
BRENDA BREWER: Good day, everyone. This is Brenda speaking. Welcome to the BC Membership call on 20 October 2022 at 15:00 UTC.

Today's meeting is recorded. Please state your name before speaking and have your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking. Attendance is taken from Zoom participation. Apologies received from Tim Smith. And I'll turn the meeting over to BC chair, Mason Cole. Thank you.

MASON COLE: Thank you, Brenda. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everybody. It's Mason, chair of the BC. Welcome to our call on 20 October. We have a bit of a sparse crowd today but I'm hoping that other people will join on. Before we get started, Barbara, your hand is raised. Go ahead, please.

BARBARA WANNER: Thanks, Mason, very much. I just wanted to introduce Nan Schecter to the group. She is USCIB's new Digital Policy associate. This is her first time that she's participated in a BC Membership call but I think she'll be working with me more on all things ICANN. I just wanted to introduce her to the group. Thanks a lot.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

MASON COLE:

Wonderful. Thank you very much, Barbara, and welcome, Nan. It's good to have you on the call. I'm sure we'll find a way to put you to work soon. So thank you very much for joining on.

Okay. Brenda has the agenda up on the screen. Are there any additions or updates to the agenda before we begin? Okay. I see no hands raised. All right, we're going to dive right in. Steve, over to you for item number two, please. Go ahead.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thanks, Mason. I'll share the screen for the policy calendar that was sent out yesterday and dive right in. The first thing I want to do was thank Vivek, who had some help from Olajidi to put in a brief comment on Universal Acceptance roadmap. I think that we approach this from the standpoint of BC concerns and not from the perspective of registries and registrars new systems. The BC considers Universal Acceptance an awfully important initiative for purposes of serving business registrants and users. So thank you guys for doing that.

Second item up, we have a number of open public comments and it's unusual. This year, there have been months that go by without any open public comments and suddenly there's nine of them. The BC was among the groups who have asked ICANN staff to extend some of these public comment periods. So far, staff has granted on a couple of key ones and they've been to move them out into November and even into December. The first item up, number one here is this Holistic Review of ICANN, which was teed up by the ATRT3. It means whatever anybody wants it to mean. So the team put together a Terms of Reference to try

to give a common understanding of what would be done in a Holistic Review. That is what's being commented on. We're not being asked to suggest what we want the review to do or what we want it to change, but rather just what elements could be looked at in such a review when the team comes together, like what is in scope and not, and what methods and processes would they use to accomplish the review.

So a huge thank you to Barbara Wanner, who took the lead on drafting. Margie Milam has also been a help on that. I'm working with Barbara and Margie on getting the BC draft comment in your hands in advance to the 10 of November. You'll have at least a week before the 10th of November due date so that BC members can assess. Barbara, I'd be happy to give you the floor if you'd like to share anything about where your current draft is going.

BARBARA WANNER:

Thanks, Steve. I think it's sort of ready for a critical review by both you and Margie. Basically, I have reiterated the BC's position that we feel there are structural imbalances both in the Board and in the GNSO Council and urged that the Term of References be sufficiently broad to enable consideration of structural changes. I think certain aspects of what they want to consider in this Holistic Review Terms of Reference are a bit ambitious given what we have encountered concerning the imbalances. For example, they call for the SOs and ACs to do self-assessments and so forth.

Well, my view is that we may encounter the same sort of obstructionist and zero sum behavior in working with our colleagues in the Non-

Contracted Party House on self-assessment or what should constitute a self-assessment that we've had on policy issues. I incorporate those concerns in that draft and I welcome everybody's comment. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Barbara, thanks again. I will look at it tomorrow and Margie as well, and then we'll circulate our edits back to you, and then get it in the hands of BC members for the 3rd of November. Thanks again. Does anybody else want to volunteer for this? You can go ahead and shout out your name and we'll put you on the list as well. I don't see any hands up right now.

Okay. Number two, our amendments that have been proposed for the base Registry Agreement and the Registrar Accreditation Agreement. And specifically those amendments, which get negotiated between ICANN Org and the contracted parties, those amendments were to add their obligations to support RDAP. And RDAP is the way in which ICANN can route requests for registrant information to the registrar that controls the relationship with the registrant, and they do this via an automated service. The obligations here are necessary to replace the WHOIS Port 43 servers that registrars and registries used to run. This is in response to the EPDP and GDPR.

We are glad to get Crystal Ondo and Rajiv Prasad, both with Google, to draft a BC comment. I think they did a great job because the RDAP technology itself is not controversial as a contract amendment, but I thought it was great the way Crystal and Rajiv have come up with a way to suggest things that are important technically for it to work well. Crystal and Rajiv got the comment in time and I circulated it for BC

member review and then they extended the deadline to 16 November. That means we have another week where we can continue to make edits or suggest changes to it. I know, Margie, you are interested as well. Margie, if you want to suggest what you have in mind, you can do so now or we can do it on list.

MARGIE MILAM: Hi, everyone. It's Margie. Can you hear me?

STEVE DELBIANCO: We do.

MARGIE MILAM: Okay. Thank you. Thank you so much for the initial draft. When I took a look at the amendments, I saw there were additional amendments that had nothing to do with RDAP, and I think that's where I think we might be able to suggest some additional comments. For example, it eliminates the WHOIS lookup requirement on a registrar website. From my perspective, that's a consumer protection issue where consumers have essentially for years gone to the registrars WHOIS lookup on their website to do the WHOIS lookup, and that's eliminated and that's not necessarily a requirement to implement RDAP. So that raised a few concerns and that's something I'd like to explore putting in the comment.

The other one, it was a really interesting amendment that had to do with changing a link to a document that registrars need to link to that provides information to registrants on how the RAA works. And they

changed the link from what used to be a very robust summary in layman's terms, if you will. So you think about the RAA. It's a legal contract written by lawyers. It's interpreted and it was basically summarized in a way that a non-lawyer could understand it section by section in different parts of the RAA, and that's been eliminated. Again, that's a consumer protection information sharing transparency issue that I think goes beyond what is necessary to implement RDAP. So those are the kinds of comments that I had in mind and I'd like to at least explore whether the BC would allow us to put that in the comment.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thanks, Margie. If you take a look at the draft comment, we could make suggested edits and you can circulate it with a reply all. I would certainly include a link to the sections of the RAA and RYA where these areas of concern caught your attention. I appreciate it. Any other comments on that? Okay. Thanks, Margie. Thanks, Rajiv. I see you're on the call as well.

All right. Next item up are updates to GNSO procedures. Again, these are relatively administrative type procedures mainly to do with how people disclose Statement of Interest. Do we have Imran on the call today? I think we do not. Imran is part of the team and we are hoping this will draft the BC comment, considering they close in just a few days, but it doesn't look like we're going to get that done. I don't consider this one to be a critical one against that policy. It's about procedure. For those of you with us who participate on what is our requirement for disclosure of Statement of Interest. Unless somebody wants to jump in

and do this in the next couple of days, we probably won't comment on it. It's due next Thursday. Okay. I don't see any hands or volunteers.

Number four. There's a new policy for what to do on gTLD registration data. This all flows out of the implementation of the EPDP on the Phase 1 recommendations and then some of the Phase 2 recommendations that came out. We have commented on this many times. Margie Milam, Alex Deacon, Mark Svancarek, and I have been so entangled on it for three years. And now is an opportunity for us to respond to a very long form that ICANN came up with where we get to indicate whether we think that the implementation accurately reflects the policy or does not. We're really not supposed to say we just disagree with the policy. The policy's something that's been approved despite our opposition. At this point, we get to say, "Given the policy, does the implementation match it or not?" In so doing, we can always add rhetoric about the fact that we think the policy was inadequate. I want to give a big thank you to David Snead and Margie Milam who volunteered to jump in on that. I'm glad to say that Alex Deacon, while his work has taking him into different assignments, Alex Deacon is still helping us on this. We've held one call, we've probably drafted about a third of our responses, and we have until 21st of November. So sometime mid-November, the rest of BC will see our draft responses on that. Margie and David, my calendar still show a call today between us. Is that still on or are we doing that next week?

DAVID SNEAD:

Steve, it's David. I cancelled it 10 minutes ago. It's going to be next week.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Excellent. Thank you, David. I appreciate your volunteering on this, too. Brian King I think will help as well Alex Deacon. Is there anyone else in the BC that wants to get involved on this comment? Seeing none, I'll go to the next one.

Thank you to Lawrence and Tim for volunteering to draft this year's BC comment on the operating plan and budget for the naming and numbering parts of ICANN, the parts of ICANN that were inherited when we transitioned the IANA contract from the US government Commerce Department to ICANN as part of the 2016 transition. Now, that is due in a week. So it's time for us to be circulating a draft. Tim's on the call today. Lawrence, have you and the Finance Committee been able to take a look at that? It doesn't have to be a very long comment.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Yes. I started some work on a draft comment and we'll be sharing that on the private list maybe over the weekend into the coming week. But basically to just give an idea on what might [transfer], there isn't any proposed actions that might come out of policy developed for FY24. So in other words, yes, there is a contingency budget of about \$500,000. And for any Board decision made on policies that have to be implemented, the question will be where \$500,000 is maxed out, what then happens? Is the PTI able to come back for additional funds? Those are the kind of questions we're looking to post comments. Some of the Board decisions, especially that will be of interest to the BC, has to do with the root server. There's a new technology or new software being

implemented or being proposed and that's supposed to advance in the months ahead. Hopefully, we might have answers to what ICANN plans to do where the Board makes decisions. Hopefully, the Board is going to start making some positive decisions much faster than we've seen over the last years. When this happens, we just want to be sure that there's enough provisions to implement them.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thank you, Lawrence. The 24th of October would be a full week before the due date, a full seven days. So take your time until the 24th, and if we can circulate for BC member review, you get it to me, I'll clean it up, get it out for comment. Thanks again.

Okay, number six, its initial report on a review that ICANN is performing. It's the second time they reviewed what's called the Customer Standing Committee effectiveness. The Customer Standing Committee is about customers of IANA functions. Those will be, for our purposes, people that run TLDs. So we have a couple of BC members that also run dozens of new gTLDs. In that respect, when they are ready to light up a new gTLD that they've been delegated, they turn to the CSC as a way to express whether they're getting satisfactory service. I checked with Amazon and Google. So far, Chris Wilson of Amazon reported back that he didn't have any comments on things that the Customer Standing Committee (CSC) needed to be attended to, so we were probably not going to file on that. Crystal and Rajiv, if Google have particular concerns as a registry operator, let us know. We'd be happy to put it in.

RAJIV PRASAD: Steve, I'll defer to Crystal on this, but I think we will likely have no comment as well.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Rajiv. I had written you about a week ago on this one. So take a look at that e-mail, and then if you guys resolve that you don't think it's a concern, let me know.

RAJIV PRASAD: We'll do. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Rajiv. All right, a couple more real quick. There's an amendment proposed for the charter of one of the constituencies in our side of the GNSO house. The Non-Contract Party House is dominated by the Non-Commercial Stakeholders Group or NCSG. They, though, are supposed to give attention to one of their component constituencies, the not-for-profit operational concerns. This was created years ago by some folks who ran the International Red Cross. They were a nonprofit but they didn't share the NCUC's single-minded focus on privacy of registrar information. They believe that a nonprofit organization should be just as concerned as a business when it comes to users being defrauded, cybersquatting, things like universal acceptance of non-ASCII character sets.

So I want to thank Arinola and Samuel for volunteering to draft BC comments. This closes in a little over two weeks. So, Arinola and Samuel, I'm hoping to see a draft from you within about a week, and

then I'll work with you on that to clean it up and circulate for BC comment. Are there any other volunteers that want to get into help? Go ahead, Arinola.

ARINOLA AKINYEMI: You have a draft in your inbox already.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Fantastic. We'll go look at that right after the call, revert to you, and then circulate it for comments. Thanks, Arinola. Anything further? Okay.

The next one up is number eight, which is not an open BC comment but it's a policy concern we've had with regard to how NIS2 emerged from the European Parliament and then how European member states transpose that into their own law. I believe, Mason and Marie, you're the ones on the call with the most knowledge of this issue. Can you share anything about the current status of the NIS2 amendments?

MASON COLE: Steve, it's Mason. We haven't seen final language on NIS2 yet, that's anticipated in November. That's sort of the gating item in terms of our capability or in terms of interpreting our next step on what to do on NIS2. We have a working group within the BC. Marie is part of that, so is Nik Lagergren, so is Andrew Bennett. We're going to be taking up that issue as soon as the new language is published. I think we've seen that it's probably anticipated around the end of November and that'll be our next step. Marie probably can add some more color as well.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Anything to add, Marie?

MARIE PATTULLO: Sure. I'm happy to do so. When Mason refers to the new language, as you know, there was an insert, this 5A about the double collection of registries and registrars. We still don't know where it came from. We've heard various indications, but it's all rumors so I'm not going to share because that would be wrong.

My last contact with the MEP, the Member of European Parliament, who is responsible for this, asking when they're actually going to publish the new language, got an answer but not to the question I asked. So I still don't know when that will be. We'd know that it is supposed to come to the entire European Parliament for adoption in November, as Mason just said. So we will have to have the language by then. But we can't tell you much more than that, unfortunately, right now.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Marie. I appreciate it. With that, I'm going to turn it over to you, Marie, to talk about Council. I've inserted highlights from the agenda. We already covered the Kuala Lumpur. So I could scroll down to your Council meeting which is happening today. I'll turn it over to you.

MARIE PATTULLO: It is indeed. Firstly, Mark, my wonderful co-councilor is not here because he's teaching right now. So he's asked me to briefly update you

on one of the most important aspects, which we'll see at item seven, the DNS Abuse Small Team report, all of you have already seen that. Mark will be presenting it to Council later. So we'll update all of you after that update to Council.

Going back up. One thing on Accuracy. I know that Mason has been involved in this. As you know, there are certain recommendations from the Accuracy Scoping Team before it went to sleep for a while, which include the potential for a survey and also an audit of registrars. We're going to be talking about that later. There won't be a vote. We're just going to be talking about it. And unless you guys tell me differently, I would support that. I would say we support it because any info we can get is better than none, although I did hear from one of the councilors from the Registrar Stakeholder Group that the survey that they are currently discussing isn't actually about accuracy. It's about how registrars verify, which is a very different thing but to be seen.

On Applicant Support, that's very simply that the GAC wants more members. We gave them one plus an observer and they want plus two observers. The problem with that, as you will remember, is that this new idea, this new working group, we wanted it deliberately to be small so it didn't become like a kind of mirror council and it can reach out to as many subject matter experts as it needs to. So we're trying to push back on that but diplomatically, obviously.

I think that's probably enough—oh, one other thing. Sorry, Steve. Before I hand over to you on disclosure, yes, that's you, not me. One other thing before that, I just sent you an e-mail just before the meeting that ICANN has opened the call for volunteers for anyone who wants to

be on the IRT. That's the Implementation Review Team for, drum roll, looking at Zak, RPM's Phase 1. Now, I've sent you an e-mail. All the details are in that. Zak and I can confirm it was four years pain to get to where we got to. I don't know, however, the date for application, because unless I misread the link that you see there, it says they're going to start working November. But, Brenda, I'd be really grateful if you could try to find out when the actual deadline for submission of the application requests to be involved to ICANN is. Thank you. Enough for me. Steve, do you want to talk about WHOIS?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Marie, there was one other one that you circulated, which is the SG chairs for PDP improvements.

MARIE PATTULLO: Yeah. There's going to be a meeting—I don't have it in front of me, Steve—next week, I think, with the chairs of the SGs and Cs and the councilors to talk about two things. PDP updates, which I've already mentioned and—sorry, I shouldn't read the chat when I'm trying to speak.

STEVE DELBIANCO: We have a Standing Committee on SCBO.

MARIE PATTULLO: And the SCBO. Now, I know that Tim Smith, a wonderful CSG liaison, is on the SCBO. So I think what we need to do is talk to Tim to make sure we've got all of the input that we need there.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Excellent. I'd like to put an exclamation point the first thing you discussed, which is the call for volunteers on the IRT for rights protection mechanisms, the BC and the IPC are probably the two most vocal groups in ICANN for ensuring that businesses that have domain names, businesses that have brands, have rights protection mechanisms they can use to avoid defrauding and fooling their customers. It would be remarkable if the BC and IPC didn't have members of this Implementation Review Team. Our absence would be shocking and would be noted by the NCSG, Registrars, and Registries. We've got to get somebody on that team who's familiar with the rights protection mechanisms that are operating today. So I can't emphasize it enough and I don't want to just rely upon the group of officers and volunteers that are already doing the work. This is where we need some fresh blood who has some experience. I'm going to call on Zak with a hand up. Go ahead, Zak.

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: Thanks, Steve. That hand up is not to volunteer, I'm afraid. I agree that there should be participation by the BC and the IPC on this. I frankly don't even recall at this point what the recommendations were but I'm sure they were very important. Arinola and I, we were involved in the Transfer Policy Working Group. They just doubled the number of hours

per week on members of the working group. They're making it two one and a half hour sessions a week now. It's getting to be too much. I hope there's somebody in the BC that will participate in this. If not directly, maybe there's a way that we could rotate or remotely monitor this situation somehow. But yeah, this is important. But on the other hand, I don't believe that the recommendations were so earth shattering or go to the core issues that BC members are particularly concerned with, fortunately. Thanks.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thank you, Zak. I've displayed the screen. They talked about 35 recommendations from the workgroup. And they think the time commitment is conference calls as needed beginning of November for one hour each. So they don't believe it's going to be as intense. As you indicated earlier, they have a framework for policy recommendations for GNSO. So I don't think this will be as intense as what you just revealed. They have different categories of recommendations, practices, phase one RPMs, resourcing.

Who on the BC has got some experience using rights protection mechanisms, whether that's part of a round or just policing your brand and keeping your customers happy? Who else has some experience that could volunteer to be the participant? You'll have plenty of support but we need somebody who can sign up to be on those calls. This is why we're involved in ICANN. Who do we have that could get involved? This is the time. You won't have to do a lot of writing. You just have to join these calls. We don't have anybody. All right, I'll put out an e-mail call, Marie. The BC has to be in this. This is not going to work if we don't.

All right, I'll stop that share and go back to the policy calendar and address one other item in the policy calendar. It has to do with the WHOIS Disclosure System. I think that's what Marie was suggesting I should cover. I represent us on that small team. We've had two meetings a week at 90 minutes each, just as Zak described. We had hoped to have put in front of Council for their meeting today our recommendations so the Council could vote on it, send it to the Board, and give Board the opportunity to adopt it. This is not a policy matter. It's an implementation of a system that is seen as a far less expensive, easier to implement version than the SSAD, the Standardized System for Access and Disclosure. So we are still doing our work. We haven't achieved what the chair regards as consensus. Again, we're not doing a PDP. We're not a working group or a PDP so we don't have to have consensus. It could be a majority vote. It's whatever the chair would like to do. We are debating about how registrars and registries would use the system. We're debating about whether e-mails would go out to registrars when somebody puts in a request. There are a handful of privacy roadblocks that are being thrown off by ICANN Legal staff who is really concerned about the information that's conveyed in the e-mails. They're also nervous about retaining the information that we put in when we're making a request. We need it to be retained so that it can be analyzed later on for the purpose of determining whether registrars are paying any attention or just denying us our disclosure requests.

So I don't think we're likely to resolve this until our next series of calls. So we won't get it to you, Marie, until your November meeting. The hope is that if it's put into the queue at that point, that ICANN could still implement it rather quickly. Because this is just some configuration of

the Salesforce system that ICANN already subscribes to. They already use the system, the registrars and registries use it. So this is just configuring new rules and forms for that. We'll say that at the bottom of the policy calendar, I included that we did not arrive at a formal recommendation. I'll let you know, again, whether we're going to make any progress on that. Are there any questions for Marie on Council? Marie, your hand's up. Go ahead.

MARIE PATTULLO:

My question isn't for me, it's for you, if I may. Multiple questions. Firstly, I hope you can attend Council later so that you can feed me if you want us to send in about the discussion. There is a blog that's coming out today I think about this, which I've sent you, Steve, literally during this call. It's the first time I saw it. One thing of note to me in that was they mentioned that ICANN—I don't have it on screen. Sorry, I don't change screens—would retain the data about the request or they'll have to figure out how to do that. So what do we know about this, please? Secondly, I noted in the blog, there was no mention of what would happen with requests put to registrars who are not part of the system? Have you got any closer to figuring out how we can actually capture that kind of data? Thanks.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thanks, Marie. I will definitely look at the blog as soon as we get off the call here. I would say on the key question—and we raised this in Kuala Lumpur—we were very concerned in Kuala Lumpur that staff had come back to say that if a registrar is not actively enrolled in this disclosure

system, that they wouldn't even allow us to complete a request for data. We pushed back hard and got rather universal support for that, and staff reversed their position while we were in KL. They said they would allow us, the requesters, to put in all the information and that they would send an e-mail to a registrar alerting them. Part of the justification is, of course, to document later on the kinds of requests and the origins. But another justification is that if a registrar got several e-mail pings, that people are looking for disclosure on registrants that they manage, they may decide, "Okay, let me go check the system. Let me go ahead and sign into the system. And I want the data to be there for requests that have been entered." This is common sense stuff. We haven't had a lot of pushback from contracted parties. They've been fine about it. It was ICANN Legal that was worried about conveying PII and the e-mails that go over. Okay. I think we're going to end up encrypting it through PGP encryption, which is the way it's done under UDRP requests today.

The other is that they're nervous about asking a requester to put in all that information, knowing that the information may not be looked at by a registrar. I've assured them that if a requester goes to the work of putting it in, it's because they want to record the fact that they made a reasonable request of information they needed and they were ignored. So we desperately want to keep that alive, Marie. Staff and everyone else agreed, although I won't believe it until I see it in the final plan. But I think we're going to win on that. Anything else, Marie? Great. Thank you.

Mason, channel three is really the matters that Tim handles for us under CSG liaison. Tim's unable to join at the Board meeting today, and he

gave us a very brief update. It's now at the very bottom in yellow. Then on November the 21st, CSG is having our call with four of the Board members who represent various parts of the GNSO. We told them we want to talk about DNS abuse, the WHOIS request system, and the status of the privacy/proxy accreditation system. I believe that Brenda has sent out invitations so that all of you should have that invite for November the 21st. We also learned that the IPC, it's their turn to be the chair of CSG activities when we meet in Cancún at ICANN76. Mason, that's it for the policy calendar. I can turn it back over to you.

MASON COLE:

Thanks very much, Steve. Excellent update. We've got a lot on our plate right now, so thank you for championing everything that we're doing right now in the BC. If there are BC members who are available with some time to assist with Steve and the rest of the leadership team on the work of the BC, you can see that we've got a lot in front of us. So your help would be very much appreciated. Okay. Any questions or updates for Steve, before we move on? All right, let's move to Item three on the agenda. Lawrence, over to you for the Finance and Operations update, please.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS:

Thank you, chair. Good day to everyone. I will first of all want to start by appreciating members who have gone ahead to make their financial status valid for the current financial year. A few payments came in. We acknowledge this. Thanks a lot for making this happen. I believe that this is in preparation for the elections that are forthcoming on Monday,

the 24th of October. That's this coming Monday, the process for electing four BC officers will begin. We expect that for two weeks after the 24th, that's from the 24th of October until the 7th of November, we will have nomination periods for the position of chair, vice chair for Finance and Operations, vice chair for Policy Coordination, and our CSG representative.

Kindly note that only financially up-to-date members are allowed to nominate and also to be nominated into any of these positions. Right after the 7th of November, where nomination closes after two weeks, we plan to have a candidates call on the 14th of November, which is also a day, a month for the second BC meeting in November. Right after the candidates call on the 14th, sorry, we expect candidate statements to be submitted to the private BC at least by Monday the 14th, while we will have a candidate call on Thursday, the 17th of November. I beg your pardon for that. Electronic voting will begin on the 18th and this will take us through to Thursday, the 24th of November. We expect all things going well that by the 25th of November, we will be able to announce the slate of BC officers for the coming year who will take their seats on the first of January 2023.

Right after this process, we will also start the process of filling vacant positions in our different committees. The committees that need candidates currently, aside from Finance, Committee Credentials is at full capacity. But we have positions available on the Onboarding Committee and the Communications Committee. For all these vacant positions, we intend to start the process of filling these vacancies from the 28th of November and the nomination period also open for two weeks will end by the 12th of December. We will have a need for

elections where we have more than five candidates indicating interest to serve on these committees. But where we don't have up to or more than five candidates, there will not be any need for elections. All the committees, except for Finance Committee, pick their own shares internally.

With that, we shall be good with regards to officers and committee elections for the coming year. We also want to again reiterate that the BC will have a session during the IGF. We are promoting a session on DNS Abuse, the Global IGF. This is happening at Addis Ababa. I know that for some of us will be there physically, while a number will be joining remotely. But we will be providing further details about this particular session. And as we provide information, we believe that our members will be able to mobilize and also participate as we should be able to use this opportunity to air our views with regards work being done and what we feel about DNS abuse.

The Additional Budget Request for FY24 has been launched by ICANN. This is a process where additional funding is put behind selected initiatives that are submitted by the community and different constituencies. We, as the BC, benefit from additional budget requests in terms of printing of hard copies of newsletters. We also have benefited from Additional Budget Requests towards provisioning a dedicated course on ICANN lens. Today, we have a BC course that's all about the Business Constituency due to this intervention. We have until sometime in January. I'm not so clear about the date now but I will find out and post that on the private list.

There is also a webinar that has been earmarked for Thursday, the 8th of December. So I want to encourage members, if you think that there is something the BC should be doing and definitely will be of benefit to the wider ICANN community, it might possibly be executed and benefit from an Additional Budget Request. So please, let's share our ideas so that we can put this together and make the submission in time before the deadline.

I would want to stop at this point. I'm not sure if we have our NomCom reps around. If they are, we might want to give a few minutes to hear what's happening on the NomCom side. I believe that right now, preparations will be ongoing in terms of outreach and the planning process. But where we don't have Vivek and Jordyn in today's meeting, we will definitely make timeout before the year runs out, seeing that we just have a few more meetings before the close of the year. At this point, I would want to yield the floor back. In case you have any questions, please, I'll be happy to take them. Otherwise, I will yield the floor back to Mason.

MASON COLE:

Thank you very much, Lawrence. I appreciate the update. Any questions or comments for Lawrence, please? Okay. I see no hands. It looks like the queue is clear.

All right. We are ahead of schedule. But before we adjourn, let me ask for any other business to be brought before the BC this morning. Any other business for the BC? Okay, all right. Very good. Then in that case, I'll notify you that our next meeting is Thursday, the 3rd of November.

For the Membership meeting, that'll be at our normal time. If there's no other business to be brought before the BC this morning, I'm going to return some minutes back to your day. So if there's no other business, BC is adjourned. Thanks, everybody.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]