BRENDA BREWER:	Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. This is Brenda speaking. Welcome to the Business Constituency membership call on 2 June, 2022 at 15:00 UTC. Today's call is recorded. Kindly state your name before speaking and have your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking. Attendance is taken from Zoom participation. And we do have apologies from Tim Smith and Claire-Line Lallemand Juan. I will now turn the meeting over to our chair, Mason Cole. Thank you.
MASON COLE:	Thank you, Brenda. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everybody. Mason here, chair of the BC. Good to have you on the call. It's two minutes past the hour on 2nd of June. And we have the agenda up on the screen. So thank you for joining the call today. And are there any changes or additions to the agenda before we get started? Okay, don't see any hands. All right, thanks very much.
	We're switching up the agenda briefly today because Lawrence has to leave the call early. So we're going to dive right in and go to item number two on the agenda. Lawrence, over to you please.
LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS:	Thank you, Mason. Good morning, afternoon, and evening to all members. I'm sure that we will have a great day if our days are just starting. I'm starting my report to members today with some open ICANN announcements. First of all, I'm happy to announce that the BC has been in the news again. The new BC ICANN Learn course has gone

live on ICANN Learn. The announcements regarding this can be found on the blog site of ICANN org and it's been severally replicated across social media platforms belonging to ICANN.

The new course about the BC is available on ICANN Learn. It went live on the 25th of May and it's currently serving content. This new course describes the mission and the structure of the BC. How BC members proactively participate in ICANN policy development and [inaudible] within ICANN and how more businesses can get to join the BC.

I want to encourage members to kindly take time out to run this course. It will be nice for veterans in the business constituency to know how they would fare in terms of their scores and rating. And for those who recently just joined the BC, it would be nice to use this tool to update your knowledge about the BC. It's a very rich course content. And many thanks to the onboarding committee and other committees including communications and credentials who helped to see that we had a wonderful resource put out there.

In my report that I will share with members after the call, much after today, you will find links to the BC calls there. And I'm sure if you were to check the ICANN org site, you will also find links that will help you reach the course. Thanks again to staff that helped to work on this. Particularly, to Brenda, Chantelle, Carlos, and Chris Mondini.

Preparations are in top gear for ICANN74 at The Hague. And I'm sure that members have had time to participate in the prep week that's ending today. I'm sure also that members will have concluded the process of registration either onsite or online participants. Kindly ensure

that you do this in time to secure a place whether you're going to be at The Hague physically. I'm sure that there is enough room for participation online. But for those who will be there physically, please kindly ensure that you conclude this process so that you can be allowed into the meeting venue even while there physically.

Another important ICANN announcement that just came out is, ICANN has announced that the ICANN74 Policy Forum is going to be in Washington DC. I think that's an error, sorry. But we have two meetings that have now been slated for the US in 2023 and 2025. So ICANN has announced that in Washington DC, we'll be there for ICANN77 Policy Forum, not 74 which we'll hold at Marriott in Washington DC from the 12th to the 15th of June. While in Washington, in 2025, we will—sorry, while in Seattle in 2025 at the Hyatt for ICANN82. There's going to also be another meeting in North America. That's from the 8th to the 13th of March, 2025. This is welcome news for the community. Hope we will be able to resolve these issues to ensure that a lot of participation will be encouraged.

ICANN has also announced that they have completed a new audit for the IANA functions and everything has been reported to have gone well. In terms of membership, the BC's membership currently is at 65 for FY '22 and it looks like we'll be closing at that figure. We still have a few members who haven't paid up but who we're working with to add that to the FY '23 bills. And so, that number might eventually change when that happens.

There's an ongoing effort for outreach, BC outreach effort at AIS 22, 35 in Mauritius. AIS is the African Internet Summit. And so, the BC has

actively sustained participation of the African Internet Summit since 2017 using the instrument of ICANN CROP which provides facility for members to participate in IG events that are relevant to our ecosystem. This year, the BC has co-sponsored my participation at the African Internet Summit happening right now as I speak in Mauritius. I would have loved to show you the wonderful view here but it's past 7 midnight and so everywhere has turned dark.

The event had 866 participants registering but they had to also follow the COVID rules and so had two halls that were seating 50 persons while others had to stay in their rooms and other locations. At any rate, I had an opportunity today to address—during the policy development session to address the summit and spoke about the need of having more Africans engaging in the business constituency and in ICANN.

After my short speech, a former member who had exited the BC approached me to be re-engaged and I will be working with the invoicing secretariat to ensure that we are able to get him back into our membership. I look forward to having [inaudible] two, three more other persons from this ecosystem join in the BC.

In terms of direct outreach for new members we—I continue to encourage our membership especially now that we are edging towards the end of one financial year and moving to another. This will be a very beautiful time to have new members engaged in the BC. So we want to encourage members to kindly—you can reach out to me with persons who you might want to refer that we'll reach out to and speak to with regards to BC membership especially for the coming financial year. And where you want to also talk to them, please we have resources. A link to

our website and materials that we can send for you to help reach out and help conduct some outreach to get more members into our fold. This will definitely help with diversity. It will also help with our funding because we already have more new members, we will definitely have enough to cover our financial needs as a constituency.

Currently, the ICANN74 newsletter is under production and I'm sure they will have copies out in the coming week just before the hustle and bustle of ICANN74 gets into full effect. The social media handles are still active. We want to encourage members to tag ICANN BC across various social media handles when they post, so that we can also see what content they are posting and re-tweet the same.

With regards to our finance, I announced in the last meeting that out of the budget of $89,000 that we had approved, our expenditures at the region of 40,381. All the funds that came in for FY '22 in terms of revenue, stood at 35,828. So we've only shot over what we received in FY '22 by about $4,500. Our projected expenditure might go up by a thousand or two but this is still a safe figure seeing that we currently have well over 100,000 including the $65,000 that we have reserved as BC strategic funds still sitting on our account. And as more members continue to pay their dues, we definitely will remain in a very stable health condition as a constituency.

I want to use this opportunity to thank everyone that have started paying their dues. The frequency of remittance is very appreciable. Thank you very much and this is well appreciated. For members who might have issues, for instance you desire to pay with a credit card and don't know where to find the link, once you are logged into your BC

account as a member and you click on the invoice, you will find the link for payment right below the invoice.

As I also mentioned in our last meeting, we now have a new accountant engaged for the BC. The accounting firm of McDonald Jacobs has been engaged and we are working actively to ensure that bookkeeping efforts and IRS filing requirements are improved massively. For the dues, yes, I have mentioned the dues earlier, so please keep your dues coming. And if you have any issues whatsoever, please reach out to invoice@icannbc or reach out to myself. We'll be happy to provide support that can help you resolve these issues.

The next BC meeting will be a hybrid event on the 16th of June, 2022 by 13:00 UTC at The Hague in Netherlands. And for participation, we will all need to register on the ICANN74 meeting website and we'll get the links for participation. I would stop at this point to take any questions you might have. Anyway you don't have any questions for me, I will give the floor back to Mason.

MASON COLE: Thank you, Lawrence. Questions for Lawrence anyone. Okay, all right. Brenda, just to follow up on Lawrence's report, any updates or reminders that you'd like to issue to the BC with regard to registering for The Hague or logistics for the BC meeting or anything along those lines?

BRENDA BREWER: Yes, I would be happy to remind everyone the importance of registering early and putting the meetings, so sessions you want to attend on your calendar because they are limiting space for the in-person people. And even if you are remote, kindly register as soon as you can, so you can see the schedule.

Yesterday, I did send an email to CSG members which includes all of you with some great directions as far as registering and paying attention to the frequently asked questions which can be updated regularly. So that's what I had to report about ICANN74.

MASON COLE: Okay. Thanks, Brenda. All right, questions for Lawrence on his report or Brenda regarding the logistics for ICANN74. Okay, I don't see any hands. All right Lawrence, thanks for the report. I understand you may have to leave the call early, so thanks for that. And just on behalf of the BC, thank you again for all the work you're doing to get our bookkeeping and our financial transactions handed over to the new firm. It's been a long hard slog and I know everyone is very appreciative.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Thank you very much.

MASON COLE: Okay. Brenda, if you could put the agenda back up, please. All right. Let's move to item three which is our review of the policy calendar. Steve, over to you, please, Steve Supreme Court DelBianco.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Mason. And that little reference was a segue to why I'm going to apologize for getting you the policy calendar so late. It's because NetChoice had a case before the US Supreme Court, and just two nights ago, the Supreme Court granted our appeal motion. So we have been able to stop the State of Texas from forcing Facebook, Twitter and YouTube to carry content they don't want to carry for the time being. The legal battle continues but it was a big win. Thanks, Mason. Appreciate that.

The policy calendar that you have on the screen in front of you shows there are no open public comments at this time. ICANN org seems to be trying to limit the number of comments that are posted for public response in the one or two weeks leading up to an ICANN meeting. And I think that's a courtesy to let everybody avoid being overloaded.

So I did want to bring up though that one of the issues that we are closely focused on is NIS2 and the European Parliament, European Commission, and then of course, European government. We've been working on this for well over a year and Drew Bennett has been leading our effort in that regard. Let me see if Andrew—yeah, Drew is on the call. So for Drew and Marie, I'd like you to speak to what happened earlier this week when Marie circulated some excerpts of the trilogue draft in terms of assessing did we get as much of what we sought as we hoped and what are the next steps, so Drew and Marie.

EN

DREW BENNETT: [inaudible]. Yeah, let me give you—[inaudible] details are reviewed and of course, there's a lot more of the document to be read and a few things could still change. The highlights in terms of, I guess some of the finer points that we were consistently engaged on. And I guess, it's good to see that clearly there was points to be engaged on. And I think big picture, obviously, as we've stressed throughout having Article 23 was very important, and that achievement is there. And also, that it has as broad a scope as possible or I guess that we saw that scope get broader throughout the process here.

And so, that's a really good sign and probably fundamentally the most important thing that includes TLD, name registries and the entity is providing domain name registration services. I believe that's what the final text—well, the text that we have seen says and what should be final. And so, that scope had been broadened actually from previous versions but clearly does include registries and registrars, and I think [inaudible] contracted parties.

In terms of the data collected of legal persons, it was a little narrower than we would have liked but does include the email address which is important. The data collected that ends up in the text is domain name, date of registration, registrant's full name, registrant's contact, email address, registrant's contact telephone number, and the email and address and telephone number of the contact administrating the domain name. What you don't have in there is a physical address.

We do have the word verification in the recitals. Article 23, reference to the collection of accurate and complete information. So we do need that word verified in there but there is I believe text about a verification

in Recital 61. Let's see. I'm sorry. I'm still reading through some of this. And this is, I think, one of the areas that we could see some fine tuning because there still is—maybe Marie will probably correct me. The kind of publication finalization process. And actually, Marie if you could, that would be a good thing to follow up on when I'm done.

Then the domain name registration should be publicly available. I think that was another win. There was earlier versions that were [inaudible] published and we were kind of concerned about how contracted parties or others would interpret a [inaudible] publish and find a way to publish without that really being frankly accessible. And so, what the text ended up saying is made publicly available. We think that's a positive. And then, the timeline, the shot clock on that, the text ended up as, without undue delay and in any event within 72 hours. We think more strong language there. So we're at peace with that.

I think this issue of verification, how accurate and complete is defined and verified may still be worked out in the final language of the recital. Marie, how does that work from this point on? I mean, obviously also, there's the translation to the national laws. And I think a lot of that could happen there. But is there going to be anything in the past that we've seen so far to your knowledge and when was that kind of published?

MARIE PATTULLO: Thanks for that, Drew. Before we go further, I'd really like to thank you for the incredible work you did on leading this for the BC. From the Brussels site, now the co-legislators, so that's the European Parliament

and the council, agreed with the help of the commission in the process called the trilogue, on what is called the political agreement. But there are still some open bets. Now our sources and our friends in Brussels have told us that yesterday, the commission circulated a number of amendments that it would like to see to this political agreement. There's going to be a technical meeting tomorrow. Clearly, we haven't actually seen the text, so this is based on what we've been told by friends and colleagues.

There are a couple of worrying things in there. For example, we understand that in Recital 60, where we did have a very helpful reference to tackling illegal activities as proposed by the parliament, but that apparently has gone from the commission's latest compromise. There's also another couple of points of major concern to me. At least one being that a group of us lobbied very hard against a last-minute commission suggestion that verification of email address should only be where—well, verification in general, should only be where there is a suspicion of domain name abuse. We only found this out yesterday. That the commission is still trying to propose this.

So we've been in touch with their lead parliamentarian this morning, sending them our arguments again as to why this is a dreadful idea. This would kneecap the—it would really damage the verification process.

There's also some other tweaks in the recitals that the commission wants to see. Now, I'm not saying that this is going to happen because the commission isn't actually in charge, the parliament and the council are. But this proposal from the commission, I'd say 11 [inaudible] but it's really 13 [inaudible] a proposal from the commission to do some

EN

amendments. We haven't seen it. We know the meeting is tomorrow. Our guess is that, why they haven't officially released the agreement as struck, whatever happens tomorrow, I would say from my perspective that we're an awful lot better than we were before NIS2.

And please remember that under European law, this is only step 1. And what I mean by that is that this sort of law which is called a directive has to be changed by the member states and transposed into their national legal systems. What that means is, whatever happens tomorrow and thereafter, when the directive is actually adopted, the BC and all of our friends, we need to be active at national level in quite a lot of the European countries.

And at that point, we'll be working on the talking points and figuring out which countries are likely to be the most feasible or the most receptive. And we'll be coming back to you and asking for anyone who has a base in those countries. And in particular, if they speak the languages and the national [inaudible] that they can be speaking with their national governments so that the directive becomes a baseline, a minimum and not the absolute maximum that we can achieve. Steve, back to you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Marie and Drew, appreciate the incredible work you guys have put in to this. And let me turn to the BC members. Do you have questions for Drew and Marie on the NIS2 language and transposition? Okay, seeing no hands, thank you again.

Stay off of mute, Marie because we need you and Mark to talk about GSNO. The previous council meeting was the 19th of May. You were able

to unanimously approve the revised charter for the Standing Selection Committee where Arinola represents the BC, thank you. But there was a deferral on the final report on curative rights for international governmental organizations. Jay Chapman is on there and had recommended with Zak and Andy's help that we vote for it. But I note that it was deferred and I wonder if you can explain why and what that means.

MARIE PATTULLO: Yes, sure. I'll take the second question first even. What that means is that the decision should be taken at the next council meeting because it was a four-week deferral. As to why, it's because one of the councilors [inaudible] from the—I think it's registrars. If it's registry, some people shout but my head is saying registrars. Apparently, in their stakeholder group, they have concerns. I do not know what they are. That's why it was deferred.

The big discussion that we also had in council was, as you know, there's a proposal coming out of a small group in which Steve is very active. That rather than going for the full-blown SSAD that will cost huge amounts of money and take huge amounts of time, and won't be used, it's perhaps a good idea to look at a lighter, easier version and try it out and see if it actually works. And this became a SubPro versus WHOIS debate. Those councilors who represent the contracted parties think that we need to go forward for the next round as soon as possible and anything that stops the SubPro IRT is even—delays it slightly is the world's greatest disaster.

On the other hand, this so-called pause which would be—it's not actually pause. What would happen is, there's only a [inaudible] amount of human beings. So the people in [inaudible] who would be working on the SubPro would actually have to be working on SSAD [inaudible]. That's the issue.

And the likes of the NCPH NomCom Appointee, Paul McGrady pointed out that six weeks is not the longest delay in the history of SubPro. Anyway, that's what it pretty much degenerated into. So that work continues. Just as an aside, it's not something that was discussed to council. You'll remember that we don't actually have an official policy on whether closed generics are allowed or not. So the bit after the dot, kind of generic word be close to [inaudible] registry.

And we had a meeting today at the small team and council that is trying to agree to have a talk with the GAC about this because the GAC officially asked to speak to GNSO Council to see if we can scope out how we're going to deal with this. The GAC wants closed generics only to be allowed if they comply with public interest. As we know, SubPro itself couldn't come up with an agreement because of the extremes. We've got one side who wants absolutely everything to be allowed. And the other side who wants absolutely nothing to be allowed.

Anyway, we're pretty much there on the framing documents which we should see next week. When I do I'll share it with you that would allow—is it such a step on the process. Basically, all it would allow is council to hopefully agree to actually talk to the GAC and probably ALAC to figure out how we're going to have the conversation about closed

generics. And there's a lot of stuff on DNS Abuse, so at this point, I stop talking and hand it over to Mark.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Mark, anything to add about council?

MARK DATYSGELD: Thank you very much, Steve. Would you like me to segment neatly into DNS Abuse because I think Marie covered the GNSO part very well.

STEVE DELBIANCO: And I've scrolled to the DNS Abuse section. Anything you'd like to update, Mark?

MARK DATYSGELD: Thank you very much, Steve. So yes, there are a lot of things I would like to update everybody on. So we met yesterday as the GNSO Abuse small team with ICANN compliance. We met with Jamie and Leticia from that group. They are very key figures there. And I managed to ask questions directly to them. So a few clarifications came out of that, that I think might be of interest to the general constituency. So first of all, when we were talking about Section 3.18, which is where it is laid out what exactly needs to be done in terms of DNS Abuse by the contracted parties. And that's their relationship with compliance.

Right now, that section contains very open-ended, let's call it wording that need to be taken—that the steps need to be reasonable. And we

were wondering what that meant. And the answer to that, is that it means nothing in particular as confirmed by [inaudible]. It literally means nothing. It literally means [inaudible]. So that's where we stand in terms of DNS Abuse as it is right now. So it doesn't matter if we push the current model. The current model amounts to Göran telling us that OCTO has defined that DNS Abuse is going down which might be, to a number of factors. We don't know exactly the causality there. We can't say one way or another if it's really going down.

So we will need to force the current model a little bit if we want to accomplish something more. If we want to do better in DNS Abuse, we would actually need to change things around a little so that at least [inaudible] means something and reasonable means something. That can be achieved in multiple ways. We could start another PDP. That would take, staff tells me between 5 and 7 years. It seems like it's not the best use of everybody's time. We could start very tightly scoped EPDPs potentially, plural that would apparently be faster.

But we do have another option which is just sitting down and agreeing as a community on a direction. We do have common—most stakeholders that were capturing during the outreach phase of this group saying that everybody pretty much wants something to be done about DNS Abuse. And if we can start aligning on things, there is the possibility of contracted parties negotiating directly with ICANN org. And if that was to happen, on the one hand, we don't get to exactly control the terms or anything, but it's not like we get to do that on a PDP. They're right. So it would be more about trying to find the right balance and trying to find the right footing on the discussion and seeing how we can proceed from there.

EN

So the ideas of potentially recommending, urging or encouraging the contracted parties to negotiate with ICANN, some verification is very alive right now. And there's also the possibility of just coming together as a community and agreeing on something. That is a possibility, weird as that may seem. So ICANN74 would be a very important milestone in that sense. We'll get to hear more from more actors. We have sessions of the schedule. There are bilaterals that people want to have with me right now. So that's all good. It indicates that things are happening.

What remains to be seen is what will come out of this. In that sense, I can't promise anything in particular what the direction seems to be though. And don't quote me on that. But direction seems to be that we could potentially be looking into addressing maliciously registered domains within the current scope of what DNS Abuse is defined as with help from compliance. This actually helpful compliant. That seems to be realistic and that would actually be a lot of help already. Way more help than org is starting to provide. So that's where we stand right now. Hopefully, after the ICANN 74, we will be able to talk more and see where this is going [inaudible]. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Mark. Margie Milam has a question.

MARGIE MILAM: Hi, Mark and thank you very much for the update. I just wanted to share with the BC the experience that we had back in 2013 when the RAA was negotiated. At the time, I was with ICANN staff and it wasn't negotiation with the contracted parties and ICANN but ICANN came to the table

with recommendations that the community had put out for the various things that you see in the RAA today. So for example, the abuse point of contact and some of those requirements. So this sounds like a very interesting development and one that would be a lot faster and quicker than going through a year's long PDP where we wouldn't see anything for five to seven years. So Mark, great work on that.

MARK DATYSGELD: Thank you, Margie. If you have any additional expertise you would like to contribute, not necessarily right now but in the coming months, that would be awesome because we'll be in the thick of that and all of the members who were around during that time, and I know a few of you were here working on this last time this happened. Your expertise would be incredibly appreciated, so that we can try to steer this in a positive direction.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Mark and Margie. Any other questions? All right, returning to the policy calendar agenda, I did want to indicate that we have some other council items. We don't have an agenda for the next council meeting. It doesn't occur until June 15th while we're all together in The Hague. We won't see that agenda until over the weekend. I wanted to make sure that you understood that the small team that I'm on that worked on the SSAD Light, we had a meeting on the 25th of May to talk about next steps.

This meeting was partly prompted because I had suggested the DotMusic experience with the [inaudible] Data Protection Authority—

remember Michael [inaudible] who presented to us alongside Microsoft and a couple of other players. He suggested that if you do a really detailed privacy impact assessment, and you have a good technical model for certification identification, that he was confident that DotMusic was going to get approval from the [inaudible] DPA. And that would be a road map, potentially a road map for the European Data Protection Board that ICANN org o could follow for a centralized system. I mean, a real SSAD, not an SSAD Light, SSAD useless but a real one.

So we tee that off and Michael [inaudible] joined the call. Steve Crocker and I pressed on it but [inaudible] said, he doesn't have it yet. All he has is a no action letter. He doesn't have a technical proposal that it was "approved by the DPA." And until that happens, we're going to proceed with someone unsatisfying version of SSAD Light in terms of scoping it out and it's really just a ticketing system. So we'll keep pressing on that. I'll bring it up every time but there isn't at this point any success case study I can point to from DotMusic. I'll stop there. I don't see any question. I'll have the opportunity to see if Zak has anything to add on transfer policy? We're expecting that soon.

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: Hi, Steve. It's Zak. Nothing of substance to add. The working group is still tweaking relatively minor aspects of the draft report which will be going out shortly after ICANN. And I look forward to seeing you in The Hague. Thanks very much.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Excellent. Thank you, Zak. And then, Susan Kawaguchi represents us on an accuracy group and Susan is not on the call, so I would jump to channel three and Tim Smith is not with us today. There's nothing in the update for the CSG update on here other than that I added the link at the bottom to the policy briefing for ICANN74. Mason, with that, I am done with the policy calendar. Back to you.

MASON COLE: Thanks very much, Steve. Any follow up or questions for Steve on the policy calendar before we move on? Okay. All right Steve, thanks very much for the thorough overview as usual. And Brenda, if we could go back to the—thank you very much. We have about 20 minutes left in the call and we probably are going to finish early today. So unless there are other issues, you should bring it up under AOB. But before we do that, I was going to address for item number four, a couple of ICANN74 housekeeping items.

I think Brenda covered most of them earlier in the call. But let me just repeat how important it is that if you are going to be in The Hague, it's important to register for the meeting and then register for the sessions that you want to attend in order to have a place in the room. So if you haven't done taking care of that tour, please do that right away. This of course is a hybrid meeting format so remote participation will be well accommodated but if you do plan on being in The Hague, and I hope you do—and yes, Brenda, thank you for pointing that out. In-person registration closes in a few days on June 8.

So after that, I think you're relegated to remote participation. So Brenda, anything you wanted to add on that or did I cover pretty much everything along with your earlier report?

BRENDA BREWER: I think we covered it. Thank you.

MASON COLE: All right, thank you very much. Any questions for Brenda on ICANN74 or any other housekeeping items? Okay. All right, let's move to AOB. Alex, you have an item to raise?

ALEX DEACON: Yeah, thanks Mason. This is Alex. As we have time, I'll just do a quick update on the phase one EPDP IRT implementation review team, I think as of this month we have started our 4th year of work believe it or not but there has been some movement in terms of the drafting of the data processing agreement set have been required by the policy. And instead of going into the details here, I guess I just wanted to flag this as an interesting movement and activity in terms of the IRT and what I'll do is I'll draft a quick email to the BC list just to give people some details as to what's going on and when we may finish it and what the dependencies are. Just a heads up on that. I'll close it there for now.

MASON COLE:	Okay, Alex. Thanks for that update very much. It's good to see some progress finally on implementation after so many years. So thanks for raising that. Jimson, your hand is raised. Go ahead, please.
JIMSON OLUFUYE:	Hi, Mason and everyone. Greetings. Well, sorry. I've been on the road, so I'm just joining from the road. I just wanted to find out if ExCom got the email I sent to the ExCom because maybe about a month ago or thereabouts, I promised I will [inaudible] the comment on the issue of getting a new accountant and then, let me be the [inaudible] for a review of the charter. There are [inaudible] but I'm wondering if there's any update on that. Thank you.
MASON COLE:	Thank you, Jimson for raising this. Yes, ExCom did get your email and apologies for not dealing with that in a timely way but I will have an answer for you in the next couple of days. Certainly, before ICANN74, so you should expect that shortly and then, we can take it from there. Okay. Thank you for raising that, Jimson. All right, thank you.
JIMSON OLUFUYE:	Thank you.
MASON COLE:	Any other business before we adjourn? All right, very good. So as a reminder, if you haven't registered for ICANN74, please do so. Our next meeting as Lawrence pointed out is going to be on June 16 in The Hague

and we look forward to seeing everybody there. Those of you who are making the trip. And safe travels to everyone. We'll see you in The Hague. And thanks for Brenda for the support as usual. BC is adjourned. So long, everybody.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]