BRENDA BREWER:	Good day, everyone. This is Brenda speaking. Welcome to the BC membership call on 21 March 2024 at 15:00 UTC. Today's call is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN expected standards of behavior.
	Please state your name before speaking. Have your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking. Attendance is taken from Zoom participation. I've received apologies from Steve Crocker, David Snead, Tim Smith and Nivaldo Cleto, and I'll turn the meeting over to BC Chair, Mason Cole. Thank you.
MASON COLE:	Thank you, Brenda. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. Mason Cole here, Chair of the BC. Welcome to our call on 21 March. It's good to have you on the call, and it was good to see many of you in San Juan. We had productive meetings in San Juan. I hope you feel the same. Lots of business was covered and we have some follow-up work to do, as usual.
	Before we get started, I wanted to welcome Chris Buckridge to the call. Chris is the appointed Board member for the Non-Contracted Party House, and he has a standing invitation to join the BC meeting. So, Chris, would you like to say hello to the BC?

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE:	Hello, BC. Thank you, Mason, for the introduction, and thank you for the invitation to be here. I'm certainly interested to sort of hear these discussions and see what the priorities and concerns are.
	Mason mentioned it's a standing call at this point. It often, although not today, conflicts with a meeting of the … I was going to say SubPro Caucus. I think we're changing the name to the Next Round Caucus of the Board. So I may not be able to join that regularly, but we'll see how that develops over time.
	But, yeah, glad to be here today. And as Mason said, great to see many of you in San Juan and be part of those discussions. Thanks.
MASON COLE:	Chris, thank you very much. Welcome to the call and it's good to have you.
	So, I'm looking through the participant list. I'm not sure we have any new members on the call, even though we have a couple of new members who have joined. Am I missing anyone who would like to be welcome to the BC today? Please raise your hand and let me know.
	Doesn't appear to be the case. Okay. Very good.
	All right. Well, we have critical mass, and it is now five past the hour. We have our usual policy calendar review, which will be

intensive to review, and then I have a brief finance and administrative update from Tim, who is not able to be on the call, which I'll handle on item number three. And then we'll go to AOB. Are there any updates or corrections to the agenda as you see it on the screen, please?

All right, very good. Steve, item number two. The floor is yours, please.

STEVE DELBIANCO: All right, thanks, Mason. I just displayed the policy calendar which was sent to yesterday. And Chris, I forwarded it to you so you'd have an opportunity to understand what it is we cover. And let me just make sure that I have both the hands up and the participants listed here. Okay. So since our last meeting, we filed two extra comments with ICANN. On the 12th of March, we commented on the IDN phase one final report. Ching Chiao, who handled the initial report for us and knows an awful lot about IDNs and the vagaries of things like variants … Big thank you to Ching for pulling that draft together. And we got that in.

The other is on the 19th of March. We commented on the proposed draft sections of the next round of the Applicant Guidebook. And all that ICANN wanted to know is a yes/no reply on whether we think that the guidebook section adequately reflected what the SubPro final report output was. And so this is not supposed to be the opportunity to say we differ from what

was in the final report but just that we don't think the final report matched what was in the guidebook draft.

So Imran and Ching both represent us on the SubPro Implementation Review Team. We had other volunteers (Bartlett, Crystal, Mason, who also worked on this), and we concluded that, yes, these seven draft sections matched what was in the SubPro final report. That was an easy one to file. But I appreciate the quick review. We'll have many other opportunities to comment on what makes its way into the guidebook. And remember that twelve years ago, the BC took the leadership at adding a lot of requirements to the guidebook that don't necessarily come across as policy, but became incentives for registrars to adopt the new 2013 registrar accreditation agreement because if they didn't adopt it, they weren't allowed to sell names in the new round.

So it became an inducement, an incentive, and we were able to apply a lot of pressure from the CSG at the time and got ICANN to adopt some safeguards that have gone a long way at making things better for registrants and users from the business community. I don't know that we're going to get the same kind of leverage. People have seen that trick before, but nonetheless, the guidebook is a great place for us to work. Thanks again.

And today I'm turning to public comments that are open. The first one closes today. And thanks to Crystal Ondo's good work, we submitted it already. I submitted it this morning. And it's a brief

comment supporting ICANN's recommendation that the string dot-internal be reserved for private use and not subject to bidding by someone who wants to launch a new TLD. Again, we've circulated that in San Juan, and I also sent it out two days ago with a last call.

Second one up is the string similarity review guidelines. This is something the BC cared deeply about in the 2012 round, things like similarities on that an R and an I when they're together look an awful lot like the letter M in a Latin script. Remember that? That was one. That's visual similarity. We also had similarity between singulars and plurals, because even in Spanish and Italian, you add sometimes an ES at the end. It's a Latin script problem. But singulars and plurals was a big problem for the BC.

So we want to comment substantively on this, and I want to thank Helmuts and Hafiz for volunteering. I believe that we've already got a draft. The two guys are working on it right now. It closes the 27th in March, and I will promise to circulate to all the BC members later today and tomorrow after the two of them have come up with it.

Hafiz and Helmet, are you on the call today? You want to offer any considerations about what you're drafting?

I am looking and not seeing either one on the call.

MASON COLE: Hafiz is on the call.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Okay, Hafiz, anything you want to observe about this to your colleagues?

HAFIZ FAROOQ: Yeah, hi, everyone. Thank you very much. I've already shared the draft with you with some comments. I think, as you said, on the singular and the plural, this was the concern we raised before. I think with the idea now becoming more and more common, we get some more issues for the businesses when we talk about semantic meaning and the phonetic meaning, like my company on dot-aramco TLD. So what if somebody in a different language gets a similar TLD and that gets approved? So this might have a concern for the businesses. So that's why one of the comment actually raises that concern.

                           So I want to share across. Let's get the feedback and see comments from the community and see how it goes forward. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Hafiz. All right, we'll be circulating that later today.

                           Next one up is the Applicant Support Program, which we've talked a lot about. And Lawrence served on the group that met here in

Washington last summer to try to work out a plan for this. And this is again the notion that in the next round, if an applicant for a new TLD doesn't have the financial, legal, or technical resources to do an application, then we won't necessarily get apps from a diverse set of registry operators for strings that are interesting and from operators that might help to round out a broad display of registry operators around the world in a lot of different scripts and languages and cultures. All right, so we are on Board for that goal. Right?

So the trick here is that the Applicant Support Program is supposed to take money that ICANN has set aside and assist an applicant at being able to apply. I mean, there's a significant fee. It could be $300,000 or $400,000. And there's often an equivalent amount of money that can be spent on technical and legal help.

So we are doing our best to ensure that applicants can come from both the for profit and non-profit community. There are business oriented and private sector elements that may need assistance to apply and they ought to be eligible. And thanks to Lawrence's good work, we were able to make them at least eligible. So we have to be sensitive that the guidebook itself might well try to exclude us by the fine print of how one applies and the criteria that will be applied.

This doesn't close until the 2 April, but I think in the next day or two we should get a draft from David Snead, who's working on that right now. Vivek had also said he would help.

So, Vivek, anything you want to add to that right now or. David?

All right, I will circulate that in the next two days.

All right, we have another one coming up on the 15 April, which is some bylaws amendments that would limit whether somebody who received money through the applicant support would be allowed to turn around and challenge using the accountability mechanisms that we've all created as part of the transition? And I don't even know where this came from, but it was something that was awfully important to the IPC. Is that right, Mason? Do I have it right? This is something they've been pushing on very hard?

MASON COLE: Correct.

STEVE DELBIANCO: And the BC has never taken a position on that point. This is a great opportunity to do it. Lawrence, I want to thank you and Margie for volunteering when we were in San Juan to pick up a pen on this one. We don't need to circulate something to our members until about the first week of April, like April 7. Any other BC

members that want to volunteer, just put your name in the chat and I'll add you to the list.

All right. Another week later in April, the registry service providers will have a handbook for the New gTLD Program. So these are technology-based companies that will host the registries, database and they are going to be able to provide their services to applicants so that applicants don't necessarily have to invent all of that in-house or build their own technical capabilities. So it's a good plan and they will save money. We'll have better expertise and secure operation if trusted operators are running the registry back ends.

So I would say that the BC has a moderate level of interest in ensuring that the registry service providers are fully qualified and obligated to help implement and respond to safety measures. Those would be the kind of things that we would do.

Can I get any hands from volunteers that would assist us, volunteers that know a lot about registry operations that are members of the BC? Because I'd love to get this team pulled together for the drafting.

Looking … Oh, Vivek. Always volunteering. Or do you have a comment you wanted to make? Okay, so Vivek, and … Did I see another hand? Alan: "Limited capacity." But Alan, this won't be due till the 22 April. Maybe you could join the review of it later on?

JOHN BERARD: Hey, Steve, this is Berard. I can join that.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Alright. So I have Crystal Allen Vivek, and I didn't hear that last name.

JOHN BERARD: That was John Berard, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO: John Berard. Fantastic, John. I appreciate it.

JOHN BERARD: Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: All right, thanks everyone.

MASON COLE: Got a hand up from Segunfunmi, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Segunfunmi, would you like to also volunteer or do you have a comment you wanted to make?

EN

SEGUNFUNMI OLAJIDE: I'd also like to volunteer.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Segun.

SEGUNFUNMI OLAJIDE: Thank you, sir.

STEVE DELBIANCO: All right, I'll circulate a note to all of you with a link to it as well as the deadlines that are in [pause].

Another item coming up at the end of April, is XXX. XXX is coming up for renewal. They had been a sponsored TLD. They're going to drop that and just become a regular new gTLD with the base registry agreement. So it's going to be generic, non-sponsored, and non-community-based TLD. This particular TLD has been through waves of controversy, ideas, proposals, reforms. A number of you were at the ICANN meeting in San Francisco. We had porn workers protesting outside of the hotel. It's a bizarre set of circumstances. But today XXX is going to be proposing on a renewal. They've negotiated with ICANN to adopt the base registry agreement, so it'll be an option for the BC to comment on that.

I turn now to NIS 2. This is an evergreen item in the policy calendar where we invite BC members that follow it closely to update your colleagues on how the member states are doing it, transposing NIS 2 into their state law.

I know that, Sven, you told us that Germany has given notice. They will not make the October 2024 deadline, but I wonder whether there's anybody else who's close to the European Commission and member states who can give us any updates.

No updates from Sven or Marie. Anyone else?

MASON COLE: Steve, it's Mason.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Please.

MASON COLE: Just a very brief update, which is to say that there has been some action in terms of transposition of the directive into member state law. My understanding is there are a couple of jurisdictions who have translated the directive either into a draft law or into a law that's already in effect. And with the ICANN meeting a couple of weeks ago, we're a bit behind on taking a look at those. But that's coming up. The BC should be aware that we're going to be active on that issue, and there will probably be some updates here in the

next, I'm going to say, five to seven days on what's going on with NIS 2.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Mason. And let's not wait for the next meeting. If you have an update between our BC meetings, let's circulate it to BC Private.

MASON COLE: Yup. Will do.

STEVE DELBIANCO: I know we discussed this when we met in San Juan, but I had spent a lot of time talking to Finn Peterson, who's helping a GAC-oriented working group that is trying to get other member state domain name experts to try to harmonize what they'll do in terms of, say, verification of registrants. But he indicated that for somebody that knows it really well, he's not seeing a lot of coordination among the member state governments that are pulling together the regulation.

All right, next channel up is for our counselors, Mark Datysgeld and Lawrence. You're our counselors right now. I put a brief description of what you accomplished in San Jose. There was only one consent item that was approved on the agenda. We don't have an agenda yet for your council meeting on the 18 April, but

let me turn it over to you. Anything you want to add about what's going on in council before I turn to the other specific council activities?

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Hello, Steve, this is Lawrence. I'm on the audio bridge only. I'm not sure if Mark is on ground.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Mark's not on ground. We can hear you. Go ahead, Lawrence.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Oh, great. So the next council meeting isn't until the 18 April, and I believe that we will have at least one other BC meeting before then. So the agenda for the council meeting is still being put together, but based on the discussions we had at San Juan, there are a few action items before council.

One is that we will be looking at a procedure, or rather the council is looking at filling the GAC seats, or rather the liaisons to the GAC. This might be of interest to any former council member, particularly someone with a lot of knowledge around how the GNSO and the GAC interfaces. So if there is any member who is so fitted, there might be an opportunity in this regard. The GAC liaison basically interfaces between the council and the GAC, and it's quite some heavy lifting.

We are beginning to see also some renewed interest with regards to SOI. It's looking like there might be some community approach to this, if the last ICANN meeting is anything to go by. And so council might definitely be discussing the interest of the GAC. And it seems the Board also [will] with regards the SOIs, and I believe that this is something that we would also want to keep our eyes open around.

There are a few other items that are listed on the council to-do list, but these ones I've highlighted are basically those I think would be of interest to the BC. Thank you, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Lawrence. At this point, I'll segue to a quick discussion of other council activities. Zak and Arinola, anything you want to update your colleagues on on what's going on in the Transfer Policy Working Group?

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: Hi, Steve. Nothing specific to report today other than: the grind goes on.

STEVE DELBIANCO: The grind. Okay, thanks, Zak.

The continuous improvement program. Nenad? Let's see if Nenad is on the call today. You are. Anything you want to report to us now, Nenad? Hello, Ninad?

All right, moving past that, the registration data request system. Steve Crocker and I represent the BC. He represents SSAC, but he's also a BC member on that. This was discussed extensively in San Juan, and a lot of you know, and at the BC open meeting in San Juan, it was open, and there was certainly a lot of raw nerves exposed from the registrar/registry community, who felt as if the CSG had gone too far at criticizing registrars for not responding or not disclosing with respect to requests that were made that were well-formed.

So some of that indignance was unjustified because I didn't see a single meeting where our side, the requester side, was, say, unduly harsh or rude. In fact, I think everybody went out of their way to recognize that registrars don't have to disclose, but that many of them have voluntarily participated. I've come to believe that they are under a lot of stress right now because they're trying to figure out how they're going to comply with NIS 2 by October. I saw a lot about that at the day zero event in Hamburg where a number of you were.

So it's possible that Michele or Volker are just really rubbed raw by having to comply with a lot of European government transposition of NIS 2, and they're taking it out on us otherwise. I

cannot understand the adverse reaction that we heard from members of the registrar community as we simply reported factually what we were encountering.

I think that we may have touched a nerve when we suggested that we provided information that was certainly adequate to justify disclosure. But in cases where it was privacy-proxy, they would simply say, look, it's already publicly disclosed. Well, it's not. The privacy and proxy are nowhere near responsive to a request that we make. That's a tricky one. They're under no obligation to use the system, and those who use it are under no obligation to disclose privacy-proxy.

So I'd love it if the BC had more insights. I'd like to open this up for a few minutes of conversation here about what do we do to maintain a great relationship with the registrars and contract parties as we continue to nudge them along to do a better job responding? Anyone?

MASON COLE: Steve, if I may.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Please

MASON COLE: Thanks, Steve. First of all, I want to point out we repurposed the CSG meeting in San Juan with a discussion strictly about RDRS, and it was open to the entire community. The thrust of the meeting was about user experiences, or requester experiences, as they relate to submitting requests to RDRS, where they've had successes, where they've not had successes, and constructive ideas for how to improve RDRS. Steve Crocker headlined that meeting as he's with you, Steve. He's sort of on point with the BC on RDRS. We had a lot of good learnings taken away from that meeting.   Unfortunately, contracted parties had a conflict schedule-wise, and we didn't have much participation from the contracted parties. But we emphasized the fact that that discussion needed to be constructive and cordial, and I think that we had that.

There was also a separate outreach on the contracted party side to the rest of the community about RDRS. I can't remember what day it was. I want to say it was Sunday. Chris Disspain chaired the meeting. I represented the BC in that meeting. We talked a bit about the problems that we have with RDRS, not only the fact that disclosures aren't really made in a complete and timely way, but the fact that the system is clunky, it's hard to use, it requires a lot of repetitiveness, et cetera.

I talked a bit about what we'd like to see next out of the DNS abuse amendments. We got some pushback from contracted

parties at that point about the fact that the ink wasn't dry on the current contract amendments as they relate to DNS abuse, and we're already asking for additional amendments.

But the point that I wanted to raise in that meeting and did is that with regard to systems like RDRS and problems like DNS abuse, the companies that we represent in the BC are suffering millions of dollars in losses as it relates to DNS abuse. And we don't have any more time to mess around with half solutions. We're here with constructive ideas about what to do to put solutions forward. And that's where we left the discussion.

I'm happy to say that the BC in general has good relationships with the Contracted Party House. We're going to continue those constructive discussions both in Kigali and before and after. And I encourage anyone in the BC who is interested in RDRS and in DNS abuse to continue contributing your constructive ideas to the BC leadership team so that we can represent those with contracted parties. It's going to be really critical that we have not just a gripe session, but constructive, thoughtful ideas that we can bring to the table to help not only our side, but help contracted parties meet our needs. So there you go.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Mason. Bartlett attended with NetChoice and I asked him objectively, did you hear anything that sounded like unduly critical from our side? And he looked at me like, "I don't know what

EN

they're talking about." So I still don't know what we said that turned the registrars so angry.

But let me turn next to Chris Lewis-Evans and then Marie.

CHRIS LEWIS-EVANS: Thanks, Steve and hi, everyone. So I think there was some really good constructive talk in the last one, and I think it would be good to continue that.

I think there's two things for me that stood out. So one is a top-three or a list of people we would like to see actually being on the system. A lot of the things I heard is a lot of the requests that we're making within the BC community are just from non-participating registrars. So I think it's a top-three or something that we would like to see added. And there was some promises from Ashley around trying to verbalize that and trying to get them signed up. I think that would be really beneficial, one, to get more people using it and also to be able to get better responses.

And then the second thing I've heard is around some of the uptake not happening, maybe being down to the sort of longevity of the system. Obviously it is only a test, but there's some concern that it might just go away. And I think having a good idea sooner rather than later of how long it will last and the fact it won't just go away and it'll be improved upon or an authentication system would be added too might help more use of the system.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Chris. Marie?

MARIE PATTULLO: Thanks, Steve. I can shed a little bit of light on what we apparently did wrong. I represented Mason at the informal GNSO Council meeting, which isn't a council meeting. The councilors are there together with the chairs of the various SGs. There was some comment made by a councilor who was not a contracted party councilor, which to my mind was a little disingenuous, saying, "But there were only comments from the requesters at this session." And I pointed out that's because it was a CSG session. But we also did some feather smoothing, agreeing that there are problems on both sides, there can be solutions on both sides. So what we should be doing is collecting issues from both sides, feeding them to the small team (so for us, that's to you, Steve and Steve Crocker) and having the small team put together a cross-community meeting where it is not a gripe session, but we can both talk about our issues now. We suggested doing that in … Where are we going? In Kigali. There was also a suggestion from Ashley that maybe that could be brought up and it could be done more rapidly via Zoom.

But this was part of what happened: it seemed to be, "Oh my goodness. The CSG had a session and we went there and they didn't check their agenda with us. "Well, we love you a lot, but the registrars don't check their agenda with us either." So I said that, but in very polite words. And I gave Ashley a hug and she didn't hurt me.

STEVE DELBIANCO: We have our next standing committee on Monday the 25th. There's one-hour sessions. In the one we had immediately after San Juan, there wasn't really a lot of venting by the registrars. I think they had calmed down a bit since then and we were all in our best behavior.

So you're right. I think the small team is every two weeks. We don't want to wait all the way to Kigali to address this.

Vivek and then Faisal and then I'll wrap this up. Vivek?

VIVEK GOYAL: Thanks, Steve. Well, the complaining didn't stop after the meeting and went on LinkedIn from a lot of contracted parties after that as well.

A few points. I think Marie said a lot of points I wanted to cover, but one thing I want to suggest as something that can help both the sides is that we heard from the contracted parties that a lot of

requests they got were incomplete or were not incorrect. But when those requesters reported those numbers, they said, "We did not get a response." And what the contracted parties said is that if they had filed it properly or if they had given the follow-up answers that were requested, the request would have been approved.

So in light of this, it will help if we can have a joint session or more like a training session from the contracted party side registrars where they say, "Okay, this is what I received, and if you had provided this information, this would have been approved, " or, "If you're selecting this option of why you're requesting, but provide, please, these options or these answers, then the chances of success are higher." That will save so much time and effort on both the sides and will improve our numbers on positive responses from them.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yeah, and they're allowed to reply that way, Vivek. The system includes the ability for the registrar to tell them," You're missing some essential information," or, "You need a subpoena," or, "You didn't give us what you needed." But they're not doing that right now, even in the system, and I don't know whether they're doing it with you bilaterally outside the system. Are you receiving any instructions from registrars to say, "Here's what I need"?

VIVEK GOYAL: Not outside the system. We are not. But what I also heard that they are also facing a lot of challenges from the system side on what they were promised the system would do and is not doing. So I don't know if it's a system issue or it's a process issue from their end, but since we are asking them or trying to figure out ways to improve the whole thing, maybe this is something that can help.

STEVE DELBIANCO: From the registrar side, it's just a ticketing system and it gives them a ping and then they have to go take care of the response. So I highly doubt that the registrars can use as an excuse that they don't like the way the system performs because from their perspective, it's just a reporting ticket. But I take your points. And I'm really glad to have you engaging deeply in this. If you have more thoughts to share with colleagues, anything you share in BC Private, Crocker and I will bring it into the Monday meeting [with the] small team. Thank you.

VIVEK GOYAL: [I will. Thanks].

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you. Faisal, you're last up and then we'll move on.

FAISAL SHAH: Well, I also thought that the meetings in San Juan were pretty productive and very constructive. I think the way I saw it and how we've seen historically how the registrars react is that if you actually call out the registrars by name, that seems to raise their ire. And there were a few instances where that was done, but it had to be done in order to explain what was happening.

So I think that that might have been what raised the temperature for them, and I don't know if there's any way to get around it because if we don't show examples, we don't actually call out some registrars. I'm not sure it's a disservice.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Faisal. And again, thanks to all the BC members who participated constructively in San Juan on this. Just keep it up and keep feeding us information. You could send me a private email if you want. If you have an answer to Chris Lewis-Evans' question about who are the top-three registrars that we wish would participate[,] we could try to charm our way in. And more than likely I would feed it into the small team call and leave it to the registrars to go maybe convince their own.

Okay, next up, subsequent rounds of expansion. Imran, we already talked about this. Imran and Ching. I'm turning next to Marie for CSG.

MARIE PATTULLO: Thanks, Steve. Team 14 is the first thing there. Now, as you know, we have a working group trying to figure out what went wrong last time when we, the Non-Contracted Party House (so CSG plus our non-commercial colleagues) nominated Chris, who is with us today. Hi, Chris. There were mistakes. Things did go wrong. We all know that. We missed the deadline and wasn't the first time. So this working group has three from the CSG, three from the NCSG. We're meeting once a month.

If anyone was involved in any of the discussions last time as to how we got to where we got to eventually in the summer [and] all of the problems we did have in agreeing on a nominee, please let me know (or anyone that's on the ExComm, please let me know) because we want this dialogue between us to figure out exactly what went wrong (not what we think went wrong from our side, but everyone) and see if we can figure out something that actually works and is agreed and is written down. So any experience you have with that process, please do let me know.

Now, as you know in … I'm sorry. I blanked. In San Juan (I nearly said in Kigali), we actually met face-to-face as the house. Not too many people showed up, but we did meet. It was constructive. We did agree on some stuff. We had asked Org to give us what we're calling a day zero, an extra day in Kigali. Unfortunately, they chose not to do that. So hopefully, Mason and Julf, who is the Chair of the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group, will be able to

persuade them to give us a day in Istanbul. It is important that we actually meet and speak. We're never going to get anywhere closer to body bridges if we don't do so.

The only other thing I want to do from the CSG side, Steve, if that's okay, is to congratulate Ching Chiao, who is now the CSG rep to the IANA Naming Function Review Team, IFR 2. So thank you, Ching Chiao, as always, for all the work you do.

And any questions, you know how to find me. Thanks.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Marie. I asked in the chat whether Chris Buckridge tended that. So Board seat 14 was a hot topic of the conversation that the CSG had with the NCSG.   And Marie is correct. It was a very congenial discussion, much better than previous ones. Some of that's owing to having Paul McGrady sort of being the mediator on this.   He's very skilled, very talented, at keeping things light, mediating effectively. And we contributed, I think, to the positive atmosphere by reminding the NCSG that the real solution for Board seat 14 is to make it into two Board seats. So the NCSG and the CSG each get a Board member.   That's something that we agree with.

And, Chris, you should know that the contract parties support the idea, too. Then they would get a seat for registrars and one for

registries. And that continues to be the way we'd love to proceed.

So I would ask, is there anything else? Questions for Marie on CSG?

Okay, I'll turn it back to Mason for the remainder of the agenda.

MASON COLE: Thank you, Steve. Any follow ups or questions for Steve before we move on to other agenda items, please? Faisal, is that an old hand or new hand?

FAISAL SHAH: That's an old hand. I'll take it down.

MASON COLE: Thank you. Okay, I'm going to insert an agenda item here before number three. And if I may, I'd like to call either on Vivek or Mia. And I did not prepare either of you for this contribution. So I apologize for putting you on the spot, but I understand there have been some developments with the NomCom that might be of interest to the BC, and particularly since we have two seats on the NomCom. And I wondered if you might update the BC on what we found out in San Juan and what we need to do to prepare for an update to the NomCom. Could I ask for a contribution, please?

VIVEK GOYAL: Sure. Maybe I'll start. And Mia, please add if I missed something. Because of the implementation of some new recommendations, there will be some change in the NomCom going forward. One is that all the non-voting members are going to become voting members. But the more important one that will impact us directly is that all members who are serving on the NomCom now will not be eligible to serve on the NomCom next year. So they want to start from a clean slate next year because of the term limits and the way the terms are going to work going forward. Every member appointing to the NomCom will be there for two years. So to figure out whether existing members continue and [or] they drop out and all that, they put in place this clean slate thing. So all of us who are on NomCom now will not be eligible to serve on the NomCom again next year.

Now, what this means is that everybody in NomCom will be new. So they have requested all constituencies that whosoever they appoint to the NomCom for next year should possibly have some experience in NomCom before so that they can contribute better., and it's not a fresh start for everybody who's there. That's, I think, very critical for us.

Mia, anything else you would like to add?

MIA BRICKHOUSE: Nope, you covered it. Thanks, Vivek.

VIVEK GOYAL: Okay.

MASON COLE: All right, Vivek. Mia, thank you very much. Vivek, what does that mean for BC selections to the NomCom coming up?

VIVEK GOYAL: So, like you mentioned, we have two seats there. I am termed out. So as it is for a small business seat, we definitely needed a new person. With Mia, this was her first time in NomCom, though it did not seem like that with way she contributed and brought value to it. But it will be very unfortunate that she will not be able to continue for a second term there.   So for next year, whomsoever we are planning to send to NomCom ideally should have had some experience in NomCom before. That will be ideal.

One thing I am not 100% sure now of (I've heard it, but not had time to check) is that next year some members in NomCom will get a three-year term, and some of them will get a one-year term. I want to repeat, I'm not sure of this. I've heard this but not had a chance to check on this. But that is, again, to make sure that, every time, there are some members for whom it's the second year in NomCom and for some members it's the first year. So I do not have clarity whether this is actually the case or on what basis

are they going to decide who will be there for three years and who's going to be there for one year.

So we are meeting again in April as a NomCom for an intercessional, and I will have more clarity on this when we meet in person. And I'll report back to BC. We'll report back to BC.

MASON COLE: Okay. Thank you, Vivek. That would be very important because, as you know, we fought pretty hard for those two seats to remain under BC administration, and we'd like an opportunity to contribute as much to the NomCom as we can. So it sounds like a bit of chaos on the NomCom side coming up, and we need to be prepared to fill those seats. So I agree with Marie in the chat that it's a worrying step, removing that level of expertise, particularly after you and Mia have contributed so extensively to the NomCom. But if you would keep the BC updated after your April meeting, that would be very welcome.

VIVEK GOYAL: Absolutely. Thank you much.

MASON COLE: Thank you, Vivek. Thank you, Mia.

All right, any follow ups on the NomCom issue before we move on?

Okay. Very good. All right, let's go to item number three on the agenda, which is a quick update from Tim Smith, our vice-chair for finance and administration. Tim was unable to make the meeting. He provided the ExComm with a brief update, which I will share with you now. And pardon me from reading from notes, but I want to make sure I don't miss anything.

First is that Tim is now in the process of bringing fiscal year 24 financial records up to date, which obviously will help us set our budget for fiscal year 25, which is coming up later this year. We're also required to post fiscal year 23 results and the FY 24 budget to the BC website for member information, which we will do. Has not been done at this point, but we will do shortly.

We made a couple of payments to vendors on outstanding items. That's not of particular interest, except to tell you that our accounts are in good order.

We have received payment from a number of new members, none of whom I think are on the call today, but I'll identify them anyway. And I'm going to have a hard time with one of these names, but Cosmin Elefterescu of Titan Research has joined the BC. Jeff Gabriel of Saw Technologies, Mark Daniel of Domain Holdings Groups, and Helmuts Meskonis, who we met in the last BC call and who was also in San Juan. He is of Domain Summit Limited. All are new BC members, and we should take an opportunity to welcome them when we can.

If you missed it, the March 2024 BC newsletter was published just in time for ICANN 79. Tim did a good job of putting that together, as you might have seen. So if you haven't had a chance to review that, I encourage you to take a look at it or ask for a copy.

And then finally, there are elections coming up. We have elections for a BC representative to the GNSO Council and, as we just discussed, our NomCom delegates. The nomination period will open, if my information is correct, here, on May 3, and will run until May 16. And that's a two-week period. The nomination period will be for two weeks, in line with the BC charter. So if you are interested in any of those roles, you're encouraged to either discuss those roles with ExComm in terms of what the expectations are, or if you're interested in the NomCom role, reach out to Mia and Vivek. Or if you're interested in the councilor role, obviously, you can speak to Mark or Lawrence or Marie, who was our most recent counselor before Lawrence assumed that role.

So that, I believe, is the update for item number three. Does anyone have anything else that I might have missed for finance administration, please? Jimson, please?

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Okay, thank you very much, Mason, and greetings, everybody. Well, I just want to get a clarification on something you mentioned. Maybe Tim will listen to this recording and provide

the clarification. It's with regard to, say, the publishing of our results, maybe a budget result on the website, maybe meant to the BC Private list, not the website. We don't publish our financial information on the website. Yes, maybe on the private list, just to be sure.

MASON COLE: Okay. Thank you for that clarification, Jipson. Sure. Okay. Thank you, Jimson. I appreciate that.

Any other updates on item number three for the agenda, please?

All right. Before we adjourn, any other business for the BC.

STEVE CROCKER: If I might.

MASON COLE: Oh, Steve. Yeah. Welcome to the call. Didn't know you were here. Go ahead, please.

STEVE CROCKER: Apologies. I had a conflict. I just finished a talk at [Cloudfuzz], which was exactly at the time of this meeting. I just wanted to mention the open session for requesters to comment on RDRS that we had in San Juan. Some notes are being prepared. I had thought that they would come out more quickly, but they'll be

EN

available next week. And I want to say great deal of appreciation for this group and for the IPC as well, the IPC constituency. The hosting by the Commercial Stakeholder Group was a very big help.

In any case, [it] just says this. I wanted to share that there are notes that will be coming out. The notes are based on the transcript. So there's zero information in there that isn't already available publicly. And the only purpose of the notes is to provide sort of quicker, easier-to-read summary, hopefully without any real bias. But one never knows sort of how much is tweaked in the process, but without any attempt to provide any bias on it.

MASON COLE: Steve Crocker, thank you very much. Questions or comments for Steve Crocker on this issue before we adjourn?

All right. Steve, thank you.

All right, Brenda, you have down on the agenda that our next meeting is April 4 at the normal time, correct?

BRENDA BREWER: That is correct, Mason. Thank you.

MASON COLE: All right. Very good.

All right. If there's no other business, then we will see you all in two weeks. Brenda, thank you for the support. Thanks for everybody who's contributed to the meeting today. And the BC is adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]