BRENDA BREWER: Good day, everyone. This is Brenda speaking. Welcome to BC membership call on 6 July 2023 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'll turn the meeting over to BC Chair Mason Cole. Thank you.

MASON COLE: Thank you, Brenda. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. This is Mason Cole, Chair of the BC. It's three past the hour on 6 July. Thank you very much for joining our BC call today. We have quite a bit to cover following the ICANN meeting in Washington, D.C. So we're going to get to the agenda in just a moment. Before I do, I'm sorry, I need to interrupt with just a quick housekeeping item. Brenda, are you in contact with Lawrence?

BRENDA BREWER: Lawrence just joined.

MASON COLE: Excellent. Okay, great. Thank you very much. All right. Thank you, everyone. So we have our agenda up on the screen. Are there any additions or updates to the agenda before we begin, please? All right. Very good. We're going to dive right in because we have quite a bit to cover on the policy calendar. And then I know Lawrence has some

---

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.

updates as well. So, Steve, let me turn the floor over to you. Please go ahead.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, everyone. So I'm going to breeze through this, but we are going to jump the order around so that Tim Smith can go before we dive into the comments and council.

So the first thing I'll quickly note to you is that since we last met, we filed four very substantive comments, thanks to the great volunteering that's been done in the BC. On June 19th, we filed on the IDN, or Internationalized Domain Names, EPDP. And Ching Chiao, thank you for drafting and leading on that. It's something you know a lot about. And then Zak Muscovitch drafted a handful of very constructive comments on the Internet Service Providers Constituency Charter Amendments. And then on June 30th, Vivek drafted for us a response to Tripti, the chair, when she asked, what should we do about balancing out the representation on NomCom? And this is a very sensitive key issue for the BC, who currently designates both a small and a large business rep on the NomCom. Council is drafting a response, and I'm anxious to hear from Marie about that later today in the meeting to see where council is. And then finally, just yesterday, we submitted proposed amendments on the governance proposal for PTI and IANA. Rajiv Prasad of Google, thank you for drafting those.

So before I get into the current open public comments, I was going to zip down to the bottom so that we could turn right away to Tim to talk to us about CSG, since Tim has to drop for another call. Go ahead, Tim.

TIM SMITH: Thanks, Steve. Good morning, everyone, or good afternoon for those of you not in North America. Not too, too much to report. I guess one of the things that took place at ICANN 77 is the NCSG and CSG had a joint meeting that Paul McGrady, he didn't convene it, but he was the facilitator of that meeting, and it was to help us get past an impasse that we have with selecting somebody for board seat 14. So it was a productive meeting and we came away from it with some action items. One of them would be that CSG would interview Rafik Dammak, who was a candidate brought forward by NCSG. And the other action item was for NCSG to review a proposal that would help us overcome an impasse in the future.

So both of those items are sort of in progress right at the moment and were to be completed by June 30, of course, at the end of last week. So we did that. And the next step will be to bring our findings to a meeting that is planned, hasn't been scheduled yet, but was expected to be next week. So haven't heard anything about NCSG's view on the draft proposal and determination hasn't been made on as it relates to accepting any new candidates. But it's a process that's in motion, and we will be bringing the CSG excom back to the table next week for a meeting, and we'll keep you posted on how things progress. I really don't have much more to say about that.

Actually, a couple of things that aren't in the written report that is in the policy calendar is something that was brought forward some time ago, which was that CSG has been asked to provide a representative for the IANA naming function review. And the deadline for naming somebody

was actually June 30, but that date has now been extended. So we'll be discussing that on a CSG call next week. Again, if there's anybody on this call who wants to be part of that, happy to put your name forward. Just let me know offline.

And other than that, I guess the other big news in CSG world is that Mason Cole is now the chair of CSG for the coming term. And so that'll be good for all of us, I think. So that's it. But I'll answer any questions.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Tim, what's the length of that term by which one of the CSG members acts as our chair?

TIM SMITH: That's actually a great question. I had sort of thought it went meeting to meeting, but this past one I thought went longer. Maybe it just seemed longer because of all the deliberations of Board seat 14.

MASON COLE: It's actually a six month term, Tim.

TIM SMITH: Okay, so December 31st, I guess, is you're off the hook. And then it becomes Philippe, I guess.

MASON COLE: That's right. Okay, good.

STEVE DELBIANCO: And just to clarify, the CSG is not an entity. It's just a group of the BC, the ISPCP, and the IPC. And we are labeled as being the Commercial Stakeholders Group. But we don't have officers or a charter of any import. And that's why we just take turns having one of the three constituencies be the so-called chair every six months. It assumed a greater role, I think, in the last six months since we were negotiating over Board seat 14. It's ordinarily a role that feels more administrative, but it's way more substantive this time around. So thank you, Mason, for stepping up to that.

TIM SMITH: Exactly, for sure. Okay, thanks.

STEVE DELBIANCO: All right, does anyone have questions for Tim?

TIM SMITH: Steve, I will be dropping off, but I know somewhere else on your agenda there is the whole closed generics comment. And I have been looking at that, and I will be preparing something for that. I know it's not officially a public comment, but we are invited to make comments and seek any clarification on the framework. So I will be doing that, but I don't have anything to present to you today. Other than to say that from my quick read of it, it looks like they considered our past positions on closed generics and our concerns for deception and competitor exclusion. So I

was encouraged by that in my read of it, but I will be preparing a comment.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Tim. I have it on the screen right now, and I highlighted a word in there that while we're glad that they paid attention to our issue, they used the word solely to exclude. That is a ridiculous way to phrase it, because anybody wanting to run a closed generic could do so by claiming they have other reasons other than to exclude other parties to serve their own commercial interests. They might be interested in public safety, right? They might have intellectual property concerns. So it just doesn't work to use solely exclude, and we may need to comment on that. And I don't think this needs to be a very long comment, especially because the framework group is not a regular public comment period. This is a working group that will consider what they hear from us, but then they will go back and come up with a decision, a facilitated dialogue. And if they don't agree on a framework, then they think this issue is dead. I highlighted this in yellow, and then the board would just have to step in to decide how to placate the GAC when it comes to closed generics.

I will observe from my perspective that the framework they've designed is so complicated and so full of roadblocks that it is a gauntlet that I don't believe any applicant will want to run. It is designed to dissuade anyone from trying to run a generic keyword in a way that's closed to that single competitor. That's unfortunate because if it's done well without deception or competitive disadvantage, it could work well. And don't forget that BC has members in terms of Google and Amazon that

have a number of generic TLDs. May not be running them as closed, but they have a lot of generic TLDs. Anyone else want to volunteer to help Tim and I with this comment? It's due the 15th of July and we want to circulate something. Looking for a volunteer to speak up on the chat or raise a hand. Could really use another one. Oh, Marie. Awesome. That's great. For closed generics. Marie and I were veterans of the last time we had these battles, 10 years ago. It was delight, Marie. It was delight more than surprise.

TIM SMITH: So I'll do something in the next 24 hours on that and circulate it to Steve and Marie and then we can pull it together.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Tim. Appreciate it. So we've already covered one of the two public comments that are open right now. The other one open is amendments, surgical amendments, which discussed extensively at our meeting in Washington, D.C. a couple of weeks ago. These are amendments that ICANN Org has negotiated with registrars and with registries to where they modify their respective contract obligations to respond to DNS abuse. These were supposedly designed to create actual obligations to mitigate DNS abuse, not simply an obligation to have a email or contact with which they would hear complaints.

We discussed this pretty extensively at the Washington meeting, and I was among those who suggested that the obligations in here would be important for ICANN compliance to follow up on. They're not all that happy about that, but they realize that if you step up to greater

EN

obligations, there's going to be some consequence if a registrar fails to act. So Margie Milam had volunteered to draft some comments for us on this, and I know that Margie's on the line. I'll ask Margie in a moment if you would like to speak about that, but I'll note that the registrars in particular are really nervous about getting approval from the registrars themselves. They have a very interesting set of rules where they have to go out and recruit registrars to give their approval to these amendments. And they're afraid that if we are recommending strengthening the obligations, raising the obligations, that it might impair their ability to get approval. That may not be a problem that they have to deal with, because in my short history of 20 years at ICANN, I've yet to see where public comments on a negotiated contract amendment resulted in any changes to what had already been approved. Margie, why don't you tell us what you're thinking?

MARGIE MILAM: Hi everyone, it's Margie Milam. Yeah, Steve, I agree with you. The track record is pretty low in terms of actually making changes. Although I do note that the latest change I saw was related to the .NET agreement. It looks like ICANN did amend the contracts, or take it back to the negotiating tables is probably the right way to say it, with Verisign in that they changed one of the things that we raised, which was the definition of security and stability and ensuring that it's in line with what we need for consensus policy implementation. So I thought that was a good development, a positive development.

And as we put together the comments for the RAA and registry agreement, one of the things I heard while we were at the ICANN

meeting was that even if it turns out that the additional changes may not get incorporated into this version that's being negotiated, it sets a suggestion or proposal for the next version of the agreements, which is possible when we do the new round of gTLDs.

If you remember back in the last round, in order to participate in the new round, registrars had to adopt the new version of the RAA, and that is how the 2013 RAA was adopted across the registrar community. So the thought here is that the BC comments would make several suggestions. I'm not holding my breath to think that very many of them would be incorporated, although there may be one or two, but in a sense, it sets the suggestion for ICANN to look at as they develop the drafts for the next round of gTLDs.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Any questions for Margie? Margie, we do want to distribute a draft. Today's sort of the day, but we can do it by tomorrow. And keep in mind that—I mean, I was a big fan of the idea of using the new round of 2012 as an incentive, a carrot to draw registrars into adopting the 2013 RAA. But conversations I've had with registrars in the last couple of months indicate there's not a lot of eagerness on their part to take on new obligations just to be able to sell names in the next round. They might wait and see what kind of names they even are going to have the opportunity to sell. In other words, there's just not as much excitement in the registrar community for the next round. Do you have the same sense?

MARGIE MILAM: I don't know. I mean, I really haven't spoken to them at that level. The thing about the new round is that it doesn't require the vote that you have to have in order to make the amendments that exist today. So that's the kind of the procedural difference between doing it in this particular comment period and in the future. But, yeah, I don't have any visibility into how many of them would decide not to participate. I doubt that would happen, honestly.

STEVE DELBIANCO: There are three ways. So Margie's talked about the carrot and stick method where people can voluntarily take on a new agreement in order to be able to sell names. Another would be a contract amendment process and the third method is consensus policies. And while it takes years and it's difficult to overcome the objections of the contract parties, if we develop a consensus policy, it is instantly binding on all the contract parties, whether they like it or not.

So we have three different methods. Of course, the contract parties all prefer consensus policy, since it's something that's very challenging to get through. Do we have any other volunteers that would help Margie and I with our comments on this? I know there are plenty of ideas that were circulated in the IPC for things they want to add, brand new obligations that Marc Trachtenberg and others want to add. And when they were raised, the contract parties showed no interest whatsoever. That doesn't mean we shouldn't ask for it. And it's possible that this could be a joint comment if the IPC is far enough along. Does anyone know whether they have drafted something for this? Don't know yet.

Okay. All right, Margie, let's work on that. We're going to have a busy next six days.

MARGIE MILAM: Yep. Great. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you. All right. And then finally on NIS 2, I was going to ask whether any BC members on the call have an update on where things stand on NIS 2. And if not, we'll jump over to council. Any indications as to whether Denmark or the Czech Republic have proceeded? Mason Cole.

MASON COLE: Thanks, Steve. So I did have a productive discussion with some folks in Washington, D.C. about NIS 2. My understanding about where things stand right now is that the European Union is gathering representatives to work on implementation guidelines, and those implementation guidelines will probably be published later in the year. Finn Petersen from Denmark is leading the charge, I had a good discussion with him in D.C. We've made the BC's position known on our preferences regarding NIS 2 implementation. We'll continue to have those discussions with them, but this is an ongoing process.

There are 27 member states in the EU. The transposition of the directive is going to vary jurisdiction to jurisdiction, and it's likely that contracted parties are going to sort of glom on to whatever jurisdiction is the most permissive in terms of their behavior, and then behave accordingly. So

we've got an opportunity to try to influence those implementation guidelines, which we are doing. We're in discussion with Finn and others, and that's an ongoing process. So that's my update for now.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Mason. Any questions or other comments on where we are in NIS 2? Okay, hearing none, I'll bring up Channel 2, which is Council. Marie and Mark are still our GNSO councilors until the AGM, and our previous council meeting was at the ICANN 77 meeting in D.C., and there was only one resolution adopted, and it was to commemorate Pam Little. And your next council meeting isn't until the 20th of July. Don't have an agenda yet, so I wanted to turn it over to Marie and Mark. Do you have any more insights for us as to what you'll cover on the 20th or what council is currently working on?

MARIE PATTULLO: Thanks, Steve. The only indication I've got as to what's likely to be on the next agenda is accuracy. You may remember it was put to sleep, but it was put to sleep for six months, so to put it to sleep for another six months, it will require another decision. This opens the possibility for us to do what I do keep doing and saying, where's the DPA? Because absent the data processing agreement, none of this can happen anyway. But that's a guess. I can't say that for certain, but I would assume so. I would also assume there'll be a lot of stuff about SubPro again. But that's quite obvious.

What we're doing at the moment, you mentioned earlier NomCom. Well, the reaction from council did go in earlier. There was a bit of toing

and froing, but thanks again to Paul McGrady and his very diplomatic style, what the council letter has said is that NPOC should also have a seat, because at the moment it says NCSG, as opposed to it should be NCUC and NPOC. And there was a bit of toing and froing on wording for them, trying to make it very clear that everyone should only have one seat, and we know what that means. But that was dealt with by saying that every constituency should be allowed to appoint but nominate at least one, and it should be dealt with fairly. They wanted the term equally, but you've seen the email chain and I'll send you on the final letter now. That just happened this morning.

I came out of another meeting just prior to this, which blew Marie's little mind. We're back on the SOI. You remember the infamous statement of interest, where a bunch of us in council have been tasked with trying to come up with a compromise here.

Now, we had a meeting in D.C., the last day of D.C., where we were more or less getting to a compromise, which was just about no one's ever used this exemption, which has been there forever. If you're concerned that somebody might use it in the future, let's make it even tighter, even more restricted. What happened today is Sebastien Ducos for the registries came back and said, spoke to the registries and quote, they won't budge. It has to be full transparency.

But this is the bit that Marie's brain has difficulties with. Apparently this means at the moment that either you say, are you here on behalf of someone, as in you are paid by them specifically to be in that meeting, not your general SOI, your activity SOI, in which case you say, yes, and you say, who, the end. Or can you say who you are here on behalf of?

No. In which case, everything you will say will be taken to be you presenting your own views as you're representing yourself.

Now Susan Payne and I were talking about this and came up with the conclusion that that means absolutely nothing changes. It's back to the status quo. In fact, it's even less restrictive than it is at the moment. Seb then referenced comments from Chris Disspain, who apparently has a concern that they're worried that one big player is going to capture a working group by sending in a wide variety of people to be in the same group, but not saying who they're there for.

By the same token, Seb believes that this registry idea would prevent you, the representative, from changing your mind every five minutes if your client changes its mind every five minutes. That, again, is not logical. If you're a big player, that's not where you're going to go.

He also referred to new applicants as being an edge case, the concern that you don't want to admit that you're working for a potential new applicant, saying that last time around that was very, very time limited for a small window and this time it isn't. And I pointed out that in that case, it's an edge case, a minute edge case, bearing in mind how many people don't use this thing anyway.

Anyway, end result, I'm waiting for the bit of paper to put all of that into some kind of logical format and I'll send it to you, because I just don't understand what they want. I really don't.

STEVE DELBIANCO: A question on the SOI, Marie. For most of us, we occasionally will step up and represent the BC on a working group.

MARIE PATTULLO: Different. That's representative model.

STEVE DELBIANCO: And when that happens, there wouldn't need to be an SOI because Caroline was volunteered to represent the BC position, just like Zak and Arinola do on transfer. So this wouldn't affect the way they work. It's only when an individual who may or may not be part of another ICANN constituency and stakeholder group puts themselves into a working group. Is that correct?

MARIE PATTULLO: It will affect the consensus call. It will affect the outcome. What I mean by that is, are you specifically being paid by or representing one entity for this working group? Yes. Who? The BC. The end. And at that point, the consensus calls that work under the representative model, that's the way it goes anyway. You can only participate in the consensus call if you are one of the representatives. So in no way would you be not complying with whatever these new rules are by saying, yes, I'm here for the BC.

But I'll take another example. When I was on the RPMs working group, I was there for AIM. So who are you there for? AIM. I wasn't there for the BC. And people who tried to point out that I was making BC comments, I quite happily told them, no, I wasn't. Thank you very much. It's a very

odd thing, Steve. It's a very, very, very strange thing, but I will send you the stuff when I get it.

Okay if I move on to one last area? Which is, I know Lawrence will talk about it more, it's the GGP about the applicant support. As a slight sideline to that, last week I participated in EURALO'S, what they call a readout. Every time we have a public meeting, ten days, two weeks later, they have an online meeting where various of us from Europe turn up and give our headlines.

And I mentioned again that to us, it's important that applicant support includes outreach, education and financial support is appropriate to small companies, stressing that they're the ones who are most likely to actually know what they're doing, and pulled out a figure that is true in Europe, which is 98% of all companies in Europe are small or medium sized. So I can only imagine it's even more when you're talking about developing nations under certain regions of global south.

Now EURALO were very supportive of this. I think that's something we should bear in mind. And as an aside, and I don't know if it's possible, we might want to consider at some point having an actual BC ALAC meeting. Doesn't have to be part of the schedule for the next meeting, but I know that we do have a lot of issues where we seem to align. Suggestion. But anyway, over to Lawrence on the GGP, if that's okay.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE ROBERTS: That's okay, Marie. And maybe I'll just take, I'll just cover a brief on GGP also with this. So Marie has made a valid case on why we should have ICANN prioritizing and also targeting business in terms of the outreach

that needs to be conducted so that people know that there is this facility available to be able to do that. Available to be able to put applications through in the next round. But for some reasons, there is some pushback on the GGP working group itself in the sense that they feel that business shouldn't be a target. The target, the idea of target is in the sense that ICANN itself is going to have to spend and the working group is basically saying the target group should have priority over others and where we are not able to cover everyone, at least those groups should be covered.

I've been advocating on behalf of CSG that if there needs to be a target group, then business definitely needs to be targeted. Not just because they have the potential to continue to run a registry. It's not just about assessing applications and having them drop off eventually, but the prospects are higher for business to keep those names running, resolving and meeting all the contractual obligations. So on the long run, I see any investment made in this regards as worthwhile.

But we have pushed back, and eventually resolved that there should be a section of the report going to public comments and to the GNSO that the BC desires to be included as a target audience, but the decision should be left to whoever it is who are making the decisions to see if that should happen. So, I believe that during the public comments also, the BC should also make some strong intervention in this regards and continue to see that there is some priority given to not just business.

In my part of the world, Africa, for instance, I believe that those who would even apply, the percentage of non-commercials who might apply will be next to zero. And those who might even have an appetite to

apply will definitely be businesses. But if these groups are not focused on, then we might end up not having representation at the next rounds. Back to you, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Lawrence, even if the applicant support program doesn't target businesses, can we at least assume that a business will be allowed to apply and would be eligible for support if they were able to navigate the process and fill out the application? In other words, eligibility is different than whether they're targeted for outreach.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE ROBERTS: Sure. I also, to this point that you speak, Steve, that's the sense that I initially got on the working group that businesses shouldn't be targeted. And to the point where we pushed back talking about that right now we're just talking about advocacy and outreach. Even at this point, we're still having this much back and forth. So, if things go the way, if the feeling in the room is how things will play out, definitely there will be some disenfranchisement of business, which we should definitely do our best to guide against. I agree with you that applications should come in and if those who will make the decision will decide otherwise, they should, I mean, business should at least have the opportunity of receiving a fair evaluation.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Have you defined the criteria of eligibility for people seeking support yet?

LAWRENCE OLAWALE ROBERTS: So, that is not within the remit of the GGP. The GGP has a very guided remit and it's hopeful that, I mean, we are thinking that once we make our submissions to the GNSO Council, that will determine how those other questions that are not within our remit will be addressed. But right now, even within the GGP, we are not clear on how some of these things will be addressed. To a large extent, I understand that a lot of work is going to be falling back on staff and we might just wait to get staff advice on how they intend to implement those areas.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Well, I would ask you to fight for business to be eligible as a core requirement and ask that they target and spend money advocating and advertising to business so that business becomes aware. But if you win the first and not the second, it's still very helpful. Various business organizations and chamber of commerce can also increase outreach and awareness. And the business community tends to pay attention to business opportunities like having your own TLD. So, make sure that we're eligible, and the rest is just gravy.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE ROBERTS: All right. Noted.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Marie and Mark, are there any other Council-oriented processes? And I also wanted to invite Zak and Arinola, if you want to update us on the current status of transfer, please speak up or raise your hand.

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: I'm happy to provide an update. So, Arinola and I have passed the two-year mark as the B.C.'s representative in this Transfer Policy Working Group, and I'm pleased to report a modest potential success that is just around the corner. You'll see that in the last paragraph in the screen in front of you. Yes, it begins with the latest transfer policy issue is a registrant initiated transfer dispute mechanism. And there's been considerable resistance to even having the working group consider such a thing [in this report.]

So, what I was getting there in that text update was that if you have a stolen domain name, [hijacked] domain name, today you're entirely reliant upon your registrar commencing a formal transfer dispute resolution policy procedure and paying a $1,500 fee for doing it. Or you're reliant upon your registrar successfully negotiating with the registrar who got your domain name after it was hijacked or stolen from you.

So, in either case, registrants are beholden to the registrars to recover stolen or hijacked domain names. And what we've been pushing for in the working group from its very beginning two years ago with Arinola, is empowering registrants to have their own means of recourse to get back stolen or hijacked domain names short of having to go to court.

And so, there was a report from a previous working group that dealt with this in 2014 that recommended against a registrant-initiated transfer dispute mechanism. And so, it was an uphill battle to try to change that policy to get this current working group almost 10 years

later to try to suggest such a policy. So, we have been suggesting, and the working group members and staff have properly pointed out that this particular working group doesn't have the mandate to create such a policy, but there was even resistance to suggesting one to the GNSO.

But as of the ICANN meeting in Washington, there seems to be a modest change of heart in that respect. So, I'm putting into the chat a draft recommendation that will hopefully shortly be finalized by the working group. And as you can see, it's a modest victory in the sense that it looks like we're close to at least having the working group recommend to the GNSO Council that it study this issue and produce a report. So, it's not a full-blown recommendation from this working group that GNSO should create such a registrant-initiated transfer policy, but it is one small step in that direction. And just a few short weeks ago, even this seemed unlikely. So, Arinola and I are rather pleased with this modest progress. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Zak and Arinola, thank you. Great report, and I appreciate all the work you're putting in on transfer working group. Any BC members have a question for Zak and Arinola on transfer? We've already covered GGP. Mark Datysgeld, anything new on DNS abuse? We covered earlier the public comment period.

MARK DATYSGELD: So far, no, Steve. Everybody's on waiting mode to see how the public comments will turn out, and I believe we'll have substantial things to discuss after that.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Mark. I'll just add on number four. In yellow, I highlighted what's been going on since ICANN 77. Just last week, myself and Steve Crocker pushed hard on a bulk upload capability for requesters in the registrant data request system. ICANN Org is not budging. They will not do it. They will not lift a finger. They won't write an API. Steve Crocker said that's okay. Steve's a really good programmer, and he says that in a few months, we can develop software that will upload from your Google sheet or Excel sheet or [inaudible] file and pump those into the system. We have another call next Monday to follow up on that, since, as I pointed out, there's a real challenge validating and answering questions and challenges that come up during each records processing.

So it's funny, when the GAC says we need certain changes made to the RDRS, staff moves immediately. But when the requester community asks for anything, we're told no more development. Sorry to hear that. Okay, that's it for me. Let me turn it back over to Mason to send it to Lawrence. Thank you.

MASON COLE: Thank you, Steve. Members, any updates, questions, comments for Steve before we move on? All right, thank you very much, Steve. Good update. Lots of stuff in front of us. We've got a lot of work to do. So thank you for the update. Lawrence, over to you, please, for the finance and administrative update.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE ROBERTS: Thank you, Chair. Okay, so I will first of all start with a bit of announcements that I feel are useful to our members. ICANN is still seeking pro bono service providers for the applicant support program. There is a short survey that needs to be filled out. So these service providers definitely will be expected to provide technical, legal, financial advice, registry type advice, and everything that covers the end-to-end process of delegating, of having a name delegated in the space. Pro bono service providers do not receive payment for these services, so might need to limit the number of persons they are able to provide these services to. It's a good opportunity for our members in business to plug in and to expand their services.

Also, on the 4th of September, 2023, there is a DNS symposium planned for Da Nang in Vietnam. It's interesting that it's going to open up with a day of DNS abuse discussions on the 4th of September. And then the DNS symposium drives through the 6th and 7th. So if we have members who will be participating at this event, we will definitely love to have a feedback, especially as with regards how the DNS abuse session goes. Wondering why the choice of Vietnam, but it's what it is.

We had a very successful outreach event at Washington D.C. and want to thank everyone who participated, and especially Caroline for the time and effort that was put into ensuring the success of that event. Particularly also want to extend very, very special thanks to NetChoice and Amazon for providing some on-the-spot sponsorship that allowed a lot of color to this very event. We had some very good participation, a good number of participants from the board leadership down into ICANN Org leadership and members that were present at Washington, D.C.

We also will be following up on the participants at that event with the aim of securing new memberships, aside those who have already promised that they would definitely be engaging further with the B.C. But all in all, it was a lovely event. Apologies that we could not document it in terms of pictures and all that. We did make an effort to reach out to the ICANN comms team, but the feedback we got was that it couldn't cover our events because it was outside the meeting venue.

But all the same, we will share the bit of information we have, especially the speech that was to be delivered by Tripti, but couldn't because of the sound, the surrounding noise and all that. But give or take, it's been an event. The feedback from this event is that it was a very good one and I'm happy that we were able to pull this off. Again, many thanks to NetChoice, Amazon, Steve, Chris and to Caroline for the modest support that was provided to us. The GSE team from ICANN also sat through different meetings and also contributed financially to the success of this outreach event.

The call for the next B.C. newsletter of ICANN 78 in Hamburg is open. I want to encourage members to kindly submit articles for the next edition of the B.C.'s newsletter. This could be write-ups that you have professionally published or your experience within the B.C. and ICANN, or if you have pictures related to the B.C. and its members, you can please also submit all these for publication. We are open to receive these articles for the next 30 days and we'll have to quickly then move to production as we would love to have a printed copy of the newsletter asides the soft copies that we normally work with.

So please, let's send our contributions to bc-info@ICANN.org or you can send your articles to myself or to Brenda. Anyone of us will receive and will curate this. Again, special thanks to Mark Datysgeld and [inaudible] for the translation of the last B.C. newsletter to Portuguese. They basically just took what we had published and domesticated it for their local readers. This is encouraged and we're hoping that we'll be able to do the same with the next edition. And we'll also want to encourage those who might be able to help. I will also be looking at the ICANN translation angle to see if we can have letters translated in more languages.

The FY24 invoices are out and I believe everyone should have received an invoice by now. A good number of us have started paying our dues. I want to encourage that you please try to do so in the earliest.

For those of us who sent our payments through a check, please kindly ensure that when you are making out your checks, it is to the ICANN GNSO Business Users Constituency and not to McDonald Jacobs, who are our accountants. Normally there's a process that McDonald will have to go through to convert checks written out in their name to be paid to the B.C. So we can avoid those steps by just ensuring that the checks are made out to the Business Constituency so that they are easily processed in our account. Thank you. I will still send out an email with this detail, just in case you need to have the names. I mean, you want to have the name as I have mentioned it.

But if anyone still has issues with invoices for FY24, please reach out to myself or to Joseph, the lead for the invoicing secretariat, so that we can help you through the process, either providing another invoice or if

we need to change an address or you need something specifically, we can help with that process. Elections are not due until October, and the next B.C. meeting is on the 20th of July. If you have any questions, I'll be happy to take them. Otherwise, I will yield the floor back to Mason.

MASON COLE: Thank you, Lawrence. Questions or updates for Lawrence, please, members. All right, the queue is clear. Very good, Lawrence. Thank you for that update. All right, ladies and gentlemen, we have six minutes left. We are in all other business. Is there any other business to raise for the B.C. in our meeting this morning, please? Okay, looks like the queue is clear. As Lawrence mentioned, our next B.C. membership meeting is July 20 at our regular time. And I don't think I have any other housekeeping items. Brenda, do you have anything to raise in terms of housekeeping for the B.C.?

BRENDA BREWER: Hi, Mason. Thank you. No, but it's not too early to start thinking about ICANN 78 in Hamburg, Germany in October. There you go.

MASON COLE: And is there anything in particular that B.C. needs to be concerned about yet?

BRENDA BREWER: Not yet. Not yet. But just don't hesitate keeping it on your agenda. That's all.

MASON COLE: It'll come up faster than we anticipate. Okay, very good. All right. Any other business for the B.C. this morning? All right. Very good. I donate five minutes back of your morning and we'll see you on the 20th, if not sooner. Thanks, everyone. B.C. is adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]