BRENDA BREWER: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Welcome to Business Constituency membership call on 29th July 2021 at 15:00 UTC. Today's call is recorded. Kindly have your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking. Attendance is taken from Zoom participation. Apologies have been received from Barbara Wanner and Toba Obaniyi. And now, I'll turn the call over to Mason. Thank you.

MASON COLE: Thank you very much, Brenda. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. Mason Cole here, chair of the BC. Welcome to the BC call on 29th July. It's good to have you all with us. As usual, we have a crowded agenda and we have one hour to handle our agenda items. So, we're going to go ahead and dive right in. So, before we do that, any updates or edits to the agenda as it stands, as you see on your screen? Okay. Seeing none, we're going to move to item number two. Steve, may I turn the floor over to you for the policy discussion, please?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks very much, Mason. You should have on your screens the same policy calendar that I circulated yesterday. I will get through this very quickly so we can cover some of the other administrative items near the end of the agenda. Margie and Mark are still on the ePDP Phase 2A call and had to drop off a half an hour early, but that's going so well.

Two things since our last call. On July 19th—that was last Monday—we submitted two comments, both related to the ePDP Phase 2A, which is

the how to handle WHOIS in the post-GDPR environment. So, the first was something that Alex Deacon and Barbara did a lot of drafting on. Margie contributed. So did Mark, Mason, Andrew, and Nik.

It's a response to the Phase 2A initial report. It was a structured response, so we had to conform our answers to the 11 structured questions. But to make it easy for others to consume that, I pasted up a PDF that includes the questions and our answers in a way that was more accessible than the giant Google sheet that staff prepares from the submitted responses to these forms. So, that's linked right there to our policy positions page. Again, thanks for all the input on that.

We reiterated many of those arguments on today's call. I've had three calls on the ePDP this week already. We're getting nowhere. We aren't able to persuade the contracted parties that they should take a more active role at differentiating between legal and natural registrants for the purposes of being able to publish legal persons' registration data when NIS2 is adopted by the European Parliament and then transposed by the European nations. We're getting nowhere on that but I'm going to look for Nik and Andrew a little later in the agenda to talk about the European Parliament progress.

Also last week, on the 19th, thanks to some heroic work by Mason Cole, Mason pulled together—from three prior BC positions—excepts that are responsive in some ways to an ICANN request for information because they're looking for vendors who could do identity verification for the SSAD. That was the standardized system for access and disclosure. That SSAD is nowhere near what we had wanted it to be, so the BC and the IPC had suggested that, if that's all it is, don't bother building it. But that

was an opportunity and Mason was really right to point out that the BC has a lot to say on the topic.

And we compiled that into a comment that we submitted on Monday. As your policy coordination chair, I verified that everything in there is previously adopted positions, so we didn't put it out for the full seven-day review. We repackaged it and submitted it to ICANN. If there are any concerns or objections about that, let me know. I'd be happy to discuss with any of you.

Let me see if I'll bring up the chat just in case somebody mentioned something. I want to be able to see that. Oh. So, Alex is suggesting that contributions weren't there but, Alex, you're always a valuable contributor. Thank you. All right. Let me scroll down to the open public comment, and there's only one right now. Woo hoo!

The .arrow Registry Agreement is up for renewal and they're adopting some of the elements of the base Registry Agreement. Unfortunately, they're maintaining their sponsor designation, which was the original setup when it came into being. I want to thank Zak Muscovitch for once again taking the role of analyzing these new contract proposals and preparing a draft BC comment. And Zak, later in the agenda you'll see we'll pick up the transfer policy. We'll at this point just focus on the attached BC comment. And I'll put the comment up and let you talk your colleagues through what's in there. Go ahead, Zak.

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: Thank you, Steve. So, I took a look at the proposed revised Registry Agreement and I compared it with the previous ones. I looked at the

background documents. And my ultimate conclusion on this was there wasn't a heck of a lot for us to comment on.

So, the gist of this draft comment is basically we support that it's continuing as a sponsored registry. We support the revisions that take from the base Registry Agreement. Nothing controversial that I identified. However, if someone in the BC identifies something that ought to be addressed or strikes them as worth commenting on, please, by all means, I could use the input and insight on that. So, that's it. Thanks very much.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Zak, thanks for doing that. I highlighted on the screen, too, that you called out the importance of adopting things like public interest commitments. So, at this point I think we're pretty happy with what .arrow has. Your comment is out for member review. I highly doubt anybody will improve upon it too much but thank you for getting it started. It's a big help. And comments or questions for Zak? Okay. Thanks, Zak. The next up, I'd like to turn to Andrew Bennett and Nik Lagergren to talk to us about the latest iteration of what's happening at the European Parliament, its supporting committees, with respect to the NIS2. So, for that, Drew, over to you.

ANDREW BENNETT: Thanks, Steve. I'll hand it up to Nik to start because Nik's going to give us an update on some of the … Just briefly on some of the intelligence we received this week since our last call. And Alex, you know what our next

steps are. Go for it, Nik. We'll be very fast because I know we've got a tight agenda.

NIKLAS LAGERGREN: Sure, of course. So, very quickly, we got quite interesting feedback yesterday. Not yesterday, but earlier this week, by the lead rapporteur himself, Mr. Groothuis who was in touch with Marie Pattullo, basically telling her that we were spot on in our request, that he was very much supportive of our request, which is very encouraging.

But one thing he pointed out is that, basically, nothing will happen in the month of August between himself and the shadow rapporteurs in terms of negotiating further amendments or compromise amendments, but he said the job would resume quite quickly in early September with the aim of striking some kind of compromise by mid-September in view of the vote in the ITRE committee on the 14th of October.

Interestingly, he specifically mentioned that getting help from interested parties, like we are, in moving certain MEPs that have been extremely unhelpful—I am, for instance, thinking about the shadow rapporteur from the green group—would be helpful to his cause. And basically, that's where we stand right now from an institutional point of view.

ANDREW BENNETT: Thanks, Nik. And so, with that in mind, we are teeing up a template letter for that kind of outreach to those MEPs and we have regrouped our drafting group for the BC on NIS2 outreach. Nik and I will have a template for them to start on on Monday and our timeline looks

something like two weeks—that's for drafting team—and then two weeks of it for the whole BC with the goal of having a letter ready to send that first week of September, which, according to Mr. Groothuis would be the ideal outreach time.

And then, we'll see the work of the committee really commencing two weeks after that. So, that will even give us some time for follow-up, I think, once we receive some initial confirmation of receiving it from the MEPs. We'll be kind of updating everyone throughout that process as to who we're targeting and why, and we'll get feedback from the BC. We understand August might be slow but I think that's a pretty generous timeline: two weeks for drafting, two weeks for you all to look at and maybe get reminders about it. But I think that should be okay. If there are any questions, though, or discussion folks have on that now, go for it.

NIKLAS LAGERGREN: Drew, very briefly, can I just add a very quick point on the request we got from Mr. Groothuis to follow up with other MEPs? I do think that from a BC perspective we need to carefully calibrate the people we reach out to. You know that there are other supportive groups that have been active on this.

For instance, I'm thinking about a group that is gathered around Marie Pattullo's aim and Dean Mark's coalition for online accountability that have signed up to letters, with other signatories coming from the online pharmacies, the Child Protection Group, the anti-spammers and a few others. And I'm thinking that, when it comes to supporting Groothuis

with other political groups, a group like this one might be better suited, for instance, when it comes to reaching out to the socialist or to the greens, and I do think that the BC should above all focus on groups like the EPP or the conservative. Basically, the pro-business groups that will react positively when they see an outreach from the Business Constituency, but I wouldn't spend too much time or waste too much time on behalf of the BC with, say, the greens or the communists.

ANDREW BENNETT: I, for one, support that. I'm biased. But I know that Nik did make a similar point to our drafting team and Marie Pattullo was supportive of that strategy. We've got some time to further shape it but, if folks have any other feelings on that strategy for prioritizing the more business-friendly MEPs for our outreach, we welcome that.

STEVE DELBIANCO: I see a hand up from Mason. Go ahead, Mason.

MASON COLE: Thanks, Steve, and thanks, Drew and Nik. I just wondered if we could raise it one level just so that the BC understand why the NIS2 proposal is as important as it is. This is a lot of in-the-weeds detail about who to reach out to, and what we're saying, and that kind of thing, but could you guys give just a quick overview about why this is so important to the BC and why it's important in the ICANN arena?

ANDREW BENNETT: Sure. I think, the ICANN arena, we made those points, Steve mentioned, in the Phase 2A comments, and those are out for everyone to see. A lot of folks contributed to that. I guess maybe Nik putting in the perspective of the European Union, and this legislation, and what it could do in terms of the recognition of WHOIS and then the enforcement to come at the member-state level.

NIKLAS LAGERGREN: Well I think, in a nutshell, Drew, a lot of the problems we're facing right now when it comes to WHOIS at ICANN basically stem from what I would refer to as a misinterpretation of the meaning of what GDPR is and what its provisions mean. And because of that, we've ended up in the shitty situation—pardon my French—that we are since May 2018 and the entry into force of the GDPR. And I think it's in this context that NIS2 could be extremely, extremely useful.

Because, basically, if we get a good NIS2 directive specifically on WHOIS, that could basically prove to others that have been claiming that what the EU says is this and not that, it would basically get another interpretation also from the EU, its main legislator, about their understanding of what GDPR means and how access and maintenance of WHOIS databases should be run—of course, in full legality and in line with the GDPR.

STEVE DELBIANCO: I want to clarify the contextual question with somewhere that happened less than 20 minutes ago. So, on the ePDP call, we're at a loggerhead over the question of whether to restart the ePDP if NIS2 were approved.

So, Margie Milam said that the BC proposes that our report indicate we restart the ePDP as soon as the NIS2 is adopted and approved by the European Parliament, not necessarily transposed by multiple nations.

At that point, Stephanie Perrin of the NCSG—and this is all public record, I can send you the chat transcript—said, "Well, that's ridiculous. What about any other country? Canada may issue a new policy or a new interpretation of privacy, so we'd have to restart for virtually any country." She said, "There's nothing special about NIS." Then I said, "NIS2 has paragraphs that are specifically there to address the overinterpretation of GDPR that was taken by ICANN in its policy development of the Temp Spec."

At that point, Volker Greimann with a registrar in Europe said, "That is a lie." He said, "The interpretation by ICANN of GDPR was exactly correct and it was done to avoid creating liability and fines for its contracted parties." So, anything we do in our communication should specifically address the points about how NIS2 is designed and is right on target for the over-interpretation that ICANN did on GDPR.

At this point, we are getting nowhere within the ePDP, so it would be great to be able to point to paragraphs, language, report language, if there is such a thing with a European Parliament adoption of a resolution. But we need to be able to show them that this was aimed at what ICANN did wrong a year and a half ago. Any further comments?

ANDREW BENNETT: Yeah. I'll just say that you can see in the latest compromise amendments, which are referenced, like I said, in our response on the

Phase 2A questions, that there is a sense in which … And that's from the industry committee but still a very important opinion in this process. They're speaking directly to Volker's comment in that what he described was, yes, an effort to avoid liability, frankly, but to … One that we have argued compromises cybersecurity.

And what you see here in Europe through the NIS2 directive … Which is much broader than just about WHOIS data access but is about the fundamentals of cybersecurity from the European point of view. And clearly, access to WHOIS data—and accurate and timely access, nonetheless—is foundational to that. So, that is, I think, the real, fundamental argument we're making about NIS2 with them and that I think we will see play out over the coming, unfortunately, years. But over time, nonetheless. Steve, you're on mute.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you. I'll send you the chat transcript and transcript of today's ePDP call when it comes out, and then maybe … I think Margie is going to contribute to the drafting. We need to get Margie and Mark involved in that as well as Brian and Alex.

ANDREW BENNETT: Yep.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Okay. Any other questions for Drew and Nik? Thanks again, Drew and Nik, for all your leadership on this. Going to turn next to Mark Datysgeld

and Marie Pattullo, our councilors at the GNSO Council. Marie and Mark, just let me know how you want me to scroll the policy calendar.

MARIE PATTULLO: Thanks, Steve. I'll kick off. We had the last council last week. You will be incredibly happy to know you will not be hearing me banging on about accuracy quite so much as, at long last—at very long last—the council has adopted the instructions for the Accuracy Scoping Team. There will be an official call for volunteers very soon.

We from the BC are very, very lucky to have both Susan Kawaguchi and [inaudible], who are going to be our two reps. I'm not expecting this to happen tomorrow but it will be soon and I know that they will both be brilliant on that team and, of course, be looking to all of us to assist them with it. I can only wish them lots of luck and lots of patience. We had quite a long discussion, Steve, if you want to scroll a wee bit more, about the rights protection mechanisms Phase 2.

Now, you'll remember that we had years' worth of discussion on the Phase 1, which is all of the rights protection mechanisms that came in for the new gTLDs under the last round. But it didn't touch the UDRP, which has been around by 20-plus years, written by WIPO. That's Phase 2. So, what's going to happen now is we need to re-charter the group for Phase 2. Why do we need to re-charter it? Because the first charter for Phase 1 was a bit of a mess.

As part of this exercise, ICANN Org and council leadership have suggested that the GDS within ICANN should go away and draft up a report explaining to us all of the data, and facts, and issues that people

have raised with UDRP. So far, so logical, apart from the fact that—for those of you who were on our call two weeks ago, you'll know that Zak raised this, too—the GDS wouldn't know a UDRP if it fell over it. This is nothing controversial and certainly nothing against the GDS but they've never taken a UDRP. They've never been party to a UDRP.

And it struck us that the most sensible people to take this forward would be people who actually do know what they're talking about because they can then produce a report that's based on reality and fact. There was a suggestion that maybe some people in our colleagues from the IPC might want to take this on. They didn't, which I understand, both for political and for … What's the word I'm looking for? Reasons of optics.

So, the most obvious, clearly, person to hold the pen here is WIPO. That's the World Intellectual Property Organization. I say that because they wrote the UDRP. They do it all day, every day. And they would, of course, have all of these facts, stats, data, and be able to reach out to the other providers around the world who do this. That's what the argument … I'm sorry. That's what the discussion was about last week, with those of us on one hand saying, "If we're going to be practical, let's do it with the most efficient and knowledgeable author," and those on the other side apparently seeming to think that WIPO is somehow a self-interested, nasty person.

WIPO is an independent, global, not-for-profit body who has got all of the status. So that, to me, as Steve has put here, is just illogical and impractical. Anyway, upshot is that, thank you very much, GDS will now present at forthcoming council about what they intend to do, which I still think is illogical and impractical but we'll see what they say. Now, I

don't really have anything else to say about the council meeting but, Mark, over to you.

MARK DATYSGELD: Thank you for that, Marie. Unfortunately, apologies, but I was preparing today, actually, for the ICANN72 production planning call, which the staff implied was for the 29th but what they actually meant was the 12th of August. So all of my effort was directed toward that, so I didn't bring any notes, but we'll keep you guys posted. Thanks.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Marie and Mark, thank you for all the work you put in at council. BC colleagues, do you have any questions or comments for our councilors? Next meeting is 19th August. Thank you. We're going to now move to Waudo Siganga. Oh, sorry. Sorry, sorry. Zak, while we're on this topic, I'd like you to take up a discussion of the Transfer Policy Review Working Group, as well as I have your request that I can bring up on the screen when you tell me to. Go ahead, Zak.

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: Thanks very much, Steve. There's a Transfer Policy Working Group underway. It started in about mid-May and it follows that PDP 3.0 representative model. And so, I'm normally the representative of the BC and there are representatives from all the other stakeholder groups on there. It's scheduled to—I didn't know this when I signed up—go for another two years, June 2023.

Essentially, what this Transfer Policy Working Group has undertaken is a review of when and how domain names can be transferred. The working group is heavily balanced in favor of registrars but the other stakeholder groups do have representation, as well. It's divided into two parts, a 1A and a 1B. The 1A is primarily technical issues such as authentication codes, how long should they be, who keeps them, forms of authorization, etc.

And the second part is what I was more interested in, which is the locking policy for domain names. So, when it comes to locking, the fundamental issue is balancing security and portability. So, if you look at it similar to how phone numbers were in many countries, years ago, it was very tough to move your phone number from one company to another. Part of that is you don't want somebody to steal your phone number and move it without authorization.

So, the working group is going to be primarily involved in the second phase in examining the transfer locks. And from a business perspective, as a lawyer whose practice is business law and trademark law for 21 years, the current transfer policy is nearly incomprehensible. It's misunderstood by ICANN staff. It's misunderstood by registrars themselves. It's misunderstood by registrants.

And so, there is a real hodge-podge of policies that have been adopted by registrars when it comes to when and how you can transfer your domain name. From a business perspective, the is an interest both in portability and security. And so, one of the objectives, I would think, for the entire working group and for the BC in particular is to ensure that there is clarity in the transfer policy.

So, there is a document that Steve attached to the e-mail with the agenda. It's a request for so-called early input. And Steve, you could put it up on the screen now. So, this is a request for early input. And as the document says itself at paragraph two this is "redundant." That's because there are already representatives from each of the stakeholder groups.

However, I have no technical expertise having … I've never worked at a registrar and a lot of the stuff is very technical in nature. If there is anybody in the Business Constituency in particular that has any expertise from a business and registrar perspective or anyone else that cares to provide some input into this document, I've taken an initial stab at answering some of the questions. Bearing in mind it is redundant because these issues are going to be discussed over the course of the next two years, in any event.

There is also, lastly, opportunity for some to increase our bench strength, I think, because the BC is entitled to two representatives and two alternates. If there were someone else who was interested in participating in this fascinating topic along with me, particularly that has technical expertise, that would, of course, be great. And maybe Mason, Steve, and I could work that out with the working group, as well, even though it's a bit late. So, those are my comments and report on this working group. If anyone has any questions or comments, I'd be happy to hear them.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Zak, thank you again for leading on this. Zak is right about bench strength development. So, BC members, even brand new BC members, should volunteer to join Zak at drafting our markup on this document. That would get your feet wet about whether you'd also like to jump in and be a secondary BC rep on the working group itself. So, you can take baby steps to move into this. And I know nobody better than Zak at trying to train you along and make sure that you understand the acronym soup and the process at ICANN.

So, let me look to the queue. We've got a lot of members on the call today. How about a new member who wants to work with Zak on this really plain, nuts and bolts process of transferring domain names? Looking at some of the new members who haven't participated yet on content or comment development. Anyone? Excellent. Arinola, thank you very much for volunteering. Let's do that. After this call, would you send Arinola the same Word Doc that I attached, or very latest copy, and make some arrangements to work together on that?

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: Absolutely. God bless you, Arinola. I'll do that.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Zak. All right, Marie. I had taken out of the policy calendar this questionnaire because it had finished, but you've just revealed in that that it is extended. So, Marie, would you please cover that and I'll scramble to display the information? Go ahead.

MARIE PATTULLO: Sure. You know that the board is looking at how to set up the SSAD. You know what the BC thinks of that so I'm not going to expand. As part of the way they're doing this looking at what to do, they've set up a new policy procedural step called the "Operational Design Procedure," ODP, which is supposed to be where ICANN Org collects all the facts, and the stats, and the data so that the board can take an informed decision: cost, benefit, how much will it cost to set this monster up, how many people will use it, so on and so on.

So, as part of this OPD, they launched a survey. You remember we talked about this at the last BC meeting in quite some detail. Now, you'll also remember that we're really concerned about this because, on the one hand, yay, we like figures. Figures are good. On the other hand, to use Steve's word, it's a trap.

If we do not say to them, to this survey, that we make lots of requests for WHOIS data, the response will be, "Ah, well, then we don't need to do anything," which misses the entire point, which is that the SSAD as supposed now to be implemented will not work. It leaves the individual decision down to the registry or the registrar. There's no timeline. You know all of this. So, it's really important that we do reply.

There is also another trap—again, I'm quoting Zak—that they're looking at volume. They're looking at the volume of requests we make. Now, the problem with that is that you might only need to make one, two, three requests to get non-public WHOIS data in order to be able to stop a massive infrastructure attack, for example. So, it's not just because you make thousands of requests that we are protecting what we're supposed to be protecting, i.e. consumers, infrastructure, cybersecurity,

and whatever your domain is. So, the survey was supposed to close. This newsletter just came in while we were on the call saying it's still open. Steve, back to you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Marie. What I have displayed in the chat is the e-mail I sent all of you on the 16th of July to discuss the survey. I'm going to update and resend that to all of you with the new date of August the 5th as soon as we've finished this call. And again, I imagine they extended it because they got very few responses, and that does not bode well for us. Zak, you had a comment about it too?

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: Yeah. I was surprised when I did this survey that it just asks, "What describes your organization?" It doesn't ask you who your organization is, etc. So, it seemed quite odd to me, the nature of the survey, which is anonymous.

STEVE DELBIANCO: That may have been intended to make it easier for people to fill it out and not be worried about being challenged on how many queries they're doing. I don't suspect that the anonymity is a trap but I do think that the lack of people submitting is a trap for us. All right, I'll go back to the policy calendar and turn things over to Waudo Siganga, a representative on the Commercial Stakeholders Group. Waudo, can you hear us?

WAUDO SIGANGA: Yes, thank you. Can you hear me, Steve?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Perfectly, thank you.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Well, thank you, Steve. Hello, everybody. This is Waudo Siganga reporting on the activities of the CSG. I apologize; this time, I did not have a report that's written down. This is because there has not been much happening at the CSG the last two weeks, since the last BC meeting. We have not had any meeting or engagement during that period of time. However, our five policy priorities for the near-term remain the same, if I can just maybe reiterate them.

Number one is to decrease the incidences of DNS abuse. Number two is to improve access to domain name registration data. Number three is to improve ICANN compliance function. Number four is to bring ICANN up to date on its overdue obligations from previous reviews. And the fifth one is to follow up developments around the ATRT recommendations for the holistic review.

To ensure these priorities lead to more fruitful outcomes especially, the CSG is currently reviewing the tactics and strategies of engagement, especially with the board and with Org. So, that exercise is ongoing and there are some recommendations and strategies that we are putting in place to make sure that, as we engage with the Org and the board, we have fruitful outcomes.

Planning has also started for the CSG activities related to ICANN72. ICANN72 will include the usual meetings like the open meeting and the closed meeting. So, I'll be coming back to you as a … We'll proceed with that planning in case we need some input from the constituency.

Then, finally, the last time I also talked about the upcoming election of the GNSO Chair. So, this discussion is also ongoing and will be ongoing within the CSG. There is a timeline that has been given for that election. I think the election itself will be held on the 27th of October, during ICANN72, and by the 27th of September the two houses will have to submit the names of their nominees.

As I mentioned the last time, the ISPCP, who is our partner in the CSG, is rooting for the incumbent—that is Philippe Fouquart—to defend his seat, and they are actively seeking our support from the BC. So, any input from BC members, particularly our two representatives in the GNSO, will be welcome as me and Mason proceed to discuss this issue within the CSG. So, that's my short report for now. Steve, thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Waudo. And it isn't necessary to prepare a long written report for each biweekly call. You're welcome to do that, but I'd like to make it easier for you. So, for instance, when I send the draft policy calendar out on a Monday evening, you can annotate the prior reports that you did just to update that. But your long written report two weeks ago was outstanding and I thank you for that.

WAUDO SIGANGA:	Thank you, Steve.
STEVE DELBIANCO:	Marie is indicating Philippe being a good chair and my experience watching in council is that he has been very neutral, in effect, so I agree with Marie on that.
WAUDO SIGANGA:	Yeah, thanks for that input. We'll take it in.
STEVE DELBIANCO:	And Mark Datysgeld, our other councilor, has said the same thing. So, unless BC members have other input for Waudo, we're looking at a very favorable report on Philippe.
WAUDO SIGANGA:	So, Steve, for now I think we can take it as it's a BC position that will support Philippe.
STEVE DELBIANCO:	BC members, is there …? If there is further discussion … What I would say, that it would be helpful to send an e-mail to BC private indicating that those who aren't on the call … We have 22 people on this call, Waudo, but there are another 20, then, who are not on. I'd want to give everyone in BC private the chance to weigh in on Philippe. So, if you could pose that as a quick question to everybody and ask them for a reply by the end of this week.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Thank you, we'll follow that with an e-mail. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Waudo. And also, look in your inboxes for the resend of the SSAD ODP survey, which is now due August the 5th. With that, Mason, we are finished with the policy calendar, with, I think, plenty of time to cover the rest of the items.

MASON COLE: Indeed. Thank you very much, Steve. Great overview of the policy calendar, as always. So, thanks everybody for your contributions and input on policy discussion. So, Brenda is in the process of putting up the agenda. We're going to move now to item number three, which is Lawrence's operation and finance report. Lawrence, are you on the line? Over to you.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Thank you. Good day to everyone. Pardon me, I'm in a location that doesn't have very good Internet connectivity. So, I will not be able to put on my video for today's report. I also hope that the connection I have will see me through reading this report. Brenda, I would also like to share my screen if you could give me rights. So, to start with, we have concluded the process of the NomCom election, and congratulations to Tola, who was reelected for the small seat, and to Scott to represent the BC for the large business seat.

Their terms will start at the end of the forthcoming AGM and would run for another year. We are grateful for them stepping forward and I believe that they continue to have the full BC's support in their role. I'm also sure that they have taken to heart the comments that were shared at the last BC meeting with regards [further interaction], which I already see happening. I want to also say that, as of today, we still maintain 63 members in the Business Constituency in terms of membership. And out of those numbers, 20 companies are yet to renew their FY22 dues.

We want to encourage … That's about 31.7% in terms of mass. So, that's still quite a critical mass and we want to encourage everyone that is yet … Of those within this 20 to quickly [do the needful] in terms of paying their dues. If you have any challenge or if you didn't receive an invoice from the invoicing secretariat, please do me a mail or send a mail to invoicing at icannbc.org so that we can quickly sort out whatever issues might be on ground. We want to let all the BC members know that volunteers are still needed for the BC's onboarding committee.

The onboarding committee has a dual task of not just onboarding new members into the BC but also those who have a desire to know more about the BC. They also have this additional task of developing resources on the ICANN Learn platform, and we already have some funding approved, provided by ICANN for this. We want to quickly ensure that we are able to meet the deadlines that are set forth in the additional budget requests, which is to have a first report in December 2021.

And so, the committee has started getting up to speed but we need … We're inviting more members to join the onboarding committee. Right

EN

now, the onboarding committee are down to two because Ben had another role that he had to take up within his company and so had to resign from the onboarding committee.

So, we currently have three vacancies for members to fill up, which will not require any election except if we have more than three persons showing interest. There is also vacancy in the communications committee, so please, if you are interested, reach out to Brenda, to Chantelle, or to myself, and we would be happy to guide you going forward.

The FY21 financial report for the BC is ready and I will be sharing this with us, sharing it in our mailboxes, in the coming week after ExCom and finance committee has had an opportunity to review this report. On the screen before us is a summary of the expenditures for FY21. There were some tasks that we were able to carry out despite the COVID pandemic, whilst some suffered a setback.

But hopefully, once we resume to physical meetings, we'll be able to carry on with those arrangements, including our much talked about anniversary celebration. We had a budget. We basically spent about $2,000 designing and producing our different three editions of the ICANN … I mean of the BC newsletters. We spent about $3,007 on the MemberClicks platform for this for FY21 and ICANN in its usual practice has reimbursed that to us.

We have this backup website that we normally have in place just in case the primary site goes down, and we service that with $1,000. We have someone who has also been maintaining all our web [tasks], so to say,

acting as the webmaster for us, who we pay $1,000 annually for that service. The ex-officials' honors for FY21 cost much more than the $500 budgeted as we had not only produced the plaques but had to transport it to the different continents where our ex-official members were.

We also had to put some funds into producing a tribute video aside from what was given to them. The total expended came to $3,205. We also had some costs going toward the BC invoicing, which has been a usual practice. It went a bit over what was budgeted but not too far from the budget. The BC accountant, the banking and financing services, also got serviced. We had bank charges to the tune of $1,400.

We had the usual BC support that went to the remote hub [inaudible] which ran for two weeks because the IGF last year—I mean FY22/21—spanned for two weeks and the hub was open for the entire period. We also had the support that normally goes out to AfICTA in partnership and co-sponsorship to the tune of $3,500. And the Interisle study cost us $20,000, aside from the general counsel fee that came to $600 and the miscellaneous funds set aside for miscellaneous expenses, of which $1,150 was utilized.

So, altogether, we have a total of $46,913.83 and spent out of the budget of $75,600.00. So, we definitely had … That amounted to about … What was spent amounted to 63% of the entire budget for FY21. After ExCom has reviewed these details, we will be sharing it with membership. So, you will still have an opportunity to review and provide your comments and feedback, not just to the expenditure for FY21 but also to the budget. At this point, I would like to stop just in case there is

any question for me. I would like to take that. Otherwise, I will yield the floor back to the chair for the rest of the meeting. Thank you.

MASON COLE: Thank you, Lawrence. That was a very comprehensive report. Questions or comments for Lawrence? All right. I don't see any hands. Lawrence, thank you very much. I know the entire BC is looking forward to your final report, so as soon as we get through the ExCom process then we'll look forward to distribution to the members. All right, very good. Thank you. We are now on item number four. We have 12 minutes left in the call, so we're doing fine on time. Mark Datysgeld, back over to you because I understand we have a new logo to talk about.

MARK DATYSGELD: Thank you, Mason. So, actually, I'm glad to be here because, as you know, this has been my pet project for quite a bit. Brenda has prepared a slide with the results. I wonder if it will be possible to bring that up. There we go. So with, I would say, overwhelming majority, this is our new logo. Now, this is actually a slightly tweaked version. They had the Business Constituency too far down. I took that up slightly more toward the top.

And in case anybody has any input, any final input, we'll be reaching out to the ICANN branding and design staff very soon to finalize the logo. So, this would be the perfect timing, either during this call or right after, if you want to send us an e-mail to the ExCom or directly to me with any final, final comments before we just say "Hey, we're good, let's go" and they start to really do the rest of the materials around this design.

So, thank you everyone for participating. This has been, I think, a very favorable project to us. When we get back to face-to-face meetings, it will be really more interesting to have a logo to put in booths, to do outreach, to produce materials. My original problem with this was that we did some outreach here in Brazil and our logo was basically Business Constituency. It's a powerful name but it doesn't really have that logo component to draw people's attention.

So, now we have the powerful name and a cool logo to go with it. So, yep. Let's put this on our eventual celebration of the BC that will happen some day when we are actually in the same space together. Maybe we can have that up on the projector and go, "Yay, Business Constituency!" So, thank you, everyone. Yeah, back to you all.

MASON COLE: Thanks, Mark. Outstanding work, shepherding this through the process. I always want to recognize Brenda because she was also very helpful in getting this move forward, helping the ExCom get this to the point where it is right now, to where the members could vote and choosing the logo.

So, Mark, thank you for shepherding that through the process. The logo looks great. I can't wait to apply it to the new website and to our newsletter, etc. As you point out, it will be nice to use when we all get back to face-to-face meetings, which I know I'm looking forward to. All right. Questions for Mark or comments on the logo?

Okay, no hands. All right, very good. Eight minutes to go in the meeting. Is there any other issue that the BC would like to raise for discussion or

other business that we would like to take care of? All right. No hands again. Well, ladies and gentlemen, in that case I will yield back these eight minutes to your day and thank you for attending. Thanks, everybody, for your comprehensive reports and for all your hard work on behalf of the BC. Our next meeting is, I want to say, August. I've lost it, I'm sorry. Brenda, do you know the next meeting date off the top of your head?

BRENDA BREWER: I am about to tell you. It's not off the top of my head but it will be two weeks from today, August 12th.

MASON COLE: August 12th, there we go.

BRENDA BREWER: Yes.

MASON COLE: Okay, very good. So, as usual, agenda and preparations will be forwarded out before that meeting. And if there is no other business then the BC stands adjourned. Thanks, everybody.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]