
BRENDA BREWER: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Welcome to the BC Membership Call on 30 November 2023 at 16:00 UTC.

Today's call is recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior. Kindly state your name before speaking, and have your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking. Attendance is taken from Zoom participation. I do have apology from Ching Chiao.

And I will now turn the call over to BC chair, Mason Cole. Thank you.

MASON COLE: Thank you, Brenda. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everybody. Mason Cole here, chair of the BC. Welcome to our call on 30 November. Good to see so many people on the call. We have our usual agenda on the screen. Are there any updates or changes to the agenda requested before we begin, please? Okay.

All right. Actually, we have quite a bit of policy work to get to today. And then Lawrence is not with us for Item #3. He's at the GNSO Strategic Planning Session in Washington, D.C., so Tim Smith is going to handle that portion of the agenda.

So let's move to Item #2. Steve, the floor is yours. Please go ahead.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Mason. Sharing the policy calendar right now that was circulated yesterday to the BC. First thing up is to thank Tim, Marie, Vivek for drafting—Mark Datysgeld helped as well—on a comment we just filed on

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.

the Pilot Holistic Review Revised Terms of Reference. So at this point, the review hasn't even begun. We're still in a decision on what the Terms of Reference will be for what the Pilot Review will and won't cover.

And kudos to Tim, Marie, and Vivek for focusing on what it is the BC cares significantly about, such as the restructuring of business representation on the ICANN Board. We'll just continue to beat that drum even though there's very small opening, very tiny opening for any discussion of that as part of the review itself. Thanks again on that.

Second is that earlier this week, actually on the 24th, last week, we submitted a very brief comment on AFNIC's consultation. AFNIC runs the .fr ccTLD. Mason, kudos to you for spotting this opportunity for us to file. It's not an ICANN public comment, but rather a opportunity to comment.

And whenever we spot those, we try to move as fast as we can and jump on those, but often we're only aware of them at a point where it's very difficult for the BC to have the full seven days that are called for to do a review. When those situations happen, as your vice-chair for policy, what I do is try to limit the comment to things we've said earlier. Things that have been approved by the BC for comments we've filed in another fora.

The second thing is, very quickly, call for an expedited review by BC members so that they have at least a couple of days to assess before we post, especially if it's based on prior positions. That was the case here. It was Thanksgiving holiday here in the U.S., but Mason pulled together a draft, circulated it for review. Didn't get any negative comments on it or any concerns that are raised about the short review.

So we posted that to AFNIC. And it's about fighting abuse, DNS abuse. And in particular, a relatively modest proposal by AFNIC to do a comment system to verify the holder's data in their ccTLD. But it might well apply to other ccTLDs, particularly in Europe, and we'd like to continue to support that kind of thinking. Mason, thanks again for doing that.

Looking at the ICANN comments that are open right now, there's only one open public comment with respect to some very arcane details associated with the root. So we're not going to comment on that one, but instead, all I've cited here is that we continue to want to watch very closely on the transposition of NIS 2 into member state regulations in the law.

So my question would be whether we have any updates since we met in Hamburg and talked about the implementation challenges at the eco event on day zero. I usually turn to Marie for this.

MARIE PATTULLO: Hi, Steve. Can you hear me okay?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Perfectly.

MARIE PATTULLO: I should put my video on. My apologies because there's a lot of noise in my office. So if things happen, that's not on purpose.

At the moment, I don't have direct updates apart from one. I am due to talk to some contacts of mine that I know through other [reason] in the Irish regulators shortly. This European level is tied in with a lot of other things that are happening in the digital space. And by that I mean you'll have heard of the Digital Services Act and the Digital Markets Act.

Now, as part of the implementation of these European laws, each member state needs to designate what they call a Digital Service Coordinator, which is one department within each government. Now, clearly, it's for each of them to choose which one. Some have said, "It's going to be this regulator." Some have said, "We haven't yet got a regulator. We're going to create one." This is happening as I speak.

Now, the reality that we need to bear in mind is that all of these so-called DSCs, Digital Service Coordinators, are overwhelmed. Many of them are brand-new. As I said, some of them don't actually exist yet. So our issue, NIS 2 itself. But drilling that down to Article 28 is going to be the tiniest pinpricks on their radars. And so I'd really like us to be realistic about that.

The conversation I'm having with Ireland next week is specific because, as Mason will confirm, when we spoke to the Danish guy who was chairing the cooperation group at the member states who were looking at Article 28, he made it clear that not all member states are currently involved in helping to draft the guidelines.

But there was one in particular, he said, had been vocal about Article 28 being too much for their operators, and it was all going to be too hard. Now, I can't prove it, but I am—I was going to say 100. That's a fib. I am

95% sure it's Ireland because I know certain registrars who are quite loud in Ireland. You may know them, too.

And following from an email that I heard from somebody I know very well in the Danish—sorry, in the Irish IP side—I am 96% certain that it's Ireland. So I've set up a conversation to have a one-on-one with Ireland next week, with my person there.

Apart from that, I also know that INTA are looking to roll out targeted, for want of a better term, education webinars where they are going to go into certain member states with nationals of that member state—always the best way to do it—and try to speak directly with the regulators.

That's all I have at the moment of any use, but Mason may want to have more. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Mason, anything to add?

MASON COLE:

No. Marie is exactly on target. We had a productive discussion in Hamburg with Finn Petersen, who's chairing the Implementation Coordination Group. On the good news side, we heard that most member states are looking for a strong implementation of Article 28, which is good. That's what we've been advocating for.

We do know that ICANN and Contracted Parties are lobbying heavily in Europe right now. And the working group that the BC established to help

out with informing member states about the realities of Article 28 is in the process of making sure that it's organized and that we've got a push.

We've got until October of 2024 before a member state implementation is due, so we've got our work cut out for us. But this is an important issue, and it's probably the quickest path for the BC to have an impact on WHOIS policy development over the near term.

Marie has a better grip on the fine-level details, but that's where we stand right now.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

All right. Thank you, Mason and Marie. I don't have this in the agenda, but I have a fast update on ICANN's place in the multistakeholder model in the global Internet governance structure. This was a hot topic when we were in Hamburg, the notion that the World Summit on the Information Society, known as WSIS, W-S-I-S, is coming up on its +20 year anniversary. That is the United Nations' mechanism that established the ITU as leading the way on the Internet Governance Forum, or IGF, where a number of your BC colleagues were in Japan in October for the annual meeting of the IGF.

Somewhere in the world over the next year, the WSIS+20 meeting will be held, and the United Nations is to decide what role they want to assert for governments in Internet governance, including whether the DNS itself should be continued to be managed by someone like ICANN. So this is vitally important to ICANN and something that came up extensively in Hamburg.

Also in Hamburg, Nivaldo, who's on the line right now, and Mark Datysgeld arranged a meeting for Mason and I with Renata, who is chair of the cgi.br. That's the civil society multistakeholder group in Brazil that hosted an event in 2014 called NETmundial. And that was a vitally important notion to kick off the transition of IANA from the U.S. government to ICANN.

And cgi.br just posted an announcement—I'll put it into the chat right now—that they're planning is continuing. They probably will come up with a plan to do the NETmundial+10 in São Paulo sometime in April or early May of 2024. So BC will be watching that closely.

Any questions or anything further to update on that? We know it's something Chris Wilson follows closely as well.

CHRIS WILSON: I do. And thank you for flagging, Steve. Yeah. All of it very important for us for a variety of reasons. Good to keep our eye on it.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Chris. Jimson, your hand's up.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Yes. Plus one to that. I just want to provide a clarification. Actually, it is the CSTD, the Commission for Science and Technology for Development, that's been charged by the United Nations to oversee the Internet governance track, actually. So ITU, UNESCO, they're all to play a part. Just

to provide that clarification. But it's good that we continue to engage. Very important.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Right. But CSTD, UNESCO, and ITU are all bodies of the UN. Agreed?

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Yes, yes.

STEVE DELBIANCO: So it's probably better to say "the UN," but not specifically for me to say "the ITU."

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Yeah. This is the CSTD, actually. The CSTD is the one charged to overlook the whole process, coordinate all the United Nation organs—UNESCO, ITU, all of them when it comes to Internet governance, basically.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Excellent. Thank you, Jimson. I don't see any other hands, so I'll proceed to the Council update under channel two. And for this, we have Mark Datysgeld and Lawrence. And we have neither of them on the call right now. Marie knows this topic better than anyone, but I don't have too much in the way of an update because there hasn't been a Council meeting planned out yet. That agenda won't be until December the 11th, and that's for the December 21st meeting.

Back on November the 16th, the previous Council meeting, I've got a link there to the agenda, the Zoom recording, and transcript. But the only resolution was to improve a fundamental Bylaws change governing the IANA Naming Function Review. And I spoke to all of you on our last call about that, and the BC helped to orchestrate that particular fundamental Bylaw, and also verbally supported it in Hamburg.

So that's it for the last Council meeting and the next Council meeting. Marie, anything you'd like to add?

MARIE PATTULLO:

I am no longer a counselor. I cannot—no. Seriously, Steve, I don't know anything. My apologies. Sorry.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

No worries. So turning to what is coming up in other Council activities, I'm next going to go to Zak Muscovitch and Arinola, who represent the BC on the Transfer Policy Working Group. So transfers are about inter-registrar transfers of domain registration management.

Zac and Arinola, over to you. And let me know if you'd like me to display the attachment you provided.

ZAK MUSKOVITCH:

Thanks, Steve. This is actually good on the screen for now, and I'll get to it in a moment. So this isn't a crucial juncture that the BC needs to make a decision on this call or shortly, but it is an interesting issue that has

arisen. So it's a good opportunity for Arinola to give you an update on where the working group is focused at, at the moment.

So just to back up a bit, there was already an interim report that was filed with the GNSO after public comments in June, and that initial report recommended some changes primarily to inter-registrar transfers. This is from one registrar to another. The proposals haven't been yet adopted by the GNSO, so there's going to be a final report, ultimately, that will include that issue as well as the Change of Registrant lock, which I'll get to momentarily.

So one of the primary changes for the inter-registrar transfers was that there used to be—well, they imposed a 30-day lock, down from 60. And so what that means is anybody can change from GoDaddy to Dynadot without any restrictions. But once you're at Dynadot, you can't then do a second hop for 30 days.

And that was primarily the result of a security concern to make sure that there's an ability to not have to chase, constantly, a registrant from one [registrant] to another if they're involved in theft of the domain name or abuse of the DNS, etc.

So that's where things are at now. Keep that in mind. There's a 30-day lock on changing from one registrar to another after the first hop. The first hop is free. The second hop, there's a lock.

Now, dealing with Change of Registrant lock. This is a lock that is in the current rules that imposes a 60-day lock whenever there's a Change of Registrant. But a Change of Registrant isn't just from John to Bill and Bill to Mary. A Change of Registrant can also involve a material change to the

WHOIS information. That could mean a change of address. It could mean a change of registrant organization. It can mean a change of email, etc.

So anytime you update your WHOIS, even if it's because you moved offices, that could impose a 60-day lock. Now, you can opt out of that lock because you may need to. Suppose you're selling this domain name to a company. Or suppose there's a reorganization in your corporation. Or suppose that you're buying a domain name from someone. Or perhaps you've launched brand enforcement proceedings, and the registrant's agreed to give it to you.

Let's use the brand enforcement example. Let's say that the registrant, the abuser in this example, has just changed his or her address. That creates a 60-day lock. And then if that registrant agrees to give it to you after you send a demand letter, for example, they can't transfer it to you because of the 60-day lock. You can opt out of it, but you have to opt out of that before you make that change to the registrant information, which has been a real pain in the neck for parties.

And so some registrars—for example, GoDaddy—actually, in their registration agreement, allow you to opt out. Actually, it requires you to opt out of it. And some other registrars will allow you to change registrant at any time, but you need to call them. You need to know somebody there, etc.

Some registrars never let you opt out of this, and they'll always keep a 60-day lock. Imagine how frustrating that is for a lawyer who's transferring a portfolio of domain names from one company to another, and they can't change the title or the registrant information for 60 days,

delaying a complete close. And so it's been a frustration that some registrars don't offer the opt-out at all, and some don't prominently notify their customers. And so there's been a lot of complaints to ICANN about transfer locks.

So we previously discussed this, and Susan Kawaguchi was instrumental in assisting to draft the BC's policy on Change of Registrant lock. And you'll see it. It's on your screen before you. I'll just read it out, and you could read along with me.

"The default rule should be a transfer lock following a Change of Registrant." I'll pause there. The reason or the rationale for that is that if there's a Change of Registrant from a brand enforcement perspective, you don't want that registrant constantly changing registrants making you chase after them. So there was this interest in having a lock by default in that situation, to cover that situation.

"However, a registrar should be required in a transparent manner to enable a registrant, upon request, to opt out." And that's part of this non-transparency or non-offering of that opt-out provision that I mentioned before.

"And it should be up to each registrar to decide whether they will generally permit opt-outs. Nevertheless, each registrant should retain discretion as to whether to permit a transfer even after the registrant has ostensibly opted out for security reasons. A transfer lock should not prevent registrants and businesses from affecting bona fide transfers when necessary or desirable. There should be a fact-based rationale for

the determination of the length of the default transfer lock, whether it's 60 or 30 days, for example."

If I can just encapsulate that in less technical language. Basically, the approach that the BC adopted here is that there has to be a balance between transportability of domain names. In other words, moving them despite a default lock. And there should be a default rule that requires locks, and they could only be opted out of in the registrar's discretion or upon request of a registrant, etc.

I would say that this approach was more tilted in favor of the portability of domain names rather than security. If you wanted big security, it would say, "Let's have a 60-day lock no matter what."

Now, the working group, to my surprise, actually, brought up a major change of approach to registrant locks. There seems to be some growing support for an approach from registrars to get rid of any prohibitions on Change of Registrant in the Transfer Policy to literally remove Change of Registrant from the Transfer Policy altogether.

What their essential argument seems to be is that we already have a 30-day lock on inter-registrar transfers. So if a registrant is up to no good, the worst they could do is move from one registrar to another. And then they're locked there for 30 days, enabling you to do something about them. But they say that we don't need any Change of Registrant lock because people can opt out of it anyhow, as has been the case. And they run up against that wall on the inter-registrar transfer side.

Now, you're welcome to listen to the recording from the last working group session about this. And I raised two issues about this. And this is

the other key part. They want to notify the registrant of a transfer, but they don't want to give the registrant the ability to cancel a transfer. So if a transfer was initiated from one registrant to another, and you happen to be the original registrant and you didn't authorize that registration, you'll be notified that a Change of Registrant is going to occur.

And the wording is "immediately, the registrar ..." So in other words, once you get that email, it may already be too late. You could call up the 1-800 number at Tucows or whatever and say, "I didn't authorize this," and hope for the best, but you can't actually stop that transfer.

So I said, "This is a problem." Notification without the ability to cancel transfer is going to certainly get some pushback. And their argument is that, listen, in order to initiate a transfer, you need to get what's previously called an Auth-Code, now called a Transfer Authorization Code, by logging into your registrar account and in requesting it.

So, essentially, what they're saying is, hey, look. If someone has accessed your account at a registrar or accessed your email—for example, through your email provider—they already got you. So the problem isn't with the registrant transfer lock policy. The problem is the penetration of your email or of your account. And that's why there should be two-factor authentication, etc.

So the bottom line is this. There seems to be a movement towards getting rid of any prohibitions on Change of Registrant locks. Which, on one hand, is a good thing because it allows greater portability. On the other hand, without notifications of a Change of Registrant, there could be greater

vulnerability to domain theft because there's just notifications and no ability to cancel.

The flip side is that there's the brick wall, as you could put it, of the inter-registrar transfer lock, the 30 days preventing that second hop from registrar to registrar that allows you at least to focus on a registrar for 30 days and try to get that domain name back.

Of course, you're in the hands of the registrar because there is no registrant-initiated transfer dispute resolution policy. The Transfer Dispute Resolution Policy can only be initiated by a registrar. So if you've lost your domain name through an unauthorized transfer, you have to go to your current registrar. And if the domain name is already gone from there, you have to go to the new registrar, and you can complain. But there's no formal procedure available to help you.

Now this is, admittedly, a relatively rare instance. And this is one of the only good things about WHOIS going dark, is that once WHOIS went dark, all that registrant data was hidden. And that was used quite often for domain name thefts. So there's been a lot less domain name thefts, and that's one of the arguments in favor of simplifying the policy.

So there's no decision that needs to be made now, but it is something that's going to come up. And if anybody is more interested in this, I invite you to put it on the list or speak to Arinola and I, or even ask some questions today.

Arinola, is there anything you'd like to add to that? Let's give Arinola a moment. Okay.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Zac, thank you so much. That was well worth the time to walk through it. I feel like you're teaching us a course on this.

And in the chat, I think what I got from you is that your belief is if we move to get rid of this registrant change lock, it should be in tandem with a notification giving the original registrant a chance to act on it because the notice to me may say that, "Your name is about to be transferred." I ought to have an opportunity to hold on that, to cancel that.

Are you suggesting that's where the BC go?

ZAK MUSKOVITCH: I think that's certainly a possibility because a mere notification that says your SOL doesn't really do you much good. "Here's the 1-800 number." So it's something to certainly consider whether it should be something more than a notification. I'm not sure why some registrars are against giving the registrant the opportunity to halt the transfer.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yeah. But if we did this as a quid pro quo in exchange for removing the lock, there needs to be this other assurance that the original registrant has the chance to say no.

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: I think [inaudible].

STEVE DELBIANCO: [inaudible] I'd have to be forced to confirm because they may not answer the email, in which case they would hold up the transfer. It would be better that they are given a day or two to cancel.

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: Agreed.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Any questions from BC members for Zac and Arinola? Yeah, it's a great report. I really appreciate the way you made it understandable.

ZAK MUSKOVITCH: Well, I try.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Zak.

ZAK MUSKOVITCH: Thank you. You're welcome.

STEVE DELBIANCO: On GNSO Guidance Process, #2 here. Lawrence [is not on the] call today, and I don't think we have anything new on that.

On the [Registrant] Data Request System, or RDRS, I represent you on the small team that has been doing this for a couple of years. And just the other day, we had a couple of updates.

On November 28th, the system went live. I have a link to it there. So if you go to the system, use your ICANN email and password to log in. And you can initiate a request for the disclosure of WHOIS information. You have a chance to walk through that. And as you know, ICANN staff on our last call walked us through slides showing what the screens look like.

Anyone on the BC used it yet? I hope we get to Margie before she drops from the call there. Has anyone in the BC used the RDRS since it went live yesterday? Not seeing any hands or chat.

Faisal, in particular with you, I wanted Steve Crocker to speak with you about the opportunity to build an external app that does bulk uploads that would be suited to the way Tracer does it today. [inaudible].

FAISAL SHAH: Yeah, that would be great. I'd love to talk to him.

STEVE DELBIANCO: I thought I sent you an email introducing you to Crocker. Did you not get that?

FAISAL SHAH: No.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Should I try again?

FAISAL SHAH: Yep.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Okay.

FAISAL SHAH: That would be great.

STEVE DELBIANCO: And Crocker and I have been briefing INTA and their crowds. Marie is going to be speaking with a European audience and will also encourage the requester community to use the RDRS. We have a couple of reasons. You may well get back a faster response from a registrar. You will quickly learn which registrars have decided to enroll and play by the rules.

But more importantly, if you are making bona fide requests for information and the registrar fails to disclose or the registrar failed to even enroll in the system, we are now capturing that data to where, subsequently, we can rely on that data for some policy development rationale.

The policy development might not be whether or not we build an entire centralized system for requests to data, but policy requiring participation, response, proper evaluation of the legitimate basis that you offer. And now that will dovetail in the next year with the transposition of NIS 2.

So a lot of these things converge and come together. But if we don't use the RDRS, we create the impression that there's no demand for WHOIS

information; that nobody even needs it anymore because they're not requesting it. We have hammered the table for years to say that is an inappropriate conclusion. If there's a low use of the RDRS, it's because there's no mandate that you get the disclosure even if you give legitimate basis.

There's no mandate for participation by registrars, but over half the domain names in the gTLD space are represented by registrars that are already participating. And more are coming on board.

So my appeal to you is to use the RDRS; to try it for several queries. And at the end of each conclusion, you will get an email from ICANN indicating that the registrar has responded, whether they disclosed or not. And you are given a five-question survey where you can indicate your satisfaction with the RDRS. Not just the technical, but the satisfaction with whether or not there was an adequate response from the registrar.

I did want to also indicate that the Board wrote back to Council on the 13th of November, clarifying their view on what the RDRS was really going to conclude. What is its purpose?

And I think Becky Burr was responsible for this. I generally support that the Board is suggesting that the bar for RDRS is to really understand—gather data associated with the usage about the volume of the requests, the category of who's requesting, the type of the request, to better understand the need for a system. So the Board, at least, is asking broader questions than a simple demand measure, which I believe is not going to work out well for us.

Any questions or further comments? Great. Not seeing any hands there. I will move now to [Channel 3]. Tim Smith is currently our CSG liaison, and Marie begins her term in 2024. So they're in transition, and here's a joint report. I'll turn it over to both of you to handle the CSG section.

TIM SMITH:

Hi. I provided this report. You're right. Marie is kind of in transition. We're just sort of gradually getting her up to speed. I know probably the first thing that we're trying to get her involved with is—I'll go to the last item here on my list—which is that we're planning an intersessional meeting with NCSG and CSG and trying to set a date for that sometime early in 2024. So Marie will be the person who attends on behalf of the BC, along with Mason.

But that is just in the process of being organized. Really, everything that is being discussed at the moment with CSG relates to the outcomes or the action items from the intersessional that we had at ICANN78. So you can see those items here, most of them dealing with the GNSO vice-chair selection and with Board Seat 14 selection. And we have action items related to clarifying selection nomination, all of the interview processes related to that. So those are the things that we're looking at.

And I know Mason has been reaching out to [inaudible] in order to get some dates on the book on the books. And there are a couple of committees related to these items that need to be formed. So we're working on that right at the moment. But that's really the essence of everything that is taking place within CSG. And it has been kind of quiet since ICANN78, so we need to get some of these things moving.

And that's really all that I have to report. And I would just say that Mason is being very generous in trying to get as much of this organized before he passes off the leadership of CSG to Philippe and ISPCP, which will happen in the new year.

STEVE DELBIANCO: All right, Tim. Thank you for that report. Anyone have questions or something to add? Okay. Thank you very much.

Mason, back to you for the rest of the agenda.

MASON COLE: Thank you, Steve. Thank you, Tim, for the update. We're ahead of schedule on our agenda, and I think Brenda's putting it back up on the screen right now. We will go to Item #3, which is the Finance and Operations update.

As many of you know, Lawrence has assumed a seat on the GNSO Council as of the Hamburg meeting. Tim Smith is taking over that role. So Tim has got one foot in each role, at least for the time being, while Lawrence and Tim transfer Lawrence's duties over to Tim. So I've asked him to provide a brief update. And he may not have everything at hand. But I think you can cover the important points, Tim. So over to you.

TIM SMITH: Thanks very much. Not too much to report, really. As you say, I don't really fully take that position until the beginning of the new year, so I've

been getting briefings from Lawrence over the past little while and trying to figure out what exactly I will be doing in the new year.

But I can tell you based on discussions we have had that, really, there's been very little expense activity in the past little while. We had to pay the person who does our newsletters. And that's, I think, been the only expense that has taken place in the past short while. So not too much change in finances.

I am in the process of getting onboarded with Wells Fargo, which is our banking company. And that will enable me to monitor the finances in a better fashion.

I guess what will be taking place on the financial front, certainly early in the new year, will be the issuing of invoices for membership for the coming year. I don't have an exact date of when that takes place. I think it's in March, but we'll be giving you more updates on that as we get closer to that time.

So that's really all I have to report on that from a financial standpoint. From an operational standpoint, I guess we are in the process of working on dates for all of our meetings, our BC membership meetings for the coming year. So that's something that will probably be popping into your mailboxes in the next few weeks, I would think.

In addition to that, I'm familiarizing myself with the election timetables and newsletter deadlines and things like that so that I am fully prepared to be sending out notices to all of you for your participation in BC membership activities.

And then I guess the other thing that I'll be talking to you more about over time is that we do have committees for finance, credentials, communications, and onboarding. And we do have people, part of those committees at this time. We'll be hoping to have everybody who is engaged in the committees continuing, but we'll also be looking for new participation in committees. Again, more to come on that over time.

And I think that's all that I have to share at this time. Very light. I know you had 20 minutes at one point for a Finance and Operations update. I'm sorry I can't fill that time today.

MASON COLE:

That's quite all right, Tim. Thank you for that report. We allocated 20 minutes because, usually, Lawrence gets the short end of the stick in terms of his report, so we wanted to allow ample time. But thank you for that update.

Jimson, your hand is up. Go ahead.

JIMSON OLUFUYE:

Okay. I think that of Marie went up before me. Marie's hand. Okay.

MARIE PATTULLO:

I will go after you, Jimson. You first, please.

JIMSON OLUFUYE:

Okay. Thank you, Marie. Well, I want to first and foremost, use the opportunity to thank our chair, Mason. Mason was at our outreach event

during our summit, which has been on now for the 11th time. And we really appreciate your insights and your delivery. Thank you very much, Mason. Also, the ExCom for their continuous collaboration.

Well, this to Tim now. Well, when I was leaving [inaudible] detailed documentation on the processes. So I hope you'll get something like that to Tim.

Well, I'm still concerned because I've not heard anything about a budget process. In fact, this is the first time in my experience in the BC that I have not seen any fiscal year budget. FY24 budget normally comes out maybe around May or, latest, the first week in June. So that the ExCom considers, and the members are well apprised about it.

But today, five months after the end of the FY23, I've seen any budget for FY24. And we have not seen reports of financial performance of the BC in FY23. So I'm really concerned about this gap. And I hope, Tim, you'll be able to follow up so that the rest of us can really know what's going on.

Then the invoicing actually will take place in May, May 1st. The invoicing for new members comes up on May 1st, and then it runs through for another three months before maybe members relisted if they are not financially compliant. But it's also something I've seen that some members that are not compliant are still on the listing. Members that have not been current with their payment, even for two years, I've seen them being on the list.

So these are a number of gaps that is not in compliance with our Charter. Our Charter requires that members be in good standing for every fiscal year. And if they fail, then they can always reapply and come back. But

[not that] that they will remain enjoying our services, and they are not financially compliant.

So, Tim, just take note of this and do follow with Lawrence to get more detailed clarifications. Thank you.

TIM SMITH: Thanks for that, Jimson. I will certainly look into all of that. You and I can have a discussion offline about you rejoining the Finance Committee. But I appreciate all of that input, and I will look into that. Thank you.

MASON COLE: Thank you for raising that, Jimson. Okay, any other follow-up or questions for Tim, please, for Item #3? Marie.

MARIE PATTULLO: Thank you. It's not really a question to Tim, but it is follow-up. And it goes to a conversation a number of us have been having recently. The BC, we're nice people. We do good things. We do lots of good things. So each and every one of you does amazing things.

I know this is in advance, but please start thinking already about how you want to prove that in the Puerto Rico newsletter. And I know that this is Tim's job, not mine, but it does follow up from what Mark and I have been trying to achieve on Council, and now Lawrence and Mark, proving that we are diverse and interesting and do lots of different things.

Think at the moment about where we're going to be. We're going to be in Puerto Rico. Think if you've got anything in that region. And I know some of you live in that region. This is your opportunity to showcase what you do, what we do to that audience. And at this time of year, a lot of us are writing articles or reviews of the year, so please put this into your thinking already.

Also, tie it in. You know what we're trying to achieve with the Applicant Support Program. Let's prove to them why we need it.

So this is a plea. Please pick up your pens already. You probably already have done it, so you just need to change a few things. But let's sell each and every one of you individually, if we can, "A Day in the Life of ..." in our newsletter in Puerto Rico. Thank you.

MASON COLE:

Thank you, Marie. Great suggestion, actually. Yeah, we've published a newsletter consistently over time, but it's a PR opportunity for the BC and for our members. So you're right. Let's leverage it even more forcefully than we have before. Great input.

Okay. Anything else on finance and operations, please? Okay, all right.

Item for Any Other Business. Any other business for the BC today? All right, I see no other hands.

Brenda, am I correct? Our next meeting is December 14th. Is that right?

BRENDA BREWER: I am going to check real quick. Get my calendar. But I think you're right. It's two weeks, December 14th. You are correct. At 16:00 UTC. Thank you.

MASON COLE: Very good. Thank you, Brenda. All right. I'm going to donate about 14 minutes back to your day. And with thanks to Brenda for the support, BC is adjourned. And we'll see you in two weeks. Thanks, everybody.

MARIE PATTULLO: Thank you.

[STEVE DELBIANCO]: Thank you. Take care.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]