantastic. I'm glad you told me so that I will wait. So it's due today, Arinola. So as soon as the call is over, if you could circulate them in the next couple of hours, I'll wait for you.

ARINOLA AKINYEMI: I'll do just that. Thanks.

STEVE DELBIANCO: David and Margie are not on this call, and so I'm going to be reaching out to them afterwards to probably schedule one more call to go in and update the draft responses. Do any BC members have comments to make on what they've seen so far in these draft responses right here? All right, I'm not seeing any.

---

The last one is not really an open public comment, but rather, an update on NIS2. The final text was approved in the European Parliament on the 10<sup>th</sup>. Caroline did a comparison in the final text. In Caroline's document, green text indicates something new, there's yellow highlighting to indicate that something has been dropped. It's an intriguing comparison. I'm going to open it up for just a moment to see if you guys can observe something.

What I wanted to observe for you is at the very end, there was a change made on duplication of effort. So the left-hand column is what it was in June, and it said that there shouldn't be any duplication of collecting and maintaining the registration data. That makes sense. You didn't want to force a registry to collect it if the registrars are the ones that collect it. It said that there should be no duplication of how to maintain it either. The idea there is fitting in, all the data should be obtained from and maintained by the registrars who have the relationship. Well, that changed and it's subtle, but they dropped the word in the right-hand column "and maintain" so they said there should only be non-duplication in the collecting. They didn't say that about maintaining. So one never knows whether this was all intentional, was it driven by staff, were they correcting a mistake, or somebody had lobbied them. I don't know that world as much as I know the world in Washington, D.C. in the U.S. states.

So I think that that is a change that may result in registries having to be responsible to maintain the data, although I don't think that's going to translate into having to do accuracy requirements. And if they have to maintain the data, there better be a way for the registrars to transfer the data, the personal data to the registries, and that would be getting

---

---

in the way of what some interpreted as GDPR stopping the transfers of data between registrars and registries.

So I bring this up as only one example. There are several other examples that Caroline highlighted in this document for you. You'll see why NIS2 has got some pretty important things in it. Everything in here that's in bold, the bold was added by the European Parliament and staff. The yellow indicates things that got lost, and the green are things that were added that are new. So there's just one more section that's new, it's up here near the top. Registration data should be free of charge. There's plenty of clarification language that if it's a legal person, they should be maintained, and they should be accurate. There's a definitional item at the top that it could be that registries, registrars, and resellers would all be implicated. But there's a carve out for ICANN. So ICANN work very hard to say that the recursive domain name servers, the authoritative servers, should not necessarily be subject to this. And ICANN was able to obtain that. Caroline, anything you want to add, just put your hand up. Any BC members have questions on the NIS2?

CAROLINE LUPETINI:

I guess the only thing I'll emphasize is the fact that the only things that I added were the highlighting. Anything bolded or italicized, that was in the original text. I can't tell you what it means. But I didn't want to change anything based on the original text, just call out any differences.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thank you, Caroline. Any questions or comments from BC members, especially those of you that were working on what happened in the



---

European Parliament? All right, I'll go back to policy calendar. Thanks, Caroline.

Okay, Council. When I wrote this yesterday, the Council meeting hadn't happened yet. It occurred several hours ago. I was on. Marie and Mark were on. It was the wee hours of the night for a couple of us. That meeting—let me see really quickly. The WHOIS Disclosure System, I had recommended that we be a yes because both the staff report and the addendum indicated we would have an opportunity to get at the underlying raw data. I told you earlier that we had already won the point that the system will log requests even if the registrar is not participating, and that led me to believe we could be a yes. So I'm happy to report that that was approved today unanimously. Everyone, IPC and others, all voted yes on the WDS motion.

So it's not a policy, it was simply a vote on whether to take the letter and the addendum and send them up to the Board so the Board could consider whether it wants to implement this. We tried to do so early enough so that the staff of ICANN Org could implement it during 2023. When the voting happened, the IPC made a statement explaining their vote was a yes, but they were very vigilant about the changes that would be required to something like this once NIS2 becomes law in the States. So I think that was a helpful clarification to make.

Mark, anything you want to add to this? I don't see Mark anymore. All right.

MARK DATYSGELD: I'm right here.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yes, go ahead.

MARK DATYSGELD: Thank you, everyone. Still a little tired but let me try to summarize what went down. I think that yesterday was pretty interesting in terms of what's being accomplished by the Council. We had unanimous votes on three prepositions. That was WDS, that was accuracy, and that was DNS abuse. What this amounts to is that I feel that the Council is starting to make progress again, that's the thing. There's a general spirit that in the past four years or so, it's been particularly difficult to move anything forward. And with that, it becomes a situation in which we need to start advancing policy. We can keep arguing forever and that has been pursued, actually, since 2018. It led the Council basically nowhere. So people are starting to really try to advance things as best as possible to get ICANN Org out of a place of complacency, basically. We have been discussing a lot how the things that go up to the Board and then end up nowhere, and we don't really have leverage of that. So I feel that more broadly, there's an attempt to start shaking up the Board. There's an attempt to start shaking up the CEO and really getting them to move and start thinking about policy again. Because over the past few years, it has become a situation in which they don't need to do that, because they rely on us constantly disagreeing. So I'll make a brief pause before going on.

STEVE DELBIANCO: At the pause, I'll call on Barbara Wanner.

---

BARBARA WANNER: Thanks, Steve, and thanks, Mark, as always. I'm just curious. I mean, after these four years of gridlock in the GNSO Council, what do you think brought the Council to this point where they realize that—like the U.S. Congress, they can't afford to be dysfunctional anymore, had a lot of dysfunction here in the States. But was there any one particular thing that caused the shift in attitude? I mean, it's welcome. But I'm just curious. I welcome your insights.

STEVE DELBIANCO: I'm going to turn to Mark for that, Barbara. But it's what we discussed earlier in the Candidate call. I think that when we're trying to change the status quo, it was a combination of external pressure in the way of NIS2 and potential congressional action and internal cooperation, partly in response to that pressure. But that internal cooperation had to be done in a civil manner and not a disruptive manner. I can tell you that Mark, John McElwaine, and I representing us on the small team, made sure that the conduct on that small team for WS was always civil and respectful. Most of what we said was returned in kind from the Registrars and Registries. So I think it's a combination of external pressure and internal cooperation. Mark?

BARBARA WANNER: Thank you.

---

MARK DATYSGELD:

Thank you very much, both Barbara and Steve. I feel that one thing that has become very important is that we are better able to communicate external tracks nowadays. When I mentioned NIS2 to the CPH, both on the call and outside of the call, they were very clear in saying that they understand that this is an issue and that it is on their radar. I think that we are doing a good job communicating tracks, that we are doing a good job putting on pressure. It's exactly as Steve said, as Mason said, it is about trying to get the message across as strongly as possible, as early as possible because that is, at the end of the day, being accounted for.

I think it's a lot of the reason we were able to move DNS abuse ahead in the first place, because people understand that there is an objective track to their business model. I think that this is a good strategy moving forward. It's not like the accuracy we've had without us being able to achieve anything or gain anything. The accuracy is clearly moving ahead with people understanding. It seems like people understand that NIS2 will rock the boat here. Hopefully, this is the kind of thing that we'll be able to do more and more. We try to make people aware. If we can't win via vote or whatever, that hasn't proven very useful. Instead, we try to create an environment in which it becomes clear that some action needs to be taken. That's kind of where I think we're headed, and it reflects what our leadership was saying before. So for the first two topics, that was that.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Mark, on the registration data accuracy, there was a debate among BC leadership about whether we would be a no or a yes on that. I picked up on Margie Milam's point that NIS2 changes things and suggested we ask

for a deferral. But I only made that as a recommendation to you and Marie. You guys thought it over, discussed the optics and problems of asking for a deferral without advanced notice, and decided that yes, it would be better, as long as you had the opportunity that you took this morning to make a formal statement about the way NIS2 is going to affect the accuracy requirements. I'm happy to hear you do that this morning on the call, and then that vote was also unanimous. So on the first in the second and even the third vote, we have issues that typically the Non-Commercial Stakeholders Group are completely opposed to, and yet they all voted yes. So this contributes to even further to Barbara Wanner's surprise that even the NCSG went along with things that they usually would have opposed reflexively. Then, Mark, I was going to turn to your final one on the DNS abuse. I'll let you pick up there.

MARK DATYSGELD:

Thank you, Steve. So yeah, fundamentally on DNS abuse, we managed to get to the point we wanted, we are recommending. The community will now have a look at bulk registrations and malicious registrations. What this allows us to do is try to scope what we want to do with those questions, instead of attempting to elevate them to PDP and create more obligations for the community. What this does in practice is it will allow us to leverage this decision. It will allow us to leverage this motion to start requesting more information about these things. Potentially, just by doing that, it will already signal true actors like the DNS Abuse Institute and to their different initiatives from the CPH that deserve things we're concerned about.

---

So over the course of the next few months, I would say, we will be getting back to a consultation about that. Hopefully, whatever outcome we achieve, it will come out of this place where we can discuss better these things. It will come out of community consultation. We will have actually strong backing to say pursue malicious registrations as an objective within ICANN or something along those lines. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: All right. I dropped off the call after the voting was over. Do you have anything important to share on items seven and eight on your agenda? They're on the screen right now.

MARK DATYSGELD: Not in particular.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Okay. All right. There are other Council activities. We've covered DNS abuse, we've covered closed generics, and Zak has already covered number three. Lawrence, is there anything you'd like to add on the GNSO Guidance Process? I have it on the screen right now. Over to you.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Thanks, Steve. The GNSO Guidance Process has a meeting scheduled for Monday. This is going to be right after the CSG meeting with the Board. It's our initial meeting. I presume that from the Doodle poll, we should have almost about 80% participation from members. The group allows for observers across different constituencies. If you're interested, all

---

you need to do is send a mail to the GNSO secretariat that you'd like to be an observer, and you will be allowed to observe the meetings, can raise hands, or use the chat, but will get firsthand information on discussions.

Mike Silber is the chair for the GGP. Hopefully, the first meeting will just set the agenda for discussions, modalities for meeting, and how subsequent meetings will go. I know Olajidi is on the call. He reached out to me that he's signed up to be an observer. That will be all about the GGP process for now. Thank you, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thanks, Lawrence. Again, this is a special process setup on how we proceed with Applicant Support. For those of you that are relatively new to this, Applicant Support says that when we do the next round of new gTLDs, there are applicants for certain TLDs that may serve smaller communities or nonprofit communities who will not be able to afford the half a million U.S. dollars in costs minimum to go through the application process and pay the fees to get a new gTLD.

So back in 2012, we had cooked up something called Applicant Support, the ability to reduce or eliminate the fees that are paid and even to provide pro bono legal help to applicants. Only a handful of applicants used it. Andrew Mack of the BC was one of the leaders on that. We've been wondering why more didn't use it. So this guidance process is designed to say maybe we can make Applicant Support work better for applicants in the next round. Is that a fair characterization, Lawrence?

---

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Spot on. Thanks for that, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Okay, great. Then we've already covered number five. So I can wrap up now and turn it back over to Mason. Thank you.

MASON COLE: Thank you, Steve, much appreciated. Lots of things in front of the BC right now on the policy front, so we've got a lot to cover. All right. We're a little short on time, Lawrence, again, I'm afraid. If you can make haste with your report, that would be very helpful. Over to you, Lawrence.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: No problem, chair. Just to provide us details on the timeline for the elections that are ongoing, the Candidates call is done with. The primary members representing each company should get a tally in their boxes by Friday. We have the process of voting all the four officers open until the end of the coming week. The results will be announced on Monday, the 28<sup>th</sup>. Due to the holidays in the U.S., we have to make some slight adjustments to the previous timelines. We want to encourage all members to please cast their votes. Where you do not find the ballots in the coming week in your box, you could please reach out to Brenda for assistance, maybe it needs to be resent.

With that, we'd like members to also know that right after this election will be elections into different committees. We want to encourage especially members who joined the BC recently, Imran, Olajidi, and a whole lot of others who have joined in the previous year and in this



---

year. This will be a good time for us to jump into any of the BC committees, Finance. We've got the Credentials Committee filled up, I guess, but we still have space in Finance. We have seats that need to be taken in the Communications, Onboarding, across all the committees. More information will be shared with us right after the Officers Elections. We want to encourage that we do our best to stay engaged.

There are some open announcements from ICANN, just in case you can push out the information. ICANN77 Fellowship Program has been announced. The policy process has opened. The BC members who have been Fellows before, because there's a process, this round is open to just alumni of Fellowship Program, can use this opportunity to be at ICANN77.

The IGF is a few days ahead. After the next week, the other week basically is the IGF week. Don't forget that the BC has a session that most of us will be participating at. I want to encourage the BC to actively participate at least at IGF. It's the first time that we're having the private sector chair the M3AAWG. And the current M3AAWG has been a very active member of the Business Constituency, Paul Mitchell. So let's put in all the support we can to ensure that the private sector is also equally represented. We're looking forward to the session. I guess Mark will be there in person.

If there are any questions with regard to the ongoing process for elections or anything that has to do with Finance and Operation, you can ask here or send a mail and we'll get back to you. Thank you very much. Chair, back to you, sir.

MASON COLE: Thank you, Lawrence. I appreciate your diligence on everything, as usual. Any updates or comments or questions for Lawrence? Okay. I see no hands.

All right, everyone. We are close to time. So let me call for any other business for the BC this morning. Any other business to cover today? All right. If that's the case, I'll say thank you. Oh, Mark, I'm sorry. Did you need to contribute here? No, we don't hear you.

MARK DATYSGELD: I have a small thing to show. Is my screen sharing? I think Brenda needs to stop sharing. Let me see if it works real quick. Do you guys see the BC logo?

MASON COLE: We do.

MARK DATYSGELD: Okay. If I press this, do you hear sound coming from the video?

MASON COLE: I don't think so.

BRENDA BREWER: We did not.

---

---

MARK DATYSGELD: Give me a hot second and I'll see if it goes. If it doesn't, I'll check next time. Here, share sound. Let me try this again. Do you hear music?

MASON COLE: Now we do. Yes.

MARK DATYSGELD: Okay, everyone, this is a very short promotional video that I'm coming up for the BC. We have a lot of outreach to perform. It's what I've been talking about, just quick 45 seconds of your life. Then you please give me your impressions and we'll finish the meeting after that. Okay? So hold on tight. Let's watch the new BC promotional video.

VIDEO: The Business Constituency is the place for your company to represent its interests in the global Internet governance arena. Its volunteers work tirelessly to represent you and your clients even though you might not know that. Becoming a member has many advantages, which will be shown in this short video.

Congratulations on your wedding, Mason and [San]. The BC wishes you the very best. You are truly ICANN incomparable. Absolutely non-Vegas newlyweds.

MASON COLE: Okay, Mark. You got me on that one.

MARK DATYSGELD: Hopefully, the new campaign will be a hit. Hoping for that, you know. So yeah.

MASON COLE: Thank you, Mark. That was very kind of you. I don't quite know what to say on that. But thank you. Yes, it was a wonderful wedding and we had a great time. We were surrounded by family and friends. It was tremendous. So thank you very much for the congratulations.

MARK DATYSGELD: Can I circulate that?

MASON COLE: Yeah. I'll have to ask to pay you at some point, I'm sure. All right. Thank you very much. Thanks, everybody. That's very kind of you. All right. Well, on that note, is there any other business to cover for the BC today? Okay. All right. Well, Mark, again, thank you for the congratulations and thanks, everyone. So, I guess if there's nothing else to cover today, we can adjourn. With thanks to Brenda, as always, for support, and thanks to all of you for the congratulations. The BC is now adjourned. We'll talk to you on 1 December for our next meeting. So long, everybody.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**

---