
BRENDA BREWER: Hello, everyone. This is Brenda speaking and I'd like to welcome you to the Business Constituency membership call on 11 July 2024 at 15:00 UTC. Today's call is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN expected standards of behavior. Please state your name before speaking and have your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking. We do have apologies today from David Snead and Anita Odonovich. And I will now 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 11 July. Good to see you all on the call. And we have a pretty ambitious policy calendar to cover today. So I'll turn the meeting over to Steve in a moment. But before I do, are there any updates or requests for an agenda spot this morning, please? Okay, don't see any hands. All right, we will handle our agenda in the usual order. And so let's move to item two. Steve, please take the floor.

STEVE DELBIANCO:: Hi Mason. I displayed the policy calendar that was sent out yesterday. Since our last meeting, we only had two comments that we filed. One is on an ICANN public comment process on the GNSO policy status report, looking at a handful of GNSO processes that were developed and needed to be evaluated for their effectiveness. Marie did the lion's share the work to draft it. Lawrence kicked in, I did some edits and then

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.

Steve Crocker came in with some edits that were very helpful at the end. So thank you to everyone for participating on that.

And then back on the 1st of July, last week, we filed a comment with the Netherlands, and this was an open consultation they had regarding how they would transpose the Institute directive. Mason Cole, thank you for doing the vast majority of drafting on that. And then Marie, you provided edits as did Steve Crocker. So that's now on record, not significantly different than what we filed in Sweden. But Mason, what I would say to you is that let's look ahead at the calendar and Marie, Sven, we could use your help on this. We need to take a look at the European member states. And to the extent that any of them opens a consultation period on their NIS 2 transition, giving us advanced notice so that we can give BC members a full seven days of review. It would be so helpful so that we can get it done. We have been scrambling sometimes when we learn about it late, and then and have to obtain permission for an abbreviated comment period. Is anyone aware of whether other nations are doing open consultations right now

MASON COLE:

Yes, there are ongoing consultations with various jurisdictions. I don't think any are immediately pressing right now like the previous one was. We're trying to turn if Austria has closed or kept open their comment period, it looks like it's closed. But I'll take the action item to inform the BC on known upcoming consultations. There's a tracker that we're using. So I will submit that to the BC so everybody understands where we are.

STEVE DELBIANCO:: Is it a live doc that gets updated dynamically?

MASON COLE: Yeah, so it's a website. I'll send out a link when I do.

STEVE DELBIANCO:: Yeah, that way we can assist at keeping track of the deadlines coming up in a consultation. And the beauty is that if a nation already has like Sven has been telling us a lot about what Germany's been working, then we know where they're leaning, or if they have a draft transposition, we can have a comment that's specifically targeted not only what Belgium did, but perhaps with other things we've said in the past. Thank you. Okay, and again, thanks for everyone who participated in that, especially Mason.

When I look at the open public comment periods, we've got a couple, right? The first is for internationalized domain names, non Latin, non ASCII script, generic TLDs that might require just a single [inaudible] character. There's a discussion underway on the SubPro really, which is the next round. And they've done a final report, and it listed out the notion that Chinese, Japanese, Korean languages, all use the basis of the Han script, where we are going to have to take a look at the objections process that might be necessary to support that. And a big thank you to Ching-Chiao, who has already volunteered in a reply all yesterday to draft the BC comment on that. It's due 16th of August, we have a lot of time. And the good news is that Ching already did a lot of the work on

this, and the comment that he drafted for us earlier on IDNs. So I think that's really going to be helpful. But Ching, let me ask you, since you're on the call, why is the ccNSO, the Country Code Organization, why are they not supporting it? And what do you know about the GAC?

CHING CHIAO:

Thank you, Steve. This is Ching-Chiao. So basically in our previous comment on the EPDP1, we have the position made, that's number one. And secondly, in that particular description, our reply to the EPD1, we have told, and this is actually happening, is that because of a lot of single character Han scripts, they are actually being used as country names, country abbreviation names. So that's something that they really need to look into, not only ccNSO, but also GAC, which I haven't heard anything from the GAC. So that's something probably not up to us, but for ccNSO and the GAC to decide.

STEVE DELBIANCO::

And countries are one thing. Well, what if it's the name of a city, a region, a continent, or God forbid, the name of a river? But are there objection procedures that could get in the way of a country trying to use it?

CHING CHIAO:

So you're talking about two things here. So one is the geographic name. So we all know that in the previous round, in this round, all the names went through this GMP, the geographic name panel processes. So that probably can be covered through that GMP processes. But other than

that, there's actually tens of thousands of single characters, Han single characters can be used in any forms of settings, whether it's meaningful in the meaningful context or not. So, but we are talking about primarily the single character country names here.

STEVE DELBIANCO:: Got it. We have a question from Asteway, please go ahead.

ASTEWAY NEGASH: Thank you. If I may ask a question to Ching-Chiao, why are these single character GTLDs only restricted to ideographs and sounds are not considered? So can you explain to me shortly why sounds are not considered within this?

CHING CHIAO: Got it. Very quickly on this is that the ideography, so the ideographic scripts such as Han scripts, because it provides a kind of a visually distinctive nature. So what you have seen on the screen is that the label generation, so the Chinese, Japanese, Korean generation panels have made the recommendations is that it is okay because of the single character Han script that the single character can be easily identified and it is not visually confusing. So that is why they specifically kind of single out that the CJK, the Han script are okay with a single character allocation on the top level.

STEVE DELBIANCO:: If you have some deep interest in that, would you be willing to help Ching with the drafting?

ASTEWAY NEGASH: Of course, of course, I'll be happy to.

CHING CHIAO: That would be awesome. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO:: Okay. Any other BC members? I'm looking at the chat. Great. And also you start by reading our last couple of IDN comments on phase one and the BC comments, which are on our website. [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you. I'm already going through them and I might need some help from Ching Chiao. I'll hook up with him later on. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO:: We should distribute something first week of August. Number two, the independent review process or IRP is subject to one of these implementation oversight teams or IOTs. This is the alphabet soup that makes people frustrated with ICANN. But they have proposed some updates to what are called supplementary procedures that surround the filing of an independent review process or IRP. And they're seeking, ICANN is seeking input from all of us on their proposed rules. And there's several rules in there. Some of them are seen by other clerical,

the timing on filing, circumstances, consolidation. They feel to me they're very process focused. And the BC did file a comment, for God's sakes it was six years ago. And it was done by [inaudible], myself and Chris Wilson who's on the call today. And Chris, your company has had some experience with IRP process. Others on the call that have as well. This would be an outstanding comment opportunity for us. Do I have BC members that would be willing to work on this? Oh, and Bartlett I see you're signing up to help with Asteway and Chang, right?

BARTLETT CLELAND: Yes, that's right Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO:: All right, so turn to this one, the IRP. Who else, who in the BC has got enough experience with the IRP to be able to help determine the BC's comment on these procedures? Thank you for a hand. And [inaudible] no longer with the BC who had helped to draft the last one. Chris, any chance that someone on your team that had experience with IRP would be able to draft? Wouldn't be identified as you know.

CHRIS WILSON: Thanks Steve, yeah, I think I'm happy to provide input. I don't know if I can initiate a comment, but why don't I take a look at what we filed last time and talk internally with colleagues about what we can say and what we can help with. But ideally we get someone that can sort of initiate something. That'd be great.

STEVE DELBIANCO:: If you have thoughts, you can send them to me in an email and I will put them into a comment doc. And then we don't need to disclose that Amazon had any position whatsoever. So anything you can do to be helpful, the BC will be the one representing the call. Any other BC members have been involved in IRPs? Thank you, thanks Chris. That's not due until September 16th. Thank you.

And then number three, while it's not an open public comment, we always at this point of the call turn to Marie, Sven and others in Europe who can give us more color. We covered a little bit of this earlier because Mason's going to circulate a link to a website about open transpositions. But is there anything else happening with member state transposition that you gonna bring to our attention?

MARIE PATTULLO: Hi, Steve, this is Marie. I don't have anything beyond what Mason said, but I would also point out that in Europe, we've been a bit tied up with elections. So for example, if you're looking at the coordinate, the cooperation groups, sorry, between member states, at the moment they will be more concerned about who's new in the European Parliament. And we've also had a number of national elections. So don't be terribly surprised that you don't see a lot of movement on technical issues for that reason. Thanks.

STEVE DELBIANCO:: Appreciate that, Marie. I had the impression that these were member state internal decisions that don't involve the European Parliament or commission.

MARIE PATTULLO: That's true, but what I meant was the cooperation group, which has been facilitated by the commission and ENISA.

STEVE DELBIANCO:: Yeah. Got it. Sven, others who have familiarity with the European process, anything else to add?

SVEN ECHTERNACH: So as I heard today, except Belgium and Germany, no one else is already so much ahead. On the other hand, I think there's still, it's important for non-European companies that they will choose the jurisdiction where they will assign a representative and then this jurisdiction would apply to them. And as I think Germany might be preferential because they are not adding any stricter regulation to the EU one, and they also made sure that they want to minimize the collection of data. So between the reseller, the registrar and the registry, they do not want people to double collect data. And that's most likely a grace period of a couple of months. So people do not have to be already by mid of October.

STEVE DELBIANCO:: That's fascinating. Germany's interpretation that might be an economic development to attract companies instead of going to Brussels come to Poland. Interesting idea.

MASON COLE: Steve, just one other point on this is that the implementation deadline, as you point out, is October of this year, but it's pretty well known that there are some jurisdictions who are going to miss that deadline. So this is going to be an ongoing issue beyond October for the BC. So I just wanted the BC to anticipate that.

STEVE DELBIANCO:: Any other comments, questions? Thank you, Sven, Marie. Opening it up to number two, I'm turning it over to Lawrence and Mark, our councilors. The next council meeting is the 18th of July. We had already covered on our last call what happened in Kigali. So Lawrence, I have just a handful of highlights here for council and let you lead us through it.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE ROBERTS: Thank you, Steve. To start with, before I go to the points highlighted on the policy calendar, council about an hour and a half ago had a joint meeting with the ccNSO. And one of the items of interest that came up has to do with ICANN's call, or rather the thoughts being proposed with regards to Mary Wong's letter in terms of some modifications to how we meet. This might be an issue of interest to the Business Constituency. And I believe that we should be giving some thoughts to how we think we should proceed if the meetings are too few, or if the ones we currently have needs to be remodeled.

So please, Steve, if you can go back to the top of the agenda for the council. On the 18th, we basically-

STEVE DELBIANCO:: Lawrence, let me stay with that because I scrolled right away to the item that you were talking about. Okay, please go ahead. So that's the item we were talking about on how we meet and we attached it. So they are suggesting that the BC could consolidate its input as opposed to having individual BC members. And wondering whether one of our councilors or incoming councilor could take the pen on this one to gather feedback from BC members on this. We don't have a lot of time, however. It's the 24th of July that they want the feedback on.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE ROBERTS: So to start with, this is of interest. I would want to join in this process and would also hope we have other people, maybe myself, maybe I can volunteer Vivek also. Yeah, I see Vivek says he will walk with me on this. And so we definitely, maybe we'll put up a draft and circulate some membership to be able to get our input before the 24th of July.

STEVE DELBIANCO:: Excellent. If we can circulate a draft by roughly the 17th of July, which is this time next week, that would be ideal to get BC members a chance. So it's all about how we meet. Are there any other members that would assist Lawrence and Vivek on this? It's relevant to all of us. It's not policy focused. It's about the way in which we meet both virtual and in-person, the frequency, meeting duration. So there are some new ideas in this document that they're circulating we're specifically supposed to react to. Okay, thanks, Lawrence. I'll scroll back up to the beginning of your section.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE ROBERTS: Thank you, Steve. So on the meeting, on the council meeting, we are looking to discuss, we were done with the votes on the audience requests that was unanimously approved. The EPDP on temporary specifications phase one, the board sent a letter to council and this will basically be seeking, you know, what our thoughts are with regards reviews for the temporary specs. Is there any concern from, if there's any concern from any BC member, this it will be well to let us know what these are and we can highlight this during the council meeting.

STEVE DELBIANCO:: Lawrence, this is only with respect to urgent requests that originate from government and law enforcement or is it broader?

LAWRENCE OLAWALE ROBERTS: Yes.

STEVE DELBIANCO:: So it's not us directly, although we will often ask the assistance of law enforcement investigating fraud being perpetrated on our customers. So we care about this as a presidential item, although we don't get to use the urgent request method is my understanding.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE ROBERTS: And my understanding of the issues is, you know, what should be termed as urgent. And we have members of the contracted party

claiming that over a weekend, or there might be instances where they cannot process requests and they don't want to be tied to those commitments in the agreement with ICANN. So there've been some interesting discussions, but I believe that the BC definitely will be interested in any kind of feedback. I mean, in the kind of, in any action that will provide feedback to request in a very timely fashion respective of the circumstances. And if there's anything that comes up in the course of discussion, I will draw membership's attention to it.

Item number five, accuracy check is a big issue that we've been discussing over the last two council meetings. The action from the last meeting was to get back to our membership to see if we could find ways of moving forward. So ICANN has come out to say that they are unable to provide the data sets that the accuracy scoping team requested for, they cannot process bulk requests. And so because of that, the scoping team has remained inactive because they don't have the information they need to work with.

Some members in council are of the view that we might just have to sit this out and see if NIS2 or the regional laws forces ICANN or forces the contracted parties with ICANN to find a way around this. The options were to defer further discussions for maybe another six months or a year until, and that's looking like the direction that council will go unless there are new developments on how information can be provided to the working team. That's about the state that we are in presently.

STEVE DELBIANCO:: On that one, Lawrence, given the accuracy requirements that have been imposed by Belgium and perhaps by other NIS2 transpositions, do you think it serves our interests to allow a few more countries to require the accuracy before we ask council to take another look?

LAWRENCE OLAWALE ROBERTS: Definitely, I think it does. So possibly if this is going to be deferred for another six months to maybe a year, we can go with that, hoping that in that time, the national laws will have kicked in and that there will be some very strong reasons for us to ask the council to take a second, a much deeper look at this. But we will try to see that we don't have this kicked out of discussion completely, but hopefully just kept in view for further developments.

STEVE DELBIANCO:: In the chat, Marie's saying, support deferral until NIS2 is fully implemented, but a straggler or two could take that out many, many months. If you start with six months at council on the 18th, it's possible then that six months from now, that puts us on the other side of the October deadline. But if only two or three nations have met the deadline, you could do six months more at that point. Would that be acceptable?

MARIE PATTULLO: That wasn't me, that was Margie. I had a different point though, which is kind of for you and Lawrence and Margie altogether. Lawrence, I know that the registrar stakeholder group has the published opinion

that accuracy means syntactical accuracy. So in other words, if I say marie@iliveinlawrenceshouse.com, that is accurate. But if you were to send an email, you wouldn't actually get hold of me. Now I have a concern with that because I don't regard that as being accurate. I think that the member states, when they implement NIS2, will also not have an agreement that that means accurate. But I do know that that's the registrars' position. So is that going to be discussed, that aspect going to be discussed in council? And I'd appreciate both Margie and Steve as to whether they think that syntactical accuracy equates to, yes, I can contact registrar and accuracy. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO::

Accuracy has to be functional. And if it's syntactically correct, but not deliverable, I think we should be really strong about that. Margie?

MARGIE MILAM:

Yes, this is Margie. I think accuracy is even more than that from when you look at NIS2, because it's talking about complete, accurate, and verified. And it's relating to the fields that NIS2 requires to be collected, including the identity. So I think that's where there's going to be a disconnect between the contracted parties or the registrars in this case and the rest of the community as they look as to how NIS2 would be implemented. So back in the day, I'm talking 10, 15 years ago when I used to be at ICANN and we had those accuracy studies, there were three different ways of looking at accuracy. And one of them was syntactical and one was operational, and I think the third one was

identity. So my suspicion is that it has to meet all of those requirements in order to comply with the NIS2 accuracy requirements.

STEVE DELBIANCO:: Margie and Marie, are we suggesting for our councilors to support a six month or something different?

MARIE PATTULLO: My point of view, I'd agree with Margie. Yes, let the member states get their legislation out there, but I would please ask both Lawrence and Mark and incoming Vivek to not let this registrar idea that it's all about syntax and operation overtake the fact that it doesn't let you contact the registrant if it's not the person themselves. So please do keep that one. Thank you.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE ROBERTS: Sure, thank you, Marie. That point is well taken. I think it's simple enough that the information required is one that you can get used to contact the registrant at the end of the day. So we'll keep pushing that. So to item seven, there is some feedback from the small team on singular and plural. We have some communication from the board and I believe their understanding rather is still in towards the fact that it's a hard nut to crack knowing differentiating between singulars and plurals, but this is a discussion that is just developing and I'm sure after the council meeting, there'll be some better direction on how the council will want to go around this, especially if votes are required.

For item number eight, the SubPro small team on the supplemental recommendations, we are expecting their report. That will be delivered by Paul McGrady and I'm sure that there will be some reports to provide after we review what they've presented. We had this broad discussion in Kigali with regards to item number nine, which is also of interest to the BC talking about their request for reconsideration. And the conclusion at the Kigali meeting was for a small team of councilors to write to the board, you know, stating the fact that the discussion or rather the letter hinged around no standing was in bad taste and the implications that could have to the broader community. And once the draft is, I'm sure that the draft might be approved at the next council meeting, that's the one going to the board. So hopefully this might be grounds for the board to officially declare what their intentions are with regards the request for reconsideration. Where maybe that will help to simmer down the feedbacks we've had so far. So that's all from council and the points given so far, the points raised so far is well taken.

There is also another item just before I yield the floor back to Steve that I was supposed to provide some form of statements around the aspirational statement that was put together by council. I see that it's on AOB of the council's agenda, but basically based on our last discussion, the angle, I believe the official angle of going as the BC is that we would want to maintain, we will want the freedom for councilors to continue to maintain their votes according to how they are directed by the BC irrespective of what the policy recommendations that come up to council are. That will be all for me and back to you, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO:: Thanks, Lawrence. We now have a handful of other council related activities. Zak and Arinola, anything on the transfer policy? Are we still waiting for the report?

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: Thank you so much, Steve. At this point, there's no update because we're just waiting for the report to be finalized the end of August and put out for final comment. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO:: Awesome, thank you. The next item up was the continuous improvement program and our representative there, Nenad, is not on the call. I will ask him for an update. Steve Crocker and I represent you on the RDRS standing committee. And we do a call every two weeks and it's frustrating. It's frustrating because it's led by a contract party, GoDaddy, who is very keen to keep the scope incredibly limited. In fact, his latest bid is to punt to council with a letter that asks council to consider policy discussions about responding to RDRS requests and allow the small team to avoid dealing with some of the incredible inconsistency in the way in which we get responses. All that the small team will do under his leadership is address technical changes to the screens that are used, publishing the data, and maybe adding a few explanatory or help screens to improve the quality of the data that goes in. Not much happening there of any import. Questions on that? Okay, great. And then subsequent rounds. Ching, you're alternate, and I don't know if Imran is on the call today. So do you have anything to report on what's going on there?

CHING CHIAO: Not anything specifically. So sorry, this is Ching again. But Steve, to answer your question, I do believe that we probably at this point that need to maybe to invite the staff or maybe some of the active participants to come to BC to share the latest updates on for example, the ASP and the RSP, because these two are definitely upcoming and just besides all this quote unquote, hot topics happening in the SubPro group, I think it's worthy for us to engage in, so at least to invite the staff to share the latest from the SubPro group. I mean, just in the general sense, just to share with you, it's just a tremendous amount of work these days to cover all these topics related to the next round. So I think it's time to have them to be with us.

STEVE DELBIANCO:: And you think it's better to do it prior to getting together in Istanbul, I take it?

CHING CHIAO: Yes.

STEVE DELBIANCO:: So which staff member would be the one to talk to us about SubPro?

CHING CHIAO: I would say overall, the ideal person definitely will be Lars to have him to join us, or maybe for example, the current definitely hot topic is the

ASP, which I believe a lot of BC members will be very interested in. So Kristy Buckley, the person who's in charge, definitely someone like her to join us on that particular topic.

STEVE DELBIANCO:: Mason, perhaps take that under consideration, and it would be just an email invite to see if they want to take 10 or 15 minutes out of a meeting if you thought that we had room on one of our biweekly meetings.

MASON COLE: [inaudible] Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO:: Oh, thank you. We already covered number five earlier, so I'd like to turn it over to Marie to cover the liaison position with the Commercial Stakeholders Group.

MARIE PATTULLO: Thanks, Steve, this is Marie. First up, we have just come off a Team 14 call, which was quite productive talking about how we are going to try to better work together with our colleagues from the NCSG to nominate the board seat that represents the entire house. We were just starting to throw around the fact that we need a proper procedure, we need deadlines, we need to start early enough in the process. One interesting thought that we came up with is one of the reasons why we should, if we had met our deadline and told everybody who our nomination was,

that feeds into the NomCom thinking, which then feeds into the geographical thinking. So for example, if we were to come up with a Latin American, the NomCom would factor that into there, because as you know on the board, there are geographical requirements, so it was interesting. So I should actually have something more solid to share with you soon. We also had a meeting of the CSG ExComm yesterday. Mason will jump in if I forget anything, but we were talking about the, as you remember back in Kigali, we decided that we would try to put in place regular calls for the whole house. So we're going to try to maybe do that three times a year at the moment in between the actual meetings, just to keep the relationship going, see how that works out. Brenda is also on the case already to try and get us a meeting room in Istanbul during the session, so we do have a regular house meeting. Make sure that keeps being part of every meeting.

The infamous day zero, which I don't know if Mason wants to take this. Do you want to take this one, Mason?

MASON COLE:

Sure. So Julf Helsingius who chaired the NCSG, Julf and I put together a proposal for ICANN Org to consider a day zero event. That's slightly incorrect on the report, Steve. We don't have preliminary agreement. We've got ICANN willing to entertain a proposal for a day zero event, which would include leadership of the CSG and the NCSG. This would be a repeat of the meeting that we had back last year in Hamburg. And I don't have a timeline for when to expect that decision from Org. They're obviously under a budget crunch. And so they may use that as an excuse to deny us. At the same time, we pointed out that the contracted

parties had a great time for three days in Paris with unfettered access to the board and a big party. And we're asking for a day zero event for one day for about 40 people. So we're very much hoping that we can get that on the calendar. We've got some travel arrangements to make before too long. And so we expect a decision fairly soon.

MARIE PATTULLO:

The other thing I would say is we have agreement, it seems we now have agreement within the CSG that we are going to support the current leadership of the GNSO council going forth for another term, which is waiting for the IPC to officially sign off on that. And then we'll let the NCSG know. [inaudible] Kigali, they seem to agree. For info, the chair of the CSG has now passed to the IPC. It changes every six months. So Lori Schulman has got that at the moment until she steps down at the AGM. And then it will come back to us in January of next year. So get ready to do CSG organizing things, people. That's enough for me, back to you, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO::

Thanks, Marie. Any questions for Marie on CSG? Mason, back to you, thank you.

MASON COLE:

Thank you, Steve. Good report. I have one thing to add, and that is that we have some changes in the NomCom coming up. And I know both Mia and Vivek are on the call. They can probably provide context, but our new NomCom representatives, they will take office shortly. Part of the

changes in the NomCom structure involves a procedure now that will randomize who gets to serve one-year terms and who gets to serve two-year terms. That randomization procedure will happen on Monday. It'll be carried out by the chair of the GNSO, Greg DeBiase, on a recorded call that I will attend. And we have assurances from GNSO leadership that it'll be a situation where one of our representatives will get a two-year term and one will get a one-year term. We won't have two serving one-year terms. So that's going to be helpful for us. We don't know who's going to serve which length of term. Obviously, that's going to be the result of the randomization procedure.

But I want to say, first, thank you to Mia and Vivek for their service because they did an outstanding job. And thank you to Ching and Arinola for stepping up to the plate. But Mia, Vivek, do you have any color you'd like to add on the NomCom changes before we move on?

VIVEK GOYAL:

Hi, Vivek here for the record. Mason, I think you covered it. And if you remember, we had a discussion about this when we were just starting the elections for the new BC members to represent us on the NomCom. And during discussions in the NomCom, there was a lot of opinions being voiced as to why it has been left to the last minute and should have happened earlier. And there was a lot of discussion that NomCom should inform everybody. And then somebody said, "No, everybody [inaudible]. They should come to NomCom." So I'm glad to know what is happening now. And once we have the results, then we can figure out our next steps. So who serves a one-year term? What is the eligibility like? And then who do we have to come back into those shoes for the

NomCom? Thank you for letting us know and look forward to seeing the results.

MIA BRICKHOUSE:

And Mason, I'll just add one quick thing, which, and obviously due to the restructuring, the entire NomCom will be new. And so I just want to offer probably both from Vivek and myself that please feel free to reach out if you have questions. And we've got copious notes in terms of things like format and process that we're happy to share just to ease your transition.

MASON COLE:

Very good, Mia. I'm sure that would be appreciated by Ching and Arinola. So Ching and Arinola, I encourage you to follow up with Mia and Vivek. And Mia and Vivek, thank you again for all your hard work. Okay, we have 16 minutes left in the call and let us proceed to item three, which is Tim's review of finance and operations. Tim, over to you.

TIM SMITH:

Thanks very much, Mason. Tim Smith for the record. I want to start off just reflecting back for a second to the Kigali outreach. And I wasn't on our call on July 2nd. So I'm not sure whether Asteway was there, but Asteway was one of the people who attended our Kigali outreach and joined the BC as a result of that. And Asteway, welcome. And thanks for stepping up on the IDN public comment with Ching Chiao. That's great. Great to see you. And great to see people being active as quickly as you have come in. So thank you very much.

Moving on, we are starting to work on an outreach for Istanbul and have contacted ICANN Org and the staff. And they seem to be working a little bit with us. And so we're just starting dialogue at this point. But they have had conversations. They, ICANN staff, have had conversations with a sub-branch of the Union of Commerce and Commodity Exchanges in Turkey, who are interested in or willing to prepare and arrange a networking event for a commercial stakeholder group for Turkey, for Istanbul. So that's something we'll be looking at as part of an outreach, I guess. But we'll start to plan. And I know that Nenad, when I talked to him in Kigali, he was interested in trying to work on an outreach, as was David Snead. So I'll be following up with both of them to see if there's something we can arrange for Turkey. So that's just to let you know about that.

On the finance side, we are in the process of closing out FY24. And there are just some final touches that are being put on that. And we're working with our accountant on that. But it looks like we're going to end the year with about \$42,000 in expenses on a budget that was originally planned to be about \$69,000. So we're well within our budget. And we should have that all finalized in the next little while. I know the accountant is interested in getting this wrapped up as quickly as they possibly can.

I also just prior to this meeting or last night submitted a draft FY25 budget for the ExComm. So I noticed there was some discussion this morning and we'll continue with our discussion on a draft that I presented to the ExComm. And I'm hoping we're going to have a meeting pretty soon in order to discuss that in more detail. And so once we go through that process, we'll have something to be able to present

to the finance committee and also to the membership. And I realized that we're already into FY25. So we're a little bit late in getting to this, but it's going to come together fairly quickly, I believe.

And just on membership, we have 67 members at the moment. We did pick up two new members from Kigali and there are four more applications that are in process. So it could even grow higher, which is good news. And we are at about 60% paid up at this particular point as we go into FY25. So I think all of the existing members have received their renewals. So I appreciate everybody's attention to getting those paid so that we can get all paid up and be in good shape as we go into FY25. And that's about all that I have at the moment to share with you. So I will take any questions that there may be.

JIMSON OLUFUYE:

Yes, thank you very much, Tim. I used to be the vice chair of finance and operations. Actually, there's been an issue of serious concern to me with regard to BC finances. Because FY23 and FY24, we do not have breakdown of budgets, we do not have breakdown of expenses for the fiscal year. And when I joined the BC, I never met it that way until this FY23 and FY24. And to tackle this, I was looking at, yes, perhaps we need to set up an audit committee because in any organization there should be an audit committee. For the period under review, the finance committee were never consulted. As a former vice chair, I used to be, or I've been in that, I mean, the finance committee never consulted. BC charter was violated because in the 10.6, it says that the BC budget and breakdown must be published to the BC private list. This FY23, nothing has been published. Yes, we get summary, but the charter request,

there should be transparency, there should be accountability and that's what we demand from ICANN itself. FY25, it's already started July 1st. We shouldn't still be talking about maybe budget for FY25. Should it be ready? The finance committee has been waiting. So I would like to propose if there is no objection, that we should set up an audit committee to look into the accounts of the BC from FY23 to FY24. We want the full breakdown. It's unprecedented what I've witnessed, but BC, there's always known for accountability and transparency. So that is my intervention at this point. Thank you.

TIM SMITH:

So, just let me respond by saying that it is certainly my commitment to bring these things up to date and in order by the end of my term. So within this calendar year. I hear your proposal for an audit committee. I don't know what the formal process is for approving or creating a new committee, but I'm open to hearing about that and certainly willing to do that. I've spent an enormous amount of time working on this to date and happy to continue and to work with you, Jimson, on these things. So if there is approval of an audit committee, if that's something that needs to be approved by ExComm or some fashion, I would look for some direction on that, but certainly willing to work to bring us back into order.

MASON COLE:

Okay, thank you, Tim. Thank you, Jimson, for the intervention. Any other questions or input for Tim, please? All right, very good. We're right on time. Steve, please.

STEVE DELBIANCO:: Just wanted to ask Tim, is it possible that the first step would be to meet with the finance committee, do a phone call and go over the draft budget that you've come up with and then open the conversation about whether there are any other reviews that the finance committee would like to make before starting a new committee? Can we not use the committee that we have? I guess that's my point. Thank you.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Yes, thank you very much, Steve. Actually, that has been the practice. Maybe three months to the end of the fiscal year, post-budget is sent to the finance committee. The finance committee does review, even with the current expenditure, and is now sent to the ExComm, ExComm reviews. And then before the end of the fiscal year, details are sent to the BC private list for members' input. So there has not been members' input for the past two years or thereabouts. So that's the real challenge. So since you took over in January this year, of course, you've been promising you're going to get the backlog up to date. This is July FY 25. And my fear is that it can continue like this. And I don't think, because I always make ICANN BC as an example, when I speak publicly, that we're quite transparent, very transparent in what we do, but this is not pleasing. So as Steve said, we hope something can happen. Otherwise, maybe there has to be proper audit committee to review the accounts. Thank you.

TIM SMITH: Would it be, and I'll turn to Lawrence in a second, would it be satisfactory as Steve suggests that I call a finance committee meeting to discuss sort of the scope of the concerns here and that we have a conversation within the next two weeks to do that?

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Well, that could be the first step, of course.

TIM SMITH: Thank you. Lawrence.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE ROBERTS: Yeah, thank you, Tim. And so to the issue raised by Jimson, it's good that he has been in this role and he knows the practice that definitely is being talked about. The bottom line is if you look at the BC's finances over the last three years, there are about even where we have a budget of about \$60,000 to \$65,000. We end up spending just about half of that is due to the prudent management processes and practices that the current ExComm has put in place. For the last year, for the previous year, we had about \$67,000 as our budget, but we did expand beyond some 45 to 46,000 US dollars. So I believe that the BC and its membership should be commending ExComm for the practices it's put in place to ensure that our funds are judiciously used rather than what we've experienced or what's been coming out of membership. I do not have any problems with subjecting my period of stewardship as the vice chair finance and operation to any kind of audit, whether it's internal or external, but I think we should also give some—it's circumspect with the

way we push issues within the BC. It gets to a point where we start calling the integrity of membership members who have served to questions like this. I think it is not proper at all. Talking about the finances in my time, the last year that Dr. Jimson was referring to, we have a budget in place. The budget was approved by ExComm and it was judiciously executed. We will see these outcomes when we have our reports presented by the accountant. We have an accountant whose job is to do this and we should let them do their job. Thank you.

JIMSON OLUFUYE:

Just for reference, please. BC charter section 1.2, 1.3.1, 2.5.2, 2.6.4, 10.6 and 10.6 in particular talks about accounting and transparency. That the business constituencies accounting period is a calendar year. The proposed budget for each year and the year end summary of account will be posted on the private list. This was not complied with. That is the bottom line. We need to see the line items. That is the point.

MASON COLE:

Okay, thank you, Jimson. Yeah, I know this has been an issue of concern for you for some time and in my capacity as Chair, I will commit to you that we will get information out to membership in a timely way so that it can be examined as soon as we get our books in final order for FY 25. And if that means that we need to have a meeting with a finance committee to make sure that membership is well represented with the ExComm's efforts, then we will do that. But I understand your frustration and ExComm will take this up. And I want to agree with Lawrence that the ExComm has done everything that we can to handle

BC finances in a responsible manner. So I appreciate your concern and we will make sure that we get that concern addressed. So thank you for raising this, Jimson.

All right, we are almost at time. In fact, we are at time. Is there any other business for the BC before we move on? Okay, Brenda, next BC call is two weeks from now on 25 July at the usual time?

BRENDA BREWER: That is correct.

MASON COLE: Very good. All right, ladies and gentlemen, thank you for your attention. Brenda, thank you for the support. We'll see you in two weeks time. BC is adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]