BRENDA BREWER:	Good morning. Good afternoon. Good evening, everyone. Welcome to the business constituency membership call on 1 June 2023 at 15:00 UTC.
	Today's call is recorded. Please state your name before speaking and have your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking. Attendance is taken from Zoom participation.
	I do have apologies from Zak Muscovich as well as Steve DelBianco. And 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, everybody. Mason Cole here, Chair of the BC. Welcome to our call on June 1, 2023. Welcome to June and welcome to our final call before the ICANN 77 meeting in Washington, DC. We will cover logistics on ICANN 77 under item four of the agenda.
	So you see the agenda in front of you on the screen, which Brenda has provided. Before we start, are there any updates or additions to the agenda as you see it? Okay, no hands. Very good. All right. Steve is not here today. So I'll be in charge of the policy calendar review. Let me go ahead and share my screen to do that. And then I'm going to have Tim Smith kick off because he's got to leave the call early to talk about the CSG update. Let me just pull up the policy calendar. Tim, let me scroll down please to channel three, which is the CSG update and turn the floor over to you for an update. So please go ahead.

TIM SMITH:

Okay, thanks very much, Mason. Tim Smith for the record. Just a few things on the radar, on our radar and to discuss or to bring you up to date on. I guess the first thing has to do with seat number 14 at the board. I think when we met a couple of weeks ago, I figured that the mediation would have been concluded by now and that we'd be able to say what the result of the mediation was.

It's been pretty quiet. So I really don't have an update on mediation. It is still in process. I believe Julf for NCSG and Lori Schulman for CSG are still working on that. So the only thing that I report as an update is that there was a letter yesterday to Julf and to Lori Schulman from John Jeffrey at ICANN just outlining the timelines as much as anything about the selection of board seat number 14.

And of course, the new board is supposed to sit for the AGM in October. And therefore, the selection was to have been made by April 26th. We missed that date. So he was urging us to resolve our issues and to appoint somebody new and reminded us that the person who was currently in the seat, Matthew Shears, remains there until such time that we appoint somebody new.

So it was interesting to get a letter from John Jeffrey. So obviously, it is on ICANN Org's radar that we are at this impasse.

MASON COLE:

I've got a quick update on that. So I did hear from Lori and Julf yesterday, I believe, and we're trying to arrange a one-on-one meeting

in Washington, DC to help break the impasse and it'll probably be a meeting facilitated by Melissa of ICANN staff. So hopefully, by the time we conclude on the 15th of June in DC, we'll at least have a map forward on how to resolve the conflict.

TIM SMITH:

Great. Well, thanks for that update. That's great. Good. Okay, moving on. I guess the other thing that CSG has been made aware of, or I guess the office of the Chief Technology Officer has requested a representative from CSG to be part of this IANA naming function review, the IFR. It's not something that we've discussed within CSG at this point, but we do have an opportunity to have a voice in that proceeding. And so if there's anybody on this call from the BC who might have the expertise and might have the interest in being part of that, please let me know and I'll put that name forward.

So I've given you a little bit of information in the policy calendar, and there's also a link to the IFR page so that you can look at that. And the deadline, as I pointed out here, is June 30th for us to bring somebody forward. So we do have a bit of time, but interested to know if anybody would be willing to sit there. So get in touch with me if you're interested.

Beyond that, the PSWG has invited us to a meeting, the usual meeting that we have pre-ICANN. And I believe that meeting will be next week. There was a doodle poll trying to set up a time and all the dates were sort of mid to late next week. So hopefully by the end of today or by the end of this week, we'll know when that meeting will take place. So

that's just for your information and I'll make sure that everybody's aware of that once it is confirmed.

And beyond that, in other CSG news, during ICANN 77, there will be the CSG membership meeting on Wednesday the 14th. And there will be the CPH and CSG membership meeting on Thursday the 15th. And those are basically all the notes I have for you and all the information I have for you today. Any questions or comments?

MASON COLE: Any questions or comments for Tim? Okay, Tim, thanks for that update. So I just want to reiterate those two meetings that are scheduled for ICANN 77, CSG membership on the 14th, Contracted Party House and CSG membership on the 15th, which will be one of the last meetings that we have during the week. And I encourage anyone from the BC who is in Washington DC, for ICANN 77 to attend both those meetings, but particularly the CPH and CSG membership meeting. Those have been productive and useful over the last couple of ICANN meetings, where we've had an opportunity to trade notes with our colleagues in the CPH. And it's been a good way to break the ice on issues where we've had some disagreement or even approaching some issues in the past. So Tim I think has outlined everything that needs attention from a CSG point of view here, but I do encourage you to attend both those meetings. Tim, anything else?

TIM SMITH: Well, just to, I didn't put it here because it's not CSG, but it's BC. And of course there is one other meeting, which is the BC membership

meeting, which will be on the Tuesday, the 13th at 10:45 in the morning, Eastern Daylight Time. That's probably somewhere else on the agenda, but I thought I'd throw it in there.

MASON COLE: No, no, appreciate you raising that. That is in fact on the calendar. And we have that meeting set. We're going to have a couple of guests at that session. So it would be very good if we have a good BC member turnout. We're going to talk about DNS abuse and a few other issues that are important to the BC. So yeah, it would be very helpful if we had BC members join up for all three of those meetings. Okay, Tim, thank you for the update. Anyone questions or updates for Tim, please, before we go to the rest of the policy calendar review. Okay, it looks like the queue is clear. All right.

Bear with me because Steve does the policy calendar update in a really smooth and professional way. And I am taking over for him and I am not as smooth as he is. So we will go through this together and we'll cover any issues that are important. So let's start on that. We're on agenda item number two, which is the policy calendar review.

So channel one, participation in ICANN public comments. On 25 May, we commented on the .NET Registry Renewal Agreement. Margie, Zak, and Steve were in charge of that comment. Those comments were submitted on time. And I believe everything is in order. Margie, would you like to add any color about what we submitted in the .NET comment?

EN

MARGIE MILAM: Oh, hi, it's Margie Milam. We basically commented on three main areas relating to the language in the .NET agreement as it relates to the definition of security and stability. Just highlighting that that might be different than what's applicable in the registry agreements and asking ICANN to address the discrepancy there to ensure that consensus policies would apply to .NET registry.

We also commented on the pricing issue, basically not objecting to any changes in the pricing caps. And we also addressed the thick WHOIS and suggested that the thick WHOIS should be something that's part of the agreement.

And then the final thing we talked about was the DNS abuse provisions, just to ensure that it tracks the DNS abuse language that's being negotiated. And I think there may have been another point. Maybe Zak can help me on the last point. But yeah, basically those were the main comments. There is a summary of the comments that was published by Kevin Murphy in the Domain Incite article. So I'll put that in the chat. Just talking about other comments that were submitted.

MASON COLE: Thanks, Margie. Yep, there was pretty comprehensive summary by Kevin Murphy in that blog post. So if you would drop that in the chat, that'd be great. Any follow up on the .NET comment for Margie or for the BC? Okay. All right. Very good. We're moving on. So other public comments that are outstanding right now. Phase one initial report on IDNs on the EPDP. We have Ching Chiao, who is in charge of drafting our comment. And Steve circulated Ching's draft over to BC members right,

looks like a couple of days ago. Ching, any helpful updates that you can give or input that you'd like from the BC today on your comments before we close on June 5th?

CHING CHIAO: Sure. Thanks for the opportunity for this, drafting the comments. Overall, this IDN PDP work is for what is called the variant delegation at the top level, meaning that for those who apply the IDN in the 2012 round, they will be able to get a variant string or strings in the next round.

So the working group asked us for comments on four topics. So what I helped draft simply put together is the response for the four topics that they're asking, which in those four topics, we sort of agreed with the first two. And then we kind of show our concerns on—the main concern for us is, for example, how many variant TLDs can be delegated. So the working group says four, but we are saying that let's take it slow, just maybe we start with just one first.

So one IDN they've already got, so the registry, so they've already got in the 2012 round, and the next round, they should be able to get another one. And then the other main concern that I have basically is the cost to apply for the IDN. I mean, so in the working group report, they're saying it's free of charge, but we are saying that there should be some costs because everything in sort of the new gTLD space, it should be in a cost recovery basis. So that's the four topics that I answer.

And then the last one I particularly pointed out is that because I believe that many of the BC members shows concerns related to TLDs that's in a

singular or a plural version, for example, cars and cars or game and games. So this could potentially be the same once that the IDN variant gets delegated.

So we actually understand that ICANN is not a price regulator, but this could cause the business registrar to pay more for the variant version of the IDN. So we're very cautious to tell the working group that these topics also need to be discussed and addressed. So please let me know if there's anything in the draft that you don't like, or maybe need some update. We still have a couple of days to work on it, but let me stop here.

MASON COLE: Thank you, Ching. Good summary. Anyone for an update on Ching in terms of his draft or anything else relating to that public comment? Okay. Looks like the queue is clear. Ching, thank you very much for that update and thank you for your work on the comment. And if you need anything in terms of filing or anything of that nature, please let ExCom know and we'll help you out. So thank you very much.

Moving on, on bylaw amendments to implement the NomCom 2 review. Comments close on June 12th on that. Tola and Lawrence have, along with Johnny and Mia, have volunteered to help. Drafters are editing and plan to have a second draft for member review by June 5th. So I believe we have Johnny and Mia on the call. Lawrence is on the call as well. Would anyone like to provide an update on the status of that current draft, please?

LAWRENCE OLAWALE ROBERTS: Yes, this is Lawrence. So Tola had worked on an initial draft and shared that. That has received some reviews and I have been able to build on that with some additional comments, but there's a need for us to harmonize the points.

So I think one thing worthy of note and which can be shared with membership is the view held by Tola. I mean, in the review, there was a request if the RSSAC should become voting alongside a few other advisory committees and where they are permitted to become voting delegates of the NomCom. Currently, they are non-voting delegates. They're basically joining the process of evaluating each candidate and speak to the qualities of those candidates. But when it comes to the final votes, if the candidates should be dropped or should move on in the process, the non-voting delegates do not participate in that particular vote.

But with this review, if that clause is lifted, they basically join in not just the discussions, but also in the final votes for candidates to move forward. Tola's view and submission is that RSSAC should remain non-voting alongside—which will mean that those who are also non-voting at this point remain, which are basically the advisory committees, asides At-Large, remain non-voting.

And for the RSSAC, there was an additional request that where they become voting delegates of the NomCom, that the ICANN board, who by the bylaws currently appoints the chair of the RSSAC, will stop participating in the process of appointing the RSSAC chair. I think it's basically a request for some more independence for the RSSAC. And if

they will eventually influence other people who get to the board, wouldn't want to be guided in such a manner by the board.

In my submission, which also speaks to some other clause, I am of the opinion that as long as we've already had the At-Large, which is also an advisory committee participating and voting, then it makes sense to have all other advisory committees join in voting for moving the candidates forward. We will seek to harmonize this within ourselves and where we cannot reach a compromise, it will be the responsibility of membership to decide the way forward.

I'm also proposing that the request to have the NomCom appoint independent candidates [be jettisoned]. The review committee themselves have said that this will be a difficult process. And I'm wondering, if this were to happen, it will mean that candidates or individuals who are not able to fully understand ICANN are brought on board and will definitely need some time to catch up and all that.

Marie has also provided some input on some discussion at the council level, which regards the small business and the large business seats, some historical perspective. And it definitely appears that the BC is the only place within the ICANN ecosystem that can guarantee a small seat representation for NomCom. And so we'll also be adding that into the draft that will be shared with members shortly. Thank you.

MASON COLE: Thank you, Lawrence. Indeed, if members haven't seen it, there was a letter from ICANN board chair Tripti Sinha, a copy to me and a copy to all other stakeholder group leadership and GNSO leadership within

ICANN talking about revisions on the NomCom. And we have until June 30th to reply to that letter. So that is hanging over our heads as well. It's an issue that doesn't seem to want to go away. So looking forward to your input on that, Lawrence and anything else you might need. Any updates on item number two for Lawrence, please?

Okay, let's move on to item number three. Let's see, is Zak on the call? Zak, are you with us today? Doesn't look like it. So we may have to skip over ISPCP constituency charter amendments. We have time on that one. Zak is heading up our volunteer effort. All right. PTI and IANA governance proposal comments close on July 5th. Rajiv, you're in charge. Would you like to update the BC, please?

RAJIV PRASAD: Hi, this is Rajiv. I have no material updates, but the BC comments will be completed a week prior to the comment close date.

MASON COLE: Rajiv, you are nothing if not efficient. Excellent. All right. Thanks. We look forward to your draft on that. And anything else that you might need, please call on the BC. Any updates for Rajiv on item number four, please? Okay. All right.

We have another issue, amendments to the base gTLD registry agreement in the RAA in terms of modification of contract obligations as they relate to DNS abuse. As you know, this has been a long, long, long standing issue with the BC. We've been pushing on DNS abuse and the need to modify contracts for some time now. And we finally received a

draft last week, which includes some registrar obligations, which you see on the screen right here. We need to be ready to discuss this in Washington, DC, and we need some volunteers to draft a BC comment.

This is going to be very important for the BC because there are any number of issues that we want to address in that comment as they relate to DNS abuse. And we'd like to make sure that our voice is heard on this particular issue, or continues to be heard on this issue. So, do we have a volunteer, please, to help draft a comment on RA and RAA proposed amendments? Margie?

MARGIE MILAM: Yes, I'll volunteer.

MASON COLE: Thank you very much, Margie. Anybody else? Okay, Margie, thanks. I'm sure we'll collect a little bit more support for you in the coming days, because this is a top priority for the BC. If anyone is particularly interested, please contact Steve or me offline, and we'll make sure and connect you with Margie and anyone else working on the comment. But I do encourage you to take a look at those draft changes because they're important to the BC.

All right, moving on to item number six on NIS2. This has been closely followed, as you know, NIS2 is Network and Information Security Directive that was recently ratified by the European Parliament. Andrew Bennett and [Nick Lagergan] and Marie Pattullo are following that closely. So, there, I'm trying to read through this.

EN

So, we've got several transpositions that already have been made in European member states. And the topic has been closely discussed within the BC and elsewhere within ICANN. Later on today, there's an update as a part of prep week on geopolitical issues and NIS2 will be included in that discussion. So, if you're interested in this issue, then you're encouraged to join up on that, on that meeting later today. Marie, any updates that you'd like to provide membership so far?

MARIE PATTULLO: No. All I can tell you is what everyone I think knows, it's now up to the 27 countries that make up the European Union to change this European level text into national law. So, any efforts have to be concentrated in the capitals, the 27 countries, to try to ensure that we get the best text that we can get.

MASON COLE: Yep. And it's no small feat, right, Marie? I mean, we're having to influence governments jurisdiction by jurisdiction to the extent that we can, correct?

MARIE PATTULLO: That's right. We had initially believed that there would be a tender, that there would be a study, I'm sorry, that the European Commission, so the EU civil service, was going to conduct dealing with our issues under NIS2, but that study is no longer happening. There is, there always is a kind of coordination committee where the various member states talk about how they're going to implement things. But of course, that is

them only. But there's no obligation for them to do the same thing. They all have to implement the directive, but they can do it in any way they choose. So there will definitely be variations country by country.

And as we've said many times before, Mason, the only way really to influence the capitals in Europe is to have somebody who speaks their language and who is in their country. So if any of your companies have a presence in those countries, please don't take this badly, but don't send your DC lobbyist. You need your local person who understands the local business market and the local political situation.

MASON COLE: Indeed, Marie, good point. We're lucky in the BC that we have some folks with connections inside various jurisdictions, but there, as you point out, there are 27 member states. So if anyone in the BC has relationships with anyone inside those member states who may be influential, that would be very helpful to know. So feel free to contact me again offline with that if you are in a position to help out. Anything else on NIS2 from membership before we move on?

Okay. All right. Item seven, the US government's NTIA is proposing a new policy on .US access. If you haven't seen the NTIA proposal, I encourage you to take a look at it. There's a link provided in the policy calendar. There was a draft comment that I put together that was circulated over to BC members on May 30th.

Steve filed the comment by the deadline, which was yesterday. And so our comments are on record. If you'd like to have a look at it, let me know, and I'll be happy to provide you a copy of the comment. It was

pretty straightforward and direct and in line with the BC's previous positions on WHOIS access. So it is filed and in place, and I will open the floor for any comment on this as well. Anyone want to raise their hand on NTIA's proposal on .US?

Okay. All right. Very good. Let's move on to channel two, which is our update on what's happening on the GSO council. And let me turn the floor over to Marie. Marie, I don't think Mark is on the call today, right? So it looks like it's all you today. Please go ahead.

MARIE PATTULLO: Thanks, chair. There's really not too much to update everybody on at the moment. The last meeting we have was mainly update we were given and discussions about updates. We talked about NomCom. Obviously, there is a possibility that council itself will be commenting on that letter that we received from ICANN Org.

There's been quite a lot of polemic in the discussions, but no actual facts. So again, nothing to update really. Of course, where we are on IDNs, on closed generics, as you know, there is a group who is debating how we can have a framework that everyone will accept under which we can develop the policy.

What I mean by that is, as you know, there isn't at the moment a rule on closed generics, so they're just not allowed. By closed generics, I mean things like dot bank being run by HSBC or dot book being run by the only book publisher in Guatemala or whatever it may be.

This was asked for by the GAC, and what they're trying to do is get to an agreement of what could be the framework. So nothing that says absolutely no closed generics allowed and nothing that says all the closed generics allowed. Something in the middle.

Now, they've been discussing this for a while. It's very, very secretive. Even council doesn't know what they're discussing. And we're supposed to see something soon and discuss it apparently in DC. So soon would be good.

One thing that popped up in AOB, which is trying to pop up again in AOB, is accuracy. Now, you'll remember that we managed after a lot of blood, sweat and tears to get a working group to scope out what, if anything, we can do about accuracy in registrant data. I think we can mainly agree that a lot of that is very inaccurate.

And the group is on pause, partly because there are no data processing agreements between the contracted parties and ICANN, upon which this depends. As a sideline, we don't know when there's going to be DPAs. Everybody claims they want them. Nothing seems to be happening. And partly because the group itself couldn't decide on what the word accuracy meant, which is not very useful.

Interestingly for me, we got an email 15, 20 minutes ago from one of the ISPC councilors, Thomas Rickert, who has suggested we have a better discussion next time, because accuracy under NIS2 is going to be mandated. It's going to be something that the registries and the registrars will have to do.

Now, Thomas phrases it with, "I'm not saying the GNSO should do something. Given the timeline, it's probably not for us to do it, but we should discuss it." So that's just a personal thing that I think is interesting. We'll see what happens.

On the sidelines, we've got all manner of working groups and subcommittees under council. I'm embroiled in one with a ridiculous title, but it's basically looking at the moment at the statement of interest that we all have to file, which includes the possibility for you to say, "Are you here on behalf of someone else?" "Yes." "Can you tell me who?" "No." Because, of course, there are many reasons why you can't. You're a lawyer, or you're working for a client who hasn't given you permission to disclose.

That, again, became the subject of a lot of polemic, a lot of backchat, a lot of talk. We've seen the statistics, and it's a tiny, tiny amount. It was something, from memory, it's two people out of a group of 190 who might have been representing someone else.

Anyway, where it looks like we're getting to is that you will still be able to say, "Are you here on behalf of someone?" "Yes." "Who is it?" Then you give a generic high-level answer, a client in the internet business, that kind of thing. There is a possibility that the chair of whatever working group it is may decide to say that anybody there with that exclusion in their SOI for that specific purpose, because it's working group by working group, will not be allowed to participate in the consensus call. As most of the working groups are under the so-called representative model, and you can only be in the consensus call if you are representative anyway, it's not going to make an awful lot of

difference. Just to let you know this stuff is going on, which is a little bit frustrating and very, to my mind, pointless. I think it's a solution that hasn't yet found its problem.

There's also, of course, other work going on in abuse. Now, Mark isn't here to run you through that, but Mark's group, you know he was the co-chair of a small team on abuse. Does an amazing amount of work, that boy, truly amazing. That group came back together and agreed that at the moment, we don't have enough data, intel, whatever you want to call it, on bulk registrations. So they're not going to do something about that or suggest that we do some policy work around that at the moment. Not saying it's not going to happen, it's just at the moment.

We've got a whole bunch of meetings about meetings on SubPro. Next one is next Monday. This will be our second extraordinary council meeting about SubPro in the space of 10 days. And all that is, is as you know, there were 38 recommendations that the board said, "No, we're not sure about this." They came back to Council, Council put together a small group, the small group has gone through it with the board caucus dealing with SubPro.

Some of it is just interpretation, some of it, maybe this, maybe that, maybe the other. But what we are hoping to do is by the time that the DC meeting opens officially, we will have agreement with the board on at least the next steps for these 38 Recs. And I think that's all I can give you, Mason.

MASON COLE:	Thank you, Marie. Good update. Any follow-ups for Marie on Council business, please? Marie, your next Council meeting is in Washington on the 14th of June, I believe.
MARIE PATTULLO:	Well, apart from the Extraordinary one about SubPro on Monday. If anybody's really excited by SubPro, please join.
MASON COLE:	Okay. Thank you, Marie. Any comments or suggestions for Marie, please? Okay, Marie, looks like that takes care of most of Council business. Is there anything else you want to cover?
MARIE PATTULLO:	Nope.
MASON COLE:	Okay. All right. Very good. Okay. Before we depart the policy calendar and go to Lawrence for his update, let me put Caroline on the spot, if I may. Caroline just put into the chat some helpful information about our BC outreach event, which is on Tuesday, the 13th of June in Washington DC at 6 p.m. local time. Caroline, could you give us an update, please?
CAROLINE LUPETINI:	Yeah. So, I just put into the chat a couple of reminders that one, if you haven't already, please do RSVP for our BC Outreach event. And then our big request to you as BC members is please use the second form to

nominate non-BC members that might enjoy being wined and dined at the BC Happy Hour. Ultimately, this is a recruitment event for BC membership. We want to reach out to other trade groups and then via other trade groups, ultimately other businesses, private sector organizations to join the BC. So, we need to sort of spread far and wide our professional social networks, colleagues, peers, otherwise, that they don't have to be attending ICANN 77, but if they're in the DMV area, which is to say DC, Maryland, Virginia, to please invite them, put them forward.

And actually Mason and Lawrence, I'm going to email you after this call to talk about actually sending out those invites later this week so that we can get that on everybody's calendar. I'll also, BC membership, be sending out an email with this reminder again, as well as a designed invite if you like, and then these links too.

MASON COLE: Great, thank you, Caroline. Caroline's done a wonderful job putting together an event for us, and this is a dual purpose event. One is inreach to the BC to sort of celebrate ourselves and the work that we do. And the other, as Caroline mentioned, and maybe a bit more important, is outreach to the Washington DC community, the business community, to highlight the work that BC does and invite them to join on to what we do. So, if you are planning on being in DC, please plan to attend the event. And very importantly, if you have names to add to the invitation list, please do that. Marie, your hand is up. Go ahead, please.

MARIE PATTULLO: Thanks. I just want to clarify something, if I may. We are also, I guess, allowed to invite friendly policymakers. I'm thinking people like Laureen Kapin or WIPO or people that we are working with as allies in other issues, but they're not business because they're public sector. Caroline, is that okay?

CAROLINE LUPETINI: I think that's okay. You know, I'm not an expert in terms of US public sector ethics rules. I want to say this would comply with everything. I think the answer is yes. And of course, also, when it comes to talking and networking at ICANN itself, please feel free to bring guests. Please feel free to invite people the day of the event, the day before the event, those that you see at ICANN 77. We really would love a great turnout for this event, too.

MASON COLE: Okay. Thanks for the question, Marie. And thank you very much, Caroline, for the clarification. All right. I believe that concludes where we are with the policy calendar. Brenda, if we may, can you add the agenda back? And we will move on to the next agenda item, which is Lawrence's update. Lawrence, I've eaten up too much of the clock already, and I apologize. So please go ahead with your update.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE ROBERTS: Thank you, Chair. So I will just take off from where we stopped not too long ago. We definitely will be welcoming to the outreach people who are not commercial business users per se. But we would want to

encourage that we have anyone intending to be in the room registered so that we can adequately plan around the numbers. As I speak, we have about 38 submissions in terms of—nominations I should use. And where all of that is confirmed to be in attendance, we might just have about 20, a little over 20 seats left. So also to BC members who have not yet used the RSVP forms, but who will be in BC, please kindly quickly action that so that we would hate to leave any BC member out of the outreach event who would like to be there. So please, follow the process so that we can keep track of the numbers.

With that said, still on the outreach for ICANN 77, which is going to be on Tuesday the 13th, we have a few publicity materials that can be used. Might want to share it maybe on social media through your company's handle. We encourage that or personally send that to friends. But we could as well direct interested parties to the BC's website, ICANNBC.org, where they can easily find the links to register a nominee, to submit a nominee for the event, or for you to also register yourselves. So if you have a problem remembering or finding the link in your email that had been shared by Caroline and myself earlier, please just visit the BC's website. You will find the links there.

The prep week ends today, and I'm sure that a number of us have been following. But in addition to the outreach event, we are also trying to promote, seeking to promote the BC session, which also happens to be on Tuesday the 13th at ICANN 77, the BC's open session. We would like that we encourage businesses, especially those in the DC area, to also be a part of that event. And hopefully we might have some of them making up their minds to join the BC thereafter. So aside from the outreach event that we're having later that evening, we can also do well

to invite friends, colleagues, people within the industry to join the BC open session. I think it's about 10:30 EST. That's Tuesday morning and can as well join us for the outreach later in the evening.

The BC's newsletter for ICANN 77 is almost completed in terms of production. It's done. It just needs ExCom's approval to be final. And once it's shared with ExCom and it's approved, we will not be waiting until the start of ICANN 77 to share the newsletter. It will be shared with members immediately because part of the content in the newsletter speaks about our outreach event and the BC session. And we are hoping that readership before ICANN 77 can help some other people prepare. I mean, at least the target groups prepare their minds to join us in DC.

Elections are over, and I'm grateful and thankful to everyone who participated in that process. We also want to welcome Mia. She's dropped off the call to meet with some other engagement, but we want to congratulate Mia stepping on board the large business representation for NomCom after the AGM in October. Vivek remains in his current role as the small seat rep for the NomCom and will be transitioning to the council as one of your representatives. Thank you for everyone who's participated in this process.

I also want to reiterate that registration is required for ICANN 77, either for you to join the BC session, the CSG session and our parley with the Contracted Party House in person or as a hybrid participant, registration will be required. So members, I encourage you to do so.

Invoices for FY24 have been sent out. If at this point you haven't received an invoice, please reach out to me and I will help get the

invoices secretariat to send an invoice your way. And if you've had any challenges with the invoice sent or with the mode of payment, please also reach us so that we can find alternative routes to resolving any issues that might arise.

With this, I would want to ask if there are any questions. If there are no questions for me, I will yield the floor back to Mason.

MASON COLE: Thank you, Lawrence. Any questions or comments for Lawrence, please? Okay. Well, let me just add my congratulations, Lawrence, to your election as GNSO councilor. You'll be wonderful in the role and thank you always again to Mia and to Vivek for stepping up for the NomCom role. It's good to have all three of you in leadership positions in the BC and it'll be great to have your contributions. Okay. Anything else for item number three before we move on? Okay.

Item number four is ICANN Logistics for Washington, DC. We've covered this a bit, but you can see there that Brenda has helpfully added meeting times for BC and the CSG. Please do make time to join those meetings as you're able, in Washington. It looks like also we have our next BC membership call after ICANN '77, which will be on July 6th at our normal time. Is that right, Brenda? Normal time?

BRENDA BREWER: Normal time.

MASON COLE:	Okay. If you have not registered for ICANN in DC yet, I think you have until June 7th to do that, but don't wait around because the meeting is going to be on top of us before we know it. So yeah, Brenda, thank you for dropping that meeting link into the chat.
	All right. Before we close the call, any questions for Brenda or me or Lawrence on ICANN '77 logistics? Okay. Any other business for the BC?
BRENDA BREWER:	Mason, this is Brenda. I have one quick reminder regarding any attendees at Washington DC meeting. Bring a refillable water bottle. We're being told that plastic bottles are going to be limited. So, important news, bring your own refillable water bottle.
MASON COLE:	Thanks for that heads up, Brenda.
[CAROLINE LUPETINI:]	To add to that, it is very humid and very warm in DC. Our tap water is totally fine, but yes, would strongly recommend staying hydrated.
MASON COLE:	Yep. Important to stay hydrated. And so yes, bring your supplies, including a refillable water bottle. That would be great. Okay. Any other business? Lawrence.

EN

LAWRENCE OLAWALE ROBERTS: Yes. I happen to see Steve's joined the call. Maybe we could give the floor to him to say [inaudible].

MASON COLE: Yeah, Steve, hello. And we just ran through the policy calendar earlier in the call, but is there anything that you'd like to raise before we adjourn?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yeah. Thank you, Mason. I'm sorry that I was not available for the call. It was in the air. I will say this much. I thought Mason's draft of our comments to the US Commerce Department on .US were very well done and are an excellent summary, using the government's own words to show that they want to maintain access to WHOIS data. So, thank you, Mason, for getting that in. And I'll be emailing a draft comment on NomCom and look for your comments on the IDN. Thanks, everyone.

MASON COLE: Thank you, Steve. Appreciate that update. Safe travels to you, and we'll see you in DC. All right. We have six minutes, but we can adjourn early unless there's any other business for the BC this morning.

All right, colleagues, thank you very much for a productive meeting. Look forward to seeing many of you in Washington, DC. Safe travels to everyone and we'll see you in a couple of weeks. BC's adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]