

---

BRENDA BREWER: Good day everyone. Welcome to the BC membership meeting on 16th February 2023 at 16:00 UTC. Today's call is recorded. Please state your name before speaking. Have your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking. Attendance is taken from Zoom participation. And with that, I'll turn this meeting over to BC chair, Mason Cole. Thank you.

MASON COLE: Thank you, Brenda. Good morning. Good afternoon. Good evening, everyone. Mason Cole here, chair of the BC. Good to have you on the call here on 16<sup>th</sup> February. We have our usual agenda up on the screen. Before we get started, does anyone have any additions or updates to the agenda, please?

Okay. So what we're going to do today is Steve is going to lead off as usual with the policy calendar review. Steve has promised to keep his part of the agenda fairly brief today because Lawrence has a number of things to update us on on finance and operations. And then we'll talk a little bit about ICANN 76 in Cancun as well. So with that, Steve, please take the floor. Go ahead. Thanks.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Mason. First item up is we filed a comment earlier this week on ICANN's five-year op and financial plan and next year's op plan and budget. My apologies that we couldn't get this into your hands for the seven-day review that is standard under our charter. We only gave you really a day and a half review. And that's because we got a little bit

---

*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.*

---

tangled up with a lot of other things to do. And over the weekend with Lawrence traveling, we didn't quite get it done.

I want to thank Tim Smith for drafting. And I appreciate that John Berard, among others, gave a look at the comment. There's only two pages. And we put it in. I do want you to know that at the very conclusion of our comment—and I think Margie Milam will be pleased about this—we suggested that ICANN provide the funding for additional policy and implementation work as nis2 is transposed by EU member states, that that will require further work on the SSAD as well as ICANN's compliance systems. So we've made that a budget request. Thanks again to Tim.

We only have one public comment period open that the BC is attentive to. And it's the procedures for reserving a top-level domain string for private use such that it would not be delegated. And I want to thank Rajiv who's volunteered to draft that comment for the BC. Rajiv and I have been talking and his inclination is to support what the SSAC came up with as a recommendation, as ICANN has transposed it into a proposal. Rajiv, why don't you tell folks what you're currently thinking on this basis before we circulate a draft in the next week or two?

RAJIV PRASAD:

Certainly. So the draft is in the final stages of completion. And I should have that shared out with you, Steve, and the wider BC community sometime later today. And I think in terms of the proposed procedure, I think generally supportive ought to be our position. There's nothing

---

really controversial, I suspect, in what's being proposed, about how this top-level domain string is selected.

There are some subjective elements in the procedure. And I've just pointed out that they likely need clarification as part of how the top-level domain string is selected. And it's a very short document, but I think our position ought to be generally supportive of how the procedure is expected to work out.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thanks, Rajiv. And the clarification on entirely subjective processes, procedures is something that BC often is attentive to at ICANN, because within ICANN, too many times subjective procedures are subject to gaming by parties that might have a particular agenda, and can then capture a process—the contract parties are awfully good at capturing a process in order to preserve something that they believe would be a business advantage for them, by justifying it in terms of security and stability of internal intranets.

So the more we can clarify the criteria that has to be transparent, the more that the community has input over a proposed reserved string, the better we can guard against the capture. That was one of the famous stress tests we put together for the IANA transition.

So Rajiv, when you send that over to me, I'll do a quick review, maybe give you a few edits, and then I'll take care of sharing it with the BC. You're way ahead of schedule because this is not due till the end of the month. Thank you. Any questions for Rajiv, or others who want to participate? Thanks again.

---

Next item up is not an open public comment, but our consistent attention to what's happening with NIS2. And is there any news on NIS2 transposition by member states or discussions of what it may require? Margie, I know you joined a little late, but in our comment on ICANN budget, we recommended that ICANN reserve extra funding for policy and implementation work as NIS2 is transposed. We think that will cause ICANN to undertake additional work on SSAD.

MARGIE MILAM: Oh, excellent. Thank you very much.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Marie, any news on NIS2 from your side of the pond?

MARIE PATTULLO: No, but I spoke with—I didn't speak with them. Sorry, I emailed [inaudible], which is not a part of the commission you know, it's the bit that writes intellectual property law among other things. I emailed them with some detail and with some questions, including whether they know who was awarded the tender to do the study on domain name accuracy and verification.

We know some of the people who've put themselves forward for it, because they're our friends. But we've got no idea as yet who the commissioners going to approve. If and when I get any detail, I will share it with you.

---

STEVE DELBIANCO: Great, thanks, Marie. Marie, let me leave you with the microphone for you and Mark to lead us through channel two on GNSO Council. And I realize you've already had your meeting today. And all I put in here was five items on the agenda. Go ahead.

MARIE PATTULLO: Yeah, I'll kick this off and do it really quickly, because I know we need to get to Lawrence. A lot of it was administration. Probably the two most important things for us on substance, as you know, there's a transfer policy review, because there's an awful lot of work going on there thanks to Arinola And Zak. We agreed to what we call a policy change request. In essence, all that is is they're consolidating the work they're doing, they're changing the order a bit, so it's going to take a bit longer. But it all makes sense. Unless Zak an Arinola want to come back on that, that's all that happened this morning.

The other interesting substantive conversation was about SubPro, where we were joined by Becky Burr from the Board, who ran us through what they discussed in the Board workshop. And in essence, the Board seems pretty keen to move on this quickly. They know that some of the recommendations that came out of SubPro have dependencies. For example, the conversation that's ongoing on closed generics as to what should be done on universal acceptance.

But they think that they can get to, as she put it, decision making in Cancun. I'm not quite sure what that means. And when questioned, she also said that they don't foresee any problems with the hold up of these other dependencies on setting up an IRT, an implementation review

---

team, in that the IRT could be kicked off while there are conversations ongoing with Council or the GAC or whomever.

And then we had a chat about what we're going to do in Mexico, including—I know this will make you all so happy—an open mic session. We can all come and queue up at the microphone and ask us questions to which you already know the answers. Mark, anything from you?

MARK DATYSGELD:

Yeah, so as Marie said, it was a very administrative meeting. But something that jumps to my mind is actually the questions that are being floated for us to ask the board during your next ICANN meeting. So I'm posting it on chat. There's some pretty interesting things that are being floated.

So basically, what I would say is, next round, being consolidated, potentially for 2023 AGM. That sounds ambitious, let's say, but it is what it is. A lot of tension around [inaudible] the IRTs. That seems to be a thing as well that wasn't previously being discussed and now seems to be a thing. It was very much the theme of a great part of the meeting. And Jeff is fighting a lot for SubPro being the end all to a lot of things, which I don't know how we feel or if we feel anything about it, but it seems that there is a lot of interest there for the outcomes of SubPro to be a thing. But yeah, otherwise, mostly a maintenance meeting. Thank you.

---

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Mark and Marie, I put into the chat a link to Tripti. She's the new Board chair. She posted a blog on the Board's January workshop. And the first two paragraphs are all about SubPro and the interest that she has as the new chair to have ICANN execute and deliver on what it thinks are projects that have taken a long time.

And I think that it's signaling that at least the Board chair level, there's an anxiousness to move ahead with the next round. But I mean, ordinarily, the BC uses one of these new rounds as a point of leverage to achieve consumer protection and brand protection elements as part of the rollout. And we have to look for the right opportunities to do that when it comes to defining new agreements, new contracts and agreements.

But I'm not aware of the same kind of pressure now that we had 10 years ago when the first round of expansion came out. There was tremendous pressure in the community. And Org at that time was anxious to start to bring in the revenue of the application fees to help to pay for the enhanced infrastructure they put together to evaluate the applications. And Tripti's blog is the first signal I've seen that Board and Org are beginning to get anxious to do the next round. And since Marie, you brought that up—and I didn't even realize it was a significant part of your agenda for this morning—are you sensing too that Org and Board are itching to get going?

MARIE PATTULLO:

I didn't sense anyone being itchy. But she did specify that it is one of the Board's priorities. You remember they had option one and option two,

---

option one being create a massive, great machine that can deal with every possible eventuality and cost vast amounts of money, and option two, pick what they think will be about the volume of applications and build systems and processes around that.

She also agreed with something that Council said to her before in that we're not in 2012 anymore and there's a lot of new technologies that can help with automation and speeding things up. But she did seem keen to let us know that they intend to be moving ahead and something will be happening in or around Cancun.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thank you, Marie. I've also put into the chat the final paragraph of Tripti's blog, where she also signals her intention to bring Board and Org a little closer together. If you recall, one of the things that Göran did when he came in was to give us this triumvirate of the community, Board and Org. That was pretty much something that he instituted.

I think Tripti is trying to say that the Board and Org work as one as opposed to making the Board sit out there subject to pressure from the community to where we can pressure the Board to lean on the Org. She may be signaling—maybe—that she wants less of that and would prefer that Board and Org be more aligned. So when you have new management, and we have a new acting CEO who's likely to be a candidate for the new CEO, we're going to have to pay attention to the way things could be changing. Any other comments on that?



---

MARK DATYSGLED:

I would say that the way this is being approached, Becky—she joined us briefly, and she seems to be bringing a new take on all this. So she has been giving a lot of emphasis ever since our closed meeting in LA back in December about how the Board is becoming more keen on working together with the GNSO Council as opposed to in parallel.

And they seem to be making, let's call them, honest efforts to do that. They have been more present. We have been hearing more from them. But at the same time, topics do sneak up out of nowhere, like usual. And I think we did see some of that yesterday. So we should be cautiously optimistic about that. But at the same time, it's very much a transition period as you [inaudible] so let's wait and see on that.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thank you, Mark. Below the Council agenda, we have a couple of other Council projects. And if anyone has an update, please put up your hand on this, the closed generics. Anything new on that? Okay, the transfer policy, that's Zak and Arinola. Guidance process. Lawrence, any updates on that?

LAWRENCE OLAWALE ROBERTS:

No, nothing new to report.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Okay. Zak, please go ahead.

---

ZAK MUSCOVITCH:

Thank you, Steve. We are wrapping up the review of the public comments, and the working group is going to be releasing an updated initial report shortly. But as we move into the remaining issues in the working group, one in particular is interesting. And if anybody would like to discuss it with Arinola and I offline, that'd be great. And maybe we'll schedule some time to do a BC call on it as well.

That issue is something that was originally discussed back in, I think it was 2010 when transfer policies were discussed previously. And the issue is a fast unlock scheme. A fast unlock scheme for undoing transfers. And so this was a very contentious issue when it arose previously. And the consensus was at that time not to proceed with a fast transfer to undo transfers. And that is now coming up again.

There seems to be a lot of opposition to it. It seems that it's probably not going to go ahead. But there are some people that are still looking to explore this issue and revisit it again. Essentially, a fast unlock mechanism would enable a domain name owner who's lost a domain name to have it reversed. And that obviously creates problems for the person that bought it, or the transferee. And so those are the kinds of issues that were discussed previously. So I don't anticipate that this is going to go forward. But it may. And so if anyone has any particular thoughts or concerns to share on that with Arinola and I, we'd love to hear that. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

When will we have the opportunity to evaluate proposals to change that lock?

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: Not for some time, because we're only at the very nascent stages of beginning that discussion. So we'll have plenty of notice if that issue comes to a head.

STEVE DELBIANCO: And was that idea introduced as a result of certain public comments that came in?

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: No, it was an issue that arose from the original charter for the working group, not something that arose from the recent public comments.

STEVE DELBIANCO: All right. Beautiful. Thank you. Any questions for Zak? And then Lawrence, anything on GNSO Guidance? You said no. And on DNS abuse, Mark has already discussed that. And then I don't have anything new on SSAD Light. We're still waiting for staff to come back with the implementation. And then I can proceed to Tim Smith, and the channel three on CSG.

TIM SMITH: Thanks, Steve, very much. While I didn't raise my hand when you were talking about closed generics, I guess the update is that a summary of the meeting that took place at the end of January. I circulated that to everybody earlier in the week. If you didn't see it, I can recirculate it.

---

But it is just a summary stating that the work continues on the issue of closed generics and that the hopes of the small group is that they'll have something to report before ICANN 76. So we'll see.

I guess other things, Steve, thanks for posting the links to both the prep week and the draft block schedule for ICANN 76. So that can be available for everybody. So that's great. And actually, speaking of prep week, the Work Stream 2 implementation will be part of an agenda at a meeting on Monday, February 27. While this is a CSG report that I'm giving, that will not just be a CSG review. BC, I guess, will also be part of that. So anybody who's interested in Work Stream 2 can join that meeting on Monday, February 27.

Moving along to Board seat 14, deliberations and discussions continue. And we now have interviewed five potential candidates. This is the CSG ExCom has interviewed five candidates, and we are hoping that we have come up with candidates that will be suitable and of interest to the NCSG. So that continues. We probably should have an update in a week or two on that. So we'll keep you posted as that proceeds.

And then finally, there is a CSG meeting with the Board during ICANN. And we received a note from Tripti actually with a specific question for that meeting. And as you see it, it's right here. The ICANN Board would like to explore how to combine the efficiencies of an agile approach to problem solving, like the Council small teams, with the need for accountability and transparency to make progress on policy conversations. When would such an approach be more appropriate and how can we ensure that it does not circumvent required steps in a

---

policy development process? So that's the question we just received the other day.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Tim, on that, I participated in a few recent small teams, and I would rate them highly for being efficient and effective. However, we need to establish at every turn that we cannot allow Council to limit CSG to a single rep on a small team. It's a disaster for us, because we are the IPC, the BC and the ISPCP with very different views. And if the price of us each having a seat is that the Noncontracted Parties House, the NCSG gets three, whatever. It's a price worth paying. They rarely show up with a cohesive strategy other than to block anything that we want to do. So let's just remember to remind Tripti at every turn, and the Board, that the CSG is simply a label that's given to three different constituencies, and that each of those constituencies needs to be a participant. I hope that's okay.

TIM SMITH:

Yeah, I think that's good, Steve. We at CSG ExCom have not had a chance to discuss this question since it was issued. But that's a really good point. So we'll make sure that we bring that forward when we have that discussion. So thanks for that.

And then finally, I guess the only other sort of CSG thing is that there will be a Public Safety Working Group meeting. And that's really at the end of prep week, sort of outside of prep week. But it'll be on Thursday, March 2<sup>nd</sup>, 15:00 UTC. And that is my report. Thank you. I'll take any questions.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Any questions for Tim? Beautiful, here we are at 11:24 and turning it back over to Mason.

MASON COLE: Well done, Steve. Thank you. And thanks, Tim, for your update, and Mark and Maire as well. All right, any follow-up questions for Steve, Mark, Marie, Tim, anyone? Okay, thanks very much. All right, let's move to Item three on the agenda, which is Lawrence's update. Lawrence is now visiting the US. Welcome to the US, Lawrence. And I have to say, to BC members, that Lawrence has done an outstanding job in the past week or so, helping us with what had turned into a very difficult banking issue for the BC. And he has spent some of his time here in the US visiting our bank and making sure that we have the records that we need and that we have access to our funds and we can collect funds from members, etc. He's done an outstanding job and deserves the applause of the BC. So, Lawrence, well done. Thank you very much. And I turn the floor over to you. Go ahead, please.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE ROBERTS: Thank you very much. Thanks for all the support from ExCom also. It would have been almost impossible to have gone through this without all your support. So very highly appreciative.

So to BC members, for over a year now, we've had some very teething challenges with our finances. Over the last eight months, we basically have not had the privilege to even make a single payment out of that

account, let alone having access to it, despite the fact that we had a retainership with a lawyer and despite the fact that the fee for the lawyer went from \$4000 to \$6000 and then went up a bit again to \$8,500, we basically were not getting the best of value for the payments being made. Our payments were made very late. Payments were taking about a month on average, despite the fact that we had funds in the BC's account. And we were subjected to all kinds of conditions that made it very difficult to operate.

So, ExCom took a decision to engage the services of another accountant that will also help with our bookkeeping and put in proper mechanisms for the account to be managed professionally, not just rely on the vice chair of finance and operations capabilities alone. And we again run into another challenge with the former accountant not cooperating to hand over accounts to the new one.

Eventually, Mason and myself had to approach the bank and had the previous accountant's access withdrawn. At that point, we also had the issue of accessing our accounts. And that's been the status despite calls and emails, and Mason having to personally walk into the bank, that had been our status until the previous week.

We gradually resolved a good number of these issues. We are now able to—we have had to patiently appeal to all the vendors that we engage. These vendors include the managers of our websites, the designers of our newsletters, and a number of other commitments that we have ongoing, including the payment of our website maintainers, which is, MemberClicks, all had to wait until we had these issues resolved.

---

But happy to report now that we have been able to have access. We now have access to our accounts. We have also gone ahead to make payments that were outstanding, except for a few that require some further discussions. I'm talking now about the fees for the new accountant. We're looking at, there's a proposal for a new study. And we're yet to also make our payments to the designer because I didn't have the details with me when last I visited the bank.

But aside from this, we've made all payments, and we currently have a balance of \$125,452. And the commitments that we have pending is in the range of \$10-15,000. So by the time we're closing the account for FY 23, effectively, we should still have over \$100,000 in our accounts, and that's a very good one for the BC.

Based on the budget that was drawn up for FY 23, closing budget for the year was to be in the range of 70 to 85,000 US dollars. So the fact that we are able to have over 100,000 left after we have closed activities for FY 23 speaks also to the good stewardship that ExCom is providing members at this particular time.

So to this effect, ExCom has also—before now, we had seriously considered setting up another account with another bank. And once we had that account set up, we were going to move all the funds in Wells Fargo account to the new bank. And that is still an option that we're considering, at least possibly maybe set up the new account and move what we had saved as our reserve funds there such that when we have an issue like we've had over the last eight months, the BC is not stranded or we're not in a position where we are not able to meet our fiduciary obligations.

---



---

At this point, before I go ahead with the other parts of my report, I just want again members to know that we've had this very teething issue. We are overcoming it to a great extent. Right now, we have a few issues to iron out with the bank before we decide whether we will still keep the account running or finally close it up.

But one of the focus of ExCom has been that whoever has the privilege of serving the BC as the vice chair of finance and operation, even where they don't reside in the United States, should have that ability to be able to manage our accounts. And that's one area that we are currently working to ensure is completely resolved. I would very much love to hear one or two members. If you have questions, please, I'd like to take them because it might help provide a much more rounded summary on our finances so far. Yes, Mason.

MASON COLE:

Thanks, Lawrence. I'll just ask on behalf of the BC, do you, at this point, recommend that we do switch banks, at least for the purpose of keeping our reserve fund separate, as you point out, so that we're not crippled in case something happens with Wells Fargo again?

LAWRENCE OLAWALE ROBERTS:

Yes, I strongly would advise that we definitely set up another account. And even where we want to continue to maintain the Wells Fargo account, because members are already familiar with that and some members have also provisioned that account in their CRMs and to make automated payments and all that, I still very much would advise and want to see the BC having another account with another bank and

---

moving our reserve funds—the amount that we have set aside as reserve funds currently sits at \$65,000. And so we're moving \$65,000 from an account that's over \$100,000. We definitely have moved majority of our funds to another bank. I very well suggest that we go ahead to set up an account with another bank. And it could also be an interest yielding sort of account, and just put the funds there. And if we have to revert back to that particular account, we have an auxiliary plan more or less. So I will advise we do this.

MASON COLE:

Okay. Very good. And then a follow-up question, if I may. On the issue of our accounting help. I believe I understand—and I just want to clarify for the BC—we have an accountant that we've used who's become uncooperative in terms of helping us file our taxes and keep our books. And we're looking at employing a new accounting firm for the purpose of making sure that our IRS obligations are complete and that our books are in good order. So we're strongly considering moving accounts and doing so pretty soon now that we have the Wells Fargo situation cleared up; correct?

LAWRENCE OLAWALE ROBERTS:

Yes, very correct. So recall that the new accountant was engaged last year and was able to help with some preliminary work for the first two to three months before we hit a stumbling block with the previous accountant. And so right now, we'll have to get back to this new accountant. They never disengaged, they've been very helpful,

providing advice, especially with regard setting up or another bank account and have advised us variously.

So they have stayed engaged and have shown that they are a reputable organization. There were some fixed amounts that we were to be paying monthly, which services couldn't be effected because of the stalemate we had. So these are the discussions that we need to have, what needs to happen with the backlog of payments. There's definitely the time that they were very much engaged that we have to pay for. We will get some rebates for the times where there was the stalemate and there was not so much work done. Hopefully, they will give some discounts in that regard.

Otherwise, if we were to go with the contract that we've entered into, their services is pegged at \$10,000 a year which also includes the IRS filing, our bookkeeping needs, aside from the automated system that we are supposed to provision. So in a worst-case scenario, where there is no further discounts provided, the BC, we have already entered into a contract that pays this new accountant \$10,000 for the year's service, including the IRS filing. But I'm just basically hoping to see if for the period where we had a stalemate, the BC could also make some savings in that regard. But we have a contract in place that has not been broken with the current accountant.

So right now—thanks for this question. Right now, myself and Mason are signatories to the BC's account at Wells Fargo. And we had also requested that the new accountant provide one of their top directors to also be a signatory, which was the practice that I met when I stepped into the office of vice chair.

---

---

So with this progress we've made now, especially with the Wells Fargo Bank, there is also that possibility of adding an additional member to the account. That's the accountant, aside one other BC member that had volunteered earlier to help with our finances. So I'm sure that in a worst-case scenario, if we have to fulfill that contract as it is, like I say, we will still not drop beyond \$100,000 In our balance by the end of FY 23.

MASON COLE:

Thanks, Lawrence. That's very helpful. I know this is tedious business, but it's important to the BC to make sure that our banking arrangement and our books are in order. So thank you for that explanation. And thank you for all your extra work.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE ROBERTS:

Thank you. Thank you, members. So seeing that we have some time left, I will quickly want to go through—So I had sent my report to the BC mailing list. Please, you can always review it after the meeting. But again, just reminding us about the registration for Cancun. For those who are going to be there in person, registration will end by the 8th. So we shouldn't wait until that time, especially because all the logistics are becoming tighter by the day, accommodation and [inaudible] like we've heard from members that ...

So please, let's do all we can to quickly close up registration. It is required for all the sessions. The prep week schedule is also out. Prep week is going to be from Monday the 27th of February to the 1st of March. There are 12 sessions. And there are quite a number of

---

interesting sessions that we will follow. This is always a precursor to the ICANN week itself. And it's nice to follow what's going on there.

We still have two slots for the CROP, the Community Regional Outreach Program. One slot has been allocated to Caroline. We have two slots left. And basically, because this meeting—that's for ICANN 77, because this meeting is in Washington DC, any member of the BC within North America qualify to use this facility to come physically to the ICANN meeting. There is going to be a BC outreach, which I'm going to be working with Caroline to work out the details. So any other member from within North America can join us in pulling this off.

CROP has to be used within the region where an ICANN meeting is taking place or at some other regional meeting. So if there's any other regional meeting aside from ICANN 77 that a member is interested in organizing outreach for the BC, please do a mail to ExCom and we'll drive the process from there.

The NomCom leadership positions are still open for the board of directors, the PTI Board, for At-Large—and At-Large is basically looking at Latin American region, Asia and Australia and Pacific Islands region. Those are the two regions where candidates are being requested. And also, as usual, the GNSO will be filling one seat for contracted parties and the other ones for the noncontracted party during this round.

You can get some more details about this from the ICANN website. We are currently in the process of enrolling a new member to the BC, which has gotten to a point where they are just to pay their invoice. And

---

hopefully, maybe at the next meeting, we will have Ching CHiao of Whois API Incorporated joining the BC.

We want to also encourage members to kindly reach out to business users in their sphere and encourage them to join what we do here within the BC. Most importantly, an outreach strategy, a draft outreach strategy for FY 23 has been circulated to our mailing list. Please, members should kindly take a look. And we will require your approval.

The outreach strategy is a document that is required by every SO and AC to be able to access CROP. And so despite the fact that FY 23 is nearing its end, we have to come up with this because CROP was opened back not too long ago. But typically, I'm sure that the outreach strategy we have for FY 23 will [better inform] our outreach strategy for FY 24, except if in the course of executing this, we find areas that we need to amend. Please, members, kindly take a look. You already have this in your emails.

We're planning for a BC inreach event. [It will be very interesting because we have this to discuss.] So I will leave this for Mason to handle. And just to also let us know that we are working towards the next BC newsletter. We need your articles to come in, especially members that were funded for outreaches in the course of this current year, would like to have your stories in there. And the next BC meeting will most likely be on the 2<sup>nd</sup> of March. I would want to yield the floor back to Mason, where no one has a question for me. Thank you. And thank you again for all the lovely comments in the chat. I really appreciate this. Thank you.

MASON COLE: Well deserved, Lawrence. You did a wonderful job. So thank you, and thank you for that very thorough report. Other questions for Lawrence, please? Okay. All right. With our time remaining, let me hit a couple of issues for the BC. One is ICANN 76. As Lawrence mentioned, we're planning what we call an inreach event, which is a gathering for BC members, probably cocktails or some kind of gathering in Cancun, probably at one of the hotels or something like that. Mark Datysgeld is looking into arrangements for that, including dates and times. So expect to hear from Mark or the ExCom in terms of inviting you to an inreach event that we hope, if you're going to be in Cancun, you will make time to attend. Mark, any comment on that before we move on?

MARK DATYSGELD: Yeah, real quick. Since this meeting has been a little bit confusing on the organization side, even from coming from the ICANN perspective, we'll try to keep it simple. And I'm also thinking there might be not an outreach but a community olive branch type of thing in which we invite people from some other constituencies, people that we see somehow as allies in a bit of an effort to in 2023 put ourselves out there as the constituency that is trying to bridge the Noncontracted Parties House. This seems like the time is ripe for that. It's not like a lot of us from the ExCom haven't been doing that. So thinking of ramping up that effort. More news soon.

---

MASON COLE: Very good. Thanks, Mark. And again, I hope, if you plan to be in Cancun, that you'll make time for the inreach. It'd be good to get the entire BC together for a little celebration and some outreach to the rest of the community. So I do hope you make time for that.

As a minder, Lawrence covered it but I believe registration for ICANN. 76 is due on March 8th, and after that, there is no in-person registration, at least on the ground. When you arrive in Cancun, if you're not registered, then I don't think there's an opportunity for you to register there. So Brenda, do I have that correct? Is that right?

BRENDA BREWER: You are correct.

MASON COLE: Okay. All right. Very good. We will have an in-person BC meeting on Monday afternoon. Correct, Brenda? In Cancun? I believe it's on the 13th of March.

BRENDA BREWER: That is correct. Yes. And we have a draft schedule, which I believe Steve shared. I can share that with everyone if you want to see the draft schedule. The meeting schedule is to be published tomorrow. So there shouldn't be any changes from this link I'm about to share. Monday is for BC.



---

MASON COLE:

Okay, great, thank you very much. A bit of bad timing in that the contracted parties are going to have an outreach adjacent to our meeting time to discuss their proactive work on DNS abuse. So that's a bummer, because that would be a good session for us to attend since we the BC has been so active on DNS abuse. But we'll take the time that we do have.

So please plan on making yourself available on Monday afternoon in Cancun for the BC meeting. And please also let me know if there's specific agenda items you'd like to cover. This will be an open meeting for the BC. We have 75 minutes scheduled.

When we do an open meeting at an ICANN venue, we normally have an abbreviated discussion on our policy calendar. And we kind of keep information to ourselves in order to preserve BC privacy. So if there are other agenda items or guests that you would like to see invited to the BC meeting, we have a bit of time to entertain others and to continue our discussions with the rest of the community. So if you have ideas about what you'd like to see in Cancun at the BC meeting, I encourage you to contact the ExCom to make those suggestions. That would be very helpful to the ExCom.

Okay, a couple other housekeeping items. We have one more meeting before Cancun that is on the 2<sup>nd</sup> of March in two weeks' time at our normal meeting time. We have, as Lawrence mentioned, or Steve mentioned, we have a call, or Tim, I guess, we have a call with the CSG and the PSWG which immediately precedes the BC call. So that is on the 2<sup>nd</sup> of March. I encourage all BC members to attend that discussion with PSWG. PSWG, the Public Safety Working Group of the GAC has been

---

helpful to the BC in terms of advancing our priorities within the ICANN sphere. It would be good if we had some BC members show up and make their voices heard to the PSWG and continue that good relationship.

Okay, and Brenda has dropped into the chat the link to the current draft ICANN schedule. So that is available now publicly for you to take a look at and make your plans for Cancun. Okay, I think I've talked enough there. Are there any other questions or follow-ups to what I just mentioned on any of those topics? All right. Is there any other business for the BC today?

All right. In that case, we will close the meeting a bit early. And with thanks to Brenda for the support and congratulations again to Lawrence for all his great work. We will adjourn and we will see you in two weeks' time on the 2nd of March. All right. BC is adjourned. Thanks, everyone.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPT]**