BRENDA BREWER:	Good day, everyone. This is Brenda speaking. Welcome to the BC Membership Call on 24 February at 16:00 UTC. This meeting is recorded and attendance is taken from Zoom participation. We have apologies from Tim Smith and Zak Muscovitch. And I will turn the call over to Mason. Thank you.
MASON COLE:	Thank you, Brenda. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everybody. Mason Cole here, Chair of the BC. It's good to see everybody on the call. Hopefully, we'll have a few more people straggling in a bit late here, so we have a full complement of members. But we have our agenda up on the screen and we have one hour of time today to get through the agenda, so we'll begin promptly. Anybody have any updates or requests as it relates to the agenda as you see it?
	Okay, no hands. All right. So we have lots to cover today. Our usual review of the policy calendar and operations and financial review, which Lawrence will provide. There are several issues to cover today, so let's dive right in.
	Steve, the floor is yours.
STEVE DELBIANCO:	Thanks, Mason. Do you see it on your screen right now?
MASON COLE:	Yes, sir.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Great. Thank you. Since our last meeting, we haven't filed any new comments and we still have the same two open public comments to look at.

The first is something I will file on the 2nd of March. I've given the BC members two weeks to register any objections to this. We're going to agree with the ccNSO's proposal to change their respective bylaws on voting rights when you have two ccTLDs in a single territory, one for the IDN version, one for the Latin script.

The second is the Name Collision Analysis Project. The BC was very active in this back in 2011 and 2012 and this would be the time to dive into what SSAC is doing on name collisions. And they came up with the second report and we need a volunteer from the BC to analyze that. Mark SV had done a fantastic job on this about two years ago, March of 2020. It's very technical but not very lengthy assignment. It's a matter of looking at what SSAC is recommending and determining whether it'll be sufficient to ensure that new TLDs in the next round don't collide with Intranet resources that are named with the same name as a new TLD, and would therefore create a security or performance risk inside of corporate networks.

To give you an example, .mail and .printer were two examples of new TLDs that would have collided with Intranet infrastructure naming conventions and therefore those were disallowed.

Do I have any volunteers from the BC that would assist in reviewing the SSAC reports and commenting on them? Comments are not extensive.

Somebody with a little bit of a technical background, maybe. I am people fully committed between multiple BC small teams and your role as Policy Chair, so I'm afraid that I just can't throw myself at this assignment, at least until we finish the small teams on ODA. So this will go unanswered unless I get a volunteer from the BC.

Could some of you with the larger companies, Drew at Disney, ask somebody at the technical realm at Disney if they would volunteer to spend a few hours in the next week? I'll work with them and get them up to speed. I didn't mean to call on you, Drew. Just the biggest company I see on the list. Margie, anybody from the technical team at Facebook would be a real help. Okay, I'll go to the next one.

There's an ongoing effort for us to try and convince the European parliament to update through its NIS2 clarifications. A greater amount of differentiation required for legal versus natural persons, accuracy requirements, and publication requirements that would assist us in recovering some of the functionality we lost when ICANN implemented the temp spec. It's very difficult and thankfully we have Drew leading this with a lot of help from Marie, from Mason, from Claudia Selli and other BC member that are tightly connected to the European side of law making.

So, I'd like to turn it over to Drew to talk you through number three. Drew?

DREW BENNETT: Thanks, Steve. I encourage everyone to click on the link, a Google Doc, [and this is your resource guide]. In fact, I think it can replace the usual

and very useful link-rich bullets that Steve has in the policy calendar for you. All of that is in there. All the links to the key versions and their evolution—there you go—as well as everything that we have publicly submitted to date.

That's followed by our talking points. A lot of key information. The top section here really for folks looking to engage on the topic. ICANN73 is one opportunity. We're also working with individuals to engage with decision makers in Europe and this is the type of text that can be used for that as well as some of the specifics about what we want to see come out of the Trilogue negotiations that are ongoing now between the parliament and the council, the EU.

There's also a lot of good stuff further down from the different reports that we've cited over the past six months, a year, to give you good data-rich information to draw from to kind of spell out the problem in terms of WHOIS accuracy and WHOIS access. So I think it will be quite useful and I encourage everyone to review it.

Of course, this is view only. I'm happy to grant edit access, comment access. It's a document that can evolve. I think a key part, too— [inaudible] in the weeds now, but I recommend looking at this section. Can you go down just a little bit, Steve? Where is it? Yeah, the accuracy specific revisions on accuracy. Some of this is relatively recent in terms of our thinking about specific points where we think we can kind of get some winds and also maybe the final draft version of legislation that's under negotiation now and it's really focusing on some of the points for accuracy and verification that we see in the text from both sides so far

where we think there is opportunity to further strengthen between the two versions.

I think that's all for now. I'll be reaching out to some individuals. I see Claire-Line from LBMH. I'd love to talk to you and I'll reach out to you separately and this will doc will be a key part of that.

CLAIRE-LINE LALLEMAND JUAN: Thank you, Drew. It's Claire-Line from LBMH. Of course happy to talk with you about NIS2. Just for your information, we had a prep meeting ten days ago with the French ambassador, Henri Verdier, who is representing France at the GAC before the next ICANN and he was clearly not in favor of NIS2 and the other wording on WHOIS but we are very much looking forward to helping and do some outreach in Brussels to enhance the text or make sure that the provisions that are [inaudible] go forward.

DREW BENNETT: Excellent. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Any other things you want to add on this with respect to the call for evidence?

DREW BENNETT: Well, I'll just go through these first maybe, then Mason and Marie. I think everyone is aware there is a lot of email exchange about the study

on DNS abuse and that clearly showed I think a lot of the problem that we've been stating and it's been echoed by the commission.

There is a new opportunity as part of a broad initiative on the EU basically fine-tuning different regulations as far as [inaudible] against counterfeiting with a main focus on counterfeit goods sold on the Internet and ways to address that problem, including through intermediaries.

Interesting enough one of the inputs to that initiative is the study on DNS abuse, so there's a clear conceptual line for those involved at the commission between DNS abuse and how it enables criminal activities, including counterfeiting.

So we thought it was an opportunity to have a constituency like ours reiterate that and connect the dots. And it would be in a public manner. We would be submitting a public comment.

We already have a lot of material from that document [inaudible] to draw from and we just wanted to ensure that the BC was aware and supportive of another BC submission in the EU. I think Mason might have some more about that. Mason, go ahead.

MASON COLE: Thanks, Drew. Actually, you gave the context I was going to ask for. My only question is how do you want to move on this going forward? I'm happy to contribute as I can but where do you need help?

DREW BENNETT:	I think, including you, there's some others. Many on this call who have been on our drafting group. I think it will be key just to get something on paper.
	I haven't heard a ton back in terms of what the structure of this looks like. I'm not sure if it ends up as what kind of looks like long comments that go on the commission page for the toolbox. If anyone on the call has information about that, I think we'll figure it out offline anyway. But I'll bounce off a proposal for the drafting team something to start with and then we'll evolve from there a statement on the issue that we could submit.
MASON COLE:	Okay. I just want to make sure we don't miss the deadline. And Margie is raising a couple of ideas in the chat as well.
DREW BENNETT:	I'll go ahead and read.
MARIE PATTULLO:	Thanks, Drew. Two things. As you know, NIS [inaudible]. So, in my day job, we've been in touch with the rapporteur from the European Parliament quite [inaudible] heavily from the study commissioned by DG Grow on DNS abuse, hoping that that will give him some ammunition in his dialogue, in his continued work within the Trilogue. Haven't heard back but we have at least got that out.

On the call for evidence, I'll be as brief as possible. This lives within another part of the commission called DG Grow, the unit that's responsible for intellectual property. The toolkit fits within what is called the Intellectual Property Action Plan that came out a couple of years ago. It's been under development for quite a while. There's been a whole bunch of different webinars, seminars. There's going to be more. They're invitation only.

What they're doing here … You've quoted the [top line] of what they're looking for. Free format. You can send them an email, even. All of the information will be on the commission's page. You don't have to fill in a questionnaire. Say anything you want. But I will underline something here. Do not, do not, do not expect DG Grow at this stage of the proceedings to be able to have any influence over DG Connect and it's DG Connect who are leading on NIS2.

So, by all means, put in what you think about WHOIS, put in what you think about NIS2, but be realistic.

What I would suggest, if you're going to put in something for the call for evidence … I mean, full transparency, [inaudible] obviously is but [inaudible] much wider. It goes to a whole bunch of different issues.

If you are putting something for the call for evidence for DG Grow, copy it to DG Connect, too. Don't expect Grow to send it to Connect because they won't. Thanks.

DREW BENNETT:

Great. That answers two key questions I had for you. I would then say I think that we could think of this as an opportunity just to put it really more so into the public sphere. Like I said, kind of that statement, just connecting the dots and I think alluding to the fact that the commission clearly connects the dots between the responsibilities of registries and registrars, the failures happening as outlined in the study and DNS abuse and then how that connects to activity like counterfeiting.

There's a three-page abstract about this call for evidence and another segment of it actually highlights how counterfeiters take advantage of intermediaries and lack of transparency with what your intermediaries are doing. So I think that's the other dot we connect.

So anyway, I would suggest then that the BC do … Marie, would it be an email with an attachment and then with the knowledge that attachment, that longer statement that we'll make on the issue would go into the public sphere?

MARIE PATTULLO:

Off the top of my head, I can't remember the format because I'm happily [inaudible] response but I can't remember the submission format.

But what generally happens with any public consultation from the commission is that when you … You can either submit via the dedicated page or you can submit to a functional e-mail address.

Now, if you submit via the dedicated page, you can normally upload a PDF and they will ask you if you want it to be anonymous or not. Don't

say it's going to be anonymous. Say it's public. Of course it's public. There you go! No, you have to go down a bit. Keep going. Scroll down, scroll down, scroll down. If you hit "Give Feedback" you'll see the yellow box. If you hit there … And you need to get a commission account. That's very easy. You can do it. It's very straightforward.

DREW BENNETT: Okay. Yeah. I think, at any rate, we'll start on this drafting with the idea of a format towards something that would be a PDF, similar to what we've done before. We wrote letters to parliamentarians and to the council, short body of an email stating who we are and the attachment being the [main submission]. So that's what we'll do with this. And whether it be uploaded as a PDF or email—

MARIE PATTULLO: Yeah. And even if … If you do submit a PDF via the submission page, there's nothing to stop you taking that PDF and copying it into an email and sending it to DG Connect for information.

DREW BENNETT: Okay.

MARIE PATTULLO: Just really straightforward.

DREW BENNETT: Great. Very helpful. And we'll get started on that.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Any further questions for Drew? Marie? Okay, thanks, everyone. Thanks, Drew. We're going to scroll down to Council next. This is Marie and with Mark. Marie, I think you have ten more minutes which might be just perfect.

The previous council meeting is listed there. There hasn't been a meeting since in council and I summarized this discussion before. I guess what might be new would be the small team and the SSAD ODA response. But is there anything, Marie and Mark, that you'd like to cover in the top half of the screen?

MARIE PATTULLO: Thanks, Steve. From my point of view, I have nothing that needs to take up your time. I know that we should ask Mark if he wants to say anything about the small team on DNS abuse. And then if you could lead us through the SSAD, that would be great. Thank you.

MARK DATYSGELD: Hello, everyone. Basically, nothing to say as well other than Paul McGrady and I will be co-leading the group DNS abuse from the council and we will be … Some work has started on that but still very incipient. Nothing worth taking our time over it now, but after ICANN73, more updates for sure.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Mark, thank you. I scrolled in the policy calendar to the section from the BC Working Group on DNS abuse, and Mark is also a part of that group. We haven't had a meeting since last year. And when we did meet last year, we dove into the registrar audit report and came up with seven steps the BC should pursue right here. And it's at the bottom of the policy calendar where I need you to see and to comment on. Let's feed them into Mark Datysgeld as one of the co-chairs of the DNS abuse group.

This focuses heavily on the Registrar Audit Report which revealed that very few registrars even could take in DNS abuse reports, let alone respond to them. And ICANN thinks they've solved the problem by forcing registrars to add a DNS abuse point of contact. And for us in the BC, we think that just gets to the next audit which ought to be on how do they respond now that at least they have an ability for us to submit a DNS abuse report.

So we'd like a broader audit of how well they respond or fail to respond to actual abuse complaints. The challenge there is for us, we have to actually put some actual abuse complaints into that registrar complaint system or the audit will never discover whether or not they replied. This is going to take a coordinated effort to document instances where registrar denies that it was abuse or instances where we found abuse that they failed to take action on.

Mark and Marie, I guess I'll scroll back to the council section and dive into the point on the SSAD. SSAD is the Standardized System for Access and Disclosure. It's what is supposed to be an ICANN-built system that would route requests for registrant information to the appropriate

registrars for them to assess and determine whether they would respond.

The BC, when that was recommended in EPDP Phase 2, the BC voted no. We said it was not worth the trouble since there were no obligations on disclosure. There was no centralized responsibility and accountability for evaluating legitimate requests. So we voted no on that and we were outvoted, since only the BC and IPC voted no. The rest of the BC gave a supermajority. The rest of the GNSO did a supermajority. They submitted the request to the Board and the Board evaluated it through an operational design assessment (or ODA) and that came back just a couple of weeks ago.

I am on the small team representing the BC. It's a small team that is supposed to evaluate what the Board asked us to do about the ODA and try to advise council leadership on what could be the next steps to proceed.

So, that generated a list of seven questions from staff where they are interested to see whether the BC could contribute to a consensus on how council might proceed.

So, I drafted the responses. I'll reshare those right now with you. And in red …. I sent this around last night. So, in red are the draft responses that I came up with, drawing on Margie Milam and Mark SV's good work on the BC's minority statement when we voted no.

You'll see in these questions that I took the advantage of the chance to reiterate some of the things that the BC said, even though they're not strictly responsive to the questions that staff has. In short, my answer to

question one was, well, no. It did not provide all the information we needed and this was my chance to say that we want a ticketing system for the purposes described here.

I see Alex's phone. Alex Deacon, is that you on the call? If you are, I would welcome you to offer your comments on this. I have to submit this today.

Number two was the clarifying questions and I said yes to that. Number three, I said no there were no benefits not sufficiently highlighted. On question four, we think we needed centralized decision making. Margie Milam, you'll recognize this language. It came from the draft that you did for us. Then, question five, are there ways to assess the demand? We said yes and we think a ticketing system would help to gather that data.

Then, question six. Is there a common agreement on what SSAD is about? I said no. I believe—and this is from Margie's notes—that from the beginning, the NCSG and CPH ignored the purpose of the temp spec and the EPDP and they believed it was their role to defeat any new policies so that the temp spec becomes permanent. So I believe there's been a disconnect.

And finally there is no other input that I was going to add at the end. These are due today and I have invited all of you to comment. I'm happy to take questions and comments on this call that I have to submit in about two hours. Any questions or comments?

And Marie, that link that you put in the chat is in the report, in the policy calendar, for today.

Okay, I'll be submitting that in two hours, so give me your comments if you have any.

There's another council item that we discussed two weeks ago. You recall we had a lengthy discussion led by Zak Muskovitch and Arinola Akinyemi. They presented the current questions facing the Transfer Policy Working Group. We had really … Mason, you missed it. But it was a lively debate about this notion of a lock on new registrations. So we had some domainers on the call who were debating with some of the folks trying to protect our customers and the larger companies and brands like Facebook. I would have called that to say on balance. I believe that the need for the locks is pretty compelling.

But what Zak and Arinola have done is do a follow-up call with Susan Kawaguchi, who is probably our most vocal in terms of protecting the lock. I believe we have invited Zak, Susan, and others to hold another call for the BC interested parties to further discuss this. Now, Zak I believe was unable to make the call today and Arinola is driving and listening. So I don't think we'll be able to do it here. But are there BC members interested in doing a deeper dive on what Zak and Arinola would indicate is the BC's perspective? I will turn to Susan for sure but Susan's not on the call today.

All right. Turning to the next item up. There is a council committee for continuous improvement. Susan and Imran9 are on that and I don't see either on the call today to give us a report.

I represent the BC on the small team to review paper on consensus policy, so there's nothing new on that.

So, with that, I'll turn it to channel three which is the CSG liaison role. Tim Smith is unable to be with us on this call today. He's a Trade Association president and they have their member meeting. Mason, I think that you were going take over for Tim on this part of the call.

MASON COLE: Yeah, thank you, Steve. I'll just present a bit about what Tim would have talked about today on the call. So, there is an exercise that the CSG leadership, the ExCom, went through earlier in February where we prompted by the ICANN Board to talk about what the CSG's priorities are for the year and this leads up to the CSG membership meeting that we had with the Board coming up during ICANN73. And that's an open meeting and I encourage everybody here on the call to attend that. It will be very good if we have strong BC representation on that call.

So, we had a long discussion about prioritization and we determined a few common priorities for the coming year between the BC, the IPC, and ISPC. I'll just [inaudible] those right now and I can share them on the list later if that would be helpful.

Number one, we want to improve access to registration data and that's been a priority of the BC for some time now. We've been stymied by GDPR and ICANN's weak tea response to GDPR. It's going to be important in that context that we continue engaging in the EPDP IRT and also any subsequent phases of policy development including accuracy scoping. I know that Susan Kawaguchi is representing us on the accuracy team and that's great. We're going to need continued BC engagement in those areas.

Priority number two was see if we can find an opportunity for coordinated action with contracted parties. And that is a bit of a political gambit in that we don't want to be seen, the BC doesn't want to be seen or the CSG doesn't want to be perceived as obstructive to the ICANN process, so there may be ways for us to cooperate as a CSG with contracted parties on areas where we have common points of view.

We have yet to identify exactly what those are, but for example, it could be we want to implement current recommendations before we open new reviews, including for example, the Phase 2 RPM Review.

So, the CSG leadership is going to coordinate with leadership from contracted parties and see if there are areas where we find common ground and we can advocate together on those issues.

Then, our third priority is to mitigate DNS abuse and that is, as you know, something the BC has been very active on for a number of years now, including—preceding my time as chair anyway.

So, that includes things like advocating for adoption of commons standards to address abuse, including infringement and content abuse which is based on the e-reports findings on DNS abuse that was just published recently. Identify areas where ICANN bylaws and contracts are vague on abuse and propose ways forward to increase predictability and response rates to abuse complaints.

And then further support the contracted parties on their voluntary efforts to address abuse. While we may think as a CSG and as a BC that those don't quite go far enough, we want to applaud those efforts

nonetheless because they presumably has an effect on DNS abuse. But we're looking for more extensive action beyond that.

So, when it comes to the CSG meeting with the ICANN Board, we've established an agenda for that. Again, I encourage you, it's going to be held on March 8 and I believe it's 16:30 UTC, so please put it on your calendars and register for the ICANN meeting if you haven't already. We're going to work through a discussion. We've got 90 minutes scheduled with the Board as a CSG and it's going to be a lively discussion so it would be very helpful if everybody could be on that call.

Okay, Steve, back to you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Mason. I put into the bottom of the CSG report some links to ICANN73 items. First of all, you need to register. It's easy. Registration is open now. Meeting runs from March 7-10. Prep week just ends today and I've attached the preview schedule for ICANN73. It's first attachment to the email today.

Then, I also attached a link to the GNSO policy briefing for 73 and the policy outlook reports. Earlier, Marie had put in the chat to call all of your attention to the things the GNSO will be dealing with at ICANN73.

I think that's all I've got. So, back to you, Mason, for the rest of the meeting.

MASON COLE: Thanks, Steve. Barbara has got a hand up. Barbara, was that related to Steve's report or do you have a follow-up.

BARBARA WANNER: Yes. Indirectly related to Steve's report. I just noticed on Steve's calendar that he sent us it says the CSG membership meeting is cancelled, yet I checked the schedule and it's listed on the 10th of March. It would be 8:00 AM Eastern time. So I'm just a little confused. I wanted to clarify that. Thanks.

MASON COLE: Thanks for raising that, Barbara. I believe Brenda can speak to that. Brenda, can you update us?

BRENDA BREWER: Yes. On my schedule, it is marked as cancelled, so you may need to refresh your schedule, please. Just check again. Mine clearly says it's cancelled. It just happened yesterday.

BARBARA WANNER: Okay, great. I plugged these into my own schedule probably last week. Thanks for the tip.

BRENDA BREWER: You're welcome.

MASON COLE: Thanks, Barbara. Just to be clear there is a CSG open meeting with the Board on March 8. There is not any longer a CSG open meeting on March 10th. Brenda, could you put the agenda back up please if you don't mind? All right. Thanks very much. We're doing fine on time so far, so let's go to item #3 on the agenda. Lawrence, over to you for operations and finance, please.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Thank you, Chair, and good day, everybody. I'll start my report with an open NomCom announcement. Please let's take another look at this and possibly put in an application or speak to someone who might be interested before a closure of the call. I saw Tola on the call earlier. Might want to take two minutes to speak to this particular subject. Tola? And if [inaudible], we will encourage you to also use this opportunity to provide an update on the NomCom.

ADTOLA SOGBESAN: All right. Thank you, Lawrence. You want me to just go ahead now or when you're done?

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Please go ahead.

ADTOLA SOGBESAN: Okay, thank you so much. Greetings to everyone, Chair, Steve, and everybody on the call. Somehow it is really important for us to see how best we can pass this information to our colleagues and associates.

Turnout [inaudible] are quite low on last year. Yesterday, we had about 73 applicants with only just about five that are completed. Of course, we are used to last-minute [inaudible]. It's closing in about less than ten days and experience shows that the next couple of days there will be some rush. However, if there is an opportunity we can take by applying or passing [inaudible] associate, then it is good for us.

We're trying to balance as much as possible experience because one or two or three board members who will be leaving are quite experienced, so more than ever before, the Board requires very experienced ICANNners, and more importantly, with Board experience elsewhere to assist in moving the organization forward.

So, if we have members or associates that will fit the current vacancy, please request that we ask them to put in the application. There is a very strong opportunity that very good candidates, we have not much choice this time around.

Thank you, Lawrence. Back to you.

LAWRENCE OLAWLE-ROBERTS: Thank you very much, Tola, for that. Do we have any questions for Tola from members? Okay, seeing … Barbara, I'm sure that's an old hand or is it a new one?

BARBARA WANNER: Sorry. I'll pull it down.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Thank you. So, going ahead … Thank you, Tola, for that. Please, members, use this opportunity to put in an application. There are positions not just on the ICANN Board, for the PTI Board on the GNSO Council and other parts of the community. Good luck to those of us who are already in the pool.

I would also want to draw members' attention to the fact that we have made some further improvements to the BC's website and created pages for our different committees. This can be found under the 'About Us' page. That page is still being populated and we're growing that particular information that we want to encourage members to review the BC's website and help with feedback and comments that we can use to improve our general outlook.

The BC's Communications Committee has been up and around and they are basically working on upgrading our new media strategy. So I'm sure that we would be seeing some information coming out soon and they might also be reaching out to BC members to get content and information that could go to our social media pages, as well as a monthly electronic news page.

I don't see … I'm not sure Vivek is on the call. Otherwise, maybe in subsequent meetings we will have them speak directly to these initiatives. But kudos to that work that is ongoing.

At this point, because we have ICANN73 around the corner, we have our newsletter almost ready. The ICANN73 newsletter. Thanks to all those who contributed one article or the other towards its production. The plan is to have it posted on the BC's website by the 1st of March. That's

going to be in between the time for our next BC meeting, so that's why we have this information coming to us at this point. So, please watch out for the BC's edition of ICANN73 newsletter on the BC's website from the 1st of March 2022.

The BC's onboarding committee. Please feel free at any point to interject me if you have a question. The BC's onboarding committee is also currently working on draft content that will go into ICANNLearn calls. This is very important for the BC because this is an evergreen resource that is going to be sitting somewhere on the ICANN website probably for years to come, so it's very important that we make it as rich as possible and inclusive for businesses, whether big or small, and trade organizations to find it a useful resource.

We are going to be posting—going to be sending an email out next week, Monday, the 28th of February with a link to the Google Document where it's going to be hosted for members to review and make further inputs. We're going to have two weeks to do this in alignment with the BC's charter, and after that, where we have full concurrence, majority concurrence, we will pass this off to the ICANN staff team whose responsibility will be to [inaudible].

So, this is the point where we're going to need members' input to enrich this process and to help make the draft that we have appealing to business. Please, once we share the links with you, please take time out to review the documents and make your inputs. We're going to benefit a lot from members who have been in the BC for years and please put in something that will help us make this process a very

rewarding one for newcomers and for people who are just sitting on the fringes trying to still make up their minds about joining the BC.

The BC's Finance Committee, by the BC charter, is empowered in Section 4.3.3 page to reach out to members of the BC who have not yet fulfilled their fiduciary responsibility to the BC for FY22. So, very soon, we're going to pass that [block] to …. We just have a few members and we can ask them to step into [inaudible]. To this cost, please, if you still have any issue whatsoever in resolving your invoices, let me know, so that we can help sort this out.

Members should please note that in the next two weeks—sorry, two months. In the next two months thereabout, we will be sending out new invoices for FY23. We normally do this from the 1st of May and we want to encourage members to kindly do the [inaudible] as soon as they receive the invoices and [inaudible] what they have to cover.

So, basically, where there are some other information that needs to be passed to membership, we'll definitely send this information to the BC's private list.

I will yield the floor back to Mason if nobody has a question for me. Otherwise, I'll be happy to take your questions. Thank you.

MASON COLE: Thank you, Lawrence. Any questions for Lawrence? Okay, I don't see any hands.

All right. Just a couple of housekeeping items before we raise AOB. I just want to remind everybody our next meeting as BC will be during

ICANN73. That'll be on March 8th at 14:30 UTC. And that is an open meeting, so we will probably very likely have guests in our meeting from outside the BC.

Then, just to alert you as well, we've invited—as he has accepted our invitation. We've invited Maciej Korczynski from the University of Grenoble in France who is the author of the recent European Union study on DNS abuse. He will be our guest. He is going to present for 15 minutes and then take questions for another 15 before we move on with our regular agenda. So I highly encourage you to make time for that meeting as well.

If you haven't registered for ICANN73, Brenda has put the link in the chat. Please go ahead and take care of that so you that you can be admitted into the Zoom rooms and put that on your calendar, if you would. Again, it's March 8th at 14:30 UTC is BC Membership open meeting.

Okay. All right, ladies and gentlemen. Any other business that we'd like to raise before we adjourn today?

All right. It looks like the queue is clear. So, with that, I will yield about 15 minutes back to your day and thank you for attending. Thank you to Brenda for the support as always. And the BC is adjourned. We'll see you at ICANN73, everybody. So long.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]