BRENDA BREWER:	Good day, everyone. Welcome to the BC membership call on the 12th of August, 2021. Today's meeting is recorded. Kindly state your name, when speaking, for the record and have your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking. Attendance is taken from Zoom participation. And with that, I'll turn the call over to Mason. Thank you.
MASON COLE:	Thank you very much, Brenda. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. Mason Cole here, chair of the BC. Welcome to our call on 12 August. Brenda has displayed the agenda on the screen for you. We have two main agenda items today. One is the regular policy discussion that Steve will lead. And then, following up on an e-mail of yesterday, Lawrence is going to have a discussion of our Operations and Finance Report, which I must say is very thorough and is worthy of your attention. So lets dive in. Are there any changes or updates to the agenda as presented? Okay. Seeing no hands, let's jump right into item number two. Steve, the floor is yours.
STEVE DELBIANCO:	Thanks, Mason. Do you see the policy calendar on the screen?
MASON COLE:	Okay. Fantastic.

STEVE DELBIANCO: I'll quickly get through this because I do want to leave enough time to go through the BC budget report that Lawrence has. We haven't had any new submissions since our last call. So the only public comment that's open right now is the one on the .aero registry agreement. That is a sponsored TLDs who's going to remain sponsored.

Thanks again to Zak Muscovitch for drafting the BC comment. It's attached here and you all saw it two weeks ago when Zak brought it up. It'll be submitted on the 16th of August in the form that Zak's draft has. But this would be an opportunity for BC members who might have questions for Zak or suggested additions to it. Are there any final comments on the draft that Zak has given us. Zak, is there anything further you want to bring to your members' attention?

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: Thank you, Steve. Nope. That should do it.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yeah. Thanks again for doing that, Zak. I don't see any other hands or chat on this. So we'll be submitting … I'll take care of submitting that on the 16th, Zak. Thanks, again.

Okay. The second item up is the BC continues to do significant advocacy in the European Parliament to ensure that the NIS2 contains new obligations, new clarity on—to help to remedy the overinterpretation of GDPR that ICANN undertook. ICANN Org is also strategically trying to evade a co-controllership role, which would be necessary for them to be able to continue to help protect consumers and protect businesses by

revealing the appropriate registrant information to help to stop existential security attacks, DDOS attacks, fraud, and abuse—DNS abuse in particular.

So we're grateful for the team that we have, which had been led by Ben Wallace but Ben has moved to a new BC position—a new position within Microsoft. So we have Drew Bennett, Marie, Nick, Mason, Margie, Barbara, Denise, Mark, Claudia, and myself who are currently on the drafting team. And we are welcome to have other BC members, particularly those with influence and expertise in the European parliament and the European national governments, who will need to transpose NIS2 once it's approved.

So for this portion of the meeting, Drew, I'd like to turn it over to you and Marie to lead us through the current status of what your plans are for the remaining weeks of August and September. Drew, over to you.

DREW BENNETT: Steve, a very brief update today. Steve covered broadly what our objective is, which I'm sure almost everyone is aware of. Some of the details there in the policy calendar give you the latest. As discussed previously, we are in the middle of drafting a letter template, which would target particular members of the ITRE Committee, parliament, who is basically charged with the final step in the process before you'll get compromise amendments on a final report and proposal, that hopefully the parliament will approve and it'll become a first reading at the European Council, probably sometime around the turn of the calendar year, 2021 to 2022.

So with our targeting advocacy at the ITRE Committee, we're looking at specific members and we want to get a letter providing further details on our position, our justification, our advocacy. And we want that letter to hit them on or about September 1, as they'll be meeting in September.

And the plan prior to that, then, will be our drafting committee is continuing to work on that template letter. And we will send it out to the full BC sometime next week. We'll then have a reminder on our next call about it and, all-in-all, have given the full BC another two weeks to contribute to that letter on a Google Doc. Our team has already been at it for over a week. So it should be well-refined by then. We have at least one member of that committee we're definitely going to send it to on September 1. And we'll be discussing potentially adding other members to that.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Drew, Thank you for that. Having participated on all of our EPDP Phase 2A calls, the Contracted Parties are defiant about anything in NIS2 requiring a change to ICANN policy. They believe that if and when NIS2 requires obligations for publication, or disclosure, or accuracy, that they'll simply comply with that and that the ICANN policies are adequate if they allow compliance, not require compliance. And that is on the public record. There's nothing secret about that.

Is there a way to work that into our dialog, that NIS2, if it were to establish obligations, should try to suggest the policy at ICANN that removed these obligations should be restored? Are you with me on

that? It's not enough to permit people to comply, but rather, ICANN policy, to be consistent, ought to require it.

DREW BENNETT: Yeah. I think two things. We need to highlight the shortcomings in ICANN policy. I think in the Framework and rubric of NIS2, for it to eventually instigate some change, we think that we need to empower member states to see a public interest in the WHOIS data, which would then force the kind of disclosures that ICANN policy is not. But that's the two-pronged approach on that issue.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yesterday, Contracted Parties corrected me when I said NIS2 would require publication. They said the current draft does not. So they are lobbying as well. And they believe the draft is being watered down and weakened, thanks to their efforts, so that there really wouldn't be any necessity for ICANN to undertake any policy. So we're up against it here. And it was a very tough conversation Tuesday on the EPDP call, which we'll cover a little bit later.

DREW BENNETT: Yeah. I would say pushing for the public interest provision is one clear way that we could move it over the hump in terms of that argument you were having with the Contracted Parties the other day. [It seems that] both sides currently have stances.

STEVE DELBIANCO: That's exactly right, Drew, because I pushed very hard to say that the EPDP should have an automatic restart when NIS2 is approved by the parliament—not transposed by all the countries but approved by parliament. Contracted Parties said, "No way. Don't need it." They will not agree to. So we're going to have, later on, a call when Alex comes in. And you'll hear how badly it's going over there in the EPDP. We are unlikely to have any recommendations that even anticipate a restart—just a watch and see to see if—in case NIS2 is handled.

DREW BENNETT: Okay. I'll have to jump at the half hour but I will get those updates otherwise.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Well, since you're here right now, I thought perhaps we could do that. Alex Deacon is back. I believe that Margie and Mark are still on that call. So, Alex, is there anything you want to stay about the current state of the EPDP call that you just came over from?

ALEX DEACON: Yeah. Hi, Steve, and hi, everyone. Nothing more than, I think, what you've said. I think what's important is that we start thinking about what a BC or joint minority statement would look like. I believe, Steve, if the final report is due to be published on September 3rd, then we would need to have some draft to the BC a week before that, which I don't know what it is off the top of my head. This is less than 2 weeks away so I think it's important for us to think about what that would look like, and

how we would do that, and if we would collaborate with others in that effort.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Alex. I believe we have all the raw material necessary—not only our minority report from prior phase but the extensive comment that you helped contribute to the one we submitted on the draft report. So we have the right material and we have the relationships necessary to do an outreach to the IPC. But I believe we could hold the pen on that, given that our comment was pretty extensive. And that included the answers to question 11 on process.

Are there anybody on the BC call now that would volunteer to assist at the minority report drafting, if that's what it comes to? I'll be enlisting the ordinary suspects on this—Mark, Margie, Alex, Mason. Okay. Thank you. And any questions for Drew on the drafting of our NIS2 European communication? And any other volunteers that want to join it? Drew, thank you for volunteering to help with the minority report. Appreciate that.

Okay. I'm going to scroll down to the next section, which is Council. You've already seen, in our last meeting, we summarized the July 22nd Council meeting. So we've already covered that in the Accuracy Scoping Team and everything that Marie and Mark did for us there. So, Marie and Mark, I now have on the screen the couple of excerpts from the agenda for the 19th of August Council meeting and the floor is yours.

MARIE PATTULLO:

Thank you. Mark is being Mason, as in Mark is in another call, representing the BC, that Mason can talk to. The only think I would say about the last Council, Steve, is that I know on the call today, we have both Susan and Tobe, who have really kindly volunteered to be our reps for the accuracy work—yay—at last starting. We have not yet seen the official call for volunteers for that. But as soon as we do, we will let you know and put your names in. There is a call out for a chair for that group but I haven't yet seen the call for you guys. But to let you know that it is happening. And thank you again on behalf of all of the BC for volunteering for this.

Going down again, Steve, the Council that we have next week is not going to be that exciting, I hope. You will see that the main discussions on the screen, they're procedural. I'm very happy to talk to either of them, if you think that's appropriate. But I don't think they're going to be that exciting. The only thing I would say is that under the AOB section, we're getting an update on EPDP Phase 2A. Again, I don't expect much to happen there.

The other discussion about Council, which is really under Waudo—he'll come back to this—is that as you know, the current chair comes from the ISPs, which means us for CSG, Philippe Fouquart. And as the BC, we are supporting him to go into the next term as also the new chair. But Waudo will take that further. Steve, happy to take any questions but that's all I have for today.

EN

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Marie. I'd heard from Keith Drazek that he does not intend … As the chair of EPDP Phase 2A, he does not intend to ask Council to extend the EPDP Phase 2A. He realizes we aren't going to get to consensus and there's really no point in going on. That's the thinking as of Tuesday. So you don't have anything, even, on the …. You have it on the agenda to discuss EPDP Phase 2A but there's not a formal motion to extend it.

MARIE PATTULLO: No, not even a discussion, Steve. It's under and AOB. It's an any other business.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Marie. Is there anything on the Council list about Phase 2A?

MARIE PATTULLO: Not that I have seen. I think there was, from Berry, the standard state of play update, which I will dig out and send to you but that was a few days ago.

STEVE DELBIANCO: It looks like there will be no consensus for any recommendation that changes what Phase 1 came up with. So we will likely have a minority report. And you should know that I really ticked off the CPH on Tuesday's call because I said the reason we need an automatic restart when NIS2 is enacted is because it's clear, from these proceedings, that

both the NCSG and the CPH would block a new PDP. So we want an automatic restart.

Now, NCSG didn't differ at all with what I was saying but the Contracted Parties took offense that I was putting words in their mouth or suggesting that they would vote no. And that's fine. I'm fine if they get indignant about the suggestion that they would vote to block a PDP because then we can use that to help remind them not to block a PDP when NIS2 is approved. So you can just say that's Steve being Steve. You're not the one who has to bear the brunt of their anger, okay?

MARIE PATTULLO: I will bear the brunt of anything on behalf of the BC, Steve. Don't worry. Thanks for that, though.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank, Marie. Do we have any questions for Marie on Council? Marie, thank you very much. I want to move it over to Zak Muscovitch. Zak, you and Arinola are doing the Transfer Policy and you wanted to give us an update on that. And thank you, again, for doing the early input response.

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: Sure. Thank you, Steve. Very briefly, the Transfer Policy Working Group had asked various constituencies to provide some early feedback. So we did that and we continued to provide feedback throughout the actual working group meetings.

So what Arinola and I submitted is very basic and we'll continue to update the BC as this progresses. Arinola has kindly agreed to serve the BC as an alternate to myself, which is much appreciated for the working group. So I hope we'll make that request to the GNSO shortly and we appreciate the extra bench strength. Thank you very much, Arinola.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Zak and Arinola. Arinola, anything you want to add?

ARINOLA AKINYEM: Just to thank [inaudible] for the opportunity to [inaudible]. That's all.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Okay. Thanks to both of you. We're going to move it over to Waudo Siganga, who's our elected liaison to the Commercial Stakeholders Group. I have his report here. It's the same report you saw last two weeks ago because there was nothing that's happened in the interim. But Waudo, is there anything new you want to add?

WAUDO SIGANGA: Thank you, Steve. As you said, the CSG has not had any meeting or activity since the last BC meeting. However, in the background, we have been starting to organize the meetings for ICANN 72. So ICANN 72 CSG meetings are going to take the usual format that we have been taking in the previous ICANN meetings, where they're close to CSG meeting. We plan not to have an open CSG meeting. And we also planned some other meetings with, for example, the CPH, the NCPH, and so on and so forth.

So far, nothing is really firmly confirmed. So once we confirm everything, then I'll come back to BC with the information and also with a request for any input that we may require from the BC to make those particular meetings effective.

Then, I think the other thing I can mention is that there's a meeting that's been planned for the constituency chairs from the CSG with Göran. But it's planned for later in August. So any output from that meeting that will impact on our policy issues, I'll bring a report, I think after that meeting, which might be the next BC meeting.

Then, the last item I can mention is the one that has already been mentioned by Marie, which is regarding the election for the GNSO Chair. We've been requested by our colleagues in the ISPCP to support the reelection of Philippe Fouquart as chair for the GNSO. And I think you'll remember, we mentioned this in the last BC meeting and it was decided that because the turnout in that meeting was not representative of the complete BC, I should send out an e-mail follow-up so that more members could be informed about this issue and we can collect more input. I think that e-mail went out but we did not get any extra input.

The issue has been further discussed by the ExCom and the conclusion so far is that the BC position is that we will support the reelection of Philippe going forward. But the issue is still open. So in case the BC members will have any strong feelings about it, I think the door is still open. Please bring in your views and then we can look at them at the ExCom level.

Steve, I think that's all I have for now. Sorry I don't have a long report and I don't have anything articulated because we have not had any meetings so far. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: No. That's great, Waudo. If there's no questions for Waudo … Waudo, Barbara Wanner put in the chat that the ICANN Board voted to make Seattle a virtual meeting. And thanks, Jay, for the NomCom. So that means we're done in record time with the whole policy section and you have a lot of time to give Lawrence for the financials. Thank you.

MASON COLE: Thank you, Steve. That is record speed. I think you set a new land speed record for the policy discussion so thank you very much. All right, ladies and gentlemen. We're on to item number three on the agenda which is a review of the financial report that Lawrence has prepared. Lawrence sent it out by e-mail, I believe, yesterday. And it is very thorough and extremely well-put-together. So I encourage you to take a read of that. I also encourage you to pay close attention to what Lawrence has to say and bring your questions to Lawrence during this presentation, as this is going to affect our operations for the next year.

So with that as preface … Yes, Brenda. Could you put Lawrence's report up on the screen, if you have it available. Thank you very much. Lawrence, the floor is yours. Please go ahead.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Thank you, Mason. And good day to everyone on today's call. So on the screen is the proposed FY22 budget and the financial report for FY21. I believe that we might have gone through this. So I'll make this presentation a bit faster.

Please, can you scroll to the next page where we have a sentence? This page, page 3, basically talks about a summary of the report, how it was put together, and a bit about the BC. The next page is from the Finance Committee—concurrence from the Finance Committee. And then, after that, there is the executive summary. After yesterday, I did little adjustment to the executive summary to capture all the proposed budget for FY22. So the executive summary, basically, paragraph two talks about the BC's reserve fund, which is the $60,000 that has been set aside. And that continues in FY 2022.

The BC's income for FY21 peaked at $37,907. This included the reimbursement of $3,000-plus from ICANN for the MemberClicks platform. For FY20, that total income for FY20 was $37,186 so this was just a 1.9% increase over FY20. One interesting trend that I would like us to note is that the BC's income, year-over-year has dropped significantly. The highest income that came to the BC was in FY16, which was, at that point, I think, if I recall, about $71,000 dollars. We had about 75 members, at that point. 21, the BC had 64 members and one member resigned in FY22. So right now, we are down to 63 members and that has impacted our income to a large extent.

For FY21 … Sorry, Brenda. If you can come back—scroll up a bit—yeah. For FY21, the expenditure was $46,000 US dollars, while we budgeted to spend $75,600. The reason why we had such a huge difference between

the actual and the budgeted expenditure was because some budget items were dependent on the BC having face-to-face meetings—the [inaudible] officers' travel, the outreach events that were to take place, and a number of other dependencies that couldn't happen, based on COVID. So we basically had some …. We still ran a deficit budget in FY21 because our income was $37,000 and our expenditure rose to $46,000.

Please, let's go on, Brenda. You can scroll down. So basically, section A talked about the management of the BC, which all of us here are familiar with. The officers of the BC, and the different committees that we had before, and the new ones that we have running. You can scroll down, Brenda. Thank you. Please, when you get to page nine, we'll pause a bit.

So besides the different committees, it also captured very salient parts of the charter like the term limits. And this year, we also included our NomCom representatives in the report. That's a report for the … Please, if you, at any point, want to ask a question, please just raise your hands. I'm also trying to monitor the chat.

So can you pause here, Brenda? Thank you. So here is some details on the FY21 budget performance. Like I had hinted earlier on, in FY21, we had one new member, TAU, that joined the BC and we had four members that resigned. Of the four members that resigned, the majority—I think three of them—were category tier one, while one of them was category three, as in tier three member.

We talked about the income. If we look at this breakdown that we have here, the budget performance year over year, we'll see that in terms of income, like I hinted earlier on, FY16 was when we had the highest

income of $71,000. And it dipped in FY17 to $56,000. It went down to $41,000 in FY18, $41,000 in FY19, $37,000 in FY20, and still at $37,000 in FY21.

So for all of us BC members, it's very instructive to note that we need to rework our policies so that we can attract more members, which would definitely—even with the virtual nature of outreach of $50,000. And so our current revenue is not able to meet up, except we fall back to the reserves that we have. The other alternative will be to review our membership dues, which would lead to having more revenue coming in and it becomes more sustainable.

So the deficit for … We had surplus for some years where we had very good—where we had a high number of membership to cover for our operations. But since FY18, we have run a deficit budget. And this year, our deficits, even with the COVID and not being able to meet most of our targets, the deficit was at $8,356.

Please, Brenda. You can scroll. So for FY22, we're proposing a budget of $89,000 this is 48% higher than the actual for FY21, which came $46,000. And we also have … This does not also … Of this, we are only—of the $89,000—we are only expecting a refund of $4,000 from ICANN for the MemberClicks platform. There are still some provisions from ICANN like the additional budget requests. But these will be spent directly by ICANN and it won't come to the coffers of the BC.

We also, aside from additional budget requests, there is also support for the secretariat. And when the meetings go back live, there is the CROP

and the BC support for leadership to travel. All those funding do not hit the BC's account but they are managed on our behalf by ICANN.

Please scroll down. So the budget assumptions are how we've been able to arrive at the income projection for the year. Please continue to scroll, Brenda. Here, based on last year, we have 64 members. Okay. You can pause here. Here, we had 64 members. And income from that should be at $34,520. We are not projecting for any new member until our virtual mode is over but we will still continue to make drastic efforts at recruitment and outreach. If we are able to achieve any and have any new member join, it becomes a plus and increases our budget performance.

We are projecting to have one member resign in FY22, which has happened already. So that takes our income from dues to $33,520. Please continue to scroll down. Thank you, Brenda, for the help. This talks about deficit. Like you see, FY21, FY20 where our actual deficit was proposed to be $37,000. In FY21, it was proposed to be $44,000, and in FY22, it's proposed to be $51,000.

It's instructive to also say that we have taken very careful care to ensure that whatever happens in terms of the budget we propose to have, it doesn't impact on the $60 that we have set aside as the BC's reserve fund. That will still be untouched, no matter what happens in the current financial year.

Please scroll down. So section B gives more details to our financials. Right now, as of the time we shared this report, we had the total bank balance of $143,000 US dollars. Recall that $60,000 out of this particular

sum cannot be spent in the current financial year, as it has been set aside as a reserve fund. Out of the $53,580 that we were projecting to come in, about … I'll put it at about 30%. About 20% is left outstanding. All others have been received. We just have about 18 to 20 members that are yet to pay for FY22. But the majority of the funds that we expect to come is already sitting in our account, except for about $6,000 that we have left.

Please, you can scroll down. So for each of these budget items, there are notes to it. And I'll try to make the notes as explicit as possible. So the fees and [inaudible] are just the BC dues that I expected to come in. ICANN will reimburse us for what we spend for the MemberClicks. We're projecting to be at $4,298 for FY22 because of some improvements that MemberClicks made on the site, which is a one-off fee. Our present expense is budgeted at $89,000. I'll come to that shortly. And our bank charges still remain at about $2,000.

Please, you can scroll down. Before you are the list of … [Inaudible] has already resigned so rather than having 64, we now have 63 members. We hope to Altronics back sometime in the future. And we will also be reaching out to other members who have left, trying to encourage them to comeback. So we have 30. Within the BC, we have 30, now 29, companies under category one membership. We have five companies under category two membership. And we have 29 under category three membership.

Please let us go ahead. These are the notes that we can read up on our own. Please let's keep going. ICANN reimbursement is what we will get

back from ICANN, which is just the MemberClicks. Other outputs and incomes, we're not expecting any yet.

So we're going through to number four, which is the operation expense. It's $9,000. The breakdown is listed below for this … Sorry if I'm fast. Yes. Let's scroll down. Keep scrolling. So what comes up to $89,000? We have the invoicing fee. Okay. Thank you, Brenda. We have the invoicing fee. The accountant's fee has gone up from $2,500 to $4,000. And we are making improvements to our financial system, recordkeeping and all that. The bank charges, they maintained $2,000 this year. So we're still maintaining $2,0000 for FY22. The MemberClicks payment for last year was $3,700 with $500 added to that. That will come to about $4,300 which we would eventually get back from ICANN.

Please let's go on. We normally have someone—a webmaster—that we maintain payments for of $1,000. The [inaudible] officers' travel is key to getting all the ExCom members to each of the public meetings. So we're maintaining that budget head—pretty important.

Because, in a bit, reduce the budget outlay for FY22, we have actual cut down our conventional $20,000 funds for outreach—reduced that to $10,000 and reallocated some of these funds to other areas, just to ensure that we keep our budget as low as possible. We are proposing to have BC members in-reach. I'm sorry. I did not update this. This is supposed to be at ICANN 72, 73, or 74. Whenever it is that we have and ICANN meeting in FY22, we are hopeful that we will be able to have something that will bring us back together under one roof, and share happy moments, and all that. We have a little allocation for his, which

will be used at one of the ICANN meetings, possibly maybe the first that become physical.

We normally have this leadership … What's it called? Have a program for leadership development and we basically just rerouted that to the onboarding committee to take responsibility over that. It used to be a responsibility sitting with myself as the vice chair. We have a budget allocation of $10,000 from ICANN for ICANN Learn, which we have to expend before December of this year. And the BC is also allocating a few funds to this, just in case there's a need for a consultant or some other services that ICANN is presently not covering.

Please scroll up. Please pardon me. I will soon try and get through with this. So keep going please. I'm basically looking at the huge budget items. So we have the BC study that cost us up to $20,000 last year. We have allocated $10,000 that, trying to save funds against and cutting down the budget as much as possible.

So with every day, the ExCom has done a huge job. And still, we're looking at $89,000 as a proposed budget for FY 22. This will definitely mean that we'll be running a deficit budget again this year, except if by the end of the financial year, we are able to come up with a strategy that increases membership of the BC drastically and we are able to have more funds come in.

With all this, we have still maintained the $60,000 US dollars that is in our reserve fund. And we are hopeful that as more people pay their dues and as we get some additional funding, our financials will improve to a large extent.

Currently, when you pull out the current funds that we have in the bank, I hinted earlier on was $143,000. And if we pull out $60,000 from that, that leaves us with $83,000. When ICANN makes its reimbursement and the 20 members that we have currently paid-up, that will be more than enough to cover for our budget proposal for FY22. Please scroll. There is our funds. Additional budget requests came to $14,500. And the other funding supports, we have some other forms of funding supports from ICANN, which we've already said in this report.

Note nine talks about operational expenses. These were all the expenses for FY21. Please take time to go through them so that we don't spend some more time on the … Please, you can scroll down. I think one of the things I'm really happy about in FY21 was the ability to be able to sponsor the Interisle study, which definitely was a very, very good investment. That was the major expenditures that got the BC budget up to $46,000. If we didn't do that, we would have spent roughly $26,000 in the last financial year.

So please keep scrolling up. Thank you for your patience to sit through all this. Please keep on going. So basically, what we have in section C are a list of all the members of the BC right now—the regions just introduced a country in the region, based on ICANN. And it's interesting to note … Brenda, please scroll down. Please make sure you read through. If your company's details are missing, I will apologize ahead of time. I would be shocked if there is anyway. But I would like each of us to check, especially the contact person. I know there's a change in Microsoft. It hasn't communicated to us who the primary contact will be. We are waiting for some information in that regard.

So from the directory, we were able to decipher the number of companies from each region. Please scroll down. Keep going. And I think of great importance to each and every one of us here is this—the membership share by regions. This wasn't done before. I want to encourage Africa and Latin America to work towards ensuring that we are able to get companies into category one. Right now, we only have one from Asia Pacific. That's in Jordan. We have four from Europe. We have 25 from North America. So we need to have Latin America and Africa step up in this category.

In tier two, which are basically the trade associations, we don't have any trade association diversity. We need to. We need our colleagues from Asia Pacific to please work towards recruiting—helping to recruit, especially tier two category members—trade associations. And then, we basically have all the regions covered in tier three.

So I want to stop at this point and take any questions that any would have with regards the financial report and the FY22 budget. Thank you.

MASON COLE: Thank you, Lawrence. Excellent overview and a comprehensive report. So questions for Lawrence? The floor is now open. Lawrence I'm not seeing any up. Arinola, please go ahead.

ARINOLA AKINYEM: Thank you. Thank you, Lawrence for the wonderful report, though it's coming a bit late. But we appreciate that it has a lot of work to be done on the budget and the financial expenses. I've been privileged to serve

the BC on the Finance Committee for about three, four years. And having worked on budgets, I see a few changes with I seek clarification for. Item number 12 on your FY22 budget.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Sorry, Brenda. Could you help scroll to that.

ARINOLA AKINYEM: Let's start with item number eight. It's a comprehensive one but I can keep it brief. I see that we said the website backup maintenance for the BC website is going to be discontinued. I'm trying to wonder if there's an alternative that has been made or there is probably no need for this anymore. So maybe you could clarify that.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Okay. Thank you. I will just take all the questions and then I will answer them together. Please go ahead.

ARINOLA AKINYEM: Yeah. That would be better. You have cleared up item number 12 because you said it's for 72, 73, and 74. So that's quite clear. I observed that committees also have their budgets but we do not have probably … I know that it is [inaudible]. To ask for every subcommittee, with their various [inaudible] the amount budgeted for them ought to also be compared in your report. [Inaudible] on that part.

Going further down, items number 16 and 17 seem to me, what we've always done, to be the same. Considering that currently we are running most of my things in virtual, printing out factsheets and all that can … I've always tried, since we started with COVID 19 pandemic. Perhaps you could look into that again or probably you could justify why that. I saw the [inaudible] on the budget for BC webinars and virtual events. I would like to be clarified on that, too.

Then we go to ICANN, which talks about Internet Governance Forum Support and related items. Then, I see another one under item number 22. It says "events." Then I see in 23 that says "BC IGF Remote Hub Abuja," and then the AfICTA Summit 2021 call [support]. Now, for me, I'm a bit confused why we have IGF—that was third event—and then we will still have another item, "BC IGF [inaudible]." Well, I think, for me the, AfICTA support, AfICTA Summits are postposed this year. They have always reallocated the outreach budget item. That has always been the vision to allocate that, with two regions out of the five regions on the ICANN being taken care of from that.

So probably, you would want to clarify those or to build better clarification into those, or just why these items are real budget items and not on the outreach budget Thank you.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: All right. Thank you. Brenda, please can you scroll back up? Sorry for the back and forth. Okay so we're starting with the website backup maintenance, which is item number eight. So aside from what we now have as icannbc.org, we also had an icann-bc.global, which was a replica

of the main website on .global. And we reviewed that particular site. That cost us $2,500 US dollars each year to maintain.

We reviewed that and we've seen that basically, what we have going right now with MemberClicks, MemberClicks is able to archive all this information. We basically have that as a backup, just in case the MemberClicks site goes down. It was quite unreliable at the early period, so to say, because we were trying to find our feet. But right now, it's very stable and we have what we call a dual site because once you click on icannbc.org, the site that it revolves to is also the same site when you click on [bizcon.org.] [bizcon] doesn't redirect. It is a full site, just like we have icannbc.org. So that has cancelled. Do we need to keep expending $2,500 on icann-bc.global? And that's why we are discontinuing that service.

There was talk about the different committees. Definitely, the different committees basically are just doing—taking off certain work that used to exist. So we used to make these expenditures in the past. We are just focusing—we're just refocusing, more or less. And that's why we are also … So, for instance, communications, we are going to subscribing for a form of MailChimp service, Hootsuite service to be able to manager our social media pages well. And that's what the budgets are actually for. It is for annual subscriptions to Hootsuite, to MailChimp. And we are hoping that when we get this properly done, we are able to also use those avenues to generate funds—at least to be sustainable—if we can't add those to our operations. So that is a plus for us.

You can scroll up a bit, Brenda. The next one has to do with the design. Yes. So item number 16, you will see what we used to have over the past

years in item number 16. We've had NEXTMedia, which is a company in Malaga, Spain, designing the BC's newsletters for, I think, four or five years now, from what she told me. And she has maintained her price. She hasn't increased the price over these years that she's been designing our newsletters. And everyone will attest to the fact that she's done a very wonderful job in helping with the AdWords.

So she basically does the design and then we use the additional budget request allocation to print those newsletters for the public ICANN meetings. So in that way, the BC saves some cost and uses the ICANN allocation. But because we've been in the virtual state, we have not been able to use the ICANN additional budget request to print. So the payments we make is just good enough to get the virtual copies that we put on our website. And this fee you see here covers the cost for the next three editions of the BC's newsletter.

Now, for publications and outreach materials, what you see here is going to cover generic outreach materials. We basically have been waiting for the new logo. We will have done this back in the last two ICANN meetings but we were waiting for the BC's logo. So now, whatever material we're doing now, which we design and print, will carry the new brand of the BC. So this is what that covers.

The BC webinar and virtual events, one of the additional budget requests that we did was to … We used to have some support before. And we have re-engineered that to include having a webinar to select leaders who will get funded to ICANN meetings. We're hoping we that we tick this off and ICANN is then going to see that it works. Then they could also unfreeze or unpause their funding and continue to support us

EN

in that regard. So it's spending a little and hoping to get back something much more at the end of the day.

Please pardon me as I go through. Outreach. Please, can you scroll up a bit, Brenda, so I can … Down to … Yes. So we have the Internet Governance travel support and related events. So in my early days in the BC, we used to have this tradition of the BC sponsoring, particularly to ICANN meetings—members to ICANN meetings. And it was exciting for me. I've never benefited from it but I saw situations where members would indicate that they wanted the flight. Some members would indicate that they wanted the hotel. And the BC would use that as a way of bringing more of its members into ICANN meetings. That has informed this, what you see here, which is the Internet Governance travel support and related events.

There are some events that the BC will benefit from by sponsoring members to. We might cover—might just be the airfare or maybe the hotel for the event. The BC, by doing this particularly, we would have more members in a lot of these events—the IGF, the NamesCon—events that basically has to deal with the DNS, [inaudible] and can benefit from this. It's actually pegged at $5,000 because the idea was to have about $1,000 allocated to each region. And so people—members from each reason—could identify different places and it's basically a travel fund.

So the BC's outreach fund, in my thinking, is not basically for travel. If we're doing outreach, it's basically for outreach. But this is clearly going to be to support members traveling to different places that we feel the BC will get a lot of value from. If you recall, the last meeting or two meetings ago, there was a call to sponsor one of the … That's one of the

kind of events that we hope to use the funding, for sponsored events to cover. So if there is a BC thing that think that … If there's a program that we think the BC should have some interest in funding it can go within these words.

To the BC IGF Remote Hub, recall you have been active part of the hub for the last four or five years, where we had gotten BC's funding. And basically, last year, the BC funded the IGF Remote Hub in Abuja to the tune of $2,000. So the Remote Hub was a very good experiment in the last year because everyone went virtual and the hubs were the only places that physical meetings were taking place across countries. And it was a remarkable feat to have the BC support such an initiative. It's not new. The BC has kept supporting the initiative over the last four years. And that's why it's having its own budget line item.

The same with the AfICTA summit. The AfICTA summit has enjoyed BC funding. It didn't have a [vote] of its own. That was why we were able to rely on outreach. But when you do so, there is the tendency to want to allocate all the funding to outreach.

So for FY22, what we are seeking to do, because we presume that the meeting might also be a virtual meeting, that's why we decided to reallocate some of the funds, and reduce it by $1,000 and revaluate in the year ahead. I hope this answers all your questions and I'm sure there's justifications for all the actions taken. Thank you.

MASON COLE: Thank you, Lawrence. We are two minutes over but are there any other questions for Lawrence before we move forward.

ARINOLA AKINYEMI: Thank you, Mason, if I could come again.

MASON COLE: Quickly, please, Arinola. Yes. Thank you.

ARINOLA AKINYEMI: Thank you, Lawrence for the clarification. I missed out on item number 22, which is BC sponsored events. That is one. Two, for the Remote Hub, I have been actively participating in it, yes. And it has been allocated about $700 over a period of time. Perhaps there's a reason why it's not $2,000. That's another question I have, if you could clarify that.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: All right. So I have spoke about the BC sponsored events earlier. For the Remote Hub, last year, the Abuja Remote Hub got funding to the tune of $2,000 from the BC, basically because the hub was also going to be open for a two-week period, which was the length of the entire IGF, which indeed was what played out. Also, there were a lot of other considerations that took place but that was what ExCom allocated to the Abuja IGF Remote Hub last year, FY21. The same level of funding is predicted for this year. Thank you.

MASON COLE: Okay. Thank you, Arinola for the questions and thank you, Lawrence, for the follow-up. We're now four minutes over. So I'm going to suggest that

we cut the queue there and if anyone has individual questions for Lawrence, that we can follow up by e-mail before the ExCom takes up the rest of the budget issue.

All right. Very quickly, is there any issue any member would like to raise or any other business for the BC this morning. All right. I see no hands. All right, ladies and gentlemen. Thank you very much. Our next meeting is Thursday, August 26th at our regular time. So I look forward to seeing you then. And if there's no other business, then the BC stands adjourned. Thank you all.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]