

---

BRENDA BREWER: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is Brenda speaking. Welcome to the Business Constituency Membership Call on 17th August, 2023 at 1500 UTC. Today's call is recorded. Please state your name before speaking and have your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking. Attendance is taken from Zoom participation. With that, I'll turn the meeting over to BC chair, Mason Cole. Thank you.

MASON COLE: Thank you, Brenda. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. Mason Cole here, chair of the BC. Good to have you on the call. Welcome to the BC call on 17th August. And we have our usual agenda on the screen. We have quite a bit to cover today. And I know several of us have calls at the top of the hour, so we'll need to make a hard stop in one hour's time. Any updates or additions to the agenda as you see on the screen, please? Okay. No hands. All right. Very good. We're going to dive right in. Steve, agenda Item 2. Please go ahead.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Okay, Mason. Are you able to see the policy calendar online?

MASON COLE: Yes, sir.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Great. I sent this around yesterday. There are no new comments filed since we last met. So, I'll dive right into the open public comments. 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.*

---

only have two open ICANN public comments, and then we have one from the UK government on this too. For the open ICANN public comment is on the recommendations that came out of a GNSO guidance process, and that is a procedure developed by the GNSO whereby a group comes together and tries to come up with consensus recommendations. And the topic they were assigned is how will ICANN org support applicants for new gTLDs, if those applicants need legal, technical, and financial support. Lawrence was our rep on the team, and Segun Fume was an observer.

And I would love to lean on those who know it best to help to draft a BC comment. Lawrence has already educated all of you that the chair of this GGP process took it in a very specific direction and took it in the direction of not allowing any support or assistance to go to businesses, even just a small business. So, he was leaning entirely towards nonprofits, and our position in the BC, of course, is that small businesses, particularly from developing markets ought to be entitled to apply and should not be disqualified from applying if they in fact want to create an entire new gTLD as associated with the business community or the customers or even a trade association in a different jurisdiction.

So, I am looking to see whether we can get a volunteer, but I don't want it to default like it always does on the people that do the most work. Lawrence can advise on this, but shouldn't be the guy who has to hold the pen. And it doesn't have to be a very long comment at all. This is not a challenging one, and it's one where we've already done some of the work in the past. Do I have anybody that could potentially volunteer on this? All right. Looking in the chat and, Vivek. Well, that's

---

great kind of you to step up. Appreciate that very much. And David Snead as well. So, Vivek and David, thank you. I will follow-up with an email after today's call setting up exactly the things that we've said about this in the past, and I will copy, Segun Fume and Lawrence so that they'll be available to give us advice. It's due the 11th September, so we'd want to be circulating something note later than about 3rd of September. Thank you very much, David and Vivek.

Next item up is on ICANN open public comment on the ccNSO has come up with a proposed policy for how they're going to review the way they do delegation transfer revocation and retirement of ccTLDs, and that's relevant to the BC. And I want to thank Ching and Margie. Ching gave his regrets for today's call. Margie is on, but we have plenty of time on this, and I've already written them with previous BC comments that we can pick up on. Margie, is there anything you wanted to add to that?

MARGIE MILAM:

No. Hi. It's Margie. I need to work with Ching on that and giving us the additional information regarding past comments.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thank you, Margie. Appreciate that. If anyone else wants to volunteer, you just need to write to me, and I'll connect you with Ching and Margie. The next item up, then with item 3, is that the UK government is currently seeking comments by the end of August, so that's relatively quick. And Margie stepped up to volunteer on that. And Margie and I have gone back and forth with a couple of emails and believe that we can leverage heavily the comments that the BC filed on the . US as

---

opposed to . UK. Right? The comments that Mason helped to draft for . US, which establishes the US position, but also, the comments that we filed with respect to the DNS Abuse contract amendments.

So, I think we can pick and choose from things that we put in, and we don't have to be too sensitive to ICANN's depuration of powers and limitations on ICANN's ability to have jurisdiction over content. We can be a little more aggressive and try to play into what Nigel and the UK government have in mind here. It's not an I can't comment, right? Margie, is there anything else you want to add to that?

MARGIE MILAM:

Yeah. Hi. It's Margie. Just a couple of things. It relates to powers of the UK that to step in extraordinary events. It's sort of a fail-safe if the current ccTLD provider or registrars that are targeting UK consumers, somehow failed to live up to their operations, then the UK government can step in and essentially enforce. So, it's a limited scope from that perspective, but it's a perfect place to talk about the definition of DNS abuse as an example, and in particular, since we don't have the limitations that the ICANN org has in its bylaws. That's where the comments that related to DNS abuse will be helpful to say, look, DNS abuse is more expansive than just the four items that are normally included by the contracted parties in DNS abuse.

So, I've been working with Mason on kind of trying to pull together from different BC comments. Mason, I think we should be able to get something out later today. So, there's plenty of time for the BC members to take a look. Is that right, Mason?

MASON COLE: Yeah. That's why I had my hand raised. Yeah. I was just going to say that the BC should expect that later today.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yeah. Thank you both. I have a question for you. The UK not being part of the EU is probably not watching this too as closely as we do. And I'm wondering, do we make any reference at all to this too in this discussion or just completely pull that out?

MARGIE MILAM: I'm so sorry. Marie's has her hand up.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Marie?

MARIE PATTULLO: Thanks. It's probably to say what you're saying, Margie, anyway. They are watching. Despite the fact they're not involved, they're going to be affected by what happens at European level. I would reference it, on my brief read of what you've drafted, Mason, I think you've done it correctly. You've mentioned it as the fact that the UK is outside the European Union, but it will be affected by. It's not a negative too to mention it because they know it's happening.

---

STEVE DELBIANCO:

It also struck me that the UK draft seems to acknowledge that UK-related domain name could be a domain name that is registered by a UK entity or a domain that is accessed by UK residents. Right? So, they're seeing both sides, both registrants and users, and that's helpful too. Are there any others that want to assist? Well, all of you are going to get a chance to volunteer to edit and review, make comments, and ask questions once Mason and Margie's prepare a draft later on this week. But thanks again, Margie and Mason. Appreciate that.

The only other item I have under the open public comment list is the NIS2, which we follow in general, and we lean heavily on Marie and Andrew for that. We don't have, as far as I know, anything new other than maybe an update on whether the GNSO Council of ICANN should be doing any kind of education or advocacy to the European Union member states or the commission instead of working through the GAC and more officially. So, I put a link to mark data skills email to Council, which included an attachment that Mason had drafted that just objectively compared what was in this too versus what was in ICANN contracts and policies. So, I wonder whether Mark is trying to get into the waiting room. I'll admit Mark. But Mason, Mark, and those on the Ex-comm who just finished the conversation we had, what is our current thinking on whether Council--? What are we going to say to Council about weighing in with EC and EU states?

MASON COLE:

I'll go first as I may see.

---

STEVE DELBIANCO: Please.

MASON COLE: So, the BC has a general concern about two issues. One, the Council being in a lobbying role. That is not the Council's role. The Council's role is to advise the ICANN Board on policy recommendations. It is not to lobby the government. That's why we have the GAC. And we want to be careful that the Council doesn't misrepresent the positions of the broader community. The BC has differences of opinion about the implementation of NIS2 and the transposition of NIS2 by member states.

Our Positions differ from those of the contracted parties. We want to make sure that in any communication from any part of the ICANN sphere, whether that's the GNSO Council or ICANN org itself, is reflective of the fact that constituencies have different positions. And we don't want ours buried in sort of a PR outreach that anybody in the ICANN sphere might make to the European authorities. So, we're carefully approaching this. Marie and Mark probably have much better insight on the deliberations inside the Council, so I'll defer to them. But this is a matter of sensitivity the BC is paying close attention to.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Marie, please.

MARIE PATTULLO: Thank you. There is a small team within Council that has been named the outreach on NIS2 team. There was initially the idea, as Mason just

---

explained, that Council itself would make some kind of communication to various people in the European Union. That appears to have been set upon for the time being. However, ICANN org is going to be putting forward what it calls ICANN org's perspective for 2 reasons. One, to thank them as it were for the references to the multistakeholder model within the directive. And secondly, to outline what they claim is the current accuracy and data access requirements that are set down within ICANN policies and explaining how ICANN policies work and their iterative and so forth.

We have been told that we should see a draft of that communication that ICANN org intends to send in quite short term to certain people within the union. We will hopefully get that. But Council next week would not be having another discussion, it's simply going to be an AOB on what I just said. But we believe that we need to very closely look at what ICANN org intends to say to the union. If anybody wants more details on the procedure, we're happy to do so, but that will take up a lot of time. This is a concern and it is something that we do need to watch. Thank you, Mason. Thank you, Steve. Sorry.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thanks, Marie. Any other comments or questions on NIS2 and what's going on with Council? Thank you. I'm going to move now move to Mark and to Marie to cover Council. You'll see what I pasted in here was the approval of resolutions from the last meeting Council had on the 20th of July. You can ask Marie and Mark any questions on those. And then I put in also from the agenda that Council has for their meeting on the 24th of August. I put in items that I thought were



---

relevant to discussion, but I will now turn to Marie and Mark. Can you tell me how to scroll and I'll help you out? Thank you.

MARIE PATTULLO:

Thanks, Steve. This is Marie. I'll kickoff and then I'll hand over to Mark, as always. As you know, the main part of the concern that we have about accuracy is it keeps being pushed down further and further down the line. Until we have the data processing agreement, it's all academic anyway. We have now actually as Council at last, officially asked Org to tell us what the heck is going on with the EPA. I don't expect a response of any substance, but at least that request has officially been made. If you can scroll down, please. Unless people have concerns to me-- Steve, can you scroll down a bit, please? Thank you.

The next one to me that matters, there's a whole lot of discussion about SubPro. If you want that, Mark and I will come back on that. There has been on Item 5, a very long drawn out and irritating process about the statement of interest. As you know, there is currently statement of interest that all of you, all of us are obliged to have to be involved in ICANN itself, saying who you are and what you do. The idea is now there would be a separate one as well if you are going to be involved in a specific work team, a PDP or whatever it may be. There has been a lot of noise coming from the Contracted Party House with support, I have to say, from the ISPs, that the current status quo should not be maintained.

What I mean by that is currently, there's a question that says, are you participating on behalf of someone else? Yes or no? And that's it. With

this new statement, if it's specifically for that working group, the idea is that specifically for that working group, are you being paid by someone else to be here? Yes or no? If yes, who? If you cannot say who, for a professional reason, attorney-client privilege, that kind of thing. Can you at least give a high-level description of who this person is? They are a government that participates in the GAC, for example.

Now we had come to, within the working group in Council, pretty much an agreement on waffly language pointing out that this has never actually been a problem. The suspicion is that certain large players are populating the working groups with vast amounts of paid consultants or attorneys just to be there in their behalf. Of which there is no proof. It's also an on a system. So, if you check the no button, no one's going to check. What are you actually trying to achieve by this? Oh, transparency. But look at the facts, it's never happened. Oh, but it might.

Anyway, we got to the point where we thought we were okay until two weeks ago, yesterday in a meeting which I couldn't attend, where everybody who had prior more or less said it might be okay, decided that, no, this was bad and evil and transparency. So, what we have now is a big discussion to happen next Thursday. Because there was no agreement in that group, all that happens is we stay with exactly what we've got right now, until such time as they decide what they want to do about this so-called transparency mechanism. It's a lot of work, I'm sorry for that, but it is important. If you want me to forward on the reports and more details or answer any questions, let me know.

---

---

Before I shut up, I'll go to the closed generics where I'll be shorter. Again, as you know at the moment, anybody who applies for a closed generic, by that, I mean, let's say, for example, dot bottle. But they're actually a commercial company that makes bottles. That is this a concern for competition on the market? The last round, the 2012 round, although there's no actual policy reckon, the Board basically came up with a temporary policy that, no, they would not be allowed because it was too complicated until such time as we had a policy.

Now we've had two major efforts trying to get to agreement, no agreement. This SubPro working group, as you know that's the PDP for the next round, which is going to kick off in a couple of years, they said, "Can't come to any agreement. The Board should decide. " The recommendations and SubPro went to the Board. The Board listened to the GAC. The GAC really doesn't like closed generics. And a new thing called a facilitated dialogue was set up. It included the GAC. It included ALAC. It included the GNSO. They couldn't agree either. So, this draft framework has now come back to Council and the intention in the discussion we're going to have next week is we tell the Board we cannot come to consensus. Look at what SubPro said. It should be a Board decision. Now that's what the so-called facilitated dialogue team have put forward.

However, there is currently a big bump fight, a big discussion, I'm sorry going on on the Council list with an essence, the contracted party is saying, this isn't right for reason, reason, reason, reason, reason. Other people coming in with procedural, question marks. So, there is going to be a big discussion but what does seem to be agreed between all parties is that this should not be a reason for delaying the new round. So, this

---

---

part should be hived off, and how we deal with it or how we don't deal with it, it should not be a dependency for the new round. I will stop talking and hand over to Mark, but, of course, I'm here for any questions. Thanks, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thanks, Marie. Marie, one quick question for you. The advocates of the next round. We don't want to see anything delay it. If they suggested that this not hold it up, what would be the process if a corporation applied for dot bottles, and they were a company that made bottles and was not going to run it in an open fashion? What would happen if we didn't develop a policy and somebody applied for a closed generic?

MARIE PATTULLO:

That's exactly the procedural points that the likes of Adden have been raising. If you remember, Steve, in the last round, there were applicants who did apply and they basically got put on hold. Now under the last round in the applicant guide book, so they're all booked for what you have to do. And can somebody please allow Mark unmute because Mark can't unmute? Thank you, Brenda, if you look at the chat. Thank you. There was a policy, sorry, that there was specification in the AGB last time around that you could then withdraw your application. At the moment, there is no such wording, of course, because they didn't know whether or not there would be a policy. So, this is one of the problematic-- Yes, the applicant guide book. This is one of the problematic issues.

---

In essence, what would probably happen is you would apply for a closed generic. It would get put into a pot and sit there collecting dust. And one of the concerns about that is that that applicant, if they did not know in advance, this is what's going to happen, could complain to ICANN org under the specific procedures, in particular the freezing of expression. I forget what it's called. Steve, help me out here. The request for reconsideration? Is that correct?

STEVE DELBIANCO:

That's right. And there were a couple of BC members that applied for several, Amazon and Google applied for several gTLDs in the last round, the 2012 round. When all the dust settled, neither decided to run any of their gTLDs as closed, even those for which they were a competitor in the space. So, things became phony about it in the 2012 round, and a lot of companies just said, okay, I'm not going to deal with the hassle. I'll still run it as open. But please keep in mind, everyone, that if a bottle maker wanted the dot bottle gTLD, and they said they're running it open. If the operator still is allowed to set up dozens of second-level domain names that are reserved. So, they can reserve second-level domain names like info dot bottles, best dot bottles, eco dot bottles, plastic dot bottles, review dot bottles. They can set up a lot of the gTLD second-level domain names where the content might well be favoring that particular competitor or the content could be, in some sense, deceptive to consumers.

So, remember that the BC's concerns about fair and undeceptive practices, fair competition, those concerns are still going to be there even if a single competitor runs a generic gTLD in the open fashion.

Because as open, they still get to run as many second-level domains as they'll ever need to accomplish the purposes. So, with that in mind, we have a BC comment that we filed on this. It's pretty extensive. So, Marie, if there's a chance, perhaps you and Mark could review what the BC filed on that, on closed generic. It's on 15th of July, and there's a link to it right here on screen, you can see it in the policy calendar. So, if you wish to grab that comment, and, Marie, you're one of the ones who helped to draft it. So, use that for the purpose of Council discussion next week. Okay? Mark, are you able to speak now?

MARK DATYSGELD:

Yeah. Real quick on that one. So, the discussion, the framework was supposed to clarify questions around closed generics. It looks like it did the opposite, right? Just from talking with different people in the community, it doesn't seem like any player in particular is clear on what this means, which, therefore, means that it did not succeed in its mission. So, the discussion on going in the Council list right now is whether this is an issue that should block the advancement of the new rounds. And Greg is trying to marshal the counselors towards consensus that it's not, which for all purposes, is sensible. It's not like we should stop the entire process just because this is not happening because at most, what will happen is no closed generics. That's the most that will happen.

So, at the end of the day, I have been leaning towards observing the position in the interest of the BC members who do want to apply for a new round and would not like this to take, potentially, forever. So, it's looking like we're going to revisit this very soon, whether it is to attempt

---

---

a new framework or whether it is to actually move this in some other direction. So yeah. Keep your eyes peeled, and we will update you as soon as we know what's going on, which we do not right now. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thank you, Mark. And, Marie, in response to your question, as your policy vice chair, I would recommend yes that you comment only on list in this regard. Take a look at the BC comment, and as Mark described, we worked on it together. And the BC said that the process, the framework that they came up with was effectively a barrier to anybody applying because it was so insanely complicated. So, we were not at all impressed with the work that was done. And all you have to do is to resurface the three-sentence BC principle that we have on a single competitive running a gTLD in a way that is deceptive to consumers or exclusionary of competitors. So, we just keep reiterating the BC's position.

And we are clear that sometimes it's local consumer protection or antitrust authorities in any jurisdiction where people are affected. They can weigh in if ICANN doesn't have a policy. So, we have never claimed that ICANN has to do all of this before an application proceeds. We've just wanted to be the ones who were attentive to consumer deception and competitor exclusion. So, by reiterating that principle, I think we rise above some of the crap that's going on. And we do open the door that say that if an applicant wants to run a closed generic, they need to know that we're all going to be watching, and we'll turn it over to a

---

relevant competition authority the minute we see any activity that is exclusionary or deceptive.

Because, again, if you run an open generic, but you reserve all the second-level domain names that can still deceive consumers, we won't have solved anything by excluding closed generics. So, we would rise above it all and show that the BC's concerns could be addressed by competition and consumer protection authorities. It would be my recommendation. Any other comments on this? Great. Thank you.

On Council, there are several other items that are covered. And here, I wanted to ask Arinola, Zach gave his regrets today, but is there anything new, Arinola, or on transfer policy? I can't hear you, Arinola. All right. We'll skip past that. We already covered the GGP because that's about the applicant support that we'd covered earlier. The DNS abuse small team that we filed comments. There's nothing happening there until staff comes back with the report. I handle number 4, and our next call on that is next week. I'll inform you afterwards.

But the RDRS or SSAD satellite is shaping up to be very challenging to be able to prove that there are a lot of legitimate requests for disclosure that are being ignored. ICANN org, with the encouragement from the contract parties, is not even going to allow us to keep track of the nature or the type of request that went in for registrar who decided they weren't even going to participate. So, we do not think this is going to work well, but we're going to give it a good shot to participate, to compile the data and statistics that show that we have legitimate requests, and they often do not result in a disclosure. Happy to take any questions on that one.



---

Okay. And that covers off, I think, the statement of interest. I'd like to turn it over to Tim as our CSG liaison. Tim?

TIM SMITH: Thanks, Steve. Can you hear me?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Perfectly.

TIM SMITH: Okay. Perfect. So, yeah. Board seat 14, I guess, is the top thing. It's perhaps the agenda item that never goes away. But there's always an update, and the update, I think we mentioned on our last call that CSG was in the process of interviewing Ehab Osman and Kayla Gobeya, which we did. And so, we advised our facilitator Paul McGrady that we have interviewed two people. I believe we haven't given the names. So, while we've told this group that we've interviewed two people, I don't believe that has been shared with Paul at this point, nor has it been shared with NCSG.

The next part of the process is that NCSG is coming forward with two candidates of their own. So, we're in the process of evaluating that, and have not interviewed those candidates at this point. But I know that Mason has had some solutions with Paul, who is reaching out to NCSG, and I guess we'll be able to, by the time of our meeting, advise where we're headed and what's going on. Not too much else to report on that, but I'm sure-- When's our next meeting? I'm not sure whether it's

---

August 31st or September 7th, but we'll have an update for you at that time.

So, the only other thing to report on at this time is that we mentioned that we were trying to organize an intercessional, I guess we could call it, between CSG and NCSG, somehow to coincide with ICANN78. So, that has now been confirmed. So, that's great news. And it will take place on Friday, October 20th. We expect it to be an all-day event. We don't yet have an agenda. However, two notable things we're going to try to accomplish is finding areas of common ground that the two parties can agree on, and also to move forward and see how we can become more cohesive as a house.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Tim, on that, could you clarify how many participants from each constituency and what nature they would be? Because it's not an open to all people.

TIM SMITH:

No. That's exactly right. So, the agreement is that the chair of each of the CSG groups and the NCSE groups would attend, and then we would also invite counselors. And I guess if there's a vice chair for any of the groups, they would also be invited to attend. I act as CSG liaison for the BC to the CSG and so I'll be part of that. So, from us, it'll be four people, Mason, Tim, Mark, and Lawrence, and we're guessing and I don't know the exact numbers, Steve, but we will expect the same representation from the other houses of CSG, and from NCSG. That's about all I can say

---

on that, I think, really? Mason, any more information you can add to that?

MASON COLE:

I think you've covered it, Tim. The whole point of the intersectional is still is for the CSG and the NCSG, as you pointed out, to find some common ground, learn how to get along and advance some common priorities together. We used to do this, CSG and then NCSG, before the pandemic, and it's been something like five years since we had one now, so we're well overdue on this. And I'm cautiously optimistic we'll have some good results from it, but we'll know more after October 20th.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Any questions for Tim on the CSG report? All right. Seeing none, I'll turn it back over to you, Mason.

MASON COLE:

Thank you, Steve. Appreciate the update as always. Any questions for Steve, anyone? All right. Okay. We have about 22 minutes left to go, and we do have one item under AOB, so we need to reserve a bit of time for that. But, Lawrence, over to you for agenda Item 3, please. Take the floor.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Thank you, Chair. Good day to everyone on today's call. I want to start with reiterating the announcement we made with regards contributions

---

and articles for the next BC newsletter. We had extended earlier deadline, and we're still awaiting articles from members. I want to ask, I want to encourage us, especially members that also do some professionalizing on other platforms if you have something on cycle ID or some of the articles plays in line with the BCs for premiums and views, and for which you think would make an interesting read, kindly forward same to me. Please, if you also have any picture taken at the last ICANN meeting that you think will make a good addition to the business newsletter, please also forward same to me.

With that, for FY24, CROP for FY24 is open for use. I, as the vice chair will forward the outreach strategy after they've been reviewed by Ex-comm our general approval. But CROP is a facility by ICANN where members can use, which provides return travel tickets and accommodation for, I think, three or four nights. We started to IG-related meetings or we can use this to particularly attend, members can use this to particularly attend a public meeting happening in their region. So, for instance, for the next ICANN public meeting happening in Hamburg, which happen to be in European region, members can use CROP to attend ICANN78, and we call it outreach for the BC on the sidelines of that meeting.

BRENDA BREWER: Lawrence, with apologies, we're unable to hear you.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Can you hear me now?

BRENDA BREWER: Yes. But your audio is going in and out. May I suggest that you turn off your video? It helps the audio be more clear. Lawrence, there you go. Thank you.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Great. Thank you, Brenda. Yes. So, for members in North America, which happens to be the meeting happening in San Juan, members of North America can use that, can use [audio glitch 00:39:00] For Africa, particularly around Kigali, can use CROP for the ICANN78 meetings to attend the public meeting happening in Rwanda. Already, we've had one member indicate interest. But anyone who is interested in using any of these CROP slots, should kindly reach out to me by email or send an email to the Ex-comm list indicating such interests so that this is adequately captured.

Like I say, for one of the prerequisites is your ability to conduct outreach on the sidelines of such events. There are deadlines and you have to indicate interest some weeks before the plan travel. And we want to encourage members to indicate their interest earlier than that just in case we have to make a decision between which member can use the CROP slot for that particular meeting. I'm sure every BC member by now would have received an invoice for FY24. And many times, for those of us who have honored certain invoices and paid our dues. By Monday, the coming week, we intend to remove from the BC membership list, which can be found on [icannbc.org](http://icannbc.org), the BC's websites,

---

member companies who haven't paid their dues for FY24 and for anyone who has had any outstanding invoice open.

So, from Monday, I would want to encourage members to please visit [icannbc.org](http://icannbc.org), which is the BC website, and look on the BC membership list to see if their names are still retained on the website. Where you find your name there, please, do not-- where you find your name there, you have no reason to worry. But if you have honored all your dues including the FY24 due, and your name is not there, then that will be a very good opportunity to reach out to myself or the invoice's secretariat so that we can correct any error that we make. So, we encourage members to also pay their bills as we have elections forthcoming, and only members who are financially up to date can vote or can nominate officers and also can be voted for.

The next BC officer's election is scheduled for October, this year. And as you are aware, I as a vice chair of finance and operations will be rolling out of that office as I take up the GNSO Council role. So, to this effect, I again want to encourage-- In the past, I have asked that those interested, or whom I'd be interested in serving in this particular role, it will be good for you to on the study and try to understand what the role entails and be sure that you have all the requisite understanding for the role. Only one person has reached out, and I would want to encourage that if there are others who might be interested in standing for election to reach out so that they could have time to understand what the requirement for the role is.

That will be all for me for now. And if there are any questions, I would like to take them. I also want to add that we have a new member who

---

will be joining the BC by the next meeting as all the necessary approvals for the new member to join the BC has been executed by the credentials committee. We're just waiting for this member to make the payments and be officially onboarded. To this course, I want to enjoin members to please, continue to reach out to companies in your spare of influence that are fit for a BC membership and encourage them to join the BC. It's easy to do this by visiting join us tab on the BC website and having the form filled. Thank you. I'll revert back to the chair if there are no questions for me.

MASON COLE:

Thank you, Lawrence. Questions please for Lawrence? Okay. I don't see any hands. I just want to underline one point that Lawrence made, and that is that BC officer elections are coming up and we have a particular role to fill in Lawrence's current role as vice chair of finance. And I just want to encourage members to consider taking on this role. Lawrence has left that or will leave that role in a very strong position, both financially and in terms of organization. So, he's done an outstanding job with that vice chair's position, and whoever enters that role on behalf of the BC is doing so in the best possible position because Lawrence has organized everything extremely well. So, if you are interested in that particular role, I encourage you to consider it. And I also encourage you to contact Lawrence for more information about how to carry it out because he'll be glad to help.

All right. Let's move to AOB. Caroline, please. You have AOB item?

---

CAROLINE LUPETINI:

I do. Yeah. I actually have some news to share with the entire body. This will actually be my last meeting with the BC. I am leaving NetChoice at the end of August. My last day at NetChoice will be August 30th. I've been with NetChoice since the beginning of May of last year. I've done four ICANN in that time, one virtual IGF as well. And it's been such a privilege, it's such a pleasure, and a real honor to work with you all to learn from you all could travel to such fabulous places, and to be a colleague of yours.

I have been in the process of joining the US Department of State for some time and I finally got the call to join up as a foreign service officer earlier this month. I got my final offer late last week. And so, I'm moving on to something really exciting, something still in the international sphere. But it means that I will not be working with you all anymore. So, I want to thank you all again for the work that you do for the ability to learn from you all. It's been wonderful. So, thank you all.

MASON COLE:

Well, Caroline, first of all, congratulations on behalf of everybody in the BC. And second, if we had known that was your news, I would not have recognized you for an AOB issue.

CAROLINE LUPETINI:

It's okay. No. It's good. Thanks. Thank you. Thank you all so much.



---

MASON COLE: Well, congratulations. It's been a pleasure having you as part of the BC. You've really added a lot of value and we're going to miss having you around very much. So, congratulations again.

CAROLINE LUPETINI: Thank you all.

MASON COLE: All right. Well, on that good note from Caroline but a sad from BC, is there any other business for the BC this morning? All right. 10 minutes back to your day. Our next meeting is September 7 at our normal time. And I hope everybody continues to enjoy their summer. We have the ICANN meeting in Hamburg approaching fairly soon, so we look forward to seeing everybody there. But our next meeting will be in early September, and we will speak then. So, with that, thanks, everybody, and thanks to Brenda for the support. BC is adjourned.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**