BRENDA BREWER:	Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the BC Membership call on 19 May 2022, at 15:00 UTC.

Today's call is recorded. Kindly state your name before speaking for the record, and have your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking. Attendance is taken from Zoom participation. I will turn the meeting over to your chair, Mason Cole. Thank you.

MASON COLE:	Thank you, Brenda. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everybody. Mason Cole here, chair of the BC. Good to have you on the call. It looks like we're getting to turn out for today's meeting, which is good. We're now on 19th of May and we have an aggressive agenda today and only an hour to get through it, so we're going to dive right in. Before we do, are there any updates or changes to the agenda as requested? Okay. I see no hands.

All right, we have a guest on the call today. Actually, we have two guests on the call today, Graeme Bunton, who heads up the DNS Abuse Institute, is our guest along with his new colleague, who he'll introduce shortly. Graeme is going to give us a presentation on a product called NetBeacon they're launching shortly. Graeme, I believe we allocated 25 minutes, so 15 for your presentation and another 10 for Q&A. And then we'll move on with the rest of our agenda. So let me turn the floor over to you, Graeme. Go ahead.

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.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thanks, Mason. I really appreciate the invite from the BC today. It's always fun to see this group of people. I've got some slides, and I'll share them. I'll try and move through this relatively quickly so that we can get to the Q&A. So I might gloss over a couple of these bits and pieces, but I'm pretty available if people have questions. And also in the room is Rowena, who's just joined the DNS Abuse Institute and is busily getting up to speed. We'll both be in The Hague, if members here will be as well, please reach out and say hello. Let me share my slides. There we go. Let's make that full screen. Wrong button. There we go.

Let me actually go back to the beginning of presentation. There we go. Hopefully, a bunch of you have heard me talk about this before. It's sort of a thing that we've been hyping for a while. Out of a number of different outputs within ICANN community, there is a clear need for some sort of function to centralize abuse reporting. So we've been working on this for a while, we were previously calling it the Centralized Abuse Reporting Tool. But it turns out all sorts of forms of CART and cart.org are all taken and branding is very difficult, so we've renamed it NetBeacon and it's coming up very shortly. So I'm going to sort of run through some of the core functionality here and hopefully leave some room for some questions. Yeah, so let me get going.

Briefly—I suspect many of you all know this already—I am the executive director of the DNS Abuse Institute. The DNS Abuse Institute was created by PIR last year, PIR being the organization that runs .org. PIR is a not-for-profit, and as part of their public interest mission, have a responsibility to try and make the Internet better and really beginning to tackle DNS abuse issues felt like a thing that they could devote some resources to. And they, like me in my previous role, saw that there was

a lot of complexity in DNS abuse, that it's a global problem, that no one was going to solve individually, that even ICANN itself wasn't well positioned to solve given its particular remit. And so that's something like the institute could exist and do some really good work in the space. I think of the institute, broadly speaking, like a mechanism to find the friction and complexity within the DNS ecosystem that impedes mitigating abuse, and to pull that complexity and friction into the institute, sort of freeing the players in the ecosystem to do more on the topic. This initiative, this NetBeacon, is really a key piece of that puzzle, I think.

So there's two real problems that we're trying to solve here. One is that abuse reporting is really hard. I'm sure many of you have felt this before. To report DNS abuse across the ecosystem, you need some form of technical knowledge, like you need to be able to identify who a registrar is, need to be able to find that registrars abuse reporting page, which isn't necessarily easy. There's no standards for evidence across the ecosystem. There's no consistent implementation of methods across the ecosystem. By and large, it's difficult to do even for one-off and very difficult to do when you're trying to do it at scale.

On the other side, for registries and registrars, the reports of abuse that they get are brutal. They're duplicative, they're unevidenced, they're often not their domains or infrastructure, they're unactionable. And so they're spending huge amounts of time and energy, just triaging garbage, spending lots of man hours for very little benefit for making the Internet safer. It really seemed to me, the institute, I guess, like something in the middle of this, an intermediary that makes it easy to report abuse, and then gets it to where it needs to go in a fashion that's

usable, would be really necessary, and hopefully, very helpful. So this is really what we've built.

We've been working on this from sort of draft requirements to a functioning tool. In probably about eight months, we've been able to do that by partnering with vendors, clean DNS, who many will know from the ecosystem, components of this already existed. And I will admit, it's not exactly rocket science what we're doing here, but it is really about pulling a bunch of different pieces together and making it available in a way to sort of serve the greater good.

So netbeacon.org, it currently redirects because we haven't finished launching the website yet. That will begin to go up next week. It's a single place to report DNS abuse across the entire starting with gTLD ecosystem. So in a relatively truncated way, it accepts reports of abuse, standardized, easy to use forms. It turns those abuse reports into a particular abuse reporting format that enables us to make things human readable or machine readable, if we like. It enriches those reports by taking the URLs submitted and checking them against a variety of online sources for domain intelligence. You could think of those as things like Spamhaus or SURBL blocklists, things like hybrid analysis from CrowdStrike. Basically anywhere we can find out if a domain is engaged in abuse. So we're appending those to the reports. And then we're automatically distributing those to registrars, primarily with notifications to registries.

This is a screenshot of what the actual service looks like. This is from my admin account. So you sort of see everything, but you get the gist here, which is it's pretty easy to use step through forms that you can

complete, that explain the information that's required, and have useful tooltips to help people get the information that an abuse report requires.

There is a little bit of friction that we've introduced into this process. One is you need to have a working e-mail address. You need to verify an e-mail address to submit through it. That's to prevent abuse of the platform itself and it's to ensure that we can enable further communication between the report recipient and the abuse reporter in case more back and forth is required to clarify what the harm is. And there are some evidentiary requirements, we don't let you complete an abuse report unless you have just the key pieces that someone would need to take action or be able to lead them to be able to take action. That's really about ensuring that we're not wasting anybody's time and so that we can stop you ahead of time. So you just can't submit this because no one can do anything with it.

So we've got different forms for the different types of harms. Right now, core DNS abuse, malware, botnets, pharming, phishing, and spam. I actually take that back. We don't have one for pharming because pharming is pretty difficult to do anything about at the DNS layer. These forms will be available first week in June to everybody. So anyone will be able to use them.

This is an example and I'm not sure everybody's going to care about this. But this is the format that the abuse reports get turned into. It's something called EXARF, Extended Abuse Reporting Format. It means that registries and registrars, if they want to get abuse reports in this format, can do so, and then they can build automation on top of it. So it

could be that they're getting an abuse report and they can see that the enrichments on this abuse report say, "Oh look, Spamhaus, SURBL, abuse.ch, and phishlabs have all said that this domain is phishing." Well, that for them might be trustworthy enough and they're just going to automate the process to take that domain down, something like that, should they so wish.

This is a bit inside the registrar control panel. It allows them to specify which e-mail addresses particular types of abuse might go to. They're also able to get an API key to consume these abuse reports automatically so that they don't have to use e-mail if they don't want to. And you can see on the bottom left there, there's an enrichment pipeline. These are the bits of information we're appending to abuse reports. So we're enabling registries and registrars to select which enrichments they find useful. So it's not really up for us to determine for them what's evidence, but give them the opportunity to do that themselves. So we'll be looking to add as many of these different enrichment sources as we can.

On the right hand side, you can see that there is a EXARF, which is this JSON format I just showed you, or you can choose to get it in a more human readable format, if you'd like. We do allow digesting only up to 24 hours. Because what we're really trying to do is encourage people to be faster and more responsive on abuse. But particular harms like spam, for example, the volume is such that batching sometimes makes more sense.

There's a couple of other features. One is there's an API for submission so that people can submit into this platform programmatically at scale.

TBD, exactly who we will enable that functionality for. This tool only succeeds if it provides more value to registries and registrars than what they're getting through manual systems now and flooding them with low quality reports would be really problematic for its success. So we'll open that up carefully and slowly over time. But my hope is that we can build an ecosystem of people who are able to report abuse into it at scale. There's an API for consumption so that registries and registrars can just get their feeds where they need them, where they want them in their ticketing systems, for example.

It was very clear to me having surveyed the ecosystem that most people's abuse reporting processes were, frankly, terrible with the exception of few of the larger registrars. So to solve that problem, we've made these easy-to-use forms embeddable so that registries and registrars will be able to take what we've built and essentially white label it, putting it inside their abuse reporting websites so that they can get their abuse reports formatted nicely, enrich nicely back into where they want them without having to do the development work of fixing up their own abuse reporting websites.

Then there's some interesting stuff we're working on now around report relationships. This is where many registries and registrars have relationships with people reporting abuse to them already, and we want them to be able to reflect that. So we have a flag to enable registrars to recognize bilateral relationships where they've had an agreement with someone. And that really is just prepending some information to the e-mails or tickets that are being generated by the platform into their system, just to help them triage them better or to build automation on top. And as well as the labeling functionality so that if you've got regular

reporters that you trust, that you don't trust, that are law enforcement, have some attribute that will help you triage your tickets for repeated abuse reporters, you can label them as such. All that is working and ready, which is pretty exciting. It's not necessarily all the prettiest at the moment. We're still working out some rough edges, but it does what it says on the bottom box.

A couple of notes on what this tool does not do. It is not an abuse management tool. So it's not a place for registries and registrars to go in and deal with their abuse. It's really about getting that abuse through the system to where they do that already. Typically, e-mail for many of the smaller ones. Many of the bigger ones are using ticketing systems, and some of the even bigger ones are using commercial anti-abuse solutions like those provided by clean DNS, iQ Global. Mambo from Knipp I think is the other one I've seen in the industry. So we're not trying to help you manage your abuse, we're trying to get it to you in an efficient fashion.

We also can't make choices for registries and registrars. They still need to own the choices that they're making. What we're really trying to do is make those choices as easy as possible. By enriching these abuse reports, we've moved, hopefully, some of this investigatory burden from the desk of their compliance person into the tool itself. And what they get is a complete, easy-to-read standardized abuse report that they can act on right away or choose not to, but they need to make that choice.

Then we're not trying to build here a repository of all abuse, I think that creates risks for the institute, as well as for the people we want to be

dealing with abuse. So our data retention policy is going to be something on the order of 30 days. We will keep aggregate statistics but not the underlying details of each individual abuse report.

I have a whole separate project I'd be happy to talk about in another time about how to measure DNS abuse across the entire ecosystem. But this tool is successful and people are incentivized to use it both to submit abuse and to get abuse. And using it as a cudgel, I think, undermines that. So we're really not using this as a tool that way.

Timeline, briefly, public launch in the first week of June, not June 1, were working on our registrar and registry signups right now. Out of the box, it should work with all gTLDs, registrars and registries.

[2com] versions 2, 3, 4 over time is going to be integrating hosting CDN's e-mail service providers. That's because abuse crosses just the DNS and often the ecosystem requires multiple parties to act. ccTLDs as well, they are complicated and different, as they will happily tell you. And so we'll get them on board and integrated as well. One of the really interesting things that this tool will be able to do, ultimately, is take the type of abuse, determine who the appropriate actor is. So maybe it's hosting. It doesn't belong at the registrar/registry, submit that abuse to the host, we can then say, "Hey look, we sent it with this evidence two weeks ago and nothing happened," now we can escalate it deeper into the Internet stack with a neutral third party able to show you that that was the case. So when a registrar gets an abuse report that more rightly belongs to the host, they can now say, "Oh look, I know that host has refused to act. Maybe I will take that responsibility on now." That

functionality doesn't exist anywhere else right now, and I'm really excited about that potential future.

There's my e-mail address if you're looking for more information. I'm going to stop there and I can put that e-mail address in the chat, because my hunch is there are questions and I haven't been looking at the chat. But I'm here to answer them and I will also be in The Hague to answer questions there, too.

MASON COLE: Okay, Graeme. Thanks very much.

GRAEME BUNTON: That was very fast. I apologize for moving through it. There's a lot I want to share.

MASON COLE: No, no, no. That was well done. So thank you very much. There are a couple of questions in the chat that we'll open. Now I'll take a queue. So if you take a look at the chat, Steve is asking how would he report a DDoS attack via [inaudible] hosting? Would that be considered malware? Can you address that?

GRAEME BUNTON: I haven't thought about that particular use case. DDoS attack using … I'd have to think about it. I don't have an immediate answer. It doesn't fit cleanly into any one of the categories that I've got going right now.

Then I see one from Vivek about tracking whether the reporting was successful. Well, successful is really in the eye of the beholder. It could still be that the registrar got it, they looked at the abuse report, decided that it was a compromised website, the host should do something about it, but it was never going to be appropriate for them to act on at a registrar level. That still might be considered success. I think it's hard to come at it that way.

What I will say we're looking at doing is because we want to see if this tool is helping at all, we are investigating ways to see what the abused time to live is for abuse that's gone through this tool. But measuring success—and this was the project that I was talking about—sort of better in a regime where we're measuring all abuse rather than just a subset that's going through this tool. So that's where we've actually signed a contract with Maciej Korczynski from the University of Grenoble to build us our own DNS abuse intelligence platform. We'll be producing reports on that likely starting in July, August.

MASON COLE: Okay, very good. Thanks for that question, Vivek, and thanks, Graeme. Any other questions for Graeme or Rowena while we have them on the line with us? We can open a queue.

GRAEME BUNTON: Don't be shy.

MASON COLE: Tim Smith?

TIM SMITH: Hi. Thanks, Graeme and Rowena. This is this is great. This is exciting stuff. Now, you mentioned about having registrars place this in a white label fashion on their own abuse reporting websites. I'm just wondering whether what kind of uptake you're getting on that or whether you started working on that already.

GRAEME BUNTON: Really just beginning to scratch the surface of that, and so no one has formally put it in yet. My hunch is we'll get some but not everyone. The big guys already have their own forms that are probably customized. Having said that, I've talked to a number of registrars who were like, "We can't get our forms fixed, we don't have the dev resources, they're a real problem." Boy, we would love to get something like this so we can just get these abuse reports in EXARF. So I'm gently optimistic that we'll see a fair amount of that.

MASON COLE: Okay. Thanks for the question, Tim. Anyone else for Graeme and Rowena? As Graeme says, don't be shy.

GRAEME BUNTON: This is a fun crowd. There we go. Hey, Mark.

MASON COLE: Mark, go ahead.

MARK DATYSGELD: Hey, Graeme. Great to have you present this. As you know, I have been following closely the developments in the DNSAI project. I wonder how do you see these different projects being integrated with the entire community, as in how well will we be able to follow the development of this process as it unfolds and as it evolves? Do you predict having maybe some regular sessions on this? Do you predict maybe handing the ball over to the contracted parties? How do you foresee that we'll be able to see how this unfolds and maybe catch some insights into what is going on?

GRAEME BUNTON: Thanks, Mark. I will admit that I'm having a tough time looking beyond my June launch date because there's so much between me and getting it out the door and ready. Of course, we will keep the community updated and informed. I would love to see it, essentially. I'm admittedly a moderately ambitious person, and so I have some pretty big dreams for this thing, sort of neutral abuse reporting across many types of abuse facilitator for the entire Internet and a de facto standard for the ICANN community registries and registrars. What the path is from here to there in terms of both technology and policy, I think there's some things to discuss, but I don't have anything like concrete that I could share.

MARK DATYSGELD: Thank you. I just wanted to get some general idea of where at least the intentions lay. Things go all kinds of different ways but that seems like the right conception.

GRAEME BUNTON: I see Marie in the chat asked if there's a cost for users. There's neither a cost for users nor for registries and registrars. This is to fulfill our mandate to make the Internet better and it is entirely free with no plans to ever charge.

MASON COLE: Okay. Thanks for that question too, Marie. Graeme, there's another question in the chat just above Marie about stats related to the types of abuse per registrar that you receive. Would that be made available on regular intervals?

GRAEME BUNTON: I'm unsure exactly how I'm going to do that. So we will obviously have stats on how much abuse is going through this particular tool. I think it behooves us to share some of that to share whether it's successful or not, whether it's getting the uptake we hope it gets. But again, I think there's a tension between using this tool as a stick on registrars and registries, and getting their adoption. I really want to get them adopted and integrated and using it because it makes reporting abuse so much better for everybody. Just as an aside, for most registrars, they have to contractually publish an abuse@ e-mail address and I can just use that, whether they like it or not.

I think for the reporting on abuse across the ecosystem, how much abuse is at registries and registrars? This other project I'm working at is going to be way more robust and scientific, and that will be monthly intervals and public.

MASON COLE: Okay. Thanks, Graeme. A quick question from Margie, and then we'll go to Steve. Margie wants to know how many registrars and registries have indicated they'd like to use your system.

GRAEME BUNTON: So we've talked with lots and there's been lots of interest. As I was just saying, to integrate with the platform is to create an account and set your endpoints, which is where do you want these abuse reports to go, you don't really have to do anything more than that. At the end of the day, we can just send abuse reports to abuse@ e-mail addresses, and they have to take them. There's a bunch of work to be done to find all the ones who are bouncing back and redirecting people to a form. And we're working on that identifying those people to build those relationships so that they're getting these where they want them. I haven't heard anybody say no yet. So yes to Margie's question. We'll send to all, theoretically. My sense is that because of the value add-on that enrichment and the standardization, people want this. They need this. And so I'm getting pretty strong interest from registries and registrars that this is helping problems that they've got.

MASON COLE:	Okay. Thanks, Graeme, and thanks for the question, Margie. Steve, go ahead, please.

STEVE DELBIANCO:	Hey, Graeme. In response to Vivek's question about reporting, I would ask you to be perhaps creative about how you would report things. For instance, to avoid being a stick, you could do reports that didn't identify the registry or registrar, but rather the date and the nature of the reported abuse. In other words, its de-identified so that it wouldn't be used as a stick against a particular party. And those could be published unless and until you discover that there was an appropriate environment in which more detail could be published to the broader community. Because I think to fulfill the mission you put together for the Abuse Institute, we have to eventually say that there'd be transparency about reporting and transparency on the trends. And, Graeme, you know we say this at every ICANN meeting, if we could only go after the three bad actors that are making everything a problem, the rest of the good actors wouldn't have an issue, right? So we've never really had an opportunity to know who the bad actors are if we eventually can't get at the data. What are your thoughts on maybe doing a de-identified reporting early on? Thanks.

GRAEME BUNTON:	Thanks. I'm going to repeat myself a little bit. This other project I'm working on to measure DNS abuse, malware and phishing specifically, is going to be across the entire ecosystem, ccTLD, gTLD, registry, registrar. My goal is to never have that conversation about bad actors again

because we'll have an academic reliable, robust, transparent source for abuse reporting, and it is just a separate project from this particular one for that sort of stick reason. But I think that work is going to be very interesting. It sounds like I need to come back and demo that when we have it ready. I suspect that is going to be—oh no, it's 5:30. I've got to go inside. Sorry, everyone, bear with me. The bells in Florence get really loud. Boy, what a hilarious break in the middle.

So that reporting, I think is really going to serve the function that you want it to, Steve, that it's going to sort of take the cover off and really show us where abuse is specifically within the ecosystem. But I will say in the spec that we generated for that. It really highlights the opportunities where people are doing better as well so that we can celebrate as much as we're pointing a stick at. And that's going to be things like people were really responsive on speed so they're really quick. People are mitigating huge volumes of abuse and we want to make sure that we're able to do that. That project is also very exciting.

MASON COLE: Okay. Thanks very much. Other questions for Graeme? All right, Graeme, maybe the bells of Florence are signaling that you can get back to your vacation.

GRAEME BUNTON: I wish it were a vacation. I'm working every day. Feel free to reach out to me. I'll just dump my e-mail address in the chat. Thank you very much, Mason, for having me. I'll drop off as soon as I've done this. I appreciate the time.

MASON COLE: Thank you, Graeme, and thank you, Rowena, for joining the call today. We appreciate the presentation. It looks like a positive development in the world of DNS abuse. Thanks for taking time for us. I appreciate it very much. All right. Take care, guys. Thanks very much.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you.

MASON COLE: All right, folks, we're at 32 past the hour and we've got a few more policy or a few more agenda items to get to. Steve, over to you for the Policy Calendar review, please.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Mason. I'll bring it up quickly. I don't think that my report will take very long today. We have a Policy Calendar for which there were no new BC comments filed since our last meeting. And there are no open public comments on ICANN's agenda right now. The BC continues to want to work hard on NIS2 approval. And I don't see Drew on the line today. Drew, you are on the line. Did you have any update you wanted to give us on advocacy on NIS2?

DREW BENNETT: Not advocacy per se. As folks know, in mid-April, we wrote another set of letters coming into what we thought was going to be the last

EN

negotiating round or could have been, which was sometime around April 22nd, I believe. They have been getting pushed back. And we actually sent another just carbon copy of our own approved letter expanding to a few other member state representatives. Then May 12th was the final negotiation. And we ended up with a text which has not been made public yet. However, I will share with you all.

Well, here's the statement by the Commission announcing that there was a political agreement. We have had some rumors about the text, mostly good news so far. I can say there is Article 23. That would have been disaster if there was not. We've gotten some good news about some specifics of it. We await that and I will share that news with you all. I will just also share something that was posted on CircleID from Internet Infrastructure Coalition, give everyone an idea of the advocacy that was, I guess, going around our entire ICANN community. I think you'll notice there the i2C, that they were advocating with a lot of the same legislators and member states and commission members that we were—I think it's just a good point and perspective. Just to say, I think we were sending the right messages and getting them to the right people. We now eagerly await the text. As you'll see too in the message from the Commission's run, the bottom there for the timeline, which we'll note that once the draft is made public, there's 20 days to basically rubber stamp it, and then that starts the shot clock of—please correct me if I'm wrong—I think it's something like 21 months that member states have to transpose it. So there could be more opportunities for advocacy, for transition to member state law along the way. We'll also keep everyone informed about that process.

EN

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Drew. Are there any questions for Drew on the NIS2 process? I'm displaying the Commission's announcement page. So it has next steps but we don't have a text yet. As soon as anyone gets text that they're able to share, we can share it on BC private. So please keep an eye on your inbox over the next couple days. I'm pretty sure we'll probably get the text. Any questions for Drew? Drew, thank you very much. I appreciate the good work there. I'm going to go back to the Policy Calendar.

At this point, I'm going to turn things over to Mark Datysgeld and Marie. Because, Mark and Marie, I took the agenda for your meeting at Council which is coming up in about four and a half hours. I've highlighted the items. So there are two votes that you guys will get to make. Because the BC has participants on those, we verified that the BC participants on those two PDPs are recommending approval. So I will leave it to you to walk through. Just tell me when to scroll.

MARIE PATTULLO: Thanks, Steve. Conscious of time but I don't think we need to take up too much of the meeting with this. The two votes. So the revised charter for the Standing Selection Committee, nothing terribly contentious. This is procedural.

The vote on the IGOs. Now, you know this has been kicking around for many years. Thank you to Jay for representing the BC on the EPDP and doing so much work there. I don't believe Jay's on the call, but our instructions are to vote for in favor of both of these motions. I know

that Andy Abrams is on the call. I don't know, Andy, if you want to say anything about the IGOs.

ANDY ABRAMS: Hi, Marie. No, I don't have any further additions since the last time we've discussed this issue. But I understand that our proposal from the BC is the one that is submitted as a compromise proposal. Is that correct?

MARIE PATTULLO: Yes. That's the last I saw from Jay. So yes.

ANDY ABRAMS: So we continue to be supportive.

MARIE PATTULLO: It's you that drafted that. So thank you.

ANDY ABRAMS: You're welcome. Hopefully, it continues to go through with the compromise proposal.

MARIE PATTULLO: Thank you so much, Andy, for all of your work on that. And thank you for the clarification. The rest, as you see, there's a whole bunch of discussions. Steve, maybe if you can just scroll down a wee bit. Thank you. PDP improvements, again, this is procedure, it's not substance. The

SubPro is an update. You can see what's happening there. Data accuracy. Again, there'll be an update where also that will include pushing the timeline out of it and a new chair. But if we go back up a bit, the one that you're actually interested in is the SSAD. And obviously, that is Steve. But Steve, before we pass back to you to talk about the SSAD, over to Mark for the bits that I've missed. Thanks.

MARK DATYSGELD: Thank you, Marie. I really don't want to take too much time. We have been advancing a lot in terms of the DNS Abuse small group. And we will have a public meeting during The Hague. This has been confirmed by staff now. So this should be a pretty good opportunity for everyone to catch up with what we have been doing. And we also expect to have some external participation to be able to interact with the community a little bit. So that should be pretty good. Look out for that session on your agendas. As far as the meeting today is concerned, I think, we better move on to talking about SSAD. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Mark and Marie. The item seven on the SSAD Light, which is where I represent the BC, that small team is going to meet again next week and we'll have an opportunity to review what ICANN is going to tell you in Council today. ICANN Org is probably going to tell you that it's going to cost a bunch of money and take a lot of time just for them to turn the SSAD Light letter into a concept paper. And they're saying that there are three projects right now that would be pushed out by one and a half months. You guys will discuss it on Council and I guess get a sense

for how the rest of Council feels about delaying the timelines of those three projects. I'm going to predict that the SubPro ODP delay will meet with howls of protest from those who can't wait for another round of new gTLDs. So I'll be listening carefully to that.

At the end of the day, all this is for is a ticketing system. There is no mandate that the contract parties share the details of their evaluation or that they have to disclose the information even where you've got legitimate reasons to seek the information. We have limited expectations as to what a ticketing system would do for us. And yet, it might be better than doing nothing. When the small team meets next week, Steve Crocker and I will be pressing for a parallel discussion of the small team to investigate what .music has been able to accomplish with the Cyprus DPA. This is the Mike Palage project. For four weeks, I've asked Mike every single week to share with me what the Cyprus DPA has told him in response to his detailed plan and his reference implementation. No answer yet. So until I see that, then I don't really know the .music is a model that we can follow European-wide. So I'm happy to take input on that but I will listen to what happens today.

Mark and Marie, I'll scroll down to the items that are not on the Council's agenda but are still items that are on the Council purview. And one is the transfer, which is the Transfer Policy Working Group and specifically looking at locking. Zak and Arinola, are there any new updates since the last time we discussed this two weeks ago?

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: Yes, Steve. The final report of first phase will be released June 20th, shortly after ICANN and will be open for about a 42-day public comment period. So, everyone, get ready to participate in that. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Zak and Arinola. Next item up was overseeing of Improvements Task Force. Susan Kawaguchi is handling that for us. I don't see Susan on the line. I'm also on a separate small team to look at modifying Consensus Policies. And in fact, that's the issue that will be discussed today. Then finally, DNS abuse. Mark do you want to update us on DNS Abuse Small Team? Not hearing you, Mark. Not hearing Mark so let's get past that and move it over to Tim Smith at CSG, the Commercial Stakeholders Group. Tim?

TIM SMITH: Thanks, Steve. Not too much to report here. There was a CSG Members meeting that many of you attended on May 10th. Becky Nash was able to give us an update on the Planning Prioritization Framework Project pilot, which is now in the hands of Org, to look at the dependencies, funding, and timing. And that's where the focus on putting things in place for FY23. There'll be more to report on that. And as a matter of fact, they did say during the meeting that there would be a webinar during ICANN74, which I found in the Planning and Finance update session during the Prep Week. Anybody who's interested in finding out more about that, that's where you'll find it.

Other than that, other topics were discussed during the CSG meeting. All of which have probably been updated already on this call. So no

need to go into any of the details there. You're all up to date on those. There will be no CSG Membership meeting during ICANN74. So sometime after 74, we'll reconvene the meeting.

I haven't seen the full schedule for ICANN74 yet, I looked yesterday and it wasn't there. But there is a GAC Public Safety Working Group and CSG meeting for Monday, June 6th at 16:00. So you're all welcome to join that. That's about it. Not hearing you, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Any questions for, Tim? Okay, fantastic. Back to you, Mason.

MASON COLE: Okay. Thanks, Steve. Thanks for paying attention to the clock today. That's very helpful. Any questions for Steve before we move on? Okay, all right. Lawrence, over to you for our agenda item number four on the Finance and Operations update, please.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: All right. Testing my microphone. I'm sure I'm audible to everyone.

MASON COLE: Yes, we hear you.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Thank you. Hopefully, I will get sharing rights. Otherwise, I'll just go ahead.

BRENDA BREWER: Yes, Lawrence, you do have sharing rights.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Thank you.

BRENDA BREWER: Welcome.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: All right. I have a bit of a glitch here. I'll just go ahead and try again later if I could share. I'll start my report with the open ICANN announcements. As we all know, ICANN74 is around the corner. And the registration portal is open for members. I'm sure busy members who plan to either physically or virtually participate at ICANN74 will have registered. We have the Prep Week coming up the tail end of May into early June, and it's really exciting to see BC members there also. We've noted some BC members that have indicated interest to be The Hague physically. We want to encourage others who are still making plans to also signify their interest, so that adequate plans and preparations can be made for all BC members to physically be in the meeting hall for our meeting.

As of today, we have 71 members in the BC entirely. We've had seven new members join the BC in FY22. All of them happened to be category three members, but this has boosted our number, increased and also improved our diversity. We are still working with seven other members

who still have invoices for FY22 open. We will continue to encourage that this is closed out as we start preparing for the coming financial year.

As of today, we have 65 fully paid up members in good standing. We want to also encourage members to continue to be our ambassadors and to advocate for companies who share the same values as the BC expects to decide to or to consider picking up a membership of the BC. As we edge into the beginning of another financial year, it will be a nice opportunity for us to welcome some more active members into the BC. We are hopeful that in the coming financial year, we will have at least another 10 also members joining the BC.

The ICANN74 newsletter is still in development. And we assure that before the meeting, before ICANN74, we will have at least a soft copy of our newsletter hosted on the BC website for members to digest. We are hopeful that—if our timeline works just as we proposed—we might be able to squeeze in a few hard copies for those who will be in The Hague, even where it means that the BC will have to devote some funding to that. The BC social media handles are still active. Please kindly subscribe to them.

I'm happy to also announce that the process for the development of a BC course on ICANN Learn is now completed and we will be going live in the days ahead. I want to use this opportunity to thank all members of staff who joined us to ensure that this was a success. Many thanks to Brenda, thanks to Chantelle, to Carlos, to Andrei that works on the business development side. And also many thanks to Chris Mondini for all the support that went into getting the ICANN Learn course to the

point and to the level that it is today. We have to a very large extent just waiting for a few things to be closed out and then we can start directing traffic to ICANN Learn to run a BC course. Many thanks again also to our committees, Credentials, Communications, and especially the Onboarding Committee that had the responsibility of delivering this task. Thank you for all the time and resources that went into this.

I would also want to say, going into the financial part of our of my report for today, I would like for members to know that while we had a budget of US$89,000 approved to cover our operations in FY22, at the beginning of the year, which was the close of the last financial year, we also had a balance of $143,000 recorded in our Wells Fargo account. I'm happy to say—well, should I be saying happy? Well, I'm happy to report that our total expenditure to date is in the sum of $40,381 if all our obligations for FY22 are met. This is because we have a number of disbursements and payments that have not been paid out. And we're also expecting ICANN to reimburse us about the sum of $3900 for member clicks, the support that they normally pay in for member clicks.

Where all this projector sums, revenue come in, and expenditures are made, we will have just spent a sum of $40,381, give or take a few hundred dollars. This just presents a deficit of $4553 when we add up the dues that were paid in FY22, despite the fact that we still have about $3500 that we expected to come in for membership fees that have not been recorded yet. While we also add in the reimbursements from ICANN for member clicks, it will mean that we will have just expended about $4000, less than $5000 over what we received for FY22. So definitely, that's the good part of how the budget performed. Let's also not forget that ExCom had also decided to increase the BC

reserve funds from US$60,000 to US$65,000 in the course of the financial year.

I'm trying to watch the queue in case there is anyone with their hands up and they might have questions. But give or take, we were able to do just about 50% of the budget that was designed because there are some budget items that are tied to a physical meeting. Being able to run outreaches in regions where we have the physical meetings, we're not expending so much on [inaudible] officers travel, because two of the three meetings designed in the year were virtual and we didn't have to support a [inaudible] officer and a few other things that we didn't have a study to fund in this particular financial year. So are the areas that impacted the budget such that we were looking at about 50% performance there about.

As I had reported at the last meeting, we now have a new accounting firm, McDonald's Jacobs that have been engaged by ExCom to take care of our bookkeeping needs and also our IRS filing requirements. They are settling down to work and we look forward to the improvements this will add to BC's financial management process and operations.

Invoices with regards FY23 invoices and use, as of today, all invoices have gone out to members and that's invoices for FY23. For those who still have an FY22 invoice open, we have merged both invoices together. We expect those payments coming in. Please, if you haven't received an invoice, we will want to encourage that you reach out to the invoicing secretariat. It might mean that there's also a need to update the records of the primary representative because those details go into those designated members' mailboxes. So if the primary representatives have

EN

changed, then there could also be an issue there. So please, we encourage that if you don't have an invoice, you're actually acting on as of today for BC membership, please reach out to myself or invoice@icannbc.org so that we can help to support and close out this request.

The next BC meeting—well, don't let me go there, I'm not too sure. I said it's at The Hague, it might be earlier. Please, if there are questions, I would love to take them at this point or will yield the floor back to the chair.

MASON COLE: Thank you, Lawrence. Questions for Lawrence? Brenda, correct me if I'm wrong, but I believe the next BC meeting is scheduled for June 2. Is that right?

BRENDA BREWER: Yes, that is correct. I was just typing that it in the chat as well.

MASON COLE: Okay, got it. Very good. All right, Lawrence, thank you for the report. We are now moving into AOB. I have one all other business item and that is that I've been in touch with Nick Tommaso who is ICANN's head of Meeting Planning about the meeting in The Hague and the current situation with the COVID pandemic. I wanted to find out from Nick whether or not ICANN was making any adjustments to meeting plans due to what's happening with the global situation. And the reply is no, ICANN is not making any changes to their plans. The meeting in The

Hague will go forward as a hybrid meeting. BC members are very much encouraged to make decisions on their own about their comfort level with traveling and being in a convention center with others.

I know that many on the ExCom do plan to be in The Hague, but you should obviously make decisions about your own comfort level and your own willingness to travel at this point. So no changes on ICANN's part in terms of plans for The Hague, it will continue forward as a hybrid meeting. If you're not there, there will be robust remote participation tools available as usual. That's the update from there.

All right. Questions on that or any other business before we adjourn? Okay. With one minute to spare, thanks to Brenda for the support. Thanks, everybody. BC has adjourned for the day. Take care.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Bye all.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]