BRENDA BREWER:	Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. Welcome to the Business Constituency Candidate and Membership call on 18 May 2023 at 14:30 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. I do have apologies from Marie Pattullo. Please note the first 30 minutes of today's meeting are dedicated to the Candidates call. When finished, the BC Membership call will begin. I will now turn the call over to BC chair, Mason Cole, for opening remarks. Thank you.
MASON COLE:	Thank you, Brenda. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening again, everyone. Mason Cole here, chair of the BC. Welcome to our call on 18 May. It's good to have you all on the call.
	As I mentioned just a moment ago, we have a new member on the call, Hafiz is with us today. So please make him feel welcome as a new member of the BC. Hafiz, we hope we get to see you in Washington, D.C. during the next ICANN meeting or at least sometime very soon. So again, welcome.
	All right, we have the first 30 minutes of the call dedicated this morning to our candidates for elective office. As usual, procedurally, what I'm going to do is turn the introductions of the candidates in the queue over to Brenda who will introduce each candidate and invite their opening

---

statement, and then each candidate will take questions from BC members about their candidacy. Then, as Brenda mentioned, after that, we'll revert to our usual BC agenda which you see on the screen here. But before we start that, are there any additions or updates to the agenda as you see it on the screen, please? Okay. The queue is clear. Brenda, allow me to turn the call over to you and please proceed with the candidates portion of the call. Thank you.

BRENDA BREWER: Thank you very much, Mason. Welcome to the Candidates portion of today's call. Our candidates speaking today are Lawrence Olawale-Roberts, nominated for the Business Constituency, GNSO Councilor representative; Vivek Goyal, Business Constituency, small seat for the NomCom representative; and Mia Brickhouse, Business Constituency, large seat NomCom representative. We will give each candidate approximately five to seven minutes to speak. We will begin with Lawrence. So, Lawrence, the floor is yours.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Thank you very much, Brenda. Currently, I am not in the Zoom Room but will make efforts to join before our meeting concludes. But before I go ahead, I just want to confirm, is Vivek is available to make it? Because he has given us an excuse, so we might just want to read his resume, the candidate statement, and any questions we have. He will be joining us later in the call, it can be posed to him.

So, my name is Lawrence Olawale-Roberts. I'm an African from Nigeria. I joined the BC in the year 2015. In that time, I have had the opportunity

on just following a good number of BC veterans and have also taken response responsibility of not only contributing to policy but trying to be a penholder on some of the issues. I have also had the unique opportunity of representing the BC as the SME rep on the NomCom currently as a vice-chair, and I am now a candidate for one of the GNSO Council seats. The GNSO Council definitely they have control the heartbeat across the GNSO. I believe ICANN as a whole because that's where most of the policy work, not only [inaudible] but gets done.

So I see this as a very serious key responsibility. Definitely, I have programmed myself, my mind and thinking, to be up to the task. One thing that I value about the BC's approach to Council affairs is the fact that issues for which councilors get to vote or contribute to in Council debated in our regular BC meetings. So, by extension, whatever decision one has taken on Council is pretty much discussed and those decisions ride on the directives of Membership. So, while there is some appreciable work to be done in terms of understanding the issues on the discussion, basically the directive of Membership makes it possible to get a lot of work done easily.

I believe over the last couple of years, you have had an opportunity to have me as a vice-chair. I will be bringing the same dedication on board. I just look forward to not only representing you, but having another experience within ICANN, I will be bringing leverage on the networks of this over time. That is definitely key to having to build consensus, which is one ingredient that is very key for a GNSO councilor. I will be available to take further questions. Thank you again for allowing me to serve you as a member of the BC. Back to you, Brenda.

BRENDA BREWER: Thank you very much, Lawrence. We will hold questions until all of our candidates have spoken. I do not have Vivek on the call at this time. I will ask Mia Brickhouse to please take the floor. Mia is nominated for the BC large business NomCom seat. Mia, please.

MIA BRICKHOUSE: Great. Thank you. Okay. Hi, everyone. My name is Mia Brickhouse. I am the head of the IP and DNS team here at Meta. I lead our brand protection efforts as well as our two ICANN accredited registrars. And prior to joining Meta, I worked for a corporation service company, which is a corporate registrar. They also provided brand protection work, which also included drafting and filing UDRPs for domain recovery. So it's a bit about my experience.

I want to talk a little bit about the work that I'm doing here at Meta. At Meta, we deal with brand abuse, phishing, impersonation, fraud at scale, and that level is amongst the highest level in the world. So we see the direct impact on users and companies that are being affected by abuse. At Meta, we value ICANN's multistakeholder model and for domain policy and we want to see it succeed. We need leaders that understand business concerns yet are able to support ICANN's consensus-based policy processes and do that in a meaningful way.

I believe that my experience will allow me to identify committee members that will advocate for business owners and like-minded constituents that have an interest in a healthy DNS ecosystem. My tech career has been entirely devoted to understanding the DNS and the role

that abuse plays within the DNS. I also believe that we should get more involvement from our community [Nautilus], and creating that space for more participation should be one of our main goals.

So I am excited for the opportunity to serve as the large seat rep on the Nominating Committee for the BC. My goal is to ensure that the best and the brightest participate and that they promote a secure and stable Internet. With that, I will defer. Or if we are going to questions, I welcome any questions. Thank you.

BRENDA BREWER: Thank you very much, Mia. Vivek is not available at this time. I will share his candidate statement on screen. Please stand by. One moment. I had a number of documents. I apologize. Okay. On the screen, you will see Vivek's candidate statement and I will read it aloud in his absence.

"Dear BC colleagues, I express my gratitude to Tola Sogbesan for nominating me and all these additional BC members for their support in my nomination as candidate for the BC NomCom small business. I humbly accept the nomination and will strive to meet the expectations of the BC members who have shown their trust in me.

As stated by ICANN Board chair, Tripti Sinha, in her opening remarks, the ICANN ecosystem is at a critical evolutionary juncture. We are at a turning point, the need for change is strong, and we must seize the opportunity as a community to make an impact and be the agents of change warranted by current conditions. Having successfully emerged from the IANA transition and learned how to operate independently as a multistakeholder community, ICANN is now a young organization with

significant powers and responsibilities in the global Internet space. The recent approval of the 98 recommendations of the SubPro and the opening of the next round of gTLD, the negotiation of contracts for fighting DNS abuse, and the implementation of Registrant Data Request Systems earlier, as said, are all outcomes of an organization that is now prioritizing action over deliberation.

To support ICANN's rapid growth plans and navigate the turbulent waters of national and international policies and politics, experienced leaders are needed at the helm. Leaders who have a proven track record of building companies, running multinational organizations, delivering on stakeholder value, and possessing the requisite knowledge of the Internet and its impact on the lives of billions of people worldwide. After gaining a good understanding of the NomCom process in my first year, and appreciating its complexity and fairness, I am eager to continue my efforts in selecting the most suitable candidates that can contribute to ICANN's growth plans, while fostering amicable relationships with members from their constituencies in my second year. Thank you for considering my nomination. Sincerely, Vivek Goyal."

And with that, we will take questions for our candidates. So you may raise your hand and we'll take questions. One moment. Do we have any questions from the Membership? Seeing no hands at this time, I'm going to share our timeline.

So we are having the Candidates call today. Ballots will be sent out tomorrow, Friday, May 19, at 00:00 UTC. And then we will have a voting period of one week. Voting will close on Thursday, May 25, at 23:59

UTC. The election results will be shared with the BC Membership on Friday, 26 May.

As you can see on the screen, the GNSO councilor as well as the NomCom delegates will take their place at the end of ICANN78. With that information, I will turn the floor back over to Mason.

MASON COLE: Thank you very much, Brenda. Mia and Lawrence, thank you for your opening statements, and, Brenda, thank you for handling Vivek's statement as well. It's a pleasure to have everybody expressed their interest in candidacy for office and we're looking forward to your elevated participation in the BC. I want to offer everybody another chance for questions before we move on to the agenda because we still have a bit of time remaining on the Candidates portion of the call. So any questions for Mia or Lawrence? Otherwise, Mia and Lawrence are getting off lightly today. Mia, anything you'd like to follow up with? Thank you very much for your candidate statement.

MIA BRICKHOUSE: I want to thank everyone for the opportunity. And if at any point questions arise, feel free to reach out to me.

MASON COLE: Thank you, Mia.

MIA BRICKHOUSE:	Thank you.
MASON COLE:	And thank you for your willingness to serve. Lawrence, anything you'd like to add as well?
LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS:	That will be my closing call as well, thanking not just those who nominated and supported, but every BC member for the support that I have enjoyed from you so far. I pledge to continue to do my best to represent the BC in the best way possible. Thanks.
MASON COLE:	All right. Thank you very much, Lawrence. All right. If BC members have additional questions for Mia or Lawrence or Vivek, I'd be happy to be a conduit, I'm sure Brenda would as well, to those candidates for your questions. We can follow up after this call if there are additional issues you'd like to raise with any of the candidates. Then we will then proceed with the rest of the call. So, Brenda, might you put up the agenda, please? There we go. Thank you very much.
	All right. Okay. Let's proceed with our normal course of business right now. Let's move to item three. Steve, over to you for the policy calendar, if you please. If I might suggest, you may want to have Tim go first because I think he's time-limited today. Over to you, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Great idea. Tim, why don't you go first while I display the policy calendar for you?

TIM SMITH: Hi, Steve and everyone. Thanks very much. I really have very little to report today. The one thing that CSG has been working on for the past while is addressing Board Seat 14. As I reported on the last call, there was a proposal that CSG and NCSG go to mediation on this matter, and NCSG accepted that suggestion. So now, mediation is underway in order to determine a path forward for, I guess, both having a new candidate or a new person in Seat 14 to replace Matthew, but also a pathway forward for future selection process. Selection process was put in place in 2018 and that is being reviewed now.

So that's really all I have to report at this point. The last discussions on this were I think as of May 11th, there was quite a bit of discussion. However, it is a confidential process, and therefore, I really don't have anything more than I can report at this time. The actual mediation is sort of on hold until—I believe it's resuming next week. So perhaps by the time we meet again in two weeks, I'll have something more than more concrete that I'll be able to report. So that's really the only activity for CSG at the moment. As I noted here in my report, Matthew Shears does stay in the seat until this issue is resolved.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Tim. I'm looking to see if any BC members have questions, but I will suggest that, Mason, you and Lars and I did a call yesterday with Sally Costerton and with some of ICANN leadership, and we brought up

EN

this process. How would you characterize Sally Costerton? She's the acting CEO, for anyone who doesn't know. How would you characterize her expectations for the arbitration process, mediation?

MASON COLE: Thanks, Steve. We had a one-on-one with Sally yesterday. It was Steve and Lawrence and myself. We covered a number of issues with Sally, including the Board seat. I guess I would characterize Sally's impression is one of eagerness to get the situation resolved, understands that there is a bit of conflict with our position in the CSG and the NCSG. And nobody, including the CSG and the NCSG Membership, want to see that, neither does Sally. So I think everybody's hopeful that Melissa, who is ICANN's conflict resolution specialist, can bring her skill to bear here and get this impasse resolved.

So, what we imparted to Sally was that we wanted to be able to resolve the Board seat and at the same time resolve the issue about a selection process for the Board seat, that we didn't want to either one of those issues to linger. And in fairness to ICANN Org and the Board itself, we wanted to see this resolved as soon as possible. I think it's fair to say that Sally agreed with that point of view and in wants to see the same. So she was supportive of the mediation process and hopeful that it can be resolved pretty soon. Steve, feel free to add your color to that.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yeah. I think that CEO Costerton lacks any true understanding of the process that's in place and the lack of leverage on one side or the other. I will say two things. I highlighted for her that if the Registries and

Registrars reached an impasse on who they would pick, we'd have a similar problem. She nodded about that. So did David Olive. And then of course, reminded her the BC has an answer to solve all this just by taking two seats away from the NomCom and giving them to GNSO. So let's just keep hammering on that. She said she was aware of that proposal. I don't know. Maybe, maybe not.

Any other questions for Tim? Okay. Thank you, Tim. I'll quickly go to the top of the policy calendar. Mason, I'm assuming you want me to plow through the policy calendar, right?

MASON COLE: Yes, please. Go ahead, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Great. Thank you. We have a handful of open public comments right now. The first one is the .NET Registry Agreement renewal. And those comments closed in the 25th of May. Margie Milam, Zak Muscovitch, and I have spent lots of time developing that. I know Johnny Olufuye and [inaudible] volunteered to help, but they haven't poked their heads into the document yet.

So Margie and I have been making changes even this morning. We currently have a draft that includes multiple recommendations, including for thick WHOIS, and picks up on the things that we discussed in the BC two weeks ago. Namely, concerns about transparency when the registry operator is instructed by a government to remove registrations or to suppress registrations from the registry. We delved

EN

into other obligations for the .NET registry to take up elements that are in the base Registry Agreement. We talked about the strange differences between the security and stability as defined terms versus undefined terms, and why that really matters when it comes to being able to force a registry operator to take on the obligations of a consensus policy. That's a very tightly focused point. And our recommendations in almost all cases are requesting that ICANN and Verisign sign give us an explanation of why they're different and give us the opportunity to say, "Well, that sounds like a difference that shouldn't be there. We should match the base Registry Agreement."

So it's a tough comment. I attached to a version as of yesterday, and the current version is in a Google Doc. I think that Zak, Margie, and I will finalize that by the end of today and circulate it to all of you for seven days of review. I would stop here and ask if Margie, Zak, anyone else wants to comment. I can display the current draft if you wish.

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: This is Zak, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Please go ahead.

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: I think you did a pretty good job for drafting your first comment, and I'm happy with it.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Zak. I appreciate that. First comment ever. Margie?

MARGIE MILAM: Thank you. Thank you, Steve and Zak. Yeah, we've been working hard on this to get the points down. I think it has some really strong language that helps with regards to the consensus policy issue. And just to make sure that the consensus policy is as adopted by the GNSO would apply to Verisign in the .NET agreement, because there's this discrepancy that I guess Mike Palage had pointed out. The other area that we've been debating—if you could put it up—relates to the thick WHOIS requirement. And the suggestion is that as opposed to waiting for the consensus policy process to run its course, that as part of the negotiations, ICANN could ask VeriSign to adopt the thick WHOIS as part of the .NET renewal. So we've been talking about whether that's something that the BC would support. And the thinking there is that ICANN has so much work ahead of it in terms of implementation of all kinds of things and to separate out the thick WHOIS so that it can be adopted now rather than later, and at least it will be done through the .NET. We may still obviously need to work on the timing for the .COM, eventually. But given that the NIS2 adoption in Europe has clarified the legal basis for thick WHOIS, there's really no obstacle now for implementing it. So that's what the proposal is with respect to thick WHOIS.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Margie. I have it on the screen. Margie outlined a lot of what you see at the top. I added the idea that we are relying heavily on the

current consensus policy to force contract parties to implement, and they have to do that as part of the existing contract. So as this comment is laid out, it has belt and suspenders. The belt is right here, which says that if ICANN was to declare that NIS2 is the required legal basis, then that's all ICANN need to do. They simply negotiate a data processing agreement with Verisign, and Verisign has to do data processing agreement modifications to all of the accredited registrars who sell .NET names.

But Margie has brought up this idea that let's add suspenders right here. Which is to say that, "Why wait for something like that, let's ask for a commitment to adopt and negotiate as soon as possible." So we have both the following consensus policy without undue delay pursuant to the policy. That's the first one and the second one. Pretty strong language. I think it all hinges on some sort of authoritative finding that NIS2 is the required legal basis. I'm pretty confident that what Pearse O'Donohue had to say about that is not the final word. But I just want to push them to resolve that question immediately. That's really what we're heading with this.

BC members, you'll have seven days to comment on what we've got in here. It's pretty extensive. Maybe some of you will have an opportunity to understand previous BC positions. Zak, that's one of the reasons I have restrictions on domain pricing, and things like restrictions on vertical integration. The idea is that with new BC members, when possible, we bring in previous positions that are relevant to what is on the table right now. That's an opportunity for them understand what the BC has done in the past and why we're coming to the conclusion today. And since we have seven days to review, there's even an

opportunity to modify the precedent of prior positions. There's nothing locked in stone forever.

Okay. I'll move on to the next one. Let me reshare. Back to the policy calendar. Great.

The Bylaws amendments for the NomCom 2 review. Right. So these are a handful of changes to the Bylaws. They come out of recommendations from a review of the NomCom. They call it the NomCom 2 review. In particular, Mia, you're going to want to pay a lot of attention to this one. It's on the policy calendar you have up on the screen. Take a look at the recommendations, take a look at what are going to be developed. Mia, it might be a great idea for you to jump in and join the drafting team, which is Lawrence, Johnny, and Tola. We've also asked Jay Sadowski and Zahid Jamil, which are BC members who haven't been active in the last couple of years but served for several years on the Nominating Committee.

So I think that since that's not due until the 29th of May, we're going to want to distribute something next week. So, Lawrence, with your experience on NomCom, I hope you can get that started, and I'm glad to help in any way possible. I circulated a draft, sort of a setup comment to all of you via e-mail earlier this week.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Thanks, Steve. So I started taking a look at this. I recall that the NomCom Review Committee eventually dropped the talk about rebalancing, possibly taking away one of the BC seats. But somewhere along the line we have seen renewed interest from a letter written by

Tripti. I just want to ask for clarification. Do we think it's a good move if we talk in any way about the discussion that happened in terms of rebalancing and the attempt to take over the BC seat, or do we play silent on that?

STEVE DELBIANCO: These are completely different elements, right? Because the rebalancing has to do with who are the reps on the NomCom. But the BC proposal has nothing to do with that. It has to do with how many board seats come from GNSO and how many come from the NomCom. So one is respect to directors, the other is respect to the people that sit on the NomCom. Are you suggesting that maybe we try to make those, combine those as a package deal?

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: No, my thinking was not to combine them and just focus on the NomCom review committee and their outcomes.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Because I believe the changing of directors from GNSO would have nothing to do with the NomCom review, but it has to do with the holistic review of the structure and representation in ICANN. And if we were to bring that into this conversation, we'll run into a buzzsaw of opposition because anybody working on the NomCom doesn't want the idea of losing two of their director nominations to the GNSO. GNSO is 99% of the [revenue,] 99% of the activity, and has only two board seats, forcing us to do this ridiculous compromise. So I would not bring that in.

It's just my opinion, but anybody else, feel free to speak up or volunteer to help. Do we have any other volunteers that would join Lawrence, Johnny, and Tola?

MIA BRICKHOUSE: Yes, Steve, this is Mia. I'd be happy to. It seems right for me to jump in right here.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Fantastic. So Mia, I will forward you the setup email that I used to get this thing going and then you should work with Tola and Lawrence and Johnny on pulling this together. By the middle of next week, a short, sweet draft. I'll take care of all the formatting. Just needed to know your main points. Great. Thank you, Mia.

Okay. I'll move on to the next one. IDNs, or internationalized domain names, are non-Latin script characters that are used to render top-level domain names. These comments aren't due to the 5th of June, but we already have a volunteer. Ching Chiao has great knowledge of the area of IDNs and has volunteered to draft the BC comment. Ching, I've already provided you with quite a bit of background on what the BC has said before on this. So with your knowledge of IDNs, I have no doubt you'll be able to come up with a good draft. You don't have to have it in final form, just basically bullets or principles, and I can help get it whipped into shape. Does anyone want to assist Ching, or Ching, do you have anything you want to add?

CHING CHIAO: Hi, Steve. This is Ching. Thanks for the opportunity, and I actually joined the webinar and I shared the result. I mean, I put up some notes and shared with the group. So please review those comments and please feel free to comment on those notes and also the slide that they provided.

On the higher-level notes, this PDP works dealt with only the top level, not the second level. So the second-level part will be dealt with at the next phase. But I've actually raised some points. I'm not going to say it's a type of red flag, but it's really worthy for the business user to consider. I'm not going into details. Please review those notes and let me know your thoughts. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Ching. The way the BC typically works, though, I would suggest that you should take from the webinar what you believe is relevant to the BC comment right now and work that into the draft that we would circulate roughly by, let's say, May 28th. I don't think that you'll see the BC members dive in. We don't have sufficient knowledge and expertise at IDNs. I doubt that they will all watch the webinar, review your notes, and then make suggestions to you. It's better for you to hold the pen and draft the comment that you think is right on.

CHING CHIAO: Sure. And definitely, you've mentioned about the background that you shared with me, the previous comments made on 2018. So I think I probably follow just along the line to come up with something that should work for the BC's position. So just let me work on that. Thanks.

STEVE DELBIANCO: And as I told you in the email, if you believe the BC can improve, modify, amend its prior position to reflect more of the threats and opportunities we face, it's completely appropriate to do so in circulating a new draft comment. It's just that if you're moving us off of a prior position, it probably raises the expectation that you'll have good rationale to move away from a previous position. By no means should you shy away from that.

CHING CHIAO: Got it. Okay. Thanks for that.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you. The next item up is a new comment just posted. The ISPCP, that's the Internet Service Providers and Connectivity Providers, the ISPs, which is the third leg of the Commercial Stakeholder Group stool, they have proposed to modify their charter. And they modify it in a lot of ways that mimic what the BC has in terms of picking up the good practices, in terms of transparency, diversity, geographic diversity, leadership, turnover, term limits, etc. We need a volunteer in the BC to examine their charter. It's a very lightweight, easy item that it doesn't involve ICANN technical policies. It just involves the conduct of running a constituency.

Are there any BC members who are interested? I don't think this will be more than a couple of hours of work to examine their amended charter and to suggest whether the BC wants to support the amendments. It

might be as simple as a single sentence. Looking for a volunteer. It's a good one for a new member of the BC to pick up on. Particularly anybody who works closely with the CSG. So this is the role that Tim has been playing for us and the idea of understanding the way that one of our three partners in CSG operates.

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: Steve, for some reason, this is interesting to me. I'll take a look.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Fantastic, Zak. Thank you very much. Anyone else? Okay. I'll move up to the next one. There's a brand new comment on an amendment to the technical identifiers which is a subsidiary of ICANN that took over when the IANA functions were transitioned into ICANN in 2016. They're simply modifying a couple of the timing windows for their operating plan and strat plan. To me, this is relatively easy. Should not require any significant amount of work. I know, Rajiv, you worked on that comment in 2022. Do you believe maybe you could take a look at this and come up with a BC position?

RAJIV PRASAD: Certainly.

MASON COLE: Beautiful, Rajiv. Thank you very much. Okay. The only other one is I typically open this up. It's not a public comment, but I ask for input from Margie, from Nick and from others, Marie, who follow the European

process closely as to where they are on NIS 2 implementation. We have been hearing that Denmark is moving rather quickly at implementation. Is there any updates or questions about the NIS 2 transposition process? Okay. And finally, I'll turn it over. We have Marie and Mark. And I don't believe Marie was able to join today, but Mark is here. Mark, it's a very short report on council because you haven't met since our last call, but take it from here, please. Mark, are you there? Okay. Until Mark works that out, I'll let you know that I have documented here what happened at the previous council meeting, the fact that they held an extraordinary meeting on May 4th, right, about the SubPro. That's the subsequent procedures for the next round. Their next meeting is the 25th of May, next week. And that agenda was supposed to be due on the 15th of May, and it looks like it just posted. So here's the agenda. So it's just posted, and it looks like they will go through the NomCom rebalancing discussion. And I do not see a resolution. I just see discussions on the agenda, progress updates and the like. Thanks, Mark. Closed generics. Tim, did you have anything you wanted to add to this, or have we already lost Tim? I think he's already gone. The transfer policy working group, Zak and Arinola, what would you update us on there?

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: Steve, Nothing from Arinola and I this week. We'll have something to report as soon as there's something new to report. Thank you.

MASON COLE: Thank you, Zak. Lawrence, if you had something on GNSO, just raise your hand. And Mark, same thing with DNS abuse. Go ahead.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: All right. So the GGP had its meeting earlier this week, and one of the things that came up for discussion was the scenario where the number of applications that are qualified as good at the end of the process is more than the budget that is approved. Right now, we understand that at the level of the last process, about $2 million is again budgeted for applicant support of the next round.

While we were having this discussion on what to do, there was a suggestion that was due to the fact that the applicant support in the last round ran for a while, and at the end of the process, those who were successful were made to know they were successful, while those who did not qualify dropped off, the thinking now is to probably have a process where as applicants finalize the applications and submit it, ICANN doesn't wait for the six months or eight months or whatever the period will be for application review, but will immediately communicate to such a person whether their application ticked all the right boxes and is good to go, and probably let them know that they might receive about a 50% discount on application fee, and then process all other applications in that manner as they come.

There were some members who felt that that might be a disadvantage to some others who maybe did not get to hear on time and put in the applications very late. We haven't really taken a position on what should happen, whether we should have an application round that is closed, and at the end of that period, everybody gets to know their fate, or for those who come in early into the process, they don't have to wait

for six or eight months or nine months or however long the period will be to know what the results will be.

I would love to be guided with thoughts around this to know what position to take, whether we should, whether we'll be tilting towards all the applications coming in, and at the end of the period, whether it's eight or nine months, everybody getting to know their fate at the same time, or for those who come in early, get to know their fate, and if they have to go look for extra support, can definitely take having enough window of time to do that.

MASON COLE: Thank you, Lawrence. Thank you. Any questions for Lawrence? DNS abuse is a waiting game, according to Mark Datysgeld in the chat. Bulk registrations and a scholar who did a study in the EU, it looks like they're going to do a new project.

With respect to the registrant data request system where I represent us on that small team, I have just a short update for you, is that every Monday we have an hourlong call where Steve Crocker and I are pretty much duking it out with the registrars who want to continue to use this RDRS experiment or pilot as a way to kill WHOIS completely. They really do, because their intent is to show that there's inadequate demand for the RDRS, and if statistically it has inadequate demand, then it would say do not proceed.

Now, the BC voted no on the SSAD to begin with because we thought that without the requirement of doing a disclosure, there wouldn't be any significant value to it. There's also a lively discussion on privacy

proxy services, that if the data is protected by a privacy proxy, there's really no point in you using the RDRS because you're only going to get privacy and proxy back. Now, I pushed back on that, suggesting that they would take on extra obligations if they don't disclose or relay the information in a privacy proxy situation, but all that Sarah Wyld had to say was, "I don't know anything about that." Fascinating. Everything's out of scope if I ever talk about ways to make the system actually useful to those of us trying to protect our consumers and our businesses.

They did a webinar on the system on the 16th and 17th of May. I watched the whole thing. I was pretty impressed. Staff has already developed the screens necessary using some existing software that I can already use as an interface with registries and registrars, but the demo of how we as requesters would put our requests in worked very well and captures all the fields that we think are necessary. You can click on that link I have under webinars and you can re-watch the Zoom if you would wish to take a look at that.

I think that that is all I've got for now, Mason. I'll send it back to you.

MASON COLE: All right. Thanks very much, Steve. Good report. Any follow-up questions for Steve, please? All right. The queue is clear. All right. Lawrence, over to you for finance and administration update, please.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Thank you, Chair. So, [inaudible] Brenda had earlier on shared the timeline for the NomCom and council elections and ballots will... We

should receive tallies tomorrow or sometime before then such that we are able to put in our votes within a week.

If you happen to be paid up as for the last... As for the current financial year FY23 and you do not receive a ballot by the weekend, please reach out to Brenda so that [inaudible] to know what's happening. Maybe it's the email that we have in record, but only primary representatives would receive a ballot.

We have preparations for the BC's outreach during ICANN 77. It's advancing and I would like to give a few minutes for Caroline to give us some updates on what's been achieved so far. So, over to you, Caroline.

CAROLINE LUPETINI: Yes. Hi, everyone. Okay. So, we spoke two weeks ago now that we had confirmed our venue date and time for our BC outreach event at ICANN 77. Again, this will be the Tuesday of our ICANN week. So, it's Tuesday, June 13th from 6:00 to 8:00 PM. It'll be food and light bites and mixing and mingling. But sort of the most important update and takeaway that I have from our last conversation two weeks ago is now we're starting to invite prospective attendees.

And to that end, I am dropping in the chat here, and I'll send this around in the email after the fact. This is a Google survey form so that we as BC members can drop in potential invitees to this event. So, you can email them yourself or we as the BC can email them. And there's actually an option in this form to do that if you want to email them. Great. If you want us to email them, also great. So that we can start building an invite list with contact information, what kind of organization they're a part of,

whether it's a trade association, a consultancy, tech company, other private sector, etc., so that we can have a nice robust attendee list of potential BC members for this event.

And like I mentioned two weeks ago, we are really hoping for DC based folks. They can be an attendee of the ICANN conference or not, either way is fine. But especially like trade associations, because trade associations have such a broad membership and other audiences that they can continue reaching out to in the sort of aftermath of this event as well. So any ideas for potential attendees that we as BC members have, please do drop them in this Google form so that we can invite them or you can invite them. And we'd love to have a nice big group on Tuesday, the 13th of June next month.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Thank you very much. And on behalf of the entire BC, I want to say a big thank you to Caroline for doing all the heavy lifting and ensuring that we have a very wonderful event, outreach event at ICANN 77. We are currently working on invitations, like she's hinted. Please use the form to nominate business [executive friends,] whether they are large, small, or trade associations to the event. We are looking to fill the room with just 60 people. We also want to be mindful of that. And I'm sure that with your help, we will get to that number. We can go a bit over that. That will be welcome.

We are also expecting to have the ICANN board leadership and our leadership also at our outreach event. The date again is the 13th of

June, Tuesday, the 13th of June for 6:00 PM [inaudible]. And more information will be passed across to us on the private list.

We're also working on some communication materials, publicity materials, not only for the outreach, but for our BC session. And we will also share that with members as we progress.

Please note that the Google form that Caroline will share, rather has shared, I can see that in the chat, that's the one that you used to nominate your peers. There's also another form on the BC's website, already on the BC's website, that you can use to register yourself for the event so that we can keep track of numbers of those coming and all the works.

One other appeal that I noted down here, like I said, we have about 60 people that we are expecting. I think that hall can't go beyond 75. But as you know, people come and go, I'm sure we'll be able to manage the crowd. But I just want to encourage BC member companies that want to promote their organization, if you have any special products or whatever also that you might want to use to highlight what you do, you can also pass that across to myself and Brenda before the outreach events or just before the outreach events. We'll have a means to publicize BC members and what they do.

Invoices for FY24 have gone out. If you haven't received that invoice for your dues for the coming year, it's about time to reach out to myself or the invoicing secretariat so that we can ensure that you are provided with one.

We want to thank members who have already started paying their dues and we want to encourage everyone to ensure that they are up to date. Being up to date financially not only helps the organization but also gives you a right to vote and to be voted for.

I note that a few members also still have FY23 invoices open. I want to encourage you to close this out because we'll be working towards pulling such members out of membership pretty soon.

Also, I want to solicit for members to submit articles for the BC's newsletter for ICANN 77. We have between now and the 29th of May, I will be sharing our timeline on the BC private list to put together your articles, wonderful articles that can be something around your experience joining the business constituency so far. It could be a policy issue that you've been following. We have quite a number of open and interesting debates ongoing. If you want to contribute to that, you can use the avenue of the BC's newsletter to promote such.

We have Vivek now in the room. I just want to provide an update that Vivek is the NomCom candidate for the small seat [currently] and to be re-elected. Vivek, just to let you know that your candidate statement was read and there were no questions that required your entry. But you might just want to say a few, maybe one or two minutes, say something to address the house before we yield it back to Mason.

VIVEK GOYAL: Yeah, thank you, Lawrence. I know we are at the end of the allocated time, so I'll just say thank you for your continued support and your trust in me. The first term at NomCom has been an eye opener and a very

learning experience for me. And I'll continue to work very hard to select candidates to ICANN different positions that help further its interest as well as the interest of the BC. If you don't have any questions now, you can always email me later or we can have a call and get together and discuss that. Thank you so much.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Thank you, Vivek. Mason, back to you.

MASON COLE: Thank you very much, Lawrence. And thank you, Vivek, for your brief statement there. Before we move on, first, Lawrence, thank you for your report. Second, any questions for Vivek while we close out the candidate portion of the call?

Okay, I don't see any hands in the queue. All right. I also want to say thank you to Caroline for all her hard work on planning the BC outreach event on June 13. I encourage everyone to make use of the spreadsheet that Caroline is circulating because we do want a very strong showing of BC members in Washington, D.C. And we want to invite as many of the Washington, D.C. business community as we can squeeze into our event space. And as Lawrence mentioned, we will have some folks from ICANN leadership there as well. So it's a good opportunity to show off some of the work that the BC is doing and make our presence felt at ICANN 77.

All right. We are way ahead of time here. I don't have anything else for the agenda except item number five, which is AOB. So is there any additional business to bring forward for the BC? Vivek?

VIVEK GOYAL: Yeah, I just want to say I am in Singapore for the INTA conference. If there are any BC members who are also attending the conference, it would be a great opportunity to meet in person, say hello, and just meet other BC members in INTA if anybody is attending. So thank you.

MASON COLE: Oh, great. Great idea, Vivek. All right. If you find yourself in Singapore, Vivek is ready to say hello to you in person. So wonderful. I hope you have a good trip, Vivek. All right. Any other business for the BC? All right. Yeah, Lawrence, go ahead.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Yes. Just wanted to check, we have a new member that you welcomed very early in the meeting, Hafiz, and just wanted to know if he could briefly introduce himself to the BC and maybe just share a few about something around his expectations.

MASON COLE: Sure. Is Hafiz still on the call? Please go ahead.

HAFIZ FAROOQ: Yes. Hi. I'm Hafiz Farooq, and I am currently working with Saudi Aramco, one of the largest energy producer in the world. And actually, I'm an ICANN fellow, have been attending ICANN 75 and 76. And I am currently a member of RSSAC also. And I actually met Vivek in the last meeting, and he actually introduced me to the BC and showed me some of the scope, which is related to the business. I think is a very promising team. And I'm very excited to join this great team and looking forward for a nice contribution as a team member.

MASON COLE: Wonderful. Thank you, Hafiz. And again, it's good to have you as part of the BC. And I hope that everybody gets a chance to meet you in person very soon. So thank you for joining.

Brenda, I believe we have our next meeting on June 1. Is that correct?

BRENDA BREWER: Yes, that is correct, Mason.

MASON COLE: Okay, so regular time on June 1. And then we won't have another meeting until we're in Washington, DC for ICANN 77. So be on the lookout for details on both a BC meeting and the BC outreach event in Washington, DC in mid-June. All right. Last chance for any other business.

All right. I'm going to donate 25 minutes of your day back. Thank you all very much. And thanks again to the candidates who represented

themselves today. We're looking forward to having you serve in your new capacities. And with that, the BC is adjourned. Thanks, everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]