
BRENDA BREWER: Good day, everyone. Welcome to the BC Membership meeting on 6 April 2023 at 15:00 UTC.

Today's call 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. 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. This is Mason, chair of the BC. It's two minutes past the hour on 6 April. Welcome to the BC call today. It was good to see many of you in Cancún. And it's a pleasure to have you back here on the BC call in our first post ICANN76 meeting.

We have our normal full agenda today, including a policy calendar review from Steve, and then hopefully Lawrence is going to be able to join. He was having some connectivity problems. But Lawrence has some good news for us in terms of our getting our bookkeeping in our financial records in order. I'd like him to update the Membership on that because it's been a lot of hard work and he's done a great job. Then we'll have all other business.

So before we begin, are there any updates or additions to the agenda before we start? Okay, very good. In that case, we're going to go straight to item number two. Steve, over to you, please.

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.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Mason. I think I can get through the policy calendar relatively quickly today. I don't have anything new that we filed since we last met. Under outstanding Public Comments right now, we only have one opportunity that's open right now. It's a proposed Bylaws amendment for the IANA Functions Review. Again, the IANA Functions Review is where ICANN took over the IANA Function and had been run by the Commerce Department of the United States. This is about a review to determine whether ICANN is executing properly on updates to the root zone to accommodate changes that are made by those that operate registries. We did support minor amendments in 2021 on the IANA contract, and we did comment on the IANA Naming Function Review. What we're looking to do now is comment on these proposed amendments to their Bylaws. I want to thank Rajiv and Crystal and Jordyn Buchanan of Google, who've agreed to draft the comment. It's due the 18th and I'll be circulating their draft before the 11th of April to give all of you seven days to review. Are there any questions? Rajiv, anything you'd like to add to that, or Crystal?

RAJIV PRASAD: I can have a draft document out to you by the close of business day.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Oh, fantastic.

RAJIV PRASAD: Just in final review stages, but you should have something in your inbox shortly.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Great. Chris Wilson, I know you just joined. Since Amazon does run multiple gTLDs, you're going to want to probably take a good look at the draft that Rajiv, Jordyn, and Crystal come up with later today on whether the IANA Naming Function Review Bylaw amendment should be done. Go ahead, Crystal. I saw your hand up.

CRYSTAL ONDO: Thanks, Steve. Basically, I was going to say the same thing. Anyone who runs a registry that's in the BC, definitely give us a hand. The Registries themselves haven't put their comment together yet. So it's kind of hard to know which direction that's going. But since Registries are the main customer for IANA, it's definitely important to get the BC-Registries perspective.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yeah, and particularly for those who run lots of gTLD registries, but there are many BC members who were anticipating maybe doing a .Brand. And as a .Brand, you too will be an IANA customer even if it is only for one TLD. So to the extent that there's interest among the BC member companies, you're going to want to be keenly aware of what we put in for these amendments and look for that draft to get circulated tomorrow. Thank you.

There are no other open public comments I wanted to draw your attention to, but I always put a placeholder for the NIS2 developments. Currently, as you know, we're waiting for transposition by member

states. While we were in Cancún, we discussed a draft that Marie obtained, the draft of the Czech Republic's transposition, so it's their draft transposition language, has a long way to go to get approved, and we obtained an English language translation of that Czech language, and that's in the attachment under NIS2 Article 28. Caroline sent an e-mail also describing the NIS2 discussions that happened at the Registry Stakeholder Group Geo TLD session in Cancún. I thought that was pretty eye-opening to hear what a lot of European-based registries thought about the NIS2 transposition that was coming up. I'm happy to entertain any clarifications from Marie, Caroline, or others.

CAROLINE LUPETINI:

Yeah, I think that was a pretty solid summary, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Okay, let me move on then. I want to go to Council. As you know, we had our previous Council meeting while in Cancún, and the next Council meeting doesn't come up until the 20th of April. We won't see an agenda for that until the 10th of April. So, Marie and Mark, what would you tell your colleagues about what's going to happen at Council?

MARIE PATTULLO:

Thanks, Steve. I'll kick off. I hope you can hear me okay. I should be not rude and put my video on. Probably the one thing of most interest to everybody right now is SubPro. As you know, during Cancún, the Board has adopted most of the recommendations that the SubPro Working Group put forward. There are 38 that they put in a bucket called

Pending. Those 38 are now being looked at by a small team in Council, not for an answer but to separate them, to sort them, to figure out those that we can go back to quickly and say, “Misunderstanding, we meant ABC,” those that might need a little bit more work and those that might be more controversial. So that’s been worked through by small team, and we’ll come back to Council pretty soon. It’s going to have to come back soon because we’ve got a timeline.

Now, Tripti, as you know, the chair of the Board, she wrote to Council in March, confirming everything I’ve just said. They want all ICANN Org staff to “submit a comprehensive implementation plan no later than 1 August.” And that has to include a work plan, details for infrastructure development timelines, and again, “anticipated resource requirements to announce the opening of the new round of gTLDs.” So in other words, after they get this work plan plus on the 1st of August, they’re going to be able to actually announce a date of launch. That means that as Council, we have to get all of our boxes in a row, ducks in a row even, by the 15th of June. That’s the last day of our meeting in Washington, which will include, for example, a timeline and working methodology and so forth.

In parallel, at the same time, the IRT, that’s the Implementation Review Team, is starting to figure out how we turn SubPro recommendations into actual stuff. Now, that is a call open at the moment for IRT volunteers. Please consider it. We need people who know what SubPro is. This is not a place you’re going to be able to relitigate anything. We need people who are prepared to roll up the sleeves and get the work done. Steve, I think maybe you can add something on to that about the IRT.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Yeah. IRTs have a have a habit of lasting a long time. And diving into the detail of what was meant by the policy recommendations, that can be really frustrating. But in this case, I think the IRT will be a little bit easier to work through. They're only going to be implementing things that seem to have achieved significant consensus. We know that Org will be inclined to try to nudge this along to keep up with what Tripti and Sally have said about being action-oriented. I would say that it's helpful if the BC volunteer knew something about Subsequent Procedures, but that's not essential. You're only going to be looking at consensus recommendations. Staff will be coming back with recommendations for how they would implement it system-wise. And your opportunity then is to say, "Well, that sounds like it's adequate," or "Have you thought about another way to approach it?" It's a good opportunity for a new BC member. I wouldn't say that you have to know a lot about SubPro because you're all pretty smart and can study up on it quickly. Do we have any volunteers that are interested right now? We need to recruit for this. We didn't have a lot of participation at the IRT Working Group. We do need a BC member to represent us. I'm happy to take private inquiries if some of you are thinking it over. Marie, how would we characterize the amount of time that would be required on, say, biweekly? Is it biweekly or monthly meeting so we think?

MARIE PATTULLO:

I don't know, Steve. Thank you, Imran, for stepping forward. I honestly don't know the answer to that. I do know that SubPro report was not short. It was quite a long report. There were quite a lot of

recommendations. So I don't think it's something that is going to be a very, very rapid and quick thing. By the same token, it is something that does need to move. It needs to have action going forward. As I just put into the chat, they're looking at first meeting already being on the 14th of May. Even the IRT is going to last three weeks.

STEVE DELBIANCO: I think it's going to be longer than that.

MARIE PATTULLO: Bless your [Inaudible] concepts. I know. I don't.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Many, many years ago, when we did the previous round of gTLD expansion, the BC was keen to see consumer safeguards, brand protection to be implemented as part of the procedures associated with the Applicant Guidebook. That's part of this as well. So those of you BC members that are particularly keen on protecting your company's consumers, this is also an opportunity to join this working group.

MARIE PATTULLO: Sorry, Steve, I didn't mean to interrupt. But remember, there are other things that are happening in parallel as well, such as deciding how we're going to deal with closed generics and Applicant Support. Applicant Support is one that we're really pushing. Because, as you know, from Lawrence, who's our rep there, they have a very bizarre way of thinking that Applicant Support apparently should not support small companies,

which is beyond insane to be subtle about that. Of course, it must support small companies. But that's Lawrence's territory, not mine.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Lawrence, did you have any update on Applicant Support where you represent us?

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Yes. So we were to have a meeting the last week. That was rescheduled this coming week, but I see that the language that we're working with GGP still is skewed towards Applicant Support going to not-for-profits, commercial entities not been prioritized as a target group. We're still pushing back on this. This is pretty much the thinking around leadership and not per se members of the group. But hopefully, in the weeks ahead, we should be able to get everything as much as possible. There are some people who feel that rather than focusing on entities, commercial, non-commercial, that the focus should be on regions that will pitch the Global North against the Global South. There are still people in the Global North, even commercial entities in the Global North, who can benefit from Applicant Support. That's why the fact that they are commercial entities. So our preference is to ensure that in terms of outreach, all groups reach out to. And in terms of the actual support itself that commercial entities are not disenfranchised in any way. I have here with me, Segunfunmi, who volunteered to be an observer on GGP and also an active member of the BC so far. Back to you, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Lawrence. Marie, if I go back up to the top, the closed generics is an issue. I wanted to turn to Zak and Arinola to talk about the Transfer Policy Working Group. Zak, when you direct me to, I will display the Word doc you circulated because we want BC members to give you input on that today. So over to you, Zak.

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: Thank you, Steve. Why don't we bring that up now then, Steve? I'll take a few minutes to go over it. Arinola, please feel free to jump in as well. Basically, where we're at with this is that the Transfer Policy Working Group has asked for early input. It was originally due by April 4, but because we were in position to have it done by then, they extended the date to later this month. So the opportunity really is for people who aren't directly involved in working group to provide any thoughts or concerns they have about these specific elements. The four specific elements are listed there—one, two, three, four. Maybe if we could just scroll down to the first one. And the whole background is there. You can take your time to review that offline. But there's a Transfer Emergency Action Contact. What this is is you've seen in the movies the red phone on the desk for direct communication between the U.S. and Russia. This is essentially the red phone for an emergency between registrars when one of their customers' domain names has been hijacked or transferred to another registrar, etc.

So the discussion there is a fairly technical nature because this TEAC probably is not going to go away. It's just a matter of how much time does the responding registrar have to answer that phone. So right now, it's at four hours, and some of the registers are like, "We're smaller

registrars. We don't have someone on call 24 hours a day. So we'd like some more time." And the other implication, if there's no response from that responding registrar then the domain name transfer is automatically rolled back. There's been some evidence provided or at least anecdotal evidence by some registrars that some people will gain that TEAC process. So they'll get their registrar to commence the TEAC right before Asian Lunar New Year, before European Christmas holidays, in the hopes that registrar on the other side won't respond and the domain name will be rolled back. So there's considerations of the gaming and abuse of that procedure as well.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Which in particular? Because in red is the draft text that you've proposed. Agree?

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: Yeah.

STEVE DELBIANCO: I wonder which of the red text particularly addresses the gaming.

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: All right, the question that they've asked here is just what additional data is required. If you just stop right there for a second, Steve. If they're asking us what additional data is required, I simply ask the question, how often and under what circumstances parties have attempted to abuse or game the TEAC procedure?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Perfect. BC members, I'm watching the queue for hands to go up to offer comments on what Zak has here. This is the only other thing I have in the policy calendar. So let's take our time and get this right.

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: Not all at once.

STEVE DELBIANCO: I understand. Not all at once, exactly. So here you have two comments regarding four-hour timeframe.

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: Yeah. I mean, it's not me or you guys who have to answer that phone at 4:00 in the morning. I can't say from our own experience, but the nature of the process is supposed to be for emergencies only. Four-hour timeframe has seemed to work for most registrars from what I gather. But I understand that some want a little bit longer because the time differences, etc. So that seems to be a reasonable consideration. From what I gather, that's probably the direction the TEAC is going to go.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Telephone numbers?

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: Yeah. The TEAC policy expressly requires that there be an actual telephone number or some other “real-time” communication method. But some of the registrars have indicated that “Listen, we’re having trouble finding someone who wants to be the guy on the phone at 2:00 in the morning,” or “Can’t we just use WhatsApp?” And the other concern is that there’s no paper trail for telephone contact. Some registrars are seamless. “We want to have something that has a paper trail. A telephone doesn’t do the trick.”

STEVE DELBIANCO: Basically, you’re saying very little change on that.

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: On the TEAC itself? Yeah. I don’t think we’re going to see much change. It’s going to continue on and there’s going to be some adjustments to the timeframe and means of communication.

STEVE DELBIANCO: All right, and Dispute Resolution Policy?

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: Sure. Most of you have heard of the UDRP. Well, this is the TDRP. This is a policy that’s very much like the UDRP in terms of its format. It’s the dispute resolution is farmed out to, a couple of arbitration houses. One’s called the ADNDRC nation. The other one is the forum in Minneapolis. They’re there to appoint arbitrators to hear disputes involving one registrar claiming that it lost a domain name from its

registrar to another registrar by unauthorized means in violation of the Transfer Policy. The Dispute Resolution Procedure is only initiatable by a registrar, not by the registrant. It costs about \$1500 to commence it plus legal fees, if any, and it's a loser pay system. So the losing registrar who loses the dispute will have to pay it. It has been used since I think 2012, a total of eight times. The reason it's only been used eight times is because the registrars don't want to pay the \$1500. Also, because they have an informal method of kind of one registrar calling up the other registrant saying, "Look what happened here. Look at our logs," this kind of thing. Also, the Transfer Dispute Resolution Policy is only there to assist when a there's been a breach of the actual policy. So a gaining registrar who's gotten a domain transferred to it, their defense could be, "Well, listen, all the procedures were followed. But someone penetrated the e-mail account of the registrant and that's outside of the scope of this Transfer Policy." So that's also why it's seldomly used.

The Transfer Policy, it's a big document, people seem to loath to open it back up. But there's a lot of dissatisfaction with it generally. I've indicated there that there's no indication what kind of evidence is required. The other criticism of it is that it doesn't really deal with domain name theft per se in most cases, and it's a lengthy legal process that registrars don't generally want to get involved in.

Yeah, okay. So ICANN approve transfers. This is more arcane than the others. ICANN approve transfers, in this context, it really just refers to certain situations within the Transfer Policy where there's like a bulk transfer of domain names that's occasioned by, for example, a registrar going out of business or a purchase of one registrars book of business to the other. Basically, if it's under I think 50,000 names being transferred

that the registry is supposed to do it for free. If it's over 50,000 names, there's a flat rate fee payable to the registry of 50,000. So there's going to be a little discussion about whether the 50,000 flat rate should remain or whether it should be variable, depending on the situation. It doesn't directly concern us, I don't think.

Yeah, so we can scroll down. Some of these questions, there's nothing to say or very little to say or they're repetitive. Here's one. This is a big issue that's gotten quite a bit of debate over the last two calls in the working group. The Transfer Policy, this isn't the first time it's been reviewed. There was another extensive review, if I'm not mistaken, back in 2012. One of the proposals that was floated back then and went nowhere because of a lot of criticism was something that's colloquially called a fast undo. A fast undo is supposed to deal with a situation when you don't want to use the TEAC or you didn't use the TEAC, which is that red phone thing, or the Transfer Policy, you don't want to pay the \$1500 and go through the legal procedure. So they wanted to have some kind of fast undo where the gaining registrar who can reverse the transfer of a domain name or domain names and send them back to the losing registrar.

This raises and has raised historically a number of issues. For example, if your company has just purchased a domain name for a million dollars and it's moved the domain name to its registrar, if there's a procedure that a losing registrar, the original registrar, where the name was held prior to you purchasing it can roll back that transfer, in other words, the seller can get the domain name back and keep the cash, that's a real problem, obviously. It affects title to domain names. It affects the certainty of continuing operations. So, there's been a lot of resistance to

the concept of a fast reversal, fast undo if it is anything other than by mutual agreement of the two registrars.

So for example, one of the proposals that was recently raised by Tucows was that if a losing registrar commences a fast undo request, sends a request, want to fast undo this domain name transfer that we just lost, and there's no response from the other registrar for a period of time, then the domain name will automatically be rolled back. So this raises questions, issues in terms of, well, not all registrars are responsive or provide good customer service. So if you're a registrant and you happen to be, unfortunately, at one of these registrars and your registrar doesn't respond or is on vacation or whatever, then you could lose that domain name. Also, the problem with this process is it doesn't involve the registrant at all. So there could be a process to take away your domain name that doesn't even notify the registrant that it's underway. And so there's a lot of pushback on these kinds of issues. My sense is that's still up in the air which way it will go. But I've certainly pointed out to the working group these issues that have historically been raised.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Zak, thank you very much for that. I did want to suggest that the perspective of the registrant needs to be paramount. That's the folks who are representing our business registrants. So I appreciate your perspective in that regard. Ching Chiao has put into the chat a comment. It's more than just your two cents, Ching. If what you've got there would supplement what Zak has in there on TEAC, this would be the time to propose an edit to the red text in our document. So, Zak, I'm trying to give you a couple of seconds to read what Ching put in the

text. Do you have any reaction to that as to whether that would be additive?

ZAK MUSCOVITCH:

Yeah. I'm just reviewing it now. Thank you, Steve. It'd be hard to address usefulness of TEAC, given registrants really taking good care of the [asset] should have implemented registrar lock in a registry lock. You know what, I think that you raise a really good point. We have to take a step back from these transfer issues for a moment. Ultimately, the greatest security that a registrant, a business that has it's growing concern omission critical domain name has, might not be found in a protection afforded by the Transfer Policy. It might be a registry lock or a similar service offered by the registrar. So I'm hesitant to look for all the answers within the Transfer Policy as it could be revised. And I think those kinds of commercial steps and precautions are very important.

I see that Crystal's mentioned she's never seen the TEAC or TDRP used. That's quite true. As I mentioned, the TDRP has only been used eight times. We have heard within the working group of the TEAC being used occasionally by some registrars with no sense of the actual volume. What really occurs—I would guesstimate 99% of the time—is these informal resolutions between registrars, where one registrar says, "Okay, I'll send you back the domain name but you have to sign this indemnity agreement in order for me to protect my business in transferring it back to you." So there is some considerable discussion about codifying this informal process. Because right now, if you're a registrant, there's nothing written down to explain to you what goes on behind the scenes between registrars when you make a complaint that

a domain name has been taken from your account without authorization. So the steps that registrars typically take could be codified and publicly published so that there's some transparency of the process.

The other big missing element of this is the customer, the registrant. The lost domain name, the stolen domain name, the hijacked domain name, we have very little data on it, mind you, because no registrar wants to admit that they encounter a lot of stolen domain names from their registrar. But we do know that it exists. So if you're a registrant and you've lost your domain name through hijacking, you have to rely upon the registrar to either informally resolve it or employ the Transfer Dispute Resolution Policy on your behalf where you can go to court. Currently, there's no way of registrant invoking the Transfer Dispute Resolution Policy, it has to rely entirely on the registrar. Once again, registrars come in all different varieties of quality and customer service. So you can't necessarily rely upon a registrar to advance your interest and try to get that domain name back. So one of the considerations that's been raised—and I've raised it consistently—is the possibility of permitting registrants themselves to directly invoke that Transfer Dispute Resolution Policy similar to how UDRPs are invoked by trademark owners. So although it's beyond the scope and the mandate of this working group to develop that crucial piece of policy, there is still is an opportunity for the working group to recommend that it be pursued. So that's something to keep an eye on as well.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Zak, thank you very much. Ching, if you want to follow up, I know you're driving, this would be a great time to follow up in writing with what you would propose to add to the red text. 18th of April is when we're submitting this. Thank you, Zak. I appreciate it.

I only have one other item under the Council issues, which is the WHOIS disclosure system. If you recall, this was renamed when we showed up in Cancún. Since Cancún, the small team where I represent the BC has had two one-hour meetings, on the 27th of March and again on April the 3rd, very slow going because we're discussing what data they're going to collect, what data collected could ever be published or revealed, and what is the whole purpose of the system. And I have to say that I'm getting some traction with support from Steve Crocker, and ensuring that they capture and retain all data that's submitted. I have been arguing strenuously that if the requesters to this system submit screenshots as evidence of abuse, evidence of the need to reveal a registrant's identity, the law enforcement officials on the phone represented by the FTC have said that they don't want their evidence to ever be published. So we have to create a opportunity to store the evidence but not reveal it to anyone if the requester decided they didn't want it to be submitted. So I'm grateful for anything I hear back from BC members about that.

Then what is the purpose? This became a significant debate that we're going to take up next week. We have said all along, it was not to assess the demand of reinstating WHOIS. We've said there will be very low demand for this system. Since there's no assurance you'll get any response at all when you make a legitimate request for disclosure. At the first, not all registrars are required to participate, and second, there

is no requirement. There is no audit to determine whether they're granting legitimate requests. So given that, I'm trying to suggest that we want to assess the quality of what the requests and responses are. We want to identify the bad actors, registrars who either deny or ignore requests for disclosure. That gets into an entire circular argument about whether the system will reveal the names of the registrars involved. That's not going well.

But Becky Burr, Board member, spoke up on the last call to say that the Board itself wants to hear from Council as to what do we hope to learn from this experiment? And if we do, will we be able to determine the next steps whether to implement \$100 million SSAD system or not? Then she asked the open-ended question of we want to determine as a result of this two-year experiment whether the SSAD is fit for purpose. Well, that opens up a brand new discussion about what purpose that is, and then whose eyes the purpose is evaluated. If it's the security community, if it's businesses, if it's law enforcement, we're going to have very different assessment as to whether this system would fit our purpose if there's no obligation to disclose even when we're providing legitimate information.

So that's where that stands. And I will turn it over. Tim is not here today to talk about CSG. But Tim's report is right here at the bottom of the list, Board Seat 14 where Mark could probably provide some updates. I guess, Mason, I would turn it over to you to determine whether you want Mark to speak at all to Board Seat 14.

MASON COLE: Sure. You got to hand up from Crystal I see.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Go ahead, Crystal.

CRYSTAL ONDO: Thanks, Steve. Just regarding SSAD, I wanted to point out one of the placeholders in the ICANN Implementation document says that they are still having legal review as to how ICANN will collect data from reporters or requesters of information. So, Steve, let's say you submit a report, your name, your e-mail, your phone number is collected, as well as your legitimate basis for wanting that information which could contain PII as well. It's unclear how, one, ICANN will get your consent to process your data or, two, how they will send it to registrars and under what obligation registrars are to maintain the confidentiality of that data. Imagine a registrar that gets 100 requests from Steve DelBianco, so they start a website that says, "Steve DelBianco requested these things," and all that data is now public because there's no agreement between ICANN and registrars. So that's just something that may slow down some of this implementation, because at this point, registrars are waiting to hear back from ICANN Legal as to that, given we don't have a DPA with ICANN at this point. So I just want to make that apparent that registrars are planning on participating. The RrSG is planning on really encouraging every member to participate. But unless we kind of understand the flow of personal information from ICANN to us and what the obligations are, it's going to be a hard fought battle.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Great point, Crystal. I appreciate that. I would say that the BC's position is that all the data that is provided should be captured. But it should only be published or revealed subject to adequate privacy protection. We want ICANN, since this is an experiment, one that could be audited to determine what did we learn, all the data that's submitted should be retained. It doesn't mean it has to be published or revealed. So I hope you can back us on that. If the requesters did the work to provide the data, the data ought to be stored but not published necessarily.

CRYSTAL ONDO: Yes. It's just hard when we don't have an agreement with ICANN as to the security practices on either side of that processing.

STEVE DELBIANCO: I understand. I appreciate that. Okay, Mason.

MASON COLE: All right. Thanks very much, Steve. That was a long, thorough review of the policy calendar. Before we go to Lawrence, I had a request from Marie to introduce the newest member of the BC. Here he is. This is Benjie. Say hi to Benjie, everybody. Okay. All right. Bye-bye, Benjie. Okay, there we go. Now that that piece of business out of the way, Lawrence, over to you, please. Go ahead.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Thank you very much. I'm still waiting to collect the dues for Benjie. I'll send the invoice to you, Mason.

All right, to start with a Finance and Operations report, we have the Council seat and the two NomCom seats of elections due by the 21st of April, that's starting Friday. I have sent an e-mail highlighting the important dates to note to members on BC private. This Council seat is for Marie. Thank you, Marie, for the excessive time and work you put into representing the BC on the GNSO Council. Vivek represents us on the small seat at NomCom, while Jordyn represents the large seat, and they are endorsed here. They are eligible to reapply and to continue in this particular role for another year.

So we will have two weeks of nominations starting Friday, the 21st of April. This will end by the 5th of May. By the 15th of May, we expect all candidates to nominate their candidates and send their statements to the BC private list, the BC Membership. And on the call of the 18th of May, it will start an hour before and we will have an opportunity to interact with all the candidates for the three different roles up for election. Right after the candidates call, Friday, the 19th of May, the electronic voting will start. The primary representative of every company will receive the ballots. So I would want to enjoin that if your details or the detail of your company has changed, we've reached out to a few of these companies that I know have had some transition. But just in case, if you just want to be sure that we have the right contact of your primary representative, please send a mail to info-bc@icann.org which is the e-mail for the secretariat. We will confirm all the details, update all the details as required.

So the voting process starts on the 19th. Only financially up-to-date members will be allowed to vote. And the results will be announced on Friday, the 26th of May, just in time for ICANN to process travel as

required. Only financially up-to-date members are able to be nominated, to nominate, and to vote in this process. Again, this is for one Council seat and the BC small and the BC large seats on NomCom.

In terms of our finances, the BC is doing very well. We have been able to overcome all the [inaudible] challenges we had in time past and have been able to pay out every commitment that's been due. Our current balance stands at \$124,424.26. We are not likely to go below the \$100,000 threshold for FY23. This is very good because our budget for the year had proposed has signified or indicated that we might need to draw down to it \$4000. But due to being very good stewards of our funds, we have been able to maintain this good balance.

Like I hinted us, we now have an accounting process platform in QuickBooks which has been integrated with our banking operations. So we are online in real time, being able to put in mechanisms to help with our bookkeeping and accounting. This will help facilitate seamless financial reporting, and also ensure that we are able to just compile reports from the back end to meet up with our IRS filings and every other thing that is needed. The accountant has been up to task, and we are happy with the services we are getting so far.

We have plans to fund a study on NIS2. We'll leave the opportunity or yield the floor later to our chair, Mason, to talk in depth about the study. But the BC has in its budget \$5000 for the funding of a study. In previous years, we had funded the outreach study to Latin America for \$25,000 and another one for about \$10,000. This particular study is going to cost the BC \$10,000. We are going to be advancing \$5000 out of the budgeted sum, while we will get funds from the [inaudible]

officers' travel and some other votes within the BC to fund the \$10,000 that will be the commitment of the BC towards this particular study. The total cost of the study, expect that \$20,000, IPC is funding to the tune of 10 while the BC will fund to the tune of 10. I say this because the BC, because we're basically spending out of our surplus, every annually the funds that we generate is in the region of \$33,000 to \$36,000. But our expenditure is much higher than that. What we spend has been from years of surplus and what we're putting into the study is definitely going to be coming out of the surplus that we have. But we feel that this is very important even to the work of the BC. Like I said, the chair will give us some more details as the meeting progresses.

We are planning a BC outreach at ICANN77 in Washington, D.C. Many thanks to Caroline, to Steve. And to those of us who reside in the in D.C., we are calling on you to help with the execution of this outreach. We have engaged with the Stakeholder Engagement Team for business and we are in talks already. We will feedback Membership on what the plans are. But we are hoping to make this a very grand outreach that will result into more companies knowing about the BC and possibly join in boosting our Membership. Aside from the outreach is towards companies that we feel should join Membership of the BC. But aside from this, we also have planned for ICANN77 in D.C. a BC inreach. We were hoping we'll be able to do this in Mexico. But the plan didn't work out so we're toying with the idea of BC members coming together in a social relaxed environment to interact closer, to get to know each other, to network better, and to also have an opportunity to advance our plans and influence within ICANN.

New invoices will begin to go out by the 1st of May. Those invoices will be for FY24. We note that a number of us had made our payments way back in FY23. Thank you for doing that. We will ensure that the credits that are necessary applied. Majority of BC members will receive an invoice for FY24 from the 1st of May. We want to encourage that you look out for this invoices and quickly settle them so that you are able to continue to participate in our activities going forward. This is not going to impact the elections that we have planned because that is based on payments and participation for FY23. But FY24 effect will kick in from the 30th of June 2023. With this, I will want to yield the floor to any BC member that has a question. Otherwise, if we do not have any question, I will yield the floor back to Mason. I'm also checking the chat just in case I missed anything. So, Mason, I yield the floor back to you then.

MASON COLE:

Thank you, Lawrence. Excellent overview as always. I just want to take a moment to compliment Lawrence and the rest of the ExCom. Because there's been a lot of a lot of business behind the scenes being handled that has been work-intensive and laborious, and everybody on the ExCom has done a wonderful job. I just want to recognize especially Lawrence for all his work in straightening out our books and making sure that our bookkeeping and our financial affairs are in good order. I also want to say thank you to Marie and Mark because they're superstar GNSO councilors, and the rest of the ExCom team has really come together to deliver quite a bit of work on behalf of the BC. So, Lawrence, excellent work and thank you again.

All right, ladies and gentlemen, we're 10 minutes away from the end of the call. Is there any other business for the BC before we adjourn? Okay, Brenda, I believe our next call is April 20. Is that correct?

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Sorry, Mason, do you want to talk a bit about the study?

MASON COLE: Oh, yeah. Thank you, Lawrence. Yes, sorry, before we adjourn. Thank you for the prompt. The study that Lawrence referred to earlier is one that has been proposed by the BC and some others in order to study the environment that we're working into in terms of the NIS2 Directive that came out of the European Union, specifically how it's going to be put into place by member states when they transpose that into binding member state law. As you might recall, NIS2 helpfully clarify some of GDPR's tenets in a way that helps BC members and those that they represent, and it's going to be an important 18 months or so remaining before the deadline for member states to transpose that directive into law. We want the opportunity to influence them. The study is meant to examine practices in the EU that will inform the best way for us to go about that. We want to be smart when we go into it because there will be a lot of people lobbying for various outcomes on NIS2 and we need the BC's voice to be heard.

So that's the reason for the study. Lawrence's outlined the rest of it pretty nicely. I think if you have questions, you can certainly bring them up to me or any other member of the ExCom offline and we'll be happy to address those.

Okay. Any other business for the BC? Brenda confirms that our next call is Thursday, on 20 April, at the regular time. So we will look forward to seeing you on the call. Benjie says, "Goodbye, everybody, and thank you for the kind introduction." With that, we'll talk to you in two weeks. The BC is adjourned. Thanks, everybody.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]