BRENDA BREWER:	Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the Business Constituency Membership Call on 8 September 2022 at 15:00 UTC.
	Today's call is recorded. Please state your name before speaking. Have your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking. And attendance is taken from Zoom participation. I do have apologies from Barbara Wanner.
	And with that, I'll turn the meeting over to 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. Good to have you on this call on 8 September. This is our last call before ICANN75 where we hope to see many of you on the ground. So we have our agenda up on the screen.
	Before we dive in, are there any updates or additions to the agenda? Okay, I don't see any hands. All right, we're going to go ahead and dive in. We have only an hour today, so we've got our usual fair amount to cover.
	Steve, let me go ahead and turn the floor over to you. Please go ahead.
STEVE DELBIANCO:	Thanks, Mason. Do you see the policy calendar?

MASON COLE: Yes, sir.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Okay. Great, everyone. It's been a while since ICANN posted public comment opportunities. In the last three BC meetings, I've described to you public comments that were upcoming so that we could get volunteers lined up and be prepared. And the torrent has been unleashed.

First one up is a relatively fun one which is to try to comment on the importance of a roadmap so that registries and registrars do the necessary changes to accommodate Universal Acceptance. Remember, that's the ability for apps, infrastructure, e-mail clients, back end services to make sure that they support IDNs and really long domain names such as the ones to the right of the dot that were initiated in the 2012 round.

Universal Acceptance has always been something the BC has pushed for. It allows our multinational customer audiences to use different languages and scripts and longer domain names, and it's essential to the BC's mission to serve businesses and customers. So we've got to comment on this. We don't need to modify it. It's not a bad plan. It's decent.

Comments closed 17th of October. We've got plenty of time. But for BC members whose businesses operate in scripts other than a Latin script in different parts of the world, different languages, this is a perfect

opportunity for you to spin out by reading the recommendations and coming up with a few comments that the BC wants to make.

So I was actually expecting a wide list of volunteers to come out of the BC, given our diverse audience. But not too many of you who are on the call today, so it might be something that I ended up pursuing later.

So let me ask right now. Can I get a volunteer or two to help with this BC comment in the next seven weeks? Looking at the chat and ... Vivek, thank you very much. I appreciate that. Okay, anyone else work with Vivek on this? Okay. Thank you, Vivek. Do me a favor, please. Read the roadmap that I linked to in the comment and then write back to me and copy BC-private private with your initial thoughts. I'll bet that will stimulate a couple of other BC members to join in.

Olajidi, I'd like to make sure I understand the pronunciation. So would you help us on the pronunciation of how you'd like us to say your name?

OLAJIDI SEGUNFUNMI: Olajidi.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Olajidi, excellent.

OLAJIDI SEGUNFUNMI: Yeah.

STEVE DELBIANCO:	And also, thank you for volunteering on the item that's going to be coming up a little bit lower, #5. Actually, I think that I had you listed down as volunteering for another one, to help Mason Cole on the Accuracy Scoping Team for Registrant Information. So, Olajidi, thank you for that, too. Will you be in Kuala Lumpur? Okay.

The second item up is due on the 20th of October. And I have brought this up on previous calls that coming out of the third Accountability and Transparency Review, there was a recommendation for something new, a new review, a specific review to take a holistic look at ICANN.

This does not replace the specific reviews that were in the Affirmation of Commitments that we brought into the Bylaws as part of the [inaudible] transition. This is an additional review, and its first incarnation is being described as a pilot. That's how the Board wanted it done. So what is in front of us now is an opportunity to influence the Terms of Reference as to what the review looks at.

Now, the BC is already on record as believing that we think it's a good time to examine that structure. And you know what the BC's issue is. We'd like to see restructuring of the way GNSO work—currently, the ability for contracted parties to block anything, that the non-contracted parties come up with, the parity that has been imposed between the commercial and non-commercial, as well as the way in which the non-commercial side of the Non-Contracted Parties House ends up being privacy maximalists without regard for consumer protection concerns. There's not much balance there.

We also resent the notion that IPC,BC, and the ISPs were smushed together into an artificial collection called the CSG that's really compromised our ability to have individual representation on projects that ICANN.

So I'm looking for volunteers to help me draft this comment. This is something we have waited a long time to do and it's an opportunity to add only a handful of people, hence the BC does not have to put a lot of effort into this. But it's very important.

Margie, it's superb to have you work with me on that. Thank you. Anyone else? Thanks, Margie.

All right, scrolling to the next one. The RAA—that's the Registrar Accreditation Agreement—and also the Registry Agreement need to be changed to obligate the contracted parties to support and use RDAP. And RDAP, again, is the Registry Data Directory Services Access Protocol. It is a replacement for Port 43, and it's one that directs queries about registrants to the parties that have the first-party relationship with registrants, and that is the registrars.

The idea is that you shouldn't have to do a lot of work to figure out who a registrar is. You should just be able to look at it for a domain name and RDAP should take care of routing your request to the right place and then routing responses back. It's not the same thing as mandatory disclosure, but it's the beginning of that path.

It's a relatively lightweight comment because the amendments in here have to do with their obligations to support our technology platform. I mean, could we go really far and say we think it ought to be changed to

support reverse WHOIS lookup? I guess we could say that. It's not going to get anywhere. It's really just an opportunity to jam the contracted parties to quickly adopt an implemented technology that came out of the EPDP Phase 1.

This is a perfect element for Alex Deacon. He understands this stuff better than everyone else in the BC, but Alex has been pulled off of BC tasks right now. So who else has the technological savvy to make a couple of observations and comments on the implementation of RDAP? Do we have anyone that's currently affiliated with registry operations at Amazon or Google, as an example? You guys would be able to comment on this and help the rest of your BC colleagues. Any volunteers to help with that? Number three. Our comment will be brief.

Okay, one more. There's a new draft policy to implement EPDP Phase 1 recommendations as well as the Phase 2 Priority 2 recommendations. This is the Implementation Review Team (IRT) from the Expedited PDP. Alex Deacon has been participating for the BC on that. Mark Svancarek, Margie, and I have all had various degrees of engagement. But the good news is that David Sneed has volunteered to sub in where Alex Deacon has had to peel off after all of these years.

And then, David, we discussed this for two or three weeks and I know you had a call with Alex. Do you want to speak to your colleagues now about soliciting another volunteer or any initial thoughts on the BC comment?

DAVID SNEAD: Sure. Of course I would love to have another volunteer. Our main comment is going to be around the fact that, as a whole there, there's not a DPA around this. And that's where the main comment is going to be. The comment's not due until October, so if anyone has additional input, I probably will start drafting towards the end of September for review. But, yeah, additional help would be great. Thanks, Margie. And we're also going to work with the IPC on our comment so that we have at least some coordination.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, David. I think it would be better if we each submitted individual comments rather than a combination one. But what I'll be able to do is to provide you with links to all of our previous comments on that. I put three links in the policy calendar today. But even our minority reports gives us an opportunity to comment on this implementation. So we'll definitely start by beating them up over the lack of DPAs. But then we should move on, I believe, and also comment on the specifics of what's being recommended and how it's being implemented. And thank you again for stepping up to volunteer.

DAVID SNEAD: Sounds good. Thanks, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO: No. Thank you, David. Appreciate it. And it's not even due until the end of October. David, will you be in Kuala Lumpur and we can further discuss with Margie?

DAVID SNEAD: Yep.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Awesome. Thank you. All right, #5. I don't have any updates on #5—it's about the NIS 2—other than this. Nick commented yesterday that he didn't believe we would see it on the September agenda at the EP (European Parliament). Likely to be in October or November before we see them approve this language. Any other intel from our European Parliament experts? Great. Thank you.

I'll move on now to channel two which is for us, the Council. What I've indicated here is a brief summary of what happened on the 25th of August. And we don't have an agenda for the 11th of September meeting in Malaysia, but we'll turn to Mark Datysgeld and Marie Pattullo to walk us through what they expect. Mark and Marie.

MARK DATYSGELD: Hello, everyone, Mark here. So since we don't have the agenda yet and we are expected to have a pretty long meeting, potentially a lot could go down. So I will focus on what I have been working, which is finalizing the draft report for the DNS Abuse Small Team.

So as of yesterday, we have a draft report ready. More or less, we are waiting on final edits from the team to potentially change the language to some level. But that's all there is to it. We have more or less focused on what we're going to address, getting back to it so that there are no surprises during the meeting.

We will be engaging in communication with the contracted parties and ICANN Org to request some light amendments to the contracts, asking them to start addressing, at some level, DNS abuse as has been discussed with Compliance. Right now the system is not strong enough for Compliance to act upon thing.

And on top of that, during our BC meeting during Kuala Lumpur, we will have Jamie with us. He confirmed this yesterday. So this will be an opportunity for us to engage in constructive conversation with him. Something sort of looking forward what we expect, the sorts of things that we are looking towards and considering the different updates the community has been giving us during this year. This meeting will be kind of key for DNS abuse. Anybody who's super interested in the project should listen to what's going on.

And in the session, we will also discuss two other important subjects, I think, which is starting to really work on community outreach together with the contracted parties. How do we go about effectively working together with the contracted parties and with the broader community, the cybersecurity community, to start communicating [through a client] what DNS abuse is and making this a more holistic thing? And the possibility of a PDP on maliciously registered domain names.

Those are the suggestions that will be coming up, and they should proceed to Council discussion by the end of the year, at most. Hopefully less than that. Everybody is very much invited to attend our public session. It should be pretty good for all business members to be there. Thanks.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Mark. Back on the Council session, is there anything Marie we'd like to add? I realize you're in a position where it's pretty noisy. Anything to add, Marie? Okay.

Then scrolling down to ... We covered #2. Look at #3. That's the Registration Data Accuracy Scoping Team. I realized that, Mason, you're on that team. And Olajidi has also volunteered to join on that. If there's any updates, Mason, just chime in. And then I would cover the SSAD Light.

MASON COLE: Not very much to report, Steve. The initial report should be published by the time we get to KL, and that's about it right now. The BC may have an opportunity to contribute to that report, but we're looking at whether or not we really want to at this stage or whether or not our concerns have been incorporated into the report.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Okay. As soon as you see a draft or even an early release circulate it, please. Thank you.

MASON COLE: We'll do.

STEVE DELBIANCO: All right, SSAD Light. SSAD was this centralized Standardized System for Access and Disclosure to registrant information. And if you recall, the BC voted no for the SSAD since it didn't obligate registrars to do the disclosure. So it really didn't give us anything. We voted no on that, and then ICANN staff came back with such an exorbitantly expensive estimate that it led everyone the community to say, "Well, let's rethink this. Despite what the PDP has got, we've got to come up with something else."

And they reverted to what Alex Deacon used to just call a ticketing system, which is basically a voluntary way for requesters—that's usually us in our community—to indicate what data they needed, what they needed it for. And for the registrars and registries to respond to those requests and track it in a centralized system so we could have some sense of whether they are ignoring us, are they delaying, or are they actually denying or disclosing.

So I'm part of a small team looking at the Light version of SSAD, which we've always called a ticketing system. And that was to be more descriptive than pejorative. ICANN has decided to come up with a new name, a WHOIS Disclosure System. So you'll hear it spoken of that way by ICANN management.

I attached for you several screenshots to give you some sense as to what ICANN IT department is coming up with. No surprise at all. A requester would log in with their standard ICANN e-mail. No certification or verification needed. Once they've logged in, they can indicate a domain name about which they want to request disclosure of certain registrant information. They'll also have to indicate reasons and

potentially even attached documents giving the evidence necessary to provide the registrar with motivation to make a disclosure decision. But it is entirely up to the registrar.

This is a system that is a very lightweight ticketing system, and if the requester and the registrar have to go back and forth on evidence or discussions, that happens outside the system. It's just really a database of tickets where the status can be updated—not mandatorily—but voluntarily updated by the registrar who decides to look at it.

The registrars have been very disappointed that there's not even an attempt to integrate it with their back end systems. And they're actually building this off of the CZDS, which I think is the zone system that's used by registrars and registrars today.

Good news, too. There's no contracts that you have to sign. There's no policy promises you have to make. And there's no payments required.

So when I described it in the call we had as a lightweight ticketing system without obligations, I reminded everybody that the requester community wanted something that goes much further, particularly because of the obligations imposed under NIS 2 when that is approved.

And then I said why would people use this if we can't make a sales pitch? Why do we expect any requesters or registrars to use it? And I said, if we as requesters would have access to the data on which registrars are denying, ignoring, or delaying, then that would provide a motivation for us to use it and for the registrars to use it.

Nobody disagreed with that. And in the chat, ICANN staff came back and said that, yeah, inside of ICANN Org they'll have somebody who will be tracking the activity. And therefore, their Compliance Team will be prepared to see whether registrars are honoring their obligations. Because EPDP Phase 1 includes an obligation via policy for them to provide reasonable access to registration data.

So this might be a way to track that. If enough requesters use it and the registrars respond, it's possible that we would be able to document that bad actors are simply ignoring. And that would be an opportunity to nudge ICANN Compliance. That is not much, but it's the best I could come up with.

Steve Crocker has got a company called Edgemoor Research, and he is trying to come up with alternatives to do this. And I believe we should wholeheartedly support Crocker's alternatives since they include reverse lookup.

Steve Crocker has embraced what we call the fifth use case on the EPDP. [Margie, I mean], this was three years ago where we came up with a use case of why you would need to do a reverse WHOIS lookup. And Crocker's got it in his suggestions and his alternative proposal.

So here's what comes next. The small team that I'm on will advise Council on this when it comes out next week. And then in the October Board meeting—sorry—the October Council meeting, Mark and Marie will have an opportunity to vote on it. And if the Board approves, ICANN staff told us they could deliver it sometime in the first six months of 2023. It isn't much, but it's something. I'm happy to take questions.

Oh, great. No, the cost estimate will be so, so low, [inaudible]. It's something they're implementing. They showed us a demo. I think they've got it practically finished, and I don't think the expense is going to be material.

Margie and then Zak. Margie.

MARGIE MILAM: Hi, Steve. Thanks for the update on that. My question is, did they explain why they only are working with registrars and not registries? It seems really odd that they chose to eliminate some sort of access path to registries.

STEVE DELBIANCO: It's because they only use RDAP to determine where the Registrar of Record is for any given domain name. And then they will require that registrar who has the first-party relationship with the registrant to be the one that evaluates whether to disclose and makes the disclosure decision. So they're following that TAG (Technical Assistance Group) that says that it's registrars that own the relationship. They're the ones to disclose. I think you already knew all of that, so tell me what you're really thinking.

MARGIE MILAM: Well, originally it was meant to be some sort of implementation, I guess, the EPDP Phase 2, if I'm not mistaken. And there was no exclusion of registries in that. So that's why [inaudible].

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yeah. There wasn't an attempt to exclude registries. But there is, in there, a declaration that says that it's the registrars that have the relationship and can make the determination. Registries don't even have the relationship and cannot make the decision, so they're not even bothering to go to the registries, thick or thin.

MARGIE MILAM: And again, that's a new concept because under EPDP Phase 1, registries are responding to disclosure requests.

STEVE DELBIANCO: They can still. This is entirely voluntary. They can still do that. You can go outside of this system and go directly to a registry if you feel that registry is going to be responsive.

MARGIE MILAM: Right. Okay. Yeah, I just ... I think that's an area we should push back because there's no logical reason for excluding the registries, given the fact that the policies were applicable to both.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Right. And this is, believe it or not, in limbo somewhere between policies because the SSAD policy is not the basis for this system. This ticketing system is outside of the policies that were approved.

MARGIE MILAM: That's right.

STEVE DELBIANCO: [It's sort of] an expediency to give something that will gather the data necessary to determine if they want to go further. So, in fact, that is why ...

MARGIE MILAM: Yeah, I got it.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yeah. And it really doesn't implement anything that we wanted. And we voted no on what they wanted to do. So at this point, we are doing our best to support something that will give us the data to show that bad actors or ignoring, delaying, or just plain denying the disclosure requests.

                       Zak.

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: Thanks, Steve. Steve, have you heard anything at all about whether the system will somehow archive or cache registration records so you could obtain historical WHOIS records, kind of like we used to do with domain tools before the data was no good subsequent to 2018? Because it's really useful for UDRP complaints to have that, and it's been a real problem. So I'm wondering if anyone's even raised that yet.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Great, great point, Zak. Let's ask ICANN what they're doing to preserve that record. But it will never be done through this ticketing system. The ticketing system is just keeping track of requests and whether or not somebody responded. It doesn't try to go in and capture historical records of what is in the WHOIS. It has no access. Other than through RDAP, it has no access to the underlying systems at all. No integration either.

So let's find a way to bring up your question. For instance, when we're interacting with the Board. When we're interacting in NCSG level, let's remind everyone that this ticketing system has no obligations to respond. It does nothing to capture the historical deltas and changes in the underlying registrant information. And so it is inadequate to the needs of us protecting our consumers and our businesses.

ZAK MUSKOVITCH: That's an understatement. Thanks, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO: No. Thank you, Zak. Any other questions? Okay. The next item up in our discussion of projects council is closed generic TLDs. You recall that closed generics would be a generic word like, let's say the word "laptops", "laptop computers." And if somebody applied for the gTLD .laptops and there happened to have been a competitor who makes and sells laptops, then they may decide that they're going to close that generic gTLD and use it for their own purposes. And that's all fine.

But what if it deceives consumers or misleads consumers because sites like search.laptops, reviews.laptops, information.laptops, best laptops ... I'm just making stuff up. If those second-level domains end up presenting content that is misleading to consumers who don't really understand that it's a single competitor controlling the gTLD and controlling domain, and controlling the content. So it suddenly becomes an issue that says that the conduct of the registry operator could potentially lead to content that is misleading and potentially anti-competitive.

So the GAC had embraced this concern when the BC and the IPC raised it in 2012—10 years ago. It's hard to believe. And there is currently an effort to try to give the GAC some satisfaction that ICANN will look to the competitive concerns and a proactive way, as opposed to waiting for bad stuff to happen and counting on governments to enforce their consumer protection and anti-trust laws.

So there is a document underway, and it looks as if they're only going to allow the CSG to have a single rep, as opposed to a separate rep for IPC, BC, and ISPCP. So do we have volunteers in the BC that would like to put their name forward. And they won't be a rep. Thank you, Marie. If you want to clarify further, please do. But they're contributing as individuals. I'm going to highlight this, Marie, because you brought this up.

It says, "They're going to contribute as independent individuals bringing their individual expertise and experience and not become a representative of their group. We have to commit to focusing on developing a framework for closed generics, even if the end product is inconsistent with the goals of the underlying BC."

So Marie is indicating as well that they need to have knowledge of the Subsequent Procedures, the process. But Marie, I was focusing more on having knowledge of the potential problem of a closed generic which is equally important. Right? Needs to have SubPro knowledge and also some knowledge of how it is that this could be a concern.

Look, BC members operate 140 different generic gTLDs as part of the last round. And some of them are generic words that are potential for this issue, but I don't believe any of them are being operated as a closed that excludes content from competitors. So I think BC has got a pretty good track record on this. We raise the concern, but we don't try to exclude the practice. We just suggest that there have to be appropriate guardrails around the practice.

Do we have anybody that could volunteer to join this. Tim Smith, that's a great idea. I didn't realize you have great experience with .pharmacy. This is a very preliminary group. So Tim, I would suggest ... Let's get your name in the mix so that Sebastian can do that. He wanted the names by the 19th of September. And it might be something you and I can discuss while we're together in Kuala Lumpur.

Any others? All we can do is throw names. Marie, could you check on this with Sebastian and ask him whether he wants the CSG to follow a single name or lots of individual names to come into Sébastien? And depending on what Sebastian wants, we can then work through CSG.

So Tim, you're our CSG liaison and we'll want to be attentive not to step on the toes of our CSG colleagues. So perhaps you can raise this as well.

Okay, I'm going to turn it over to Tim right now to cover channel three on CSG. Tim.

TIM SMITH:

Thanks, Steve. I actually wasn't aware that it was just one representative from CSG, actually. There are other qualified people within IPC, for sure, on the subject. But we will discuss that.

So on the report, I think it's fairly straightforward. Everything we've been doing lately has been preparing for the ICANN meeting in a week from now. So we'll all be traveling pretty soon, I guess, those of us who are going.

So the CSG ExCom has met a couple of times just to prepare for the meetings. And on September 20th, which I think is the Tuesday, we will have the CSG open meeting. And we've invited Xavier to come and to give us an update on an SSAD pilot—which you've just talked about, Steve—and on data accuracy. And I think they'll probably be more information than we know now by the time that meeting comes along. So that'll be good.

Also, during the open meeting we'll make some final preparations for the meeting that we have with the Board—CSG has with the Board— which will be coming up almost immediately after the CSG open meeting.

And as you can see we've, actually while we've been on the call, just sent a note to the Board saying we wanted to talk about the DNS Abuse, their group within the Board, and also any considerations they've given

to any of the various different DNS abuse initiatives outside of outside of ICANN. And we also want to know from them whether they think the ODP process is working. So those will be topics.

The one italicized piece that you see here where it says "What collaborative action should the community Board and Org be undertaking to further progress achieving our strategic priorities?" We certainly haven't determined how we want to handle that yet, so anybody here on the call or within BC that has suggestions on that, we're open to suggestions. Our feeling at this point is that we should restate the CSG priorities that we set out for this year and turn it over to them to ask how they're addressing those priorities. But, still working on that.

We also, on September 22nd , will be having our meeting with CPH. And because Göran was not available for the CSG open meeting, we've asked him to come to the CPH-CSG meeting. And we're still working on that. We don't have confirmation from Göran at this point, number one. Number two, when we presented the idea to CPH, they said they'd be happy to have him at the meeting but would prefer that he not talk.

So I don't know what the purpose of having him there would really be. On our side, we again want to ask him about auction proceeds and planning prioritization. So, still some work to be done on that meeting. I think it'll be good to meet face to face with CPH, but we'll see whether some of these other topics are covered off.

And then the GNSO. I don't know if I ... Well that, I guess, I picked up from the last report. But I can tell you that at this point, we have had

discussions about vice-chair, and it looks like IPC is interested in John McElwaine as a candidate. And BC is interested in Mark Datysgeld as a candidate. So we're still working on that within the CSG to determine how to manage having two candidates. So, still some more work to be done on that.

And that really is it for me right now. If you wanted to know the exact times of the meetings that I've been referencing, they are all listed there below. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Tim. And anybody who registers for the meeting can bring up their own calendar, either in the app or online and to register for sessions. Are there any questions for Tim before I turn it back over to Mason? Any questions for Tim on CSG? Okay, fantastic.

So I appreciate all of the new volunteers on the projects that are on our plates right now. It's going to be a very busy September/October for the BC.

Mason, I'll turn it back over to you.

MASON COLE: Thanks very much, Steve. Yeah, you're right. It's going to be a very busy Autumn season—well, a North American autumn, anyway—for the BC. So thanks for giving us the overview, as usual.

All right. Colleagues, I made a mistake on the agenda and I neglected to add Sebastien Ducos to our agenda for today, who is a guest of the BC.

He's on the line right now. As Tim just mentioned, GNSO Council elections are coming up. Sebastien is put forward as a candidate for chair, and he asked for some time with the BC today to talk about his candidacy and what's going on with the GNSO Council.

Sebastien, can you hear us? Are you on the line?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I am on the line and I can hear you perfectly, yes. I hope you can hear me, too.

MASON COLE: We do. Thank you for joining the BC today. And apologies for the agenda screw up today. That's entirely my fault.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: That's alright. It's all good.

MASON COLE: So just one second, Sebastien. So normally we have Lawrence do his Finance and Operations overview. If we have some time after Sebastien's segment, we'll get to that. I realized that we're running up against the ICANN Prep Week call starting at the top of the hour, so we're going to do our best to get as much in as we can.

So Sebastien, might I just invite you to give a quick overview of your candidacy and what you hope for, for the Council, going forward? And then maybe our BC colleagues might have some questions for you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Sure. I actually probably will keep it very short. Those who enjoyed the same exercise on Monday will have had most of this information.

So I'm Sebastien Ducos. I'm a French citizen attached to Australia, even though I'm calling you today from France. And I should be back in Australia towards the end of the year. I am a registry, historically, and still. And I'd say I've been a part of the AusRegistry Team 12 years ago, who then became the Neustar Registry Team which is now the GoDaddy Registry Team. It's the same people that moved on over the years.

I joined the Council three years ago, so I'm putting my hand up only for one year. The last remaining year that I have on Council. I have been a vice-chair of the Council for the last year, working with Philippe Fouquart, the chair, and with Tomslin as the other vice-chair.

I, very honestly, didn't prepare a big speech here. I'm more interested in your questions and your points of view and your centers of interest. I have to say that the 35-minute presentation of Steve and other policy points that you're looking at is of great interest to me. I don't come to your meetings very often, and it's always good to hear it from the other side. It's always interesting. Several points, including, for example, the SSAD that Steve and I have been working on now for a few months. So it's interesting to hear from your side, too.

Otherwise, I'm open for questions. I don't have a speech or platform or something to sell you. I would like to hear you. I would like to listen. And I would like to answer questions you may have.

MASON COLE: Thanks, Sebastien. Appreciate the opening remarks there. We have some time, BC colleagues, for questions for Sebastien. I encourage you to raise them now. Sebastien will be in KL as well, and I'm sure he'll be—

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: So ...

MASON COLE: Nope?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I will not be in KL. I will join you remotely from the beautiful Pietrasanta in Italy where I had long and previous commitments. And I also should remind you that, in agreement with the rest of the NCPH, I think Bruna was collecting questions and writing before the end of this week that I promised to answer before the end of next week. So if anybody doesn't have a question immediately, don't hesitate to add that to the pile.

MASON COLE: Thanks, Sebastien. Sorry about that. I appreciate the clarification on your schedule there. Mark Datysgeld, go ahead, please.

MARK DATYSGELD: Thank you very much, Mason. Thank you, Sebastien, for being with us. So one topic that I think has been very important this past few years

and that I have been stressing a lot among people is the need for us to act as a GNSO community and start getting the pieces together regardless of our differences. Right?

And I would ask Sebastien how does he envision a pathway for us to start working better together? I think it is something that we have been achieving. The councilors have been moving towards that direction. And he also had a very interesting document on expected behavior of councilors. There's a lot going on in that sense. So I would like to get a get a feel from him. How does he expect us to keep evolving and becoming a more cohesive GNSO? Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you. And thank you for saying the document is interesting because I keep on hearing less positive comments about it in back channels. How do I make this long sorry short? I'm sort of a mix of many cultures. Again, I'm French. I live in Australia which has a strange accent but is very much an Anglo Saxon country and has that culture. I'm also half Dutch. Yet another culture in this.

And having worked also in different countries, in different companies with very different regional cultures, I find this working together in a such a multi-cultural environment as ours always a huge challenge in the sense that the expectations, when sitting around a table from different people, come very much from the background that they know and their way of working at home.

And Americans or, more generally, Anglo Saxons seem to all [inaudible] around the same types of things. As a Frenchman I see very, very different behaviors, beyond language and beyond everything.

And we work in an environment where we've decided long ago—bottom-up consensus—that we would all force ourselves to sit around a table, take decisions collegially in consensus, which is very counter-nature, actually to many cultures. I come from a culture that is extremely top-down. You listen to the boss. The boss tells you. And you do. If the boss is going in a very obvious wrong direction, to a certain extent you let him go there because he'll crash and burn, and that's an opportunity for you to take his place. And I'm being a bit cynical, but it's a bit like that.

Obviously, it's not it's not the sort of behavior that we can promote in this. But I think that there needs to be sort of a re-nurturing of this respect of consensus. Consensus in our in our community is achieved by long, long, long hours of voluntary work, of staff work, of many, many, many people that put a lot of effort getting there. It's never what we wanted because, otherwise, we wouldn't be a community. We'd just be by ourselves. It's never exactly what we planned. It's never fitting, exactly, our schemes. But it's the consensus that we build.

And I'm a very ... I get almost emotional, but I'm a very big proponent of this really learning to respect consensus, really learning to respect those that built it vis-à-vis each other. And usually we're good natured and we're always able to grab a drink together after the sessions and everything and be friendly. But be respectful to each other away from

each other, outside of this community, inside this community when we represent ICANN, etc.

Which doesn't mean that we need to go and preach those ideas that weren't ours in the first place. Consensus is not always what we think. But I think that it's very, very important to redevelop this idea of respect around it.

Going back very quickly to this Dutch-ness, for example, my half Dutch side. Holland is this very weird country where they managed to elect a parliament that can take six to nine months to come up with a government. Then starts working and may collapse and whatever. It looks, from the outside, extremely inefficient, extremely chaotic in a very Dutch and formal manner. But extremely [inaudible]. And yet, [it still works]. It's a country that works perfectly well. It's a country that is pretty universally recognized as a good-functioning democracy. And nobody would question the way [inaudible].

It's mainly—well, it's only—because they apply and they work completely trying to build that consensus at every stage and every level. It means that things take a long time. It means that people from the outside looking inside at what we do feel that nothing is moving, but the reality is that once it is built—and provided it is respected—it's done with foundations that are solid and there for a long time.

And so that was my attempt with that document that Mark referred to. But indeed, it's not the end of the deal of managing an institution like this. But I think it's an important factor to sort of bring back into perspective. We're not friends. We're not enemies. We're colleagues.

We're working with each other to achieve a goal that is not always our first target. But let's respect the [common] work and work together.

The other option is having a boss that tells us exactly how to do things. And that, I think, nobody really wants. Or at least it's not the philosophy of the organization.

MASON COLE: Thanks, Sebastien. And thanks for the question, Mark. Other questions from BC members for Sebastien? All right, I don't see any hands. Sebastien, it's been a brief visit but thanks for joining us today. And we appreciate you making the time available.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: If you don't mind, I'd love to participate again. At ICANN, it's never a good time because there's conflicting schedule and everything. But I'll come back. Thank you very much for your invitation.

MASON COLE: We'd love to have you back. So thanks for joining, and I guess we'll see you during KL but not actually in KL. All right, thanks for making your time available, Sebastien. Much appreciated.

All right, ladies and gentlemen, we have about 10 minutes to go. Let me turn the floor over to Lawrence. Lawrence, apologies again for eating into your time. You always seem to take the brunt of when we run over time, so I apologize for that. But if you'd like to hit the highlights of your report, that would be great. So over to you, Lawrence.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Thanks, chair. So to start with, the next BC meeting which is going to be during ICANN75 is billed for Sunday. I'm sure some details around that was in the policy calendar that we just went through. And we also would want to encourage BC members who will physically be at Kuala Lumpur to kindly indicate so that Brenda and myself can track such members and make adequate provisions to ensure that, at least in the CSG and GNSO rooms, we have guaranteed seating for our members.

ExCom has adopted and approved the BC's FY23 budget as proposed by me which was shared and discussed separately on previous calls and on the BC private list. I also strongly note the preference for us to operate within our means and not place any wording that could [call] to an increase in membership fees at any point in time. So, we'll continue to operate as operate at the minimum level expected in terms of spending, such that we can keep our expenditures basically to what is generated year in and year out.

Work is also ongoing on the newsletter which will be shared in the coming week. Very soon we are billed to open two calls. And one of these calls is for members to make submissions for issues that we think require review in the current BC's Charter. This call will be opened at the time appointed by the ExCom. And what we want to do is to, aside from ...

ExCom has identified areas that need a review. For instance, whether we need to continue to maintain a General Counsel role on ExCom or

EN

not. We have new BC committees for onboarding and communication that will also benefit from being imputed into the Charter at this time.

But the next point of call will be for us to gauge suggestions for members. And then we can then start the process to make the required changes after membership have reviewed such. We're requiring staff support to track these changes, but once the call is opened we are encouraging members to kindly respond to the call.

Also, right after ICANN75, based on the timelines that we work with year in and year out, we will also be opening a call to renew for the BC officer's role that is due for renewal by the 1st of January. More information concerning this will be passed to us on the BC privately. So we want to welcome, also, new members who were able to make it on today's call, especially Olajidi Segunfumi.

With this, if you have any questions for me, I will be happy to take them. Or otherwise will yield the floor back to Mason.

MASON COLE: Thank you, Lawrence. Questions for Lawrence? Okay, I don't see any hands. Lawrence will be in Kuala Lumpur, thankfully. So he'll be available for questions for our members who are there as well. Lawrence, thanks for the report.

All right, let's move to Item 5 on the agenda which is just a quick preview of ICANN75 meeting in logistics. We've covered some of this before. I think Tim and Steve pointed out that we have a number of meetings, including a BC membership meeting on Sunday. We have a

CSG membership meeting. We also have a CSG session with Contracted Parties. So there any number of sessions that are important to BC members.

If you are on the ground in KL, I encourage you to come in person to those sessions. It's going to be full of plenty of useful information and a lot of good discussion. So if you can make it, please do. If you're not going to be in KL, I encourage you to attend remotely. We need to show the BC flag, and it would be good to have a full complement of members in our meetings.

And just a reminder. I think pre-registration for ICANN75 closes soon, so if you haven't taken can carry that chore, you should shortly. And then sign up for the sessions that you would like to attend.

All right. Any other business to bring up before the BC this morning? Okay, very good. Then I'll just sign off with a good wish for travels for everyone. And we look forward to seeing you in KL. And thanks, everybody, for attending this morning. BC is adjourned. Take care.

DEVAN REED: Thank you all for joining. I hope you'll have a wonderful rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]