| | |
|---|---|
| BRENDA BREWER: | Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the Business Constituency Membership call on the 22<sup>nd</sup> of April 2021 at 15:00 UTC. |
| | This meeting is recorded. Kindly state your name when speaking for the record, and have your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking. Attendance is taken from the Zoom participation. With that, I'll turn the call over to Mason. Thank you. |
| MASON COLE: | Thank you, Brenda. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. Mason Cole here, chair of the BC. Welcome to BC call on the 22<sup>nd</sup> of April. Thank you for making time for us, as usual. |
| | We have a relatively shorter agenda today. It's fairly normal but it's up on the screen now. It's also misnumbered due to my own fault. So we have agenda items 1, 2, 3, and 4, not 1, 2, 4, and 5. But given that, does anyone have any additions or request to add to the agenda? Okay, very good. Seeing none, we're going to go ahead and dive right in. So, we'll go to item #2. Steve, may I turn the floor over to you, please, for the Policy discussion? |
| STEVE DELBIANCO: | Yes, by all means. Thanks, Mason. I'll share the screen right now. It's the Policy Calendar that I circulated yesterday. Okay. Here we go. All right, since our last call, there's only been one item that we've posted. And that was our posting, a very brief comment that was drafted by |

---

*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.*

Lawrence. It was regarding the ccNSO's policy development process on how to retire their ccTLDs that are no longer in use. Lawrence picked up on the previous comment we had filed and reiterated those points and gave some consent to where they were going. Thanks, Lawrence, for doing that.

There's currently only one open public comment from ICANN and it's one that was posted less than two weeks ago but it's due in only about 10 days. It's the GNSO overview of all RPMs and all gTLD. This is the final recommendations. If you recall, about a year ago, in May of 2020, we commented on the initial report of the PDP, and that was a big effort. Andy Abrams, Jay, Mason, Zak, Marie, and David Snead contributed to that. Fortunately, there are not that many deviations from that initial report to the final report. So we ought to be able—especially if we can tap some of the volunteers who did the initial report last year. If we tap that same group to look at the way the final report differs, we can build on our last comment and simply reiterate areas that we felt should have been addressed but were not, and maybe even acknowledge areas where we made recommendations a year ago that they have followed. I'm anxious to see whether it's possible that—Andy's on the call, Jay, Mason. Mason's got his hands full as chair, but Zak, Marie's one of our councilors, and David. Is there any way I can tap on you to help with this? Because it's due soon enough that we need to get a comment out to the BC members in the next several days.

ANDY ABRAMS:                Hi, Steve. I'm happy to be a part of that effort.

STEVE DELBIANCO:    Andy Abrams, thank you so much. I appreciate it.

MASON COLE:    Steve, it's Mason. I can't take the pen, but I'll help out.

STEVE DELBIANCO:    Okay. David, you were really helpful last time. Any chance you could pitch in this again? Thank you, David. I appreciate it. The notion of drafting—let's automatically dumb this down to where we build our comment off of just the changes between their initial and final. And all we have to do is to pick and choose from our previously filed comment. I think that'll make it a lot easier to do. We have so far Andy Abrams, Mason, and David. And after the call, I'll circulate a note with the links that are here in the Policy Calendar. Thank you.

All right, the next item up here, it's not part of the ICANN Public Comment portion. But we are continuing to have a constructive dialogue with Contracted Party House on DNS abuse. I think it's always worthwhile to do that. I want to suggest that the first call we had, where James Galvin led most of it, I feel like we got barely into the agenda. Mason, I would be certainly in support of doing another call with CPH to pick up where we left off. We probably aren't going to get our definition involved, instead of the standard definition that they're pushing, but we ought to try to drive that forward a little bit more. We can open it up to a broader category of BC members as well. Mason, what are your thoughts on that, about another call with CPH on DNS abuse?

MASON COLE: I agree with you, Steve. I think that can be productive and I think it can also be easily arranged. I think we can even probably do it before ICANN71 if we get on the stick. I'll be glad to—

STEVE DELBIANCO: I think it would be well worth it. Maybe even given the success of last BC call where Graeme Bunton from the DNS Institute came in. I think Graeme did a great job presenting and it would have been great to, I guess, probe with more questions of Graeme. Is it possible that the DNS Abuse Institute and the CPH leadership could join on a joint call with us on DNS abuse?

MASON COLE: I'd be happy to look into that.

STEVE DELBIANCO: I think it might be worthwhile. Any other comments for BC members on that? Am I the only one who thought Graeme did a credible job two weeks ago? Maybe so. I'm easily impressed, I guess.

All right, so let's move on to discussions that Ben Wallis has been leading with certain members of the European Commission staff to talk through our suggested changes and clarifications to their NIS2 Directive prior to its being voted on. Mason, Ben Wallis, and I had a 30-minute call with them. And then Ben was good enough to do a brief BC call earlier

this week where he talked through sort of impressions on what we learned from IPC interaction and what we need to do moving forward.

Ben, I know that you've been doing a lot of thinking about this, would you be willing to talk to your colleagues about the current state and what you think we ought to do moving forward on this, too?

BEN WALLIS:     Thanks, Steve. Just scrambling around for my e-mail but I'll do it from the top of my head. As you said, a few weeks ago, the last BC meeting, I kind of gave a summary of that really interesting discussion that you, me, and Mason had with the European Commission. Then this week, we convened a meeting with the drafting team to talk about that in more detail and talk about what that might mean in terms of next steps. The process is going fairly slowly in the European Parliament, and we thought, in terms of next steps, the best thing might be to seek a meeting with the two key MEPs, request a video call with them where we could talk through our concerns and find out what they think of them. We would also develop some written talking points in advance to use in those meetings.

I kind of wrote up those ideas that came out of our meeting earlier this week and send them off the draft team just waiting for comments before I then reached out and tried to set up a meeting. We can bring in two or three BC members to talk through what our comments are and try and get some traction with these key members of the European Parliament.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Ben, I want to ask you, if you can, listen to the recording of the call that is just now concluding over the EPDP Phase 2A. I was on for the first hour. Melina of the European Commission ended up probably making the most effective intervention I've heard yet from a commission staffer. Very concerned about the way the contracted parties are going to miss the opportunity to do a self-regulatory improvement to the EPDP. And therefore, it's going to be up to the European Commission then to come down hard in this, too. I would say that the dialogue over the last 24 hours on list, as well as what you would hear when you listen to the recording, indicates that the time is about now. The time is now to show the Commission that if they don't clarify the directive, they are going to miss the opportunity to push ICANN into coming up with a policy that does the appropriate amount of disclosure.

Because there's always been this impression that if left to its own, ICANN might come around. But it hasn't been working. And today was a major step backwards with the way that Volker and the Registrars were pushing back on any notion of differentiation between legal and natural. They're claiming that publication is the same thing as saying that, "Come into the SSAC, make a request, and if it's legitimate request, yes, we'll reveal it." And they're going to call that publication. We're actually having a debate on the meaning of the word "publish" versus the meaning of a "permitted disclosure".

BEN WALLIS: I've been monitoring that quite lively thread. I'll certainly take a look at that recording. As we discussed in the drafting team this week, to the extent that we can point to the European Commission being on the

record talking about what they actually meant when they drafted the proposal, anything is helpful. The more we can draw from official comments that they're making, the better. We could use those in our talking points in our communications with legislators.

Yes. The European Commission gave us a sense that they didn't want to get too prescriptive in the legislation because with the European directors, they tend to leave the space for the member states to interpret and enact at the national level. But I think that's a good point you make that the more they see that there is willful misinterpretation or a different interpretation from some of the key stakeholders, they might be persuaded to agree with legislators that more clarification is helpful.

STEVE DELBIANCO:     Volker actually said today that he would tolerate a hundred domains that were abusive and fraudulent to consumers if he could save two registrants from problems that occurred to their privacy because of inappropriate disclosures of registrant information. He decided to say a hundred abusive domains is justified if he can protect two people. Milton Mueller went on to say that the information is available and WHOIS was mined and is being sold all over the world and that it is responsible for abuse that registrants have had to undergo.

So today was a step backwards even for Milton when things are moving along so well. And I think the deliberate, as you say, intentional misinterpretation of the word "publish" is one element. Then Melina's intervention today was just outstanding. She thought it was incredibly

disrespectful for Volker to claim that DNS abuse is really not a significant problem when you compare it to the privacy issues of registrants who are disclosed in WHOIS. I mean, things have changed from day to day then. And I'm just suggesting that Melina and her colleagues might be right now to make the recitals more detailed. Even if they don't want to change the directive language, could they make the recitals more detailed?

BEN WALLIS:
Yeah. The trick is that the Commission itself no longer has control over the wording. They put out the wording and now it's for the legislators to decide if any changes are needed. But the Commission does have a key role in that any proposed changes, they will be invited to give their views on whether they're helpful or not, whether they change the intention or not. So they still play a role in advising the legislators on the text and where clarifications could be helpful. It will be helpful if when we propose clarifications, the Commission will actually echo those in its own discussions with legislators.

STEVE DELBIANCO:
Thank you, Ben. There's going to be probably two EPDP Phase 2A calls next week. So there'll be two one-hour prep calls between the IPC, the BC, the GAC, and the ALAC. And so you're calling Mark Svancarek, also from Microsoft, joins all those calls. I could ask—Mark, I believe, is on a different call right now but it would be great for you to join the prep calls next Monday and Wednesday. These are in advance of the EPDP calls. I think the time is really right. I'm not asking you to get sucked into

this forever, but if you read the list and participate, next week could be critical right now. Okay?

BEN WALLIS: Okay. I'll look for those. I'll ask Mark to share those with me.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Exactly. Just ask Mark and then he can clue you in. There's several members of the BC that are on here. Alex, I see that you're on the call and others that have been involved. Is this a good time to talk a little bit more about EPDP before I move over to Council? Alex, is there anything from you?

ALEX DEACON: Steve, I haven't had the chance to be on the last two calls or at least the one this morning. So I'm not fully up to speed on what's going on but I'm happy to chat and share my opinions. Whether that's important or interesting, I don't know.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Alex, do you have the impression that Milton Mueller had been moving in a favorable direction with the principles he put in? Or did you think that was disingenuous?

ALEX DEACON: No. I think if you read his principles on the face of them, I think there was nothing for us to object to there. Of course, the devil is in the

details. But as we all know, it's the contracted parties that are driving this train. Milton's input, I think he's trying to kind of walk the tightrope there but it's clear that the contracted parties don't have any interest in doing that.

STEVE DELBIANCO:     I agree with you. Steve Crocker, you guys remember that name? Steve Crocker is involved representing the SSAC on the EPDP. And I think his daughter was having a child, Steve was a little bit out of pocket for the last two weeks, but he's engaged on the list pretty actively. Ben is seeing that as well. So Crocker is very helpfully pushing back. We've also had a lot of help from Melina who's a member of the European Commission. But today's call represents a new low point that we're going to need to work on. All right. Members, any other questions or comments on the EPDP and NIS2? Okay. Thank you.

Marie, I'd love to turn things over to you and Mark as our councilors. I have on the screen a section of the Policy Calendar, including the update, Marie, that you sent me last night.

MARIE PATTULLO:     Thanks, Steve. Just after our last meeting, we had an Extraordinary Council meeting and we have the normal Council meeting later today, later this evening for me. The Extraordinary meeting was frustrating. I think that's the right word. We had quite a long discussion about privacy/proxy. If you remember, that was paused by ICANN. It had nothing to do with us. So the work was already done. The IRT was together, it was working, and then it was paused. So now there is a

discussion about unpausing it, for want of a better term. The whole thing was framed in this meeting about, "Yes, but it's been superseded by the EPDP," which it has not. "And maybe we should set up a new subgroup within the EPDP-IRT to look at this," which is ridiculous.

So we pushed back saying that we have the privacy/proxy IRT. These guys have done the work, they know the stuff. The first thing to do was to reach out to them, ask them if they still want to be involved, and then they can be the ones that share their intelligence and move this forward. We kind of went on that and we do get support from the GAC liaison, Jeff, from ALAC, from the NCSG, from the IPC. So hopeful, slightly frustrated, got even more frustrated when they started talking about accuracy. Because here, as you know, there is an overview that came out of ICANN recently as to various accuracy points. We already have discussed setting up a scoping group who will get together and look at what we mean by accuracy, what we want to do, how we can go further. And again, rather than going to these people who have said they want to be in scoping group, up pop this idea that, "No, there should be a study on what accuracy means." "Well, why?" "Because we already have lots of studies and surely that should be for the scoping group to decide, not for ICANN Org to put forward." "Oh, but everyone's so busy and we're also busy." We're not busy. Nobody in the BC is busy, I know that you're all sitting there and playing with your dogs.

At this point, I was getting extremely frustrated as you can gather. And we kept hammering the point that everybody has different priorities, it's quite notable to us that our priorities never seem to actually make it up there, they just keep getting pushed back and back again. So we at least got some kind of semi-agreement that they will perhaps consider that

the scoping team that we're actually putting together should be the ones to start the work.

We then had a discussion about the SSAC, the tech guys, about their response to the SubPro report, which you've probably seen was pretty negative. And there was a lot of discussion about how some members think that SSAC has gone too far. It's gone out with its mandate on this.

Then a wee bit of a discussion about another committee, yay. GNSO Framework Continuous Improvement. Apparently, we didn't have the bandwidth to set up a committee that will be discussing committees, which is really nice to know.

Then the meeting this evening, Steve, thank you so much for putting up the main points that we're going to crop up later. I want to stop being frustrated and hand over to Mark, if that's okay.

STEVE DELBIANCO:          I think you are a little bit frustrated. But you're always smiling, I appreciate that. Mark, why don't you talk a little bit more about today's meeting?

MARK DATYSGELD:          Thank you very much. I think Marie was on point with those observations. As far as today is concerned, I am particularly interested in the Council discussion of SAC114. That's item six in our agenda. I don't know if you all had the opportunity to read this. But this is one of their recommendations, Recommendation #3, which is basically that ICANN actually seriously engage in review of what DNS abuse is. And that to me

seems like a line for us to engage further on this. Apparently, it's not just us that are very interested in this. Now the SSAC is interested in this. So when I come out to these meetings and say every stakeholder is interested in this as I did during ICANN70, and Göran goes like, "Is that so? We're already doing a bang up job in Compliance." It seems to me more and more like, no, they aren't. And every stakeholder in the community is aligned somehow in this.

So I think we are headed towards a point in which this is very viable to discuss. This is just another sign. We have ALAC, we have SSAC. We have even the contracted parties admitting that something could be done better. I have that on my radar. I want to focus specifically on what exactly will be discussed and see how the other parties will react to this. So that's an interesting one.

Marie mentioned the GNSO Framework for Continuous Improvement. I'll be honest in that, I don't understand exactly how we'll do that or what exactly we're talking about. Because, literally, last meeting, I guess Stephanie was pushing very hard that we don't have time to do anything. So I don't know exactly how that's going to work. We'll keep you all posted on this. Theoretically, this is supposed to be sort of a meta group. I don't know if Marie understood this better than me, but it's supposed to be a GNSO group about the GNSO group. We'll keep you posted on that. I can't say that I understood it completely.

For everybody who's on the EPDP boats, there's Rec 27 discussion going on today as well. It's item agenda 4 so it should be pretty early on. In case you want to hop aboard, that one should be plenty of fun. That's it for me. Thank you very much.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thinking that the IPC-BC large group that you're both part of will have something to say on the status report that is shared. As you know, the vice chair is Brian Beckham. He's going to be much more concerned than Keith, who's the chair of the EPDP. But if Keith gives a rosy scenario report, I believe you should push back a little bit. It's a tough time right now. We're at a juncture that the contracted parties are trying to run out the clock. There's not that much time left in the extension of Phase 2A. And as Phase 2A then concludes without consensus, then the only thing left is leading on Ben Wallis and his friends at the European Commission because nothing else will happen without NIS2. That's where we're going to be ending up if we don't suddenly break through this consensus. At this point, while Milton Mueller gave us a little ray of hope, the current status of the Phase 2A is there's no willingness for the contracted parties to take any of what they perceive as a risk of violating GDPR by adopting policies to differentiate and disclose. Any questions for our councilors?

Okay. Waudo Siganga handles our interactions with the Commercial Stakeholders Group. There isn't too much on here. But Waudo, I have it up on the screen. And if you wish, I can open up the attachments you gave me, the transcript or the notes that you took on the BC meetings. Go ahead, Waudo.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Thank you, Steve. Just to say that it's not necessary to open the transcripts. I think I'll just be brief and people can look at the transcripts

later on. But first of all, thank you for putting the topics on your calendar.

As you have indicated, there have been two meetings of the CSG since the last BC meeting. One was the post ICANN70 follow up with the GNSO appointed Board members. And another one was just a procedural meeting for ICANN71 planning. Perhaps I'll concentrate on the meeting with the Board members because that's where most of the policy issues are discussed. You have indicated on the Policy Calendar three items, that was the ATRT3 and holistic review, as well as the DNS abuse item. On those two, I think I'll add the item of ODP for the SSAD. I think that one was left out and I think it's important. I think I'll start my report with that particular one.

The Board informed us that icann.org has been directed to start an ODP on the SSAD. As you may know, once there is an ODP, that's one step towards possible Board approval of the SSAD. This is important for the BC because it will be appreciated that the BC has been an active and consistent critic of SSAD ever since the GNSO approved the EPDP2. As you can see, at the top of the calendar, as recently as the 30$^{th}$ of March, the BC has expressed its comments on the EPDP2 recommendations. The BC has been in opposition to proceeding with the SSAD in its present form. So for now, because there's an ODP that's been activated, the only thing that the BC and the CSG colleagues can do is to wait and see what happens during and after the ODP.

Then just a side note on that is that also the ODP will include a so-called Design Feedback Group that will be a vehicle for community input, meaning that we in BC may be called upon at some point also to make

input to that process, although we don't agree with the SSAD in the first place.

The second item I can talk about is the ATRT3 and holistic review. Basically, the BC and other CSG partners have expressed dissatisfaction with the level of information flow on the status of ATRT3 implementation or even just where and how the community can make input. For example, the CSG has committed a small group to coordinate the input but without published structures of how this will be done or where it can be taken, the small group is also not able to proceed very well.

The BC has also proposed that the information or implementation process of the ATRT3 recommendations be available at locations that are published, preferably a central location. Then there's a something about the ATRT3 implementation, which is known as the prioritization framework, it's a significant step towards the implementation of ATRT3, as well as other recommendations. It's planned to be immediately rolled out. ICANN staff have already developed a model of this prioritization framework. And on the 27$^{th}$ of this month, I think in just a few days' time, there will be a webinar to keep the community abreast to inform them about what this prioritization framework is all about. And the community including the BC will be able to give input before that framework is adopted.

I think in another e-mail that I sent this afternoon, my time or let's say in the last two hours, I sent an e-mail with a link to register for that webinar. I invite all members of the BC to register for that webinar and

we can participate in that process of developing that particular framework.

The last item that was discussed with a meeting with the GNSO affiliated Board members was on DNS abuse. I think this topic is going very well with the Board. The Board has basically opened up and is willing to discuss the issue substantively. The Board also agreed with the BC's request through our chair, Mason, to designate DNS abuse as a high priority item in future engagements. The Board mentioned to us that they are ready to receive suggestions on confronting or addressing DNS abuse, as long as such suggestions are concrete, specific, measurable, implementable, as well as falling within ICANN's remit.

I think that's what I can report in terms of policies. The other report I would have made was on ICANN71 planning. There was only one issue there, but it has passed to the deadline of 21$^{st}$ for making plenary session proposals. So that one is already passed. So what I'll do with ICANN71, in case there are any other information about ICANN71 planning, I'll be sharing with the BC on e-mail as we go along. That's what I have for the reports now.

STEVE DELBIANCO:     I have two questions for you. Were you on the production call for ICANN71 this morning by any chance?

WAUDO SIGANGA:     No, unfortunately, I didn't—

**EN**

STEVE DELBIANCO:        No. Don't worry. Mason, anybody else on the call that was on that call?

MASON COLE:        Yeah, I was on call, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO:        Anything to report on 71 planning there?

MASON COLE:        On 71 planning, we have the carry forward from ICANN70 of the plenary session on regulatory updates. There have been, I don't remember, maybe seven or eight proposals coming from the ALAC and the GAC and the Registrars for other plenaries, including the GAC echoing our requests for a plenary on regulatory updates. So we have the GAC behind us on that request, which is good.

The only other thing I have to report—and Brenda might be able to back me up on this because I don't remember the exact time—but we went ahead and locked down a BC open meeting for the week of ICANN71. Time was going fast so we had to make a quick decision on our time slot. Brenda, if you're available, could you update us on that very quickly?

BRENDA BREWER:        Hi, Mason. Yes, I can update you. I cancelled the BC Membership call for Wednesday, June 16th, block four. So it's a 90-minute session, 14:30 local Hague time, which is 12:30 UTC time.

MASON COLE:          Okay. Very good. Thanks, Brenda. I recognize the time is going to be inconvenient for some of us. But as I mentioned, the time slots were going very quickly and we had to jump on whatever was available. I just want to thank Brenda for her help in doing that. Other than that, Steve, that was pretty much the limit. The block schedule should come out—I want to see sometime next week. It will be strictly a four-day meeting from Monday to Thursday. That's pretty much it from what I remember.

STEVE DELBIANCO:     All right. So, at least one plenary. It was the regulatory plenary that BC recommended for last time that's carried over.

MASON COLE:          Correct.

STEVE DELBIANCO:     Are you aware of any other submissions from BC members as far as plenary topics?

MASON COLE:          Not really.

STEVE DELBIANCO:     Waudo, go ahead, please.

WAUDO SIGANGA:    Just a quick question for Mason. The reason why we actually rolled over that regulatory developments session in the last ICANN meeting was because there was no person actually to speak there because, as you mentioned, the U.S. government had not yet designated somebody for that position. So I'm just wondering, is there any development in that area of getting a speaker?

MASON COLE:    Thanks, Waudo. Not yet, but it's high up on our list. I don't want to cancel another plenary. So it's a priority for me and I think for the BC to make sure that we find the speaker for the U.S. That should happen very soon.

WAUDO SIGANGA:    Thank you, Steve. I think I'm finished.

STEVE DELBIANCO:    Thanks, Waudo. Are there any questions for Waudo or Mason regarding ICANN71 or the CSG? I don't see any hands up. So I'll turn it back over to you, Mason.

MASON COLE:    Okay. Thanks, Steve. Thanks for leading us through the Policy discussion, as always. Brenda, if we could have the agenda back please. All right. Thank you, Brenda. All right. I have 36 past the hour. We're running well ahead of schedule.

Lawrence, I believe, is on the call but he's had some connectivity problems. Lawrence, are you there and can you hear us well?

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS:     Yes. I can hear you. Is my line okay?

MASON COLE:     It is for now. Yes. Thank you very much. Can you proceed with your report, please?

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS:     Thank you. So I'll jump in from where we just stopped talking about plans for—pardon me, please. My connection is not so good so I wouldn't be able to turn on my video. I hope this takes me to the end of my report. Jumping into plans for ICANN71. ExCom is also considering a BC outreach event to businesses in the European Union. We have started making plans but will definitely need the help and cooperation/collaboration of BC members from the European region. I wish to put this on the table so that BC members from the region could be on a lot. We will definitely reach out to some of you, but please, if you are interested in helping with conducting an outreach event to businesses in the region, please note that we really are looking forward to some assistance from BC members in the areas of mobilizing businesses and also as panelists to whatever topic it is that the BC will be focusing on. We will definitely share more details around this on the BC private list.

Waudo had also spoken about a forthcoming webinar on planning prioritization and finance. It's important that the BC will continue to monitor development in this area. We want to encourage members to please block out 15:00 UTC on the 27th of April to join the Planning Team, the Board, and Org to see what the plans are. We could have questions that we might want to mute for this particular important aspect of ICANN.

We currently have the open positions on the Communications Committee and the Onboarding Committee. Thanks to Ben, Mark, and Roger for signifying interest for the Onboarding Committee. We have just about two slots left for the ICANN Learn and Onboarding Committee. While Usuiph and Vivek, thanks for making inquiries around Communications. We're still waiting for you to openly declare your intention on the private list. And for members who are interested to also do so, we have seven positions for Communications. Due to this, there will be a Candidates call on the 6th which happens to be the next scheduled BC meeting. So it's going to be starting about 30 minutes earlier. Calendar invite has been shared, so please let's make this happen on the 6th. Where we have just the right number of volunteers, we will not need to go into an election. Otherwise, where any of these committees are oversubscribed, there might be a need for us to run an election to trim it down to the desired number. We also want to thank BC members for interest shown in the DNS Abuse Working Group. We have a very good number of persons who have indicated interest and we are encouraged.

The BC's Finance remains stable. We have not incurred any expenses from the last report. We don't have any new members to also welcome

into the BC. I would like members to note that from the 1ˢᵗ of May, we will be sending out invoices for Financial Year '22 dues. So please by the next scheduled BC meeting, all invoices will have gone out. If by that meeting you haven't received an invoice or you want some adjustments made to your invoice, even before then, please kindly e-mail myself or invoicing@icannbc.org and we will promptly attend to your request. We are still encouraging members to reach out to companies in the sphere of interest, influence, and based on their interest in the BC, recommend them for membership. I'll stop at this point. If you have any questions, I'll be happy to take them. Otherwise, I'll yield the floor back to the chair.

MASON COLE:　　　　　Thank you very much, Lawrence. Any questions or comments for Lawrence from anyone? Okay. I don't see any hands up. All right, Lawrence, thank you again for that update.

We'll move on to the agenda. We're well ahead of schedule. Before we get to AOB, are there any issues that any members would like to raise independent of what's on the agenda today? Okay. No hands again. Very good. Any other business to bring up before—oh, Mark, I'm sorry. I just caught your hand. Go ahead.

MARK DATYSGELD:　　　Thank you, Mason. Very short things before we give people back their time. Concerning the SSAC documents that I mentioned before, I'll just leave the document here in case anybody wants to review it. So I'm

posting in chat right now if anybody wants to read it ahead of the GNSO Council meeting. So there's that.

There's also a few like inter-BC matters real quick. We have been discussing how to engage during the near future and we have been discussing outreach, but I also have been bringing up the matter of inreach. So hopefully, at some point, we can actually get to the other just to chat. I know we're all busy but the same time would be good for everybody to catch up and even if it's half professional, half [inaudible], let's hang out. It would be good to hear about where everyone is at. Even as a councilor, it makes sense to be able to listen to people in a more individual basis instead of just from a call. So let's keep considering that.

Finally, we have a new BC logo on the pipeline. It's almost done. I sent some final drafts to Lawrence yesterday. I guess we'll have to figure out now how to actually choose one. Let's discuss this within the ExCom as soon as possible. That's it for me. Thank you very much.

MASON COLE:    Thank you, Mark. Very good. All right. Any other business to raise before the BC today, before we adjourn the call? All right. I see no hands. Therefore, I will yield 16 minutes of your day back to you.

So thanks, everybody. Thank you, Brenda, as usual for your support. If anything arises before our next meeting on May 6, please bring it up on the list and we'll deal with it appropriately. Otherwise, we'll talk to you on May 6. All right? Meeting is adjourned. Thanks, everybody.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPT]**