ANDREA GLANDON:	Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the Business Constituency Membership Call being held on Thursday, the 19th of September 2024 at 15:00 UTC. I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for recording purposes and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. As a reminder, those who take part in ICANN multi-stakeholder process are to comply with the expected standards of behavior. And with this, I will turn it over to our chair, Mason Cole. You may begin.
MASON COLE:	Thank you, Andrea. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. Mason Cole here, chair of the BC. Welcome to our call on 19th September. Good to have a good turnout on membership today. We've got a lot to cover as we usually do. The agenda for today is up on the screen. Are there any additions or updates to the agenda, please? All right, very good. We're going to get started because, as I mentioned, we have a lot to cover and we have only an hour. So, Tim is going to lead off on agenda item number two, finance and operations update. Tim, over to you, please.
TIM SMITH:	Hi, everyone. My report will not take too long today. We are just in the process of finalizing the FY 25 budget. We have a couple of recommendations from the Finance Committee that need to be reviewed by the ExCom, and we should have that finalized. The two

proposals are very, very close. So we're under the $50,000 mark for a budget for an expense budget for the coming year. So we should have that finalized very, very soon. Again, our revenues for this year from membership is going to be just under $30,000. So we are chipping away at our reserve. And of course, we like to have a two-year rolling reserve. So as we go through FY 25, we'll be trying to restrain ourselves wherever we possibly can. And going into FY 26, we will certainly be looking to have a balanced budget between expense and income so that we can maintain our reserve. So that's really it for that portion of the report.

I will tell you that one of the things that we have been working on, which you would never see, is our banking arrangements. And we have been working with Wells Fargo for the past number of years, and we will continue or plan to continue to work with Wells Fargo. But we are in the process of moving to a new bank account. The new bank account is more appropriate for non-profits and for international organizations such as ours. And that will enable the officers of the BC, regardless of whether they are located in the United States or elsewhere, to be able to manage the banking. So we should have that in place, I'm told, within about two weeks. So that's good news. And that will remove one of the complexities and burdens that we have had in the past.

Beyond that, you are being reminded that the BC officer elections are about to kick off. Nominations for the officers open on September the 20th. You have been sent the dates for the entire process. And there it is, right there before you. Thank you, Brenda. So September 20th is when nominations open, and obviously the candidate statement, and then the actual electronic voting goes October 18th, with

announcement on the 25th, and everybody gets seated January 1. And the roles, just as a reminder, are the BC Chair, the Vice Chair of Policy, Vice Chair of Finance and Operations, and our CSG representative. So look forward to seeing lots of nominations for those roles starting on September 20th. Again, the nominations close on October 3rd.

Beyond that, we have been looking for sponsors for an outreach for Istanbul in November. That has not been secured at this point. So I'll be following up on that to see whether that can be put in place. What I'll also be following up with a few people on is to see what kind of interest or audience there might be of potential new members to the business constituency in Istanbul. And if there does seem to be a warm reception to that, then we can consider holding one with or without a sponsor. However, again, with tight financials, if there doesn't seem to be a great upside for us with new potential members, then we likely will not hold an outreach in Istanbul.

MASON COLE: Tim, you've got a question from Steve in the chat there. Might be relevant.

TIM SMITH: Sorry, Steve. I don't have my chat open.

STEVE DELBIANCO: I asked you about the level of funding we were seeking as a sponsorship, and I'll share that Chris Wilson of Amazon and NetChoice, we co-sponsored the DC event, which was about $3,000 US.

TIM SMITH: Okay, thanks. Yeah, I really sort of anything to offset what it would actually cost out of pocket for the DC, but $3,000 would be great. Our event in Kigali actually cost us $5,000, rental of room and meals that associated we serve lunch. Now, the one thing about that was that we had about 50 people sign up for that, which was an extremely large number of people to buy lunch for. Happy to have 50 potential new members, no question. So I'm not giving you a direct answer to your question, but $3,000 to $5,000 would be in the level that we're looking for, for sure. So. Thanks for asking.

Beyond that, I guess the one thing that I would just like to mention is that because we have ICANN 81 coming up at the beginning of November, we need to be putting out a newsletter, which, of course, is a good promotional tool for the business constituency. And I'd like to have that out certainly before the 1st of November, which would put us about nine days before the event, and that would be ideal. So I'm looking for BC members to contribute in the form of newsletter stories, good success stories about your businesses and about the ecosystem of the Internet and the value of the business constituency. And with that, I'll take any other questions that you have.

MASON COLE: Thank you, Tim. Questions or follow-ups for Tim, please. Thank you. It looks like the queue is clear. Thank you for the good report and for all your good work, as always. All right. I'm sorry. We have a question from Imran. Imran, go ahead, please.

IMRAN: I want to submit an article for the newsletter, so where should I send it, to Tim or the Secretary?

TIM SMITH: Send it to me. Thanks, Imran. Yeah, anybody who has one, just send it to me. You have my email address. Thank you.

MASON COLE: Thanks, Imran. Anyone else for Tim, please? Okay, Tim, thanks very much. Let's go to item three, and the floor is yours, Steve, for the policy calendar update.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, everyone. Since our last call, we submitted three different comments, right? We submitted one on September 9th for the data processing spec for the registrars and registries, and Segunfunmi, Margie, and Steve Crocker did a great job on that drafting. And then, earlier this week, on Monday the 16th, we filed a really interesting set of comments on the IRP supplemental procedures. Chris Wilson drafted that. I did the editing and submission. And then, on the same day, we filed a one-sentence significance of support for a proposed ICANN fundamental bylaws amendment. And it suggests that if you're getting money through a grant program, you can't use the accountability mechanisms for disputes related to a decision about whether or not your application was granted. And that narrow scope satisfied the concerns we had expressed months ago, so we supported that. And the

IPC had given us the green light on that, and I believe they submitted the same.

And then, on the same day, we filed a one-sentence significance of support for a proposed ICANN and then finally on the 17th, on Tuesday of this week, we submitted a comment on ICANN strategic plan and operating plan framework. This runs to 11 pages. This is work by Tim Smith, Segunfunmi, David Snead, and then Jimson Olufuye, came in with some additions at the end. Thank you to the finance committee, Tim, for leading it. I think our comments were right on and we emphasize the priorities that the DC had. Thank you again.

All right, turning to the open public comments, there's two that I wanted to bring up. One is on the transfer policy review. And we know that Zak and Arinola lead the BC in terms of representing us on that working group. And they often give detailed reports. They are chairing the drafting team, which includes [Tess, Sven, and Rachel.] We have a comment period that closes on the 30th. So roughly by the 23rd or 24th of September, we want to get a draft into your hands for seven days of review. Zak and Arinola, let me turn to you about updating us on the status and see if you have any questions for your colleagues at this point.

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: Thank you, Steve. This is Zak. So an initial draft was circulated to the drafting team and the drafting team is going to be meeting immediately following this call to discuss it and to go over any suggestions or revisions to it. And anyone else who's not on the drafting team is of

course welcome to stay on the call afterwards. And if we're not able to stay on this particular line, then just shoot me your email address and I'll send you the link to a Teams meeting that we'll shift to afterwards for a brief discussion. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Any questions for Zak and Arinola on this? Thank you. The second open public comment period is for another round of draft sections that ICANN is publishing on the applicant guidebook for the next round. So we, for instance, filed on that in terms of the SubPro back in March. And what this is is a series of yes and no questions. In other words, staff proposes the language for sections of the guidebook and they simply ask yes or no. Does the proposed language, is it consistent with the relevant SubPro final report recommendations? Because they're not inviting us to say we disagree with the recommendations, simply inviting us to say, does the language implement the recommendations? So for that, I think it's really important for us to work with Imran, Hassan, and Ching Chiao who represent us on the IRT for SubPro, since you will know best what was in the language. And so I would look to you again to give me your indication of yes, yes, no, no, no, whatever it is. And if there's a no, we need an explanation. And with your help on that, it should be very easy for us to be able to publish and get that out to our colleagues prior to the 21st of October, which is the due date for that comment. Ching and Imran, anything to add on that? Imran?

IMRAN: Yes, we will do the comment before the time.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Imran. All you and Ching have to do is give me yeses and noes. And if there's a no, we need to understand what we'd say, what is the problem? What is the way in which the language differs from the recommendation? Okay, thank you. And then finally, we always talk about NIS2 transposition by the European Union member states. Sven and Marie have been our leads on that. And Mason has been the one who's gladly taken up the pen to help to advance comments to member states as they consider transposition. We have a new sort of a challenge in front of us, though. There's a cooperation group within the EU, the NIS2 cooperation group, and they have just published, I think this week, their recommendations for how to implement NIS2 Article 28, which is kind of interesting because, well, a few member states have already implemented it, and yet these recommendations are here. And I wanna bring up that document and let Mason, Marie, and Sven point out some things in there that are probably gonna be of concern to the BC. So let me change the share, put that up for you.

For instance, the verification process starts off pretty strong. Email address and phone number. But all they're asking is that they are syntactically validated, and by operationally verified, you have to figure out exactly what that means. It should be proper format, telephone number in the proper format. That after the syntactic, and they do a risk-based approach to determine them at the time of registration or renewal. There is a discussion of methods, but it's not very prescriptive. And Mason, I will turn to you to lead us through this, and then I was gonna go to the section on access, which is probably more troubling to us. Go ahead.

MASON COLE: Sure, thanks, Steve. So yes, we've been watching this closely, and I will say on the whole, the output on the implementation on the part of the coordination group is positive for the BC. There are some areas of concern that we need to continue to address. As you mentioned, Steve, we've been addressing these jurisdiction by jurisdiction, or European member state by European member state. And every time a member state opens a consultation, where warranted the BC will weigh in on its recommendations for how article 28 of NIS2 should be transposed and implemented in that member state.

But as you mentioned, there are a couple of areas that we do need to follow up on. For example, we had hoped for the idea that there would be rigorous verification of registrant data for domain name registrations. We sort of got that in that they're recommending that registration data be syntactically accurate and operationally accurate, syntactically meaning that, for example, an email address is in the correct format that an email address would be in, and a phone number would be in the, it would be correctly formatted in the registration record. Now, the downside of that, of course, is those may not be working email or phone number addresses for the actual registrant. So it's a bit of a hollow verification process. It's better than nothing, but we need to keep pushing.

So as you mentioned, there is identification of a risk-based method for further validating domain names that appear to be risky. That's not particularly prescribed in terms of how to go about it or how often those verifications should take place. Again, it's a step in the right

direction, but we do need to keep pushing on European authorities to be more rigorous in terms of the WHOIS database.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Mason, let's stop there and take hands, first from Steve Crocker and then Margie.

STEVE CROCKER: Thanks very much. Two things. I haven't seen this, but I want to see it. Where's the URL for it or something? Can you put it in the chat?

STEVE DELBIANCO: It's attached to my policy calendar, first of all. So you have the PDF and then we will find a URL that we can link to.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you. Just sort of as a leading sort of teaser. So we have a system for describing the levels of verification and it matches pretty much this language. Our scale goes from zero to three, zero meaning don't do any checking, one is syntactic checking, two is operational checking, and three is the identity checking. So we can translate all of this verbiage into a very straightforward and fairly accurate rendition of this in just a few check marks, if you will. And we have some tools for being able to compare different policies. And so we can represent what's said here. We can't do the rechecking and so forth, but get the guts of it and then put that on the shelf and be able to compare that to any other representations of what the rules are.

MASON COLE: Steve, you might want to also note that they are suggesting right in the middle of the screen that it's supposed to be based on best practices within the industry. And so it would be better to advance what Edgemoor and yourself, what you guys have come up with and advance it early on so that we're in the conversation about industry best practices and then persuade at least one registrar or one entity to adopt that protocol that you're speaking of so that we can point to it as part of best practice.

STEVE CROCKER: Yeah, so sort of a brief statement. We make a sharp distinction between accurate representation of what the policies are versus advocacy for policies. Both are important. Our strong suit is the representation, but the intent of that is to make it possible to be very precise about what's being advocated either by us or by somebody else. So I just want to plant that as a critical piece of the thought process.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you. Margie.

MARGIE MILAM: Hi, everyone. This is Margie. I had a chance to look at this, and I actually think it's a strong win for the BC and for the interests of fighting against an inaccurate WHOIS and a DNS abuse. And the reason I say that is that it seems to go beyond what NIS 2 requires, in that it talks about suspending domain names when there's inaccurate information. They

give a grace period for the registrant, and there's specific language related to when a domain name is used for abuse. So if you look at that, in the case of domain names used for malicious purposes, prompt action to be taken to remove the domain name or deactivate the domain name. So this is both WHOIS and DNS abuse takedowns. And in my view, that's a significant recommendation that we should hope very strongly that it gets adopted across the board.

And Steve's right that they've adopted the methodology related to accuracy that ICANN has been using for years. As many of you may recall, I was on ICANN staff years ago, and I helped shape some of the surveys that were done, you know, whatever, it must have been 10 plus years ago. But that was the methodology that was used at that time. It was operational accuracy. It was syntactic accuracy. And then the final step was identity verification. And that's actually called out in these recommendations. But it looks like the European Union is being very targeted in that the identity verification gets triggered when there's when this risk-based approach identifies, you know, suspicious domain names. And that's what we've been talking about for years at the BC about the fact that sometimes there's patterns of abuse that are seen and that the industry should be looking at those patterns of abuse. And now that's being reflected in the guidelines. So this is, in my view, a huge win. The operational verification is more than just syntax. The phone has to actually work. So this goes beyond what even ICANN requires today of the registrars and the registries, because right now the obligation is to verify one or the other. And there is no requirement to do more if the domain names involved in DNS abuse or malicious activities. So this is great. And I think the BC should encourage the rest

of the member states to take a look at this and update their implementation to the extent that they may have already adopted laws that didn't take this into account.

STEVE DELBIANCO: So Mason, I'm thinking about subsequent letters that the BC would send to member states that are considering transposition. We've done that for several states so far. But I believe the next one we do could be modified to incorporate references to parts of this coordination recommendations that we think are excellent.

MASON COLE: Yeah, I agree with that. I also agree with Marty's direction on follow up communication with member states and with member states who've already implemented. So the BC should expect to see more of that.

STEVE DELBIANCO: What do you what are your thoughts on the access part turning away from accuracy for a moment?

MASON COLE: Oh, yeah. So there are recommendations here about who can legitimately access domain name registration data. And you see there where Steve has highlighted item number two about designation of it says member states might also designate other public authorities and private entities. And there could be also identification of others who have an interest in DNS outcomes like IP owners and other legitimate

access seekers. That's a step forward. Again, that definition may not be as inclusive as we'd hope for it to be because, you know, we'd like enumeration of say cybersecurity authorities and others that that have a stake in in combating DNS abuse.

Item number three talks about access seekers getting the data and not just the information, not just a reply about whether or not the data will be provided or not, but the actual data within a 72 hour time period. We've pushed for 24 hours for years now, but 72 seem to be codified in the last round of edits of NIS2 and that kind of thing. So we do we do at least have a defined time period for when the data could be returned. And then, as you see, an item number four toward the bottom there, Steve, when the request is urgent for whatever reason, the data should be returned within 24 hours. So Margie's correct. We've made some real strides forward on this. We still have a bit of work to do. And that's where the BC is going to be focused here for the next several weeks leading up to and after the implementation deadline, because there will be jurisdictions that miss the October 18th deadline.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yeah. So as your policy vice chair, I would suggest that without objections, if there are no objections, your BC ExCom will incorporate the best recommendations from this into communications that we might do as follow ups to nations that we've already written to, as well as new communications where we encourage Article 28 adoption. We can now point to guidelines that Marie says will be considered, quote, persuasive to member states. I hope that's the case. Any objections to that as a going forward, you'll have the opportunity to review what it is

we're proposing to submit. And we probably should do a template one rather than have every single nation be subject to seven days of BC approval. Okay, any other questions on this document?

I'll go back and share the policy calendar. And go down to channel two, which is council. We've already discussed what happened back on the 8th of August. So turning now to Mark Lawrence and Vivek, since you're in the hot seat here, the next council meeting is today at 5:00 UTC. That means the next council meeting already happened. I've highlighted here a handful of agenda highlights that we called out to folks, and I would invite you to tell us how things went at the council meeting today.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE ROBERTS: I wanted Mark to take a stab at it, since he's on the call, but to start with, I'll just take this first issue and yield the floor to Mark, which was a very healthy debate around the accuracy scoping team. We resolved and voted to defer *[inaudible]* down recommendation 1 and 2 for another six months to allow for us to be able to observe what happens around NIS2 and the impact it could have on registration data. With that, we are still able to keep the issue of accuracy on the front burner. There was also a second clause around accuracy, which required which leadership of the council proposed, and their proposal was for the council to reach out to ICANN Legal to find out if there was anything that could bar further work around accuracy. We felt that a few of us, especially the councilors within the CSG, mobilized and worked together to ensure that whatever advice was coming from Legal wasn't an advice on the process, because they could typically use that to stop further work, but just to give us their overview of what the ecosystem is, how

the ecosystem is reacting, especially to NIS2 and all the works. That also was adopted.

We had a healthy debate around the small team that was intended or is intended to take up the role of the accuracy scoping team. There were members of council who felt that a small team of councilors will be too limited to take a decision on such a wide topic of interest. I also mentioned during the Council meeting that we had members, we had some of our members who were also interested in participating in such a small team and so possibly we could look at a small team that was not just limited to councilors. There was definitely some opposition to the talk of a small team doing this, so we don't have anything concrete in that direction. In terms of if it will be open to external, to the community, there was talk about the GAC also having interest in the issue, I mean in the topic of accuracy and might want to participate in such a small group, but at the moment the discussions are such that questions that were posed, I mean a small team of volunteers will first of all start by looking at some—

STEVE DELBIANCO: Lost Lawrence there. Mark, do you want to jump on the Latin diacritics, please, while we wait for Lawrence to come back.

MARK DATYSGELD: Thank you very much, Steve. So as some of you might know, this is my next big ticket item on the Council and we had a round of public comments that was actually pretty successful. Over 40 comments received, the vast majority in favor of advancing this issue as a policy

development process, and in this case, the aim is for a very tight, very well-scoped PDP, one that addresses this issue in particular, which you may recall particularly has affected .Quebec, but in fact is something that affects any business, any NGO, any actor that is from a Latin-speaking country. So what is being sought here is that there is the ability to own a pair of TLDs, one containing diacritics and the other in ASCII, which currently ICANN potentially forces the applicant to need to choose or be in a string contention set. So moving ahead, we have a draft charter already drafted by staff, it's a pretty good one on top of that. And what we will seek in the upcoming meeting is to get this draft charter approved. With that, we would be able to proceed in a timely manner to a PDP and by the time I'm termed out on Council, I wouldn't leave this task behind, so that has been my priority to actually get this out of the Council. So this looks pretty good, looks like it will be timely for the next round of gTLDs, so pretty interesting development on that front, especially given the very significant positive reaction from the community.

On top of that, about singular and plurals, the way that this is being handled is a little bit strange in the sense that the small team plus finished their work, they delivered it and now we are trying to reconcile how that aligns with board expectations. So from the board side, if an application is made, it can be sent together, it can be bundled with an alternative application within it and let's say you have string A, if it fails, you can fall back to string B. Clarity is being sought now on what exactly that means in terms of how those applications would unfold and what it means to actually bundle these different strings together. It seems that what the board is seeking is if the strings are identical or near identical

or what exactly that means is yet to be fully explained. So hopefully all of these different processes work together in conjunction now that the GNSO Council is working better with the board, they have been more cooperative. So those are pretty good signs in terms of continuity of work on the GNSO Council with the board, but we are still carefully looking into not getting surprised again by their decisions. So on my side, that would be that. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Mark. Do we have Lawrence back? And Lawrence, would you like to finish up where you were on the accuracy elements?

LAWRENCE OLAWALE ROBERTS:Yes. I was at a point where a team of volunteers within council are supposed to frame some questions together and pose these to the community. Leadership have already drafted something, so that's what we will be working on. And after that is done, that would also give council some time to decide what kind of team or what kind of process would look at evaluating those questions and trying to do some further work after we get feedback from ICANN Legal. There's no time frame for this yet, but hopefully this will just keep the wheels moving and not cause the accuracy agenda to be put into the backburners.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Lawrence, just for background, is the reason that ICANN Legal has to give us the go-ahead, is that because contract parties and NCSG are

EN

claiming that council is not allowed to talk about accuracy? Is that what this is, a blocking mechanism?

LAWRENCE OLAWALE ROBERTS: Yes. So there is that talk that within ICANN land, the scoping team cannot get the information that they have requested for, for legal reasons. So I believe that one of the major things that council wants Legal to determine is also going by the needs to the new developments in the ecosystem, if there is now grounds for further work to be done around accuracy, we are trying to ensure that we guide that process. When I'm saying we, that's especially the CSG councilors, to ensure that whatever advice comes from Legal isn't advice that stalls the process. So we've said that whatever Legal will provide, it shouldn't be their opinion, such that we now have the contractor parties focused on that opinion, but they should just give some advice on what's happening in the ecosystem.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Got it. Okay. Do we have any questions for Lawrence, for Mark, or Vivek? Great, not seeing any, I'll move ahead to some other council activities. We have a continuous improvement program, and we had [Nenad] talk a little bit about it on our last call. Any updates for today? I don't see [Nenad] on the line. So I'll skip to the next one, which is the RDRS. Steve Crocker and I represent the BC on that group. Our last call was previous Monday. I had suggested that we ought to do sessions in Istanbul, both from the standing committee that we serve on and the CSG, to figure out where the current status is and where we go for the

next several months on the RDRS. I brought up something I've discussed with all of you, is the importance of the Article 28 transposition, because it has both disclosure and accuracy requirements, and now we have the coordination group to point to. And I indicated that, for full disclosure, that the BC and its representatives on council would continue to look for ways to set up a small team or a standing committee to keep an eye on transposition. Naturally, the registrars pushed back on that, but I wanted to be sure they knew where we were going. I do not think the registrars will hold that roundtable event like we did in the tent in Kigali. Sarah Wyld, for example, will not be attending with Tucows in person. So I don't think they'll do that event. But I do think we will have a standing committee event, and hopefully, and this, Marie, I would turn to you to see whether the CSG is interested in doing an event in Istanbul.

Steve Crocker then brought back a familiar refrain, is that the RDRS is not really measuring anything of consequence to the requester community. It is really not fit for purpose, since there is no requirement for disclosure, even if we provide legitimate means. And the registrars that do participate are basically saying, look, it's privacy proxy, that's all you're going to get, that's all we're going to do. Marie, thank you for answering. See whether CSG would be interested in doing something and make sure they understand that the registrars are not going to be doing their roundtable event. Okay. Thank you.

On SubPro, we've discussed a little bit about that with Imran and Ching, because you're going to help us on determining the BC draft response. PPSAI, our attendees are already transferred over to that call, it occurs

at the same time as our call, and then I will turn to Marie to talk to us about CSG. Go ahead, Marie.

MARGIE MILAM: Thank you. Apologies for being late, I was tied in another meeting. Conscious of time, what I would say the most important thing that I've mentioned before, but Saturday, 9th of November, half past five through half past six, come and meet Turkish Industry, please. The invitation is being drafted by the Turks, and we will share it with you all as soon as we can. It will be in the venue, so nobody will have to worry about where to meet or how to get there. Please do come if you can. On a more substantive point, you know that we have a working group that is trying to smooth out the process for how the entire NCPH, the Non-Contracted Parties House, appoints our board representative. That's called Board Seat 14. Now, not now, but you will see in attachment to the policy calendar are the draft recommendations that we're working on, basic agreements on when we should start, when we should actually start rolling the process out, how we conduct interviews and what have you. The details are still to be worked out, but what we're thinking at the moment is that the so-called search committee, we'll make it another name, we're calling it that for now, will have a representative of three from the non-commercials, three from us, which of course means one from each of the CSG constituencies, plus an alternate, so a max of 12.

sI would say, as a personal opinion, that I would assume the chair would be involved in the interviews, and at the moment it seems that they're coalescing around the idea of the search committee also conducting the

initial interviews. I question that, but it seems that most people think that's what should happen, so I would point out to the chair that they may well be co-opted into the search committee in particular because I really think that you should be in the interviews at that stage. Whether or not that search committee has a wider scope, as you see, is still being discussed. If anybody has any comments on this, it's less than one side of A4, it's easy to read, you know where to find me, I'd be very, very grateful for your feedback.

The only other point I'd say, you already know all of the draft agenda meetings we think we're having, or are having in Istanbul. There will also be a meeting between us, the entire CSG, and the PSWG, which is code for the law enforcement people of the GAC. That will be somewhere in the week starting the 21st of October. We don't yet have the date. It will last for an hour, but as soon as we know the date, we will tell you all. Thanks, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Marie. Any questions for Marie from BC members? I'm not seeing any hands right now, so thank you, Marie. Mason, back to you.

MASON COLE: Thank you, Steve. Excellent overview, as always. Lots of issues in play, and we've got some work to do ahead of us. We are ahead of schedule on our meeting, folks, so let me go to item four, which is AOB. Any business to be raised for the BC right now, please? Okay. I don't see any hands. Two reminders. One is we will meet again on October 3rd at our usual time, and that leads me into the other reminder, which is that will

be the tail end of the nomination period for BC officers. We do have a couple of roles that are in need of a candidate, so if you are interested and would like to speak to any current ExCom member about what is involved in being on the ExCom and what the specific duties of a role might be, I encourage you to get in touch with us. We'd be glad to help out. Other than that, again, next meeting is October 3rd, and Andrea, is there anything else to add from the org side before we adjourn?

ANDREA GLANDON: No, nothing that I can think of. Thank you, Mason.

MASON COLE: Thank you. All right, ladies and gentlemen, we will see you in two weeks' time. Andrea, thank you for the support, and the BC is adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]