BRENDA BREWER:	Good day, everyone. Welcome to the Business Constituency Membership call on the 4th of August 2022 at 15:00 UTC.

Today's meeting is recorded. Please state your name before speaking and have your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking. Attendance is taken from Zoom participation. And with that, I'm turning the meeting over to your chair, Mason Cole. Thank you.

MASON COLE:	Thank you, Brenda. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. Mason Cole here, chair of the BC. Welcome to our call on 4 August 2022. Good to have you all on the call. I suspect there are a number of people who are on holiday this time of year. So we have a little bit lighter attendance today, but hopefully we'll have some others join as we progress through the hour.

So we have the agenda up on the screen. Are there any updates or additions to the agenda as it's presented? Okay. All right, we're going to cover our regular Policy Calendar review with Steve. If Lawrence is able to join, he'll provide a finance and operations update. We were just on an ExCom call about an hour ago and he's having connectivity difficulties. So we'll cover as much of that as we can. We'll cover all of it, if he's available. But if not, we'll cover as much as we can, and then update membership beyond that probably over e-mail. We'll talk a bit about ICANN75 which is coming right up, and then we'll go to AOB.

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.

All right. So with no further delay, Steve, take the floor, please, for item number two.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Great. Can you see the Policy Calendar on the screen? Great. Thank you very much. So we have one comment submitted since our last meeting, and that was on the Transfer Policy. Those comments closed on August the 2nd, but then I can't extend them for two weeks, presumably because some group asked for the extension. But thanks to the good work of Zak, Arinola, Vivek, Howard, John Berard, and Chris Wilson, we got it done. We submitted the comment on time yesterday. We agreed and supported with most of the recommendations. But even for two of the recommendations we supported, we added explanatory text explaining to the rest of the ICANN community how it is the BC came around to its view, and that is not supposed to diminish from our support for the Rec but it's supposed to explain inside the BC somewhat conflicting views on these topics were resolved. Thanks to that goes to Zak Muscovitch for organizing, making that happen. Zak, do you have any other further comments on our Transfer Policy?

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: Hey, Steve. Thanks. All I would add, Steve, isn't that terrific when you finally have the comment done that they give you the extension?

STEVE DELBIANCO: I know. It's like a curse, because if I took the extension, everybody would come up with changes. So I'm glad. Thank you for all your work

on that. Zak, you did explain in our comment that you want the working group to take a harder look at something and it's the only one we didn't support. That's worthy of some conversation, I think.

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: I think so, too. I think that that is going to engender some additional discussion within the working group when the public comments come back. So I don't think it's the end of the story on that. I think what the issue is here is that the working group basically is proposing that if you want to transfer your domain name, you log in, you get your Auth Code which they're now calling a TAC, and then you provide the TAC to the person you want to transfer the domain name to. And then you get this notice. The guy who wants to transfer gets the notice saying, "Okay, the transfer is happening." At that point, the proposal said the registrant is supposed to get some instructions about how to invalidate the proposal. But due to the timing, the transfer may have already been complete by the time the registrant gets that notice. So that's an issue that some people are focusing on.

But from the perspective of other people, they say, "Hey, listen. What's the point of giving the registrant an opportunity to meaningfully cancel the transfer?" because either they wanted it in the first place—and that's why they requested the Auth Code or TAC—or their account was penetrated and that notice is going to go to the hijacker, right? So I think that's open for discussion. Some people still like the comfort of having this notice, but they kind of fail to realize that the hijacker is the guy that's going to be getting the notice. So I think there'll be more

STEVE DELBIANCO: And remind everyone what does the TAC acronym stand for?

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: That's a good question. I knew this at one point, Steve. Transfer Authorization Code.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you. All right. Any questions for BC members for the work done on that? I'm looking in the queue. I don't see any. But thanks to Vivek and Howard for helping, and John Berard. Okay. Arinola, you too. I'm going to go back to the Policy Calendar here.

Okay. Let me jump down to open comments. There is nothing that is open right now but there are two coming up in August, which we'll have to jam in quickly before we all go to Kuala Lumpur. The first is the Accountability and Transparency Review Team, ATRT3, had done a recommendation for a Holistic Review. The "holistic" there means ICANN as a whole. The BC and CSG were really eager to see if we can leverage that Holistic Review into correcting some of the imbalances in representation in GNSO, and in particular, within the Non-Contracted Party House. So we're pinning a lot of hopes on that because it's so difficult in GNSO review to get any changes because those who are on the other side are happy to keep it the way it is.

All right. So when that comes back, we saw their Terms of Reference, this is a pilot for a Holistic Review, and they're going to be asking for community input. So my point of raising it was to see if I can get some volunteers in the BC who would help to analyze the Holistic Review Terms of Reference. Again, this is an opportunity to correct some of the imbalances of power between the contracted parties, non-contracted and the BC, and the NCSG. Do I have any names? A couple of old timers that have been down this path for the last 15 years have been really helpful. No takers? All right. That's going to be a challenge.

Okay. Number two, there's an Implementation Review Team coming up for EPDP Phase 1. So Phase 1 was where the very original policy changes necessary to implement the Temporary Specification response to GDPR's impact on WHOIS. Remember all that? Well, for three years, the Implementation Review Team, IRT, for Phase 1 has been cranking along and trying to move things towards implementation, and it has been awful, because ICANN is supposed to negotiate these data transfer agreements, data processing agreements with the contract parties and that isn't going well at all. NIS2 is also going to color the progress there. Alex Deacon has led the way on this. Alex and his clients have pulled him away from the in-depth ICANN policy work that he's done for us for almost six years. So at this point, we need to find additional help to look at the IRT and draft a BC comment, but in addition, to take Alex's seat on the Implementation Review Team.

Mark Svancarek from Microsoft had been helpful on this, but his company has also redeployed him in different ways. I'm happy to report that David Snead has volunteered to work with Alex on the comment that's coming up on the IRT, and they're going to connect. I'm trying to

EN

hold a phone call where Alex would walk us through where he sees elements that we need to comment on. That would also be sort of an orientation call for others who can volunteer to help. So, looking for another couple of volunteers to work with us on IRT which will come out in August. See any names on this Phase 1 IRT, implementing WHOIS policy changes in response to GDPR.

Cole, if you could ping Mark. Mark Svancarek at Microsoft—he might be interested in helping with this. He was so involved with EPDP at one point. Okay. There's quite a bunch today. Maybe vacations already started. Thanks, Cole.

Okay. I would like to turn to Drew Bennett to cover the current state of things with NIS2. Marie and others who are conversant with the process in European governments, please chime in. Drew? Drew, are you there? I'd see your name in the list. There you go.

DREW BENNETT: Do you hear me?

STEVE DELBIANCO: We do. Thank you.

DREW BENNETT: Do you see me?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Now we do.

DREW BENNETT: I'm stopping my video and giving that a try.

STEVE DELBIANCO: We hear you perfectly, Drew. Drew, you're muted right now. Now I think we've lost Drew. So let me just summarize this. Marie, please chime in if you could, please.

We are still waiting for the European Union to adopt the final text for NIS2. Then our point on that is maybe we can still influence the text, and that's the yellow highlight that Drew provided. But once the text has been adopted then the transposition by European governments begins. We discussed this extensively in The Hague, that we ought to do our best to arrange for countries or to encourage countries that have a sort of an expansive view and what it takes to protect registrants and users, countries like—I think we talked about Denmark, the Czech Republic. And if they can begin to implement the NIS2 in transposition in their own regulations, that becomes a guidepost for the other countries of the European Union as they implement. So, Drew, I turn it over to you now that you're back on.

DREW BENNETT: Yeah. My connection is not great, though. I kind of missed whatever you said. It sounds like you summarized what [inaudible] and then talk about transposition. And yeah, I know Mason's looking to organize a small group to start our kind of strategic engagement on that process eventually across Europe. I don't have any updates, though, on the

adoption of the text. I don't know if Marie or anyone else does. But I think everything's kind of in the Policy Calendar here I think led by Mason. We'll reach [inaudible] about next steps on engaging on transposition.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Drew, I had highlighted in yellow the one line that you gave me last night, which was there's still potential for some changes to the text before it's adopted, but do we have knowledge of who's been pushing for changes to the text, or explanations?

DREW BENNETT: Frankly, a lot of BC members and their affiliates have been pushing for a change to this paragraph that you see on the screen. Changes at this point—Marie would have much more knowledge—it would be quite rare. But it's my understanding that decision makers in Europe have been receptive to our perspective that this is not a technical tweak. It is substantive and meaningful. The fact that this change happened during the time period when those were supposed to be the type of technical changes that were supposed to take place and this was more than that. So the usual that there would not be more changes to the text. This could be an exception. We're hoping it's an exception.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Drew, can I ask you to—let's explain that. The text on the screen talks about non-duplication. Because we have something like called RDAP. RDAP was supposed to be the replacement for Port 43 WHOIS access,

notion being that, technically, you make a query for WHOIS information, and it gets routed to the appropriate place. And the appropriate place is the registrars who maintain the relationships with the registrant. Now, that was laid out through the tag and it was a principle that was pervasive in the EPDP. So the policy at ICANN just to move to RDAP, which would say that there shouldn't be any requirement that both registries and registrars have the information. So what is our problem with this paragraph? Could you summarize that?

DREW BENNETT: I think it would be that it's in conflict with the broader objectives of Article 23. We don't have this on the screen. I think I won't be able to speak to what ICANN policy is supposed to be, and where it might be headed. But the intent of Article 23 is a straightforward path to that registrant information. We view this as all of the entities that were captured in the rest of Article 23, some of them, according to this paragraph, would effectively have an exception and say, "Sorry, don't look here." I think that would be—

STEVE DELBIANCO: A concern I've heard expressed is with the thin registry like .com would use this to say that they don't have the registrant information so go get it from the registrars. That would be a burden for those needing to track down registration from hundreds of different registrars. But I thought that the answer to that is something that's already been adopted by the Board and is yet to be implemented which is RDAP. RDAP gets the data from the registrar no matter whether it's a thick or thin registry. I think

we would need a better understanding of how this will harm our interests in the BC.

DREW BENNETT: Okay. I think you do not just describe it absent the policy change at ICANN.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Got it. So that the implementation of RDAP is not there yet. There's no centralized way to chase down registrant information when you have a legitimate need to get it. It won't help at all that some registries are thin and don't have the information until you get it.

DREW BENNETT: Correct.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Okay. Are there any questions for Drew or Marie or others? Any other comments? Okay. I don't see any hands up. Drew, anything further?

DREW BENNETT: No. That's all. Thanks.

STEVE DELBIANCO: No, thank you. All right. We're now going to turn to Council. I have on the screen a short summary of a couple of the votes and deferrals that happened on the 21st of July. We don't have an agenda yet for the 25th

EN

of August Council meeting. So I turn it over to Marie and to Mark, our councilors.

MARIE PATTULLO: Thank you. Mark is with us but he is working from a building site so he's not going to be on voice because what you can hear is thump and bang. But he will jump into the chat if I say something stupid. Lovely to see you all, by the way.

The last meeting, as you saw, was on the 21st to explain a couple of things that are on there and also a couple of things that aren't. We were going to have a vote on this thing called the GNSO Guidance Process. Now, what does that mean? Basically, what it means is that an awful lot of stuff that came out of SubPro report is very complex. Some of it is implementation, some of it is policy. And we'll need experts to actually work this through in practice. This is the first ever GGP, although it's existed for a long time. The idea is that this would start and cut its teeth on Applicant Support, which, as you know, is very difficult if you are trying to apply for a new gTLD.

Now, what staff came up with and then got tweaked around the edges is basically this idea that they looked at what SubPro said and said, "Yes, that's very complicated." So we know that SubPro said we should bring in experts from various parts of the community or experts from outside the community, if they're the people that know what we need. They should put their heads together, and come up with a way forward, and then come back to Council, and we'll do that.

What actually happened is they're proposing what they're calling a Steering Committee of 30 people—20 plus 10—that will oversee working groups such as, for example, the one about Applicant Support. So a bunch of us went back. Yes, 30 people, Mark. A bunch of us went back to Council and said, "So what you're saying is you want a mirror of Council, to do what Council does, so that we can set up a whole bunch of working groups under this mirror of Council?" And that doesn't sound very sensible. Wouldn't it be better if we have something a lot smaller, a lot tighter, a bunch of people who say, "What do we need on this? We need this expertise. Where can we find the expert there?" Move forward, get the experts in place and just channel it properly.

Now, I realize I'm using a lot of words. I'm going to put this into an e-mail to you. But this is basically what Mark and I and some of our friends in other parts of the house and actually other house as well think makes a lot more sense than creating this tiny monster of 30 people. So watch out for an e-mail from Mark and I on that, which we'll get to you shortly. Then hopefully, we can actually go to something more sensible. That explains that part.

Another part that's been happening, that's been bubbling up for a while is that closed generics, our old friend closed generics. SubPro talked about this for a long time and got to no result, no solution, because at one end, you've got the, "Yay, every closed generic in the world should be allowed." The other end you've got, "Oh, my God, closed generics are evil. No closed generics." So what happened is the GAC, the governments, said, "Come on, can we actually figure this out?" They went to the Board. The Board came to Council and said, "Can we have a facilitated dialogue?" A bunch of people from GNSO, bunch of people

from GAC who sit down and try to figure out a high-level workable framework that will actually allow some kind of policy on closed generics. Because right now, we don't have one. There isn't actually an official rule. Well, there is, but it's not applied.

This went through the rest in the mail, blah, blah. And what happened, what came out is that we've agreed within a small group in Council that we want a nice little small group of people who do not represent, for example, the interest of the BC, for example, the interest of the NCSG. But people will actually want to get to a solution. That they get together and they figure out—a couple of people from the GAC, few people from the GNSO, somebody from ALAC—"Is there a way we can actually come up with this framework?" Excuse me, I'm coughing a bit. I'm just getting over COVID, I'm sorry.

What's going to happen is Melissa Allgood, she now works for ICANN, she's going to be the neutral facilitator. I'm going to send you an e-mail explaining this in more detail. We're also [sending] out who the people are. But hopefully, this means we can actually get somewhere. And it cannot be, "Oh my God, no closed generics," or "Oh my God. No closed generics because then we're just going round to the second, nothing will happen."

And then we're having a lot of tos and fros about should the current GAC liaison, Jeff, have a time limit? Should the GAC liaison itself have a time limit? Should Jeff be the liaison to the GAC and to the SubPro ODP at the same time? This is all very boring. If you want to know more about it, ask Mark and I.

Now, the only really interesting bit is DNS abuse, and that's Mark. But, Mark, I don't know if you can talk or if you're still in the building site.

MARK DATYSGELD: I can talk real quick, not to burden too much. So basically, we have wrapped up the inputs review from the community. We seem to have made quite a lot of progress on that. It's been pretty good. We will arrive at a draft report within two weeks. This draft report will be presented by the Kuala Lumpur meeting. The thing is that from that point on, this starts to get into Council territory. That's where the real battles will be fought. Because so far, it's been pretty good. The decisions have favored our position a lot, and it will be a matter of seeing how this pans out after this gets to Council. Because so far, the NCSG, for example, has been awfully quiet or absent. But on the other hand, CPH is pretty much on Board with the things that we're requesting. So it should be a very manageable fight. So I'm thinking positively about this. Between KL and the next meeting, there's quite a bit of time, which will be the time where we will be working on actually finalizing the report. This will be potentially a big topic next year, so fasten your seat belts.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Okay. Marie and Mark, anything further that you want to cover on Council? DNS abuse? Okay. I'm not hearing anything. I'd like to turn over to Tim to cover CSG. Go ahead, Tim.

TIM SMITH:	Thanks, Steve. Not too much to report. But as you see there, we had a CSG Membership meeting with GNSO-appointed Board members on July 19th. I think many people on this call were probably on that call. I think there were about 38 people on the call. So, good discussion, I guess, good exchange, and a few updates. One on registration data and the SSAD Light design paper is underway. They're trying to make it with no delays to other projects that are being worked on like SubPro. They wouldn't guarantee that there would be no delays, but they were trying to minimize them.

EPDP Phase 1 negotiations with contracted parties, as you see, they are proceeding slowly but in good faith. So that was positive news to hear. On DNS abuse, we also discussed that. And the Board, of course, has their working group and they're taking a look at the landscape and all the participants and the different initiatives that are underway, including DNSAI's NetBeacon. They're trying to assemble a map of how all of these initiatives come together and how they can be advanced. That's what they're working on. BC certainly made our point that Compliance department needs to be given tools in order to address the bad actors. So we made sure that that point was made.

That's really a summary of that meeting. I guess the other thing that we've been watching, of course, we had CSG participation in the Planning Prioritization Framework Project pilot and haven't seen an update on that since before ICANN74, in fact, so still waiting on that. That's about it. As is noted here also, registration is open for ICANN75. Prep Week schedule is supposed to be posted in a couple of weeks.

Then upcoming on CSG matters. The ICANN CEO has invited CSG members to a meeting—to a dinner, in fact—during ICANN75, which I believe, that's going to be on Monday, September 19th. BC is able to have four representatives from the ExCom. We're in the process of assembling that group. As I noted here, it's an opportunity to talk about ICANN and other matters of interest in a casual way. Just waiting to learn more about that.

Then during ICANN75, there is a BC Membership meeting on Sunday, the 18th. There will also be a CSG members meeting on Tuesday, the 20th. That pretty well is it for CSG at the moment.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Any questions for Tim? Tim, I put up on the screen—they came in just the other day from ICANN management. It has to do with which topics are going to be covered during the plenaries at ICANN75. And out of five topics proposed, three topics were supported. Universal Acceptance, reputation block lists and the DNS abuse conversation, and Internet fragmentation. She goes on to say Internet fragmentation, DNS and ICANN emerged the topic with the most support for a plenary session. Does that indicate they're only going to do a single plenary session as opposed to multiple ones? Mason, please jump in on this. I think you've been part of the planning.

TIM SMITH: I haven't seen this so I can't really comment on that, Steve. I don't know.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Okay. Mason, anything to add on this?

MASON COLE: Yeah. I believe that's the case, Steve. I think there is only one plenary, and the fragmentation discussion is the one that came out on top. Brenda may know more. Brenda, is my impression correct?

STEVE DELBIANCO: It's a GAC proposition.

BRENDA BREWER: Your impression of?

STEVE DELBIANCO: That we're only going to have a single plenary.

BRENDA BREWER: Yes, that is correct.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Okay. So that's what's it's going to be, Internet fragmentation, DNS and ICANN. If there are BC members that want to get on that panel or have the BC perspective presented, we would need to start lobbying to get into that organization process right away. Are there any BC members that feel important to talk about Internet fragmentation, DNS and

ICANN? I'm not seeing any hands or chat. So I will turn it back over to you, Mason. That's it for Policy Calendar.

MASON COLE: Okay. Thanks very much, Steve. Good review on the Policy Calendar, as always. Thank you. Lawrence, are you with us and can you hear?

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Yes. Good day, everybody. Pardon me, I will not be able to speak on my video. I'm having very challenging link today. I just hope it holds through my presentation. Apologies again about my environment. It's a bit noisy, so please bear with me. To start with—

STEVE DELBIANCO: Lawrence, would you like me to present the Budget document and scroll through it as you speak?

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: That will be great, Steve. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: It's up, Lawrence.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Thanks. We had done a bit of review around this on our last meeting. That was more or less an abridged version. Here is the full version. We'll be sharing this with members after the call. Basically, this is the financial

report for FY22 and also our budget proposal for the current financial year, FY23. Let me see if I can make this a bit larger.

Okay. Basically, the summary of the report is on the Executive Summary. That's right on page five. That's to let us know that—thank you, Steve. Yes. So just to let us know that, looking at the fourth paragraph in FY22, the last financial year that just ended, we had a combined income of $35,593, which is a combination of our dues, and $3,900 that was paid by ICANN for the maintenance of our web platform which is MemberClicks. So all that came to $35,593. This represents a 1.9 increase over the FY 2021, which was a combined sum of $37,907. There was that drop because a number of members, about four members, resigned membership. But this was augmented also with seven members that eventually got to join the BC in the last financial year. We are still working with two members to see that we reduce the number of persons who eventually dropped off membership.

So that cost, a total amount that was expended for FY22 came to [inaudible] and the deficit was in the range of [$4000] thereabouts. We closed FY22 with 72 members, up from the 64. Many thanks to the credentials committee led by Zak [with awesome team] [inaudible] Vivek and [inaudible] who had a lot of job to do at some point. We're hoping that we'll be able to repeat the same feat for FY23 where we'll have at least five new members joining the BC.

The projected revenue for FY23 is sitting at about $33,272. This is where we have five members resigning and we have about five also joining in. At this point, I want to state that the BC has been fortunate to have some funds, not the reserve funds [but aside from the reserve funds]

which is in the tune of $65,000 USD. We have also been fortunate to have had some surplus from previous years. [inaudible] we continue to maintain membership income at the rate of $33,000 to $35,000, it will not be able to sustain our [inaudible] budgets. The proposed budget for FY23 is in the region of about [$74,900.]

STEVE DELBIANCO: Lawrence, it's Steve. I would just ask you to get as close to the microphone as you can, and then please address how it is we can spend twice as much as is coming in for Fiscal Year '23. Where would that money come from? Thank you.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Thank you. I hope my audio is a bit better now. So over the last—if we were to turn to—please, Steve, can you go to page 9? To answer the question, the table we have on page 9 basically summarizes our financials from FY15 to date. If we look at the first number, which is income, membership fees plus the ICANN MemberClicks refund, we have had a decline in membership dues, which in FY15 was about $67,000. But the actuals for last financial year came to—sorry. The last financial year was not $37,000, it was about $33,000 USD. So we have witnessed a decline year after year. Aside the fact that we had a reduction in our membership size, at some point we also dropped membership fees and reduced it to be able to give some relief to members. So that also had impacted how much we get to generate on an annual basis.

Now, while we are generating an average of $33,000 to $35,000 annually, our expenditure had also, to a large extent, increased and then has started to drop. It dropped because of the pandemic where we were not able to expend on outreaches and also expend on the [inaudible] offices travels, everything that had to do with face-to-face meetings. So to the fact that we are now resuming back to face-to-face meetings, our projected for the current financial year is about $74,000. After we have been able to expend all that was generated from membership dues for FY23, we will have to fall back on surplus from previous years. The surplus for this year that we're expecting to expend amounts to $46,263.

While we are able to have our surplus fund our operations in the current financial year, it will be the case that if we do not have a means of improving the revenue that we get from our dues, we will definitely have to fall back on our reserve funds to be able to meet operational needs. So we have three options from my study of what we have before us, which could be going back to increasing membership dues, which might not be—

STEVE DELBIANCO: Lawrence, just to clarify. The way that you're spending, you're proposing we spend 80 grand and our income is less than half that. So you propose to draw from our reserves in order to spend twice as much as we're bringing in to get to the $80,000. Do I have that right?

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Yes, you're correct.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Got it. And because we can only draw the reserves down until they reach what we call our minimum level to make a sustainable spend, I'm now moving ahead to your pages on your proposals for membership dues, right? Is that where I should be?

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Yes.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Okay. And that is on page … Help me out.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: The budget is on page 16.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you. All right, I'm on 16 now.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: This basically is a page that summarizes the obligations that we have to meet. And I'm optimistic that by the time we are going close to the end of FY23, we will have been able to fashion a way of keeping our funds sustainable. There are a number of options. I'm sure that ExCom has fully explored them, which can be brought back to membership on what we think the way forward to be, such that we can have as much funds

utilized as what we receive for membership dues year in year out. Do we have any questions before I move on?

We also have a number of provisions that are provided by ICANN. We have not had to make use of CROP support because of the restrictions on travel. But we continue to utilize the secretariat support. And hopefully, we'll be able to also utilize the provisions for printing in FY23. So if we move on, the detailed list of all BC members from the list here, knowing what category one to category three members pay, we use this to pull up our assumptions for FY23. We're hopeful that where we can attract some members, especially members into category one, we will have less stress in terms of the finances that needs to come in to cover operations for the BC. I am optimistic that if we are able to attract some new members and also alternative source of funding or look at alternative source of funding from within, we should be able to get up to a phase where we are not scared at all of how to operate the next four to five years. That's about it for the financial report. I don't know if we have any questions before I move on to other parts of my report for today.

MASON COLE: Thanks, Lawrence. Any questions for Lawrence? All right. I don't see anything in the queue. All right, Lawrence. Thank you very much. Did you have anything to add?

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Yes, I do. Quickly, I just want to add also that the deadline for us to turn in articles for ICANN75 newsletter is next week, Thursday, the 11th. We

have shared on the membership list some topics of interest that BC members also possibly want to focus around—the SSAD, DNS abuse, NIS2, the new gTLD rounds. And we just want to encourage members to put one or two articles together and e-mail myself or the Communications Committee. Please, if you're doing anything in this regard, even while you're still working on your draft, let us know so that we can make plans to accommodate your article. It will also be great if any of the new members that are just joining the BC and who have gone through any of the courses, it could be the BC course, Universal Acceptance, or any other topics that is of general interests, and you want to share your views about the platform, the course and stuff like that, that will be learnings for not just to BC but for the ICANN community as whole. You have just one week to have this turned in.

I will also want to use this opportunity to celebrate Chantelle. Chantelle has been a wonderful support to the BC secretariat. But based on some [promotion,] will be moving off completely from support to the BC. We want to use this opportunity to say a big thank you to Chantelle and to wish her well in her future endeavors. Thank you. That's all from me.

MASON COLE: Thank you, Lawrence, and thank you for that recognition of Chantelle. You're right, it's well-deserved. She's moving on to another role inside of ICANN. She has been a wonderful asset to the BC. We will miss her but we'll still see her around ICANN meetings, which is good to know. Marie, your hand is up. Go ahead, please.

MARIE PATTULLO: Thank you. Briefly, I've also put it in the chat. But to expand slightly, first up, as ever, Lawrence has done an amazing job. The amount of work he puts in, the amount of hours he puts in is extraordinary, and we are incredibly grateful. I'm worried about the idea of raising fees when we don't actually need to. I'm being very straightforward about this, I'm very honest. You all know that I work for a trade association, and I work in one of the richest parts of the world in the European Union. And I know the financial constraints that many of my members are currently under, even in my part of the world. Globally, I think sending a message that BC during a global financial cost of living crisis, energy crisis, unfortunately, in some parts of the world, also conflict, war, I think sending a message that we're going to put up fees so that, for example, we can do reports or we can have a nice inreach party, I would find that very, very difficult to justify even in Europe. So please don't think that I'm saying I don't want the BC to do all these wonderful things. I do. I think BC is amazing. But I am incredibly conscious right now of the cost of living and the cost of doing business. I simply think it's very, very much the wrong time to be putting up the fees when we don't actually need to. Thank you.

MASON COLE: Thank you, Marie. Lawrence, do you want to address that?

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Yes. I was just going to tie that—I am also in full support of everything you said, Marie. If it ever has to happen, it will definitely be a very last option, which I'm hoping we wouldn't need to get to. We definitely

have other options. I would love us to explore the options of having more members from category one or maybe two so we can attract a few more that will help people's [inaudible]. I also have my ears close to the ground, I understand that auction proceeds and there might be some other funds that might be accessible to the community in the weeks or months ahead, and I'm hoping that we might be able to assess some of this, if necessary, or approach one or two of our members who are able to put in some special support if the BC needs it. But like you rightly say, currently, based on what we have in the bank and even looking at the fact that if we were to hit 100% in terms of budget performance, we still will not be touching the $65,000 USD that we have set aside as strategic funds. If we ever have to have critical need for funds, it will most likely be one, two years ahead, but definitely not in FY23.

MASON COLE: Okay. Thank you, Lawrence, and thanks for the question, Marie. Any other questions for Lawrence? Okay. All right, very good. Thanks very much, Lawrence, for the report as always, and thanks for your good work. All right. Brenda, if we'd have the agenda back, please. Thank you.

Just a quick item on number four. Just a reminder to BC members that ICANN75 is coming up rapidly in September. This meeting takes place six, eight weeks before the usual scheduled time of the final ICANN meeting of the year. It's been moved up in the calendar. So I encourage you to make your preparations sooner rather than later for ICANN75. We will have, as Tim pointed out, a BC—if you're not speaking, can you please mute your microphone? We will have a membership meeting in

Kuala Lumpur on Sunday. Then there's a CSG meeting, I believe, on Monday. I don't have that right in front of me. But I believe that's the case. You're encouraged to make it to both of those meetings. We're working out the agenda for the BC meeting right now. There'll be an agenda update for the CSG meeting as well.

Then I've had a conversation with the Meeting Planning team. I think that we can expect the same types of protocols in KL that we saw in The Hague, which is everyone needs to be masked, everyone needs to have proof of vaccination, etc. As soon as I get more information from the Meetings team, I'll pass that along to membership.

Anyone else have a thought or an update on item number four on the agenda, please? Okay. All right. Thanks very much. Let's move to AOB. Any other business for the BC this morning? Zak?

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: Thanks, Mason. Just a note to let BC members know that fellow BC member David Snead, general counsel of cPanel, and I and Marc Trachtenberg from the IPC, and Jeff Neuman, will be conducting a seminar at NamesCon in Austin, Texas, September 1st on the topic of "Is ICANN Threatened by Blockchain Domain Names?" So in case anyone wants to experience 120-degree weather in Austin just before going to Kuala Lumpur, they're welcome to join us. This session is scheduled immediately following the preceding one on adult domain names. Thanks very much.

EN

MASON COLE:	Thanks, Zak. All right. Well, this idea of fragmentation in the root is a good one. So if you happen to be in Austin for the NamesCon conference, that would be a good session to attend. It's also going to be a bit of the topic of the plenary session in KL. So you should expect to see that on the ground in Malaysia. Thanks, Zak, for that update. Anyone else on AOB for today's meeting? Caroline, please.
CAROLINE LUPETINI:	I actually wanted to ask, is that Austin session going to be virtually streamed? I'd be interested in taking a look.
ZAK MUSCOVITCH:	That's a good question. I doubt it because I think they're trying to get people to go physically this year. But let me confirm that for you and get back to you by e-mail if that's all right.
CAROLINE LUPETINI:	Yes. Thank you so much.
MASON COLE:	Okay. Thanks, Caroline. Anyone else before we adjourn? All right. Our next meeting is Thursday, 18th August at our usual time. So we look forward to seeing you then. If there are any other issues to raise, feel free to contact anybody in the ExCom and we can help you bring that to the attention to the membership.

We will adjourn. Brenda, thank you for your support, and we'll see you on the 18th. BC is adjourned. Thanks, everybody.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]