
BRENDA BREWER: Hello, everyone. Welcome to the BC Membership call on 8 August 2024 at 15:00 UTC. Today's call is being 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. Apologies received today from Mason Cole. I'll turn this meeting over to BC vice-chair Steve DelBianco. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Brenda. I will be pinching for Mason to chair of the meeting for the first half. And then I have a meeting with the governor in Nebraska. Tim Smith will take over on the second half of the meeting. That's going to fit well with the segmentation between policy matters and things that are administrative and budget related. Steve Crocker also has to drop at half past the hour. So we're going to try, if we can, to jam in some important discussions on several policy matters. I'll go ahead and share the policy calendar that was sent yesterday. If you can't see it, do go to the e-mail that I had sent you because I realized it's usually quite small and difficult to read. I'll try to keep an eye on the chat as well.

Two things that we filed. On August the 1st, we did a comment with Bulgaria, and it's on their open consultation for transposition of NIS2. Again, Mason took what we had done for Sweden and the Netherlands, and adapted it to what Bulgaria was asking about. Unless there's any objection, I think the BC will continue to do the same comment to any open consultation where the government is asking for commentary 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.

how they transpose Article 28. Are there any objections from BC members about that? Because I don't want to have to put you through the rigmarole of reviewing and approving things that it's really just a cut and paste. I'm looking at the chat and don't see any hands. Good. We'll continue to do that and also transparently show it to you.

The second item up is a little trickier. Mason was invited by Tripti while we were in Kigali to have a conversation. They did have a conversation and she probed about economic impact of DNS abuse. Mason conveyed a lot of what the Executive Committee conveyed to Alan Davidson at the U.S. Commerce Department's NTIA where we had significant concerns of DNS abuse and its impact on registrants and businesses and business users, but also that the multistakeholder model and the contracted party control made it very difficult for us to advance policy outcomes. While we appreciate what contracted parties have done on DNS abuse, that's a start and not a stop, not a finish.

Tripti had asked Mason for some follow-up. Mason tried to crib from things that we and the DNS Abuse Institute and others have pulled together and sent a letter on the financial impact. It's the first of the three attachments on today's policy calendar. You'll notice I didn't link to something on the BC website because we wanted to give Tripti a chance to digest that and respond before we post it on the public website. It will undoubtedly stimulate some concern, I think, from contracted parties. I don't think we're saying anything here that we haven't said publicly, but we prefer Tripti to give us the go ahead at posting it on the website. But you all have it now. Mason had circulated a draft earlier, but I wanted to be sure you knew why it's not on the

website right now. Okay. Any questions on what we've just filed? Okay, fantastic. I'm going to move into a couple of topics.

The first comment period closes the 16th of August, and it's a discussion of a single character IDN gTLD at the top level gTLD. I want to thank Ching Chiao and Asteway Negash for drafting that BC comment. I have a link to it and it is also attached. Ching, do you want to go through anything with your colleagues to see if they have any final comments before we package this for filing?

CHING CHIAO:

Sure. Thank you, Steve. Very quickly on this subject which we covered in the past few months, actually a couple of times, this one, the single character Han script, the Chinese, Japanese, Korean scripts, whether you will be allowed to be allocatable in the next round. What we are saying is that we keep neutral. The BC's position will be neutral in this particular topic. We are actually sending additional questions on what are the actual implementation plans here since we're not seeing a very specific implementation plan in this particular document that is now up for public comment. So we're asking what exactly we can do to help in terms of the implementation phase. So please take a look. I think that's about it. Asteway, do you have anything to add?

ASTEWAY NEGASH:

No, I'm good. Basically, they have not responded to the issue that we have reported during the past public comment process. We want to know how they plan to basically implement what we plan, the issue that we have raised, so I think they've gone through it. Except they have

actually proposed a string similarity review process. We looked at all confusions related to geographic and then other matters. We also do not believe that the string similarity review might have a chance to look at such matters because labels basically need to be applied for in order for them to be reviewed by this process. Probably they might have assumed that they would go through the community objection process but there is a high chance that they might be overlooked as well. That's all.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thanks, Asteway and Ching. Be persistent and loud if previous comments have not been addressed. Always try to raise those to the top level and suggest that we believe more than ever that it's a relevant concern and we're disappointed it wasn't handled. We'll have to do something like that to get staff to pay enough attention. Any questions from BC members on this? It's going to be filed on the 16th. I will send another one out when Ching and Asteway get it in final form. I'll give you guys a last call. Okay. I'm not seeing any hands.

So go to the next item up. It's the preliminary issue report on Latin script diacritics. Do we have Mark on the call today? We do not. Mark is drafting that. Is there anyone else in the BC that wants to assist Mark Datysgeld on that? It closes at the end of August.

VIVEK GOYAL:

I'm helping Mark on this.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thanks, Vivek. Vivek, I will let him know. Thank you. Good. The IRP, Implementation Review Team for IOT Oversight Team for the Independent Review Process, that's a mouthful, but this is about a comment that closes in the middle of September. They have new rules for the process around supplemental procedures for filing an IRP. We did a comment on this six years ago. Chris Wilson was part of that. Particularly for .amazon, it was quite active in this area. So I asked Chris Wilson from Amazon if he would take a look at this, and he did more than I even hoped he would do. And I appreciate it so much. Chris drafted an outline of what the BC comment ought to look like and I agree completely with what Chris came up with. We now have to turn that outline into a comment. Chris, I'll turn it over to you first and watch the chat for other hands who would help us to turn this into a final comment. Chris?

CHRIS WILSON:

Thanks, Steve. Hopefully, folks can take a look at that outline that you attached that I sent to you. I welcome thoughts and feedback on that. But I think the ultimate goal here is to ensure as much new process as possible for BC community members. I mean, the IRP is a key accountability mechanism that we want to preserve as much as possible. [Inaudible] take a look at the outline for feedback. Please send it to me and Steve, and we can onboard that. I could say we're happy to take an initial draft if folks want to see that too in the coming weeks. I know we've got a little bit of time. Frankly, myself included, I could be on vacation soon. But if others want to be involved or have a first crack at looking at a draft, etc., let me know and I can do that. Can folks hear me?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Chris, we do. It's kind of scratchy. I'm not sure what kind of a connection you have.

CHRIS WILSON: Sorry. If folks are interested in working on this, let me know. If you have feedback on the outline, let me know and we can take it from there.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Okay. Chris, the outline—and anybody can open the outline attached to the second attachment—it is more than an outline. What you've done here is stupendous and it will be very easy to turn this into an organized comment, bullet points and sentences. Thank you again for that. But it would be great for any other BC member who's got experience with an IRP to be able to weigh in and help us turn this into final form. Anyone else on the call who's been involved in an IRP? Chris, I will work with you on this to be sure we have something to circulate. I appreciate your help.

CHRIS WILSON: Great.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you. There's also, number four, Fiscal Years '26 through '30. ICANN's got a draft Strat Plan and Op Plan framework. Comments close mid-September about the same time as the one we just covered. For

that, Tim, we typically look for you guys to lead that. You and Lawrence and the Finance Committee, is that something you guys can take a look at between now and the middle of September?

TIM SMITH:

I think we have new interest for the Finance Committee, which we'll be talking about later in the call. Certainly, I think between the group of us, we can manage that, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Beautiful. Thanks, Tim. You do a lot. Then the Initial Report for the Transfer Policy Review. Remember that Zak Muscovitch and Arinola Akinyemi have been working on this for two years. That's not necessary until the end of September, but their Initial Report came out and Zak was kind enough to share with us. I asked Zak and Arinola if they would help lead the BC comment drafting. Sometimes it's awkward for somebody who's on a working group to do that. So we can provide the cover to say it's a BC comment but we desperately need Zak and Arinola to tell us where are the soft spots in the belly of this beast, the soft spots we can probe and push to nudge the final comment closer to what the BC is after. Zak and Arinola, do you have anything to add on that? And do we have any other volunteers?

ZAK MUSKOVITCH:

Thank you, Steve. This is Zak Muscovitch. For people who are interested in this or somewhat interested in considering helping with the draft, there are two webinars scheduled on 4th of September and 9th of

September. They're different webinars so it's not a repeat. You can see the details on the ICANN Public Comments website about this. I would strongly recommend that anyone who's considering helping with the draft attend those. It will really save you a lot of grief and save all of us some time. I'm planning on attending as best I can as well because there's a lot of material. It would be a good refresher. Arinola and I are happy to assist and lead the process, but we'd love to have as many people participate as possible. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Again, any of you who dealt with on the victim side of having domain names being transferred between registrars where you didn't get the control you needed or you were restricted on making a good faith transfer that you wanted to make. There's two or three ways that BC members who register domain names for their businesses can be impacted by this. Zak, I thought that the two webinars were identical, and therefore, I only put one into the list. I would ask perhaps you and Arinola could send a list to BC private with both webinar links and dates because I misunderstood that.

ZAK MUSKOVITCH:

Sure. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Any other members willing to help Zak and Arinola on the Transfer Policy? Must have been an issue—

TESS DIAZ: Hi. This is Tess Diaz. I'll help.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Tess. I appreciate that. Zak and Arinola, Tess Diaz will work with you on this as well on Transfer. Thank you.

ZAK MUSKOVITCH: We're going to actually, Steve, have a lottery for anyone else who wants to help because we can't take everybody in.

STEVE DELBIANCO: We'll auction it. Next one up is really interesting. We'll see if we can get through this. ICANN Board is asking for relatively simple yes/no on whether the Board should allocate just \$5 million from the Auction Proceeds, half of what they think will be needed on a guess for the new gTLD applicants. This is about the Board asking. Given that there's going to be an Applicant Support Program and given that the community recommended that it be funded by Auction Proceeds, at least partially, the Board is saying, "Are you guys good with us moving \$5 million from an Auction Proceeds pool that's well over \$150 million," I believe, "and putting it in there?" The grant program that I'm speaking of is already opened. It was approved and launched in March of this year. The opportunity is for the BC to say, "Yes, please fund it," or "Yes, fund it with even more money." I don't know why they want to do just 5 when they could take the full 10.

When we initiated this on the list, Steve Crocker raised a great question to say, "Well, why do we even have an Applicant Support Program? It

didn't work very well last time around." Right you are. I answered the notion that the BC wants business registrants to be eligible to apply for a grant, whether it's a business association or could be a nonprofit entity. But we've worked hard to try to say that this time around, the Applicant Support Program needs to work properly. It needs to be advertised, it needs to be accessible. I realize it only provides relief from the financial part of the application, not all the other hard work. And I would say that we should have a quick little discussion. I want to give Steve a chance to comment. I would say that the BC's position going in is that we would support the Board transfer because the program has already been improved and opened. But Steve, I want to give the floor to you, if you'd like to suggest we take a different tack. Please, go ahead.

STEVE CROCKER:

Thanks very much. I want to make two points. One related to what I've said before and the other is a separate and new aspect of this. Continuing on what I've said before, my strong impression is the previous Applicant Support Program was waste of money because it just threw money at the application process and didn't look at the overall impact. It takes a lot of money to start a registry. It takes a lot of money to be successful at building a new registry, reducing the application fee by however much is the very smallest part of the overall thing. Going forward, if it's going to happen again, and I have not looked at the details and what the plan is, but I have not seen anything that suggests the kind of analysis that, let's say, venture capitalists would do if they were thinking about investing in a program as to whether or not it's likely to be successful. I don't want to be too negative about it, but it

has the potential trap of being performative that is doing it simply for show and not connecting up with what the actual dynamic is going to be.

And to push that even further, the people who are making the decision about formulating such a program, are they being held to account for the quality of their analysis afterwards? I'm trying to be quite stringent here about how decisions are made, the programs are started, and not just allow the entire organization, including us, to be caught in, "Well, this feels good or this feels politically correct, let's just do it. We don't have to think very hard about it." And then later down the line, the results are not so good. That's the thesis rant, if you prefer, that I've done before.

I want to raise a separate and distinct issue about this particular thing. I think we've just heard that the Board approved that they're going to go do this and now they're asking, "Hey, can we dip into the Auction Proceeds to fund this?" Well, I'm sorry. Aren't they supposed to have figured out the funding before they approve something? The Auction Proceeds are not supposed to be hamburger helper on the budget. The whole idea of the Auction Proceeds being curtailed off is that it was not supposed to be used for funding regular operations. I would say if the Board has actually said, "We're going ahead with this program," and they did not figure out where the funds are going to come from and now they're coming back and saying, "Hey, look at these unallocated auction funds," then aren't they stepping exactly across the line that they tried to draw about what the auction funds were supposed to be used for?

Now, let me just continue slightly. I was chair, I think, in the Board, anyway, when the Auction Proceed issues started to come up. And I remember saying it's a delicate problem because the funds have to be used for things that are well within ICANN's remit. Don't go off trying to cure cancer or solve world hunger. On the other hand, it should not be used for things that should be in the plan, in the budget. And if something didn't make it into the budget, and now we're dipping back into the Auction Proceeds, then that is a way of undermining budget discipline. That's bad practice. And when the auction funds go away, eventually, they'll be used up. There's going to be a lot of bad habits that have been gotten used to. So it's kind of a narrow path that has to be tread to use the auction funds outside of the commitments that are made and even the considerations that went into choosing what's in the operating budget, what's in the strategic plan, and what's in the budget and within the remit. I think those two tests have to be adhered to. I do not see that applying those funds for the Applicant Support Program is consistent with that.

Now, having said that, I know which way things are going here. The Applicant Support Program is a go. The quality of it has not been tested or reviewed stringently but they're going to go ahead anyway. And they're saying, "Hey, do you mind if we use \$5 million out of the auction funds?" "That doesn't seem like a lot of money. Let's go do that." It would put the BC among and everyone else who's being asked in an awkward position saying, "No, we think it's important to go ahead but we do not want to use the auction funds for that. That would that would be politically difficult." But you now heard me on both aspects of this, and hopefully in the fullest of time, there'll be some of us around

to say, "Look, we told you this was going to run into trouble." End of speech. Thank you very much.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thank you. It might well be that if we approve the transfer, we attach concerns about accountability. But some of the concerns you raised, I believe, were anticipated. Lawrence is going to speak next. He was on the Applicant Support Program Working Group. Keep in mind that any of the funding was supposed to come from the New gTLD Program is self-funded. So the application fees that everyone else paid were supposed to provide the surplus that would have covered any relief that was given. I believe the community supported the idea of at least partially funding that from Auction Proceeds. So this wasn't going to be an operations-funded item from the get go. It was always going to be from the application fees that were coming in. Lawrence, I'll turn it over to you, please.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS:

Thank you, Steve. Steve Crocker, all the concerns you raised on the mailing list are given now where concerns were put to bear at the point where we were discussing the GGP. A lot of these issues couldn't be addressed by that mechanism because of the slim remit that we had to work with. But to be able to understand which Steve also spoke about just now, the Applicant Support Program is supposed to be funded from proceeds that are from the current route that we're stepping into. What the Board is trying to do, because we raised this question, what were we initially told they were going to work with for Applicant Support was

\$2 million, which we felt was very, very, very inadequate if a program was to be successful at all. It's good to hear that the Board is looking at a different mechanism for funding the Applicant Support Program. Hopefully, the concerns that have been raised, a lot of which I understand is being dealt with the SubPro IRT which should look at help that could be for that applicant in terms of technical support, even business or legal support. There's some support that the community, including At-Large, have requested that ICANN provide to applicants, but ICANN is up and down, especially since it will have some legal application or give the notion that ICANN might be bonded to such contracts, including the pro bono services.

Some of us also feel that a better job has to be done. The previous round had just screened qualified applicants and eventually just one of them got [inaudible] still true and wasn't even delegated until the 12th year of that application. All of this has been put before ICANN Org, and we believe that in some way before the application round itself closes, the Applicant Support round itself closes, that a lot of those concerns will be addressed. We also see some piecemeal approach, but we are hoping that ICANN will get its ducks in a row and ensure that all those issues are dealt with. But I fully support—sorry, Ashley. I'll speak slowly. But I fully support that the BC go ahead to support this option such that there is at least some level of funding and we have that issue out of the bay while other issues can be dealt with.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thank you, Lawrence. Lawrence, go back on mute if you don't mind. We're getting an echo. I believe that I've only got about four more

minutes before I turn this over to Tim. Steve Crocker, I appreciate not only the rant but the cautionary note. What I would welcome is that we would approve the transfer, but we could attach. This is a letter, by the way. It's not a formal public comment process. Tripti has asked us to respond via Board correspondence. So to be on the front of the Board correspondence page where the BC comes back and says, "We have always supported Applicant Support Program, we support this transfer. However, we reiterate our concern that this program be judged as to its effectiveness and accountability for generating results." Something to that effect. And I would welcome an e-mail that you could put onto the thread that we've already started in the BC. I would welcome the bullet points that would stick into that letter, which we will send on the 12th of August.

STEVE CROCKER: How soon do you need the letter?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Not until the 12th of August.

STEVE CROCKER: That's for us to send it to them. How soon do you need inputs from me and—

STEVE DELBIANCO: Can you get it to me by the 10th of August? It could just be a couple of bullet points in the e-mail trail that you've got, and then I'll turn it into a letter.

STEVE CROCKER: 10th of August, two days from now. Will try.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Okay. Steve, we're going to lose you, I think, in a moment, you're going to go to the Privacy/Proxy Service Accreditation Implementation Team. Could you give us a current status of where that's going, what they're talking about?

STEVE CROCKER: The idea of accrediting privacy/proxy services was taken up some years ago, a decision was made in a policy step that they would be in accreditation. A lot of things have happened since then, GDPR and Temp Spec and so forth. The concern that I have—and I'm sorry that I can't speak broadly about everything that's going on there—but the concern that I have is that fundamentally, if somebody uses a privacy/proxy service, then they are choosing a path which inhibits or overtakes whatever the policies are that registrars have about releasing information. Registrants then have two different procedures or two different sets of policies in place regarding protecting their identity. One is what the rules are regarding the collection and disclosure of non-public information as part of just the regular control over the registrars. Then separately, they have this additional path where they can say,

“Well, never mind all that. I’m going to avail myself of these extra services.” That means that if one’s trying to get a coherent policy that includes both protection of registrants and proper disclosure for legal purposes, then those pieces aren’t adding up yet. That’s a very big concern of mine and, hopefully, yours as well. That’s something that I think needs to be raised and pursued vigorously in the IRT even though it should have been pursued back at the policy development process.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Steve, I have a particular linkage that would be relevant to you. It’s the RDRS. As you recall, some of the registrars in the RDRS will simply say that it’s publicly available if all that’s there is privacy/proxy.

STEVE CROCKER: Excellent example.

STEVE DELBIANCO: See if perhaps that can be brought into the conversation on implementation. Then also NIS2. NIS2 is going to require the publication for legal persons, not natural. There are a lot of moving parts about which the implementation of this PPSAI needs to adapt. So it’s an opportunity to say, “Things have changed. Why don’t we take a new look?”

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you. Both of those are very, very relevant, as you said. And the countervailing force is that, well, we start up this implementation

review process. That is stay focused, don't take up new issues, let's just make this thing go. I don't have to finish since you all understand this.

STEVE DELBIANCO: It's ridiculous because they delayed the whole PPSAI when the Temp Spec was adopted. So obviously, the outside world imposed GDPR, they said, "Hold on, stop the trains." And now we're saying NIS2 is a similar event.

STEVE DEL CROCKER: Last time NIS2 was brought up, the ICANN response was, "Well, it doesn't exist yet, so we don't have to pay any attention to it." Meanwhile, the train is coming down the tracks and you can hear it rumbling but it wasn't on the schedule. Anyway, thank you very much.

STEVE DELBIANCO: We're going to cover that in a minute. But remember that NIS2 has been transposed by Belgium, by Germany.

STEVE CROCKER: Now it's real.

STEVE DELBIANCO: It's real. Exactly. Thank you, Steve. I appreciate all of your comments. Number seven of our list here is the data processing spec which is really just data processing agreement. Go ahead.

STEVE CROCKER: Sorry, dropping off. Thank you. Bye-bye.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you. That's closing the 9th of September. In the chat, Margie Milam, who had to jump off the call, has already volunteered to help work on that. Anyone else who's intimately familiar with some of these specifications and DPAs? Again, this is all related to GDPR. We could desperately use some expertise to join Margie on drafting of this comment. Who else is available to help? It's due relatively soon, 9th of September. Anyone else right now? I have a feeling, Marie, it'll be you and I helping Margie but it would be great to get some more help on this. Sven, if you're still on the call, this is another one that's particularly up your alley, given that you're helping Germany with its implementation.

Number eight is NIS2, turning to Sven and Marie. Do you guys want to update us at all on where we are on NIS2?

SVEN ECHTERNACH: About Germany, I can give a quick update. On July 24th, the German government has approved it, and it will still go through the German parliament. According to Thomas Rickert, it will probably be February or March 25th, it will become effect.

STEVE DELBIANCO: How would you characterize their transposition? Is it pretty much straight to what the regulations had in it or did they stray into different areas?

SVEN ECHTERNACH: I would say it's strayed and it's not making it harder like Belgium for the parties. But I think it's 1 to 100%.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Got it. Are you noticing that companies are designating Germany as their official EU residence country for purposes of this?

SVEN ECHTERNACH: I think it would be too early to say that.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Okay. You expect that to happen eventually, don't you?

SVEN ECHTERNACH: I haven't seen the other countries. There might always be countries even better than Germany.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Okay. Well, certainly, if somebody had been thinking about Belgium, they may well switch to Germany at this point.

SVEN ECHTERNACH:

Yes.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Exactly. Sven, Marie, anything you want to add? We've already talked about the Bulgarian authorities, Netherlands and Sweden.

MARIE PATTULLO:

Nothing at this stage, Steve. And I'm conscious of time. But thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thanks, Marie. All right. Turning it over to Council. The Council meeting is today. I put some highlights in there. The last Council meeting before we met was the 18th of July. Marie, have you heard back yet on the selection of the Holistic Review Team?

MARIE PATTULLO:

Not yet. I know that my name is apparently on there, and I also see the SSC's, Standing Selection Committee mails, but not a thing. So I'm just waiting to be told what to do.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Well, good luck. I think you'd be outstanding on that team. I hope it happens. Then Lawrence, Vivek, do you want to talk at all about the Council meeting today? I put a couple of highlights in there. I'm hearing a phone ring. That would be Lawrence and Vivek. Anything you want to say about today's Council meeting?

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Sorry. Can you hear me okay?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yes. Speak a little bit louder, if you don't mind. Now we're not hearing you, Lawrence. There are no votes today as far as—well, sorry, there are two votes, number four and five and six. What do you think about number six? Accuracy Scoping Team's Rec 1?

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Are you able to hear me okay now?

STEVE DELBIANCO: All right.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Okay. The Accuracy Scoping Team is talking about votes today. It's also one where the Council leadership not only put it up for votes, but we understand that Task 1 and 2 have been completed. I was going to defer to Marie, find out if that is something that the position of the BC should be comfortable to vote on. But I wanted to say that the IPC have also get a mail. Sorry, can I go on? Are you able to hear me? All right, thank you. The IPC has raised some concerns that they would like us to be [inaudible] of the outcome further before it puts votes. Recall that at the last BC meeting, the resolution that we reached on this was to agree for a six-month deferment, hoping that by then the adoption of NIS2

might have some more adoption across country and see how that would affect the accuracy requirement of the ICANN point of view. But it does appear that the Council move is to allot Task 1 and 2, which normally has to do with—Task 1 has to do more with—excuse me, please. Recommendation 1 and Recommendation 2 basically have to do with the enforcement of reporting and also measurement of accuracy.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Okay. Lawrence, you're breaking up.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: If it does [inaudible] that we're to vote on this, now whatever it is that has to do with measurement of accuracy and enforcement of reporting is a done deal. Based on this, we have some pushback from the IPC that they would want to discuss further with their members. I do not know if the BC should also through the same line, but based on—

STEVE DELBIANCO: Lawrence, let me stop you there and let Marie answer the question you posed to her because we are having trouble hearing you. Marie, please?

MARIE PATTULLO: I'm very sorry. I didn't hear the specific question.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Lawrence was asking if you had a recommendation on how we ought to vote today on a motion to reject number one, which is the voluntary registrar survey, and number two, the audit? Go ahead, please.

MARIE PATTULLO: You may remember we talked about this a couple of weeks ago. Now, those of us involved in NIS2 think that deferring for another six months or so is probably a good idea because we can see what actually happens in reality once NIS2 comes in. I'd also like to go slightly wider here, because if you will remember, according to the Registrars, accuracy means two things, operational, i.e. if I send an e-mail or pick up a phone, it rings at the other end, and syntactical, so `lawrence@iamacompletecybercriminal.com`. Syntactically, that is correct. That is not a way to contact the registrant. Now, those of us on this side think the accuracy discussed in NIS2 refers to accurate data to be able to contact the registrant. There is merit in deferring to see what actually happens on the ground. But that said, when I look at this voluntary registrar survey, frankly, it's not going to give us anything useful. But whether or not you think we should vote in favor or defer, see what the IPC says, the whole thing drives me insane. So I leave it to you, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Lawrence, I would recommend deferral. Go with the IPC and defer. That's what I would recommend based on Marie's point. Then moving ahead, since we've got to wrap this up, Nenad, I want to turn it over to

you. You wanted to give us a quick update on the CIP-CCG. Please go ahead.

NENAD ORLIC:

Well, basically, I haven't been giving you too much information about all of this. It's been going slow track as far as I'm concerned. But now there comes some feedback that we need to provide back. Basically, it's my duty to do so. Basically, not to go any further, there are two things that need to be done. First one is to get the official information about what improvement procedures we do have here. We have some Continuous Improvement Program and we have a working group and such. And what are the problems that you need to do is we have a report on that officially. And the thing is that we are a bit late on that. But it's not a big deal because compared to others or, as I already said, compared to the other groups, they give the oral report, not the written one, that basically, we are much smaller with less friction and less problems than other groups. We have a lot less. Basically, that is not the issue here. But now we are hearing a formal part where a framework needs to be set officially, which is the first purpose of this Continuous Improvement Program and Community Coordination Group. And that is to do the framework, which would be a basis for the Continuous Improvement Program. They have set five principles, that for those principles, every group should give its insight on criteria and indicators that would be followed up. I will send you those things because now we have a limited time. We'll see that we are hurrying up everything, that we will probably not go through that now if you think that maybe you can do it later. And maybe to go with the officers on a separate meeting or send you the materials, and basically to give an input of that and to turn it

back to the CCG. What is unfortunate here is that the CCG group meeting is always a day before our meeting. It's much more useful if it's the other way around. Basically, we could finish everything by the next meeting and put it up, but it would be good if we could do it the day before the next meeting. That's the shortest update that I could do. I prepared the presentation and everything but—

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you for that. Could you e-mail the entire presentation right away to the bc-private?

NENAD ORLIC: Okay. I will. Also, I will add several different documents from the group that has the material from other SOs and groups so that you can see what others have provided as their material. I think that it would be beneficial for you to see that too.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Listen, this is so helpful. Knowing our BC colleagues and how busy they are, it's always great at the top of the e-mail to say specifically, "Here's what I need to know and by when. I need to know what you guys feel about this, this, and this, and I need to know by next Tuesday."

NENAD ORLIC: I will try to make it as effective as it is done here.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Nenad, very much. I appreciate that. I don't have anything on the RDRS that's new. On subsequent rounds, we don't. So now it goes over to Marie to talk about CSG. But at this point, I've got to go. Marie, as fast as you can, and then I'll drop.

MARIE PATTULLO: Everything you need to know is in the policy calendar. The one thing to point out is we are having a networking event with Istanbul Industry. They are paying. This is nice. Anything else you want to know, send me an e-mail. Back to Tim and Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Marie. Would that event be on Day Zero or sometime in the middle of the ICANN meeting?

MARIE PATTULLO: We're going to meet—all of us together as the house will meet at some point during the ICANN meeting. The Day Zero is just for the Council. It's just a bunch of us too. But we will inform you of that when we know more or we know at the moment is the date.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Right. So most BC members don't need to plan to be available—

MARIE PATTULLO: No, no, no. Lawrence and Vivek and Mason.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Perfect. Marie, thank you for the detailed report and for being concise. I'm going to turn it over to you now, Tim. Okay. All yours.

TIM SMITH: Thanks, Steve. Steve, thanks for sticking with us. I know that was a bit longer than you had expected. So thank you for that. I know we've lost a few other people to various other committees that are taking place. It seems to be a busy day in ICANN land. But I'll pick up from where we are.

Steve just asked the question about when this networking event or social event would be with the CSG that's being organized by the Union of Commerce and Commodity Exchanges in Turkey. We have requested that that take place before Constituency Day so that anybody that we were able to network with, we could invite to our respective constituency meetings. But we do not have that confirmed yet. We'll keep you posted on that. But it will not be part of the Day Zero or as early as Day Zero. Just so you're aware of that.

Brenda, if you can put the agenda up again, because I think we're at the end of all the policy calendar information, we're looking for—oh, great. Stuffed French toast.

BRENDA BREWER: That was not the page I picked. I promise. Just again, hold on.

TIM SMITH: It's all right. It's coming up to lunchtime.

BRENDA BREWER: There we go. Is this right?

MARIE PATTULLO: [Inaudible] the event in Istanbul, Tim.

BRENDA BREWER: I'm ordering them for you. Okay. Do you want this page or the next page?

TIM SMITH: No, this page is fine for now. I'll call for the next page. I guess the next thing here, really, is the Finance and Operations update. I'll give you a little bit of an update on that. I guess on the finance side, there is a draft budget that has been prepared for FY25. We know we're already into the fiscal year, FY25, so we are running a little bit behind. To help me get back on track, I pulled together or I asked some previous Finance Committee members to participate with me to walk through the budget that the BC ExCom had already drafted to get some input.

Over the past few weeks, I've been working with the Jimson, Chris Chaplow, and Lawrence, who are all previous finance chairs, as well as Yusuph Kileo who was a member of the Finance Committee previously. In the next couple of days, by the end of this week, I will be presenting you with a draft budget. I want to tell you that our expenses for the

coming year, as proposed in this draft, will be in the \$42,000 to \$44,000 range. Our budgets over the past few years have been more around the \$70,000 range. But our expenses have come in in that \$40,000 to \$45,000 range. So we're being perhaps a little bit more realistic in the way that we're budgeting this year. When I say realistic, I'm saying realistic from the standpoint that our revenues are going to be slightly under \$30,000 this year. While we do have a reserve in our bank at the moment, we're chewing away at it at a pretty rapid rate. We do have a commitment. We've made a commitment to always have two years of expense funding in the bank. We will end the year this year if we follow the path that we're on right now with a bank balance of just over \$80,000, which puts us right on that two-year mark.

So we have to be very, very frugal, in fact, and very, very careful with our spending over the coming year. That's something that I'll share with you in the member space of icannbc.org in the next coming days. I ask you to review it and give me your thoughts on it. I will say that, as I say, we are chewing away at that balance that we have in the bank. Going into next year, as we start planning for FY26, and perhaps even before FY26, we're going to have to think about how do we get more income, what's involved in getting more income. Ideally, that would be attracting more members. So we certainly want to do that and be attentive to that. I don't think anybody wants to go down the road of increasing membership dues, but we may have to talk about that as well. So, look for the document. I'll send you an e-mail with a link to the draft that I'm going to post. I'll pause there to just see if there are any questions about what I've just outlined.

Okay. Moving on then. I mentioned that I had asked for some volunteers from past Finance Committees to work with me in order to get me back on track. But as we were discussing it, we said, “The BC charter says that there should be a call for volunteers and therefore we should proceed with that call for volunteers,” which I did on July 23rd. And that prompted several people, in addition to the people I had called on already, to come forward to volunteer to be part of the Finance Committee. As a result, we ended up with seven people who are interested. The BC charter states that the Finance Committee is to be made up of four volunteers from the Membership, plus the Finance chair. If there are more than four people who are interested, then there is to be an election. So you all have received notice that there is an election period underway for the Finance Committee. Brenda, if you have that slide just for everybody’s benefit, then maybe we can just have the slide there.

As you can see, July 23rd until August 5th, the nomination period has closed now. You can see the people who have come forward, in addition to the names that already previously sat as members of the Finance Committee, Tola Sogbesen, Segunfunmi Olajide, and Arinola Akinyemi have also come forward with interest in being on the Finance Committee. We go through a formal election period, which means by the 18th of August, we need candidate statements posted to the members so that everybody can read up on the candidates and their interest and their suitability for the positions. Then during our next meeting on August 22nd, we will have a Candidates Membership call. Then there will be the confidential voting that will take place over the following week, so that on August 30th, we will be able to announce the

new Finance Committee. I wanted you to be aware of that, that it's taking place. I want to thank everybody who's expressed interest in being part of the Finance Committee. I've already mentioned that we are on a tight budget so once we do have a finalized budget, there will be a role for the Finance Committee to play over the coming year as we monitor our finances. Thank you all for that.

I guess moving along, we might as well stick with elections. The next slide, actually, Brenda. Of course, officers elections are coming up. And there will be elections for—this is for Calendar '25, so effective January 1, '25, the BC chair, the vice chair Policy, the vice chair Finance and Operations, and our CSG representative. We will be looking for nominations for those four roles. And the nomination period will open on September 20th going through to October 3rd. You can see the dates there. We'll be distributing this in the coming week or two so that everybody has time to digest it and to be thinking about it. We look forward to a good nomination period and a good slate of candidates for the coming year.

Again, if you're wondering why the announcement of the election is October 25th and the new officers taking their seats on January 1st, it's because some of the officers actually are eligible as funded travelers for ICANN. And the first meeting of the next calendar year will be next March in Seattle. And there's a 90-day period before that as a deadline for travel submissions. So we need to get everybody in place well in advance of the new year. Any questions on any of those?

Okay. Then just moving on. Marie already talked about the social event taking place sometime during our Istanbul visit. We'll share details with

you as they come. But that should be a good event and we invite you all to come. Of course, it's an opportunity for us to try to find suitable new members to be part of our constituency.

The other thing that we've also talked about is doing a BC specific outreach in Istanbul, which may be a subset or a different set of people from the business community that will want to be part of it. We're starting to think about that a little bit. In keeping with our need to keep our costs down, we're hoping that we'll be able to find sponsors from the area, from Turkey and the region who would be interested in sponsoring an outreach event. So we're looking at that. But it's early days at this point before we know whether that's going to come together. I say early days and here we are the middle of August. Of course, we're in Istanbul from the 9th through 14th of November. So we need to get working on that. That's everything that I have on the Finance and Operations report. Are there any questions for me or any comments?

Then with that, we actually have three minutes for all other business. I'm wondering if there is any other business that anybody would like to bring forward at this time.

BRENDA BREWER:

Hi, this is Brenda. I do, please. I'm unable to raise my hand so I apologize. For the next meeting, we have it scheduled for 60 minutes. And since we're adding the candidate call, we should add an extra 45 minutes to the meeting. Look for updates to your calendar invite for the

August 22nd meeting. I'm not sure if we'll add 45 in front of 15:00 UTC or after 16:00 UTC. Just look for that update, please.

TIM SMITH: Okay. All right. Good. Thank you, Brenda. Thanks for that. Nenad, do you have a comment about the—

NENAD ORLIC: If you want, maybe you and I can stay for a minute or two after this, right? I can tell you right here now. I already spoke with some. There might be interest in this. We need to put the official proposal, what you're looking for and why, and to be distributed. But from what I've seen, it's very interesting. The chosen organization for CSG event is in fact the [inaudible] mediation and arbitration of Turkey, which makes sense in terms of they do domain disputes here in Turkey. But I don't know about the—is that the real target group for the BC that they were out to the outreach?

TIM SMITH: Well, maybe you and I can talk about that directly one on one.

NENAD ORLIC: That's what I think.

TIM SMITH: Actually, your audio connection is a bit off. So maybe that's something that you and I can just schedule some time to talk about offline.

NENAD ORLIC: Yeah, I'll look at it.

TIM SMITH: Okay. All right. Anything else that anybody has to bring? Then thank you all. We are right to time. I appreciate everybody staying with us. Take care. Have a good day.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you, everyone. Thank you, Tim.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]