
ICANN83 | PF – GNSO: BC Membership Work Session
Wednesday, June 11, 2025 – 15:30 to 17:00 CEST

BRENDA BREWER

Hello and welcome to the BC Membership Work Session on 11 June 2025. My name is Brenda, and I am the participation manager for this session. Please note this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN expected standards of behavior and the ICANN community anti-harassment policy. If you would like to speak during this session, please raise your hand in Zoom. When called upon, virtual participants will be given permission to unmute in Zoom, and on-site participants will use a physical microphone to speak. Please state your name for the record and speak at a reasonable pace. And I will now hand the floor over to Mason Cole, BC Chair.

MASON COLE

Thank you. Thank you, Brenda. Good afternoon, everyone. Mason Cole here, Chair of the BC. Good to have you in the room here in Prague. Brenda, if you would, yeah, thank you very much. The, yeah, okay, that's the agenda as it stands, right, after we took Ching's presentation out, okay. So, the updated agenda is now on the screen. Ching Chiao was to give a presentation. He's now unable to make the meeting. So, we may have a short, we may have a short BC meeting today just because I don't think Tola is on the line either, but I see that Segunfunmi is. So, in terms of the agenda, we have Elisa Busetto here on my right, who's going to give us a

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.

presentation on the new gTLD program. If Tola joins, we'll have a quick finance and operations update. And then, Segunfunmi, who is participating remotely, will do our regular policy calendar review as well. We have 90 minutes. I suspect we won't probably need all of that, all the better. So, are there any updates or additions to the agenda, please? I had one request under AOB, I believe. So, we will, was that Paolo that wanted to do that? Well, we'll come to that. Okay. So, any updates to the agenda, please? Okay. Very good. Alisa, welcome to the BC. Thank you for joining us. I understand that you have a presentation for us on the status of the new gTLD program and you're available for questions afterwards as well. Oh, Lars is doing the talking? I'm sorry. Okay. Good. Lars, take it away.

LARS HOFFMANN

I'll do my best. I'll be short. I suspect some of you may have heard me give some of this presentation already. If you want me to elaborate, I can go on for a long, long, long time, but I will start off with not doing so unless you make me. Brenda, can I see the next slide, please? So, we'll give a quick overview of the applicant guidebook, applicant journey. We have a couple of slides that we also share with the brand registry group, so that may be of interest to your members. I will go through those very quickly. Look here at number six in the end, kind of the differences to 2012, but I think I'll spend the 10 minutes or so I'll try on the applicant journey. If you interrupt me, please, at any moment with questions, there's no problem at all and then we can dig deeper into any topics that you would like more information on. The next slide, please, Brenda,

and one more. Thank you. This is the general overview on the guidebook here. Just a couple of highlights who can apply. The answer is legal entities, corporations, organizations, institutions, governmental, non-governmental, and intergovernmental organizations can apply to the TLD program, individuals cannot. The period for the applications will open according to our planning that hasn't changed in the last two years, in full 2026. The window will open for 12 to 15 weeks. That number will nail down with the final adoption of the AGB at the very latest, but the policy says that's the timeframe, so it'll be anywhere in between those dates at that time. The application fee, I think, has been communicated first during the Kigali meeting last year, \$227,000. There's additional conditional fees as well. Elisa, would you mind pasting in the chat a link to the slides deck that has the fee slides on it as well, because we didn't include them. So you have more details on that as well. There's also an FAQ around fees available on the website. And then how will applicants apply? There's an application system that we are in the process of building. It's a very complex system, as you can imagine. You'll see that in a moment when I'll show the applicant journey. This system we expect to be ready for internal testing at the end of this year, very early in January. We hope to share that with the community kind of in a form of demonstration during the Mumbai meeting in March next year. Tools and training courses, I'm going to say, sorry, will also be provided in the run-up to the opening of the round. The next slide, please, Brenda. Thank you. So this one here is our big overview of the applicant journey from the very left of the applicant submission

to the very right of the delegation process. I will take this apart in three different slides to go over this, but we want to show this as a big picture as well. I appreciate that it's difficult to read, especially on the screen. But yeah, we thought it's important to show that in one big flow. I said that before in other presentations, this is not the path that every application will take. It depends on the type of the application, whether it's in contention or not, for example. But in principle, these are the various steps that an application could go through from submission to delegation. And I'll put that into chunks if you want. So I'll start off on the next slide, please, Brenda, with the period from the submission to the prioritization draw. So submission period, 12 to 15 weeks. Then we'll have probably around 56 days we have up there. So that's seven weeks, eight weeks, even eight times seven. For the administrative check and the reveal day preparation, payment periods are also due to that period and that time still, et cetera, et cetera. Then we'll have the reveal day, which is the day that all the public facing information for the applications will be published. If you look at the applicant guidebook, you'll see all the questions that are going to be asked to applicants that are contained in the annex. And that annex also tells you which answers to those questions will be published and which will remain confidential. This is mainly due to privacy reasons, as you can maybe imagine. On reveal day, we then have a two week period to use your replacement string, which is one of the things that is different from the last round. Applicants have the ability in the next round to submit, in addition to the applied force string, a replacement string. String does not have to be related to

the applied force string. It can be a different string type as well. And then the concept here was developed essentially by the board and the GAC, resulting from a GAC advice that was, I think, also issued in Kigali last year. And it's a compromise from that process, this replacement string concept. Anybody, as I said, can submit a replacement string. Anybody can use the replacement string, whether they are in contention with another string or not on reveal day. And really, that just means there's an identical string at that moment, if you'd be in contention with. But even if you're not, you can still change your string. There's two conditions around that, which is A, you can't use it if somebody else applied for your replacement string. So then you can't use your replacement string because you shouldn't be allowed to join a different contention set or create a contention set. Similarly, if somebody else has picked the exact same replacement string, again, you cannot use that. So also to avoid that potentially both pick it and then create a new contention set.

MASON COLE

Lars, we have a question over here, please.

VIVEK GOYAL

Hi, quick question. On the replacement string, will all the replacement strings be then revealed again at the end of 14 days? Or as they replace?

LARS HOFFMANN

So on reveal day, the first yellowed hexagon, it's not really a hexagon, but that's the best I can do, will be revealed the applied for string of every applicant and also the replacement string, it's part of the public facing information. So you can see what everybody else has applied for and also what the potential replacement string would be. Based on the availability, if there are matches or not, you're allowed to use your replacement string, if nobody else has applied for that or has used it as a replacement. Then you confirm to ICANN in the system whether you want to, I said you do nothing, and maintain your applied for string or the way you want to switch it to your replacement string. Then we get to what we call here string confirmation day, and that moment, that's 14 days later, the strings are then locked in. So either you have used your replacement string, and then that's your new applied for string, or you have not and you maintain your originally applied for string, and you cannot use your replacement string at any time later in the process. That's not possible.

VIVEK GOYAL

So suppose the 14 days starts and after two days somebody tells ICANN that I want to use my replacement string, that information will only be available to the world only after the 14 days end and everybody's locked. So there's like another revealed day.

LARS HOFFMANN

Apologies. Yeah, I didn't understand. That is correct. So in that period you will not know whether somebody has or has not done that. Thank you. Very good question actually.

Then we get to string confirmation day, everything is locked in, and then a couple of processes kick off. Actually Brenda, could I see the next slide already? You'll see here the purple is still there, that is on the previous slide. And on the top you see also the yellow at the very top, which is prioritization draw, that takes place after string confirmation day. And what also kicks off right afterwards are two, I think, important processes of the program. The first is here in light green, the string evaluation. So this is essentially the string similarity evaluation. My colleague gave a presentation on this this morning. Some of this is very technical and above my pay grade, but it is something that will take place during a period. The length of that evaluation will depend on the amount of strings an application will receive. As you can imagine, all the strings will be compared to one another. So if you have—Kathy Kleiman estimated 20,000 applications, I'd take on a bet on that. I think it's going to be fewer than that. In any case, if there's 20,000 applications, obviously to compare them to one another, that's going to be a lot quicker than if you have 500 applications comparing them to one another. So that time period is a little bit vague, and we'll know that obviously once we have the number. The purple period below, that's a predetermined time frame. This is what we call the community input and objections period. These are four different processes, which is the applicant comment

period, the GAC early warning period and the objections period. All three of those will last a concurrent 90 days. Applicant comments can be provided by anyone about an application. The input there can be taken into account by applicable evaluators. The GAC early warning can be issued by an individual GAC member, by any individual GAC member or by a group of GAC members. The application cannot be stopped by an early warning. But we see in the last round that sometimes that has led to GAC advice. And so what happened in 2012 as well is that applicants usually engaged with the GAC member to see how their concerns can be addressed to then move forward without any further concerns or the possibility of the threat, if you want, of GAC advice coming on later on. The objections can be made by those with standing. There's different forms of objections. You can see the details in the draft guidebook. Those will be adjudicated by an independent panel dispute resolution provider. And we are, in fact, in the process of the RFP already out. Oh, we're already in the process of making the decision. You see, that's how on top of things I am. And then we also have the singular and plural notification period. So there anyone can notify, I can, that they believe that two strings represent the same word. Single and plural form of the same word in the same language. There's some documentation required around that when they send the notification to I can. And if that is verified, then those strings will be put into contention.

And that brings us to the light yellow. What follows after that is contention resolution. So string similarity has occurred. There's

objection processes to these. There's also string confusion objection process to this. So once that has run its course and once the singular plural period has run its course, we'll have the final set of contention sets at that moment. And those applications that are not in contention will move, in fact, directly to the next slide, which the application applicant review. We'll see that in a moment. But those that are in contention will then move to contention resolution. The board has resolved that in the next round there is no private resolution, which means that applicants have to resolve contention either through an I can auction or through the community priority evaluation. The exception to that rule are brand applicants. Per policy, brands are allowed at that moment to change their string to a different string to escape or evade contention. They can only do so by adding a word to their originally applied for string. And they can only do so if that new string does not create a new or joins an existing contention set. So the brands can really only do that to move out of contention. If they do not, then their change request for a new string would be denied.

STEVE CROCKER

This new rule that they can't resolve their contentions privately, what happens if they actually just go off in the corner and make a private deal and one of them drops out? How do you know?

LARS HOFFMANN

Thanks, Steve. It's a good question. We discussed it with the IRT as well. The guidebook clearly describes what is not allowed, which is

not just not making a deal, but it's actually a blackout for communications. So they're not allowed to communicate with one another if you find yourself in contention. And there's a list of possible repercussions that ICANN can take if they are found to be not aligned with that rule.

STEVE CROCKER

This will be interesting.

LARS HOFFMANN

I cannot disagree. The next slide, please. So once contention is resolved, either through an auction, and just a quick side note, the auction methodology in the next round will be the same as during the last round. So it's ascending clock, second price auction. The application either has not been or has prevailed in the contention, will then move here to the light blue. Now it's a lot of blue, but anyway, the square box, which is the application and applicant evaluations. The applicant evaluation, you see that in the bullets below, is the background screening and financial operational evaluation. And the application evaluation are dependent on what type of application it is. And this is an comprehensive list of all of those evaluations. You can discern yourself here. Obviously, if you're not a brand TLD, you will not have to undergo spec 13. And if you are not found to be a name collision high risk string, you will not have to submit a mitigation plan that will not be evaluated, et cetera, et cetera. But these are the evaluations that could take place during that period. And once the applicant has passed these

evaluations, we then move on to contracting. We expect that to take about 90 days and then post-delegation, sorry, post-contracting. And then the delegation follows after that. Overall, I will add this very quickly. And I'm not sure what the timeline is in the guidebook, but I think it is. We estimate based on this flow and the various processes that an application kind of moves through this whole process smoothly. We call it the golden path internally, so you're not in contention. There's no GAC advice on your application. There's no objections. We think that if we receive around 2,000 applications, that this journey from submission window to a delegation will take about 15 months. But we understand, or as everybody understands, that especially contention, which a GAC advice could extend that period quite significantly. Just one point here. I'm not sure I mentioned that before maybe during the GAC. There is the prioritization draw that really just comes in at this moment. So string similarity review happens for all strings at the same time. There's no priority there. And then if you're in contention or not, that determines whether you go through contention resolution or the application prioritization. The higher number could in theory mean that you delegated later. Just for those who were there in 2012, we actually looked at, there was a lot of discussions with the IRT around the prioritization draw, we looked a little bit at the relation between priority number and delegation in 2012 and it turned out that the relationship was ten years at best because a lot of applications received GAC advice, had objections, etc., etc. So there was no real curve of like the lower the number, definitely the earlier delegated.

It really essentially depends on whether or not your application is in contention, is subject to objections or subject to GAC advice that is a much bigger implication or impact on the delegation timing than the priority number in itself. This brings me to the end of this section of the applicant journey. It took a little bit longer than I thought I would. We're going after this into some issues around brands and something else, sorry, the trademark protection and financial operation evaluations. But I'll pause here for a moment to see if there's any more questions on the journey or any of the processes that I described. Thanks, Mason.

I'll go through these next slides quite quickly. So Brenda, if I can have two more slides. So the trademark protections in the next round, similar to what happened in 2012, we had the RPM, rights protection mechanisms, PDP that had some recommendations that are applicable to the next round that have been implemented in the applicant guidebook. Brenda, one more slide, please. The trademark clearing house obviously will be part of the next round again. Sunrise services, trademark claim services, abuse case management look probably similar to many of you who were around in 2012. On the next slide, Brenda, please, there's different claims that can be run here obviously too. Again, these are not necessarily innovative. The URS UDRP and the TDDRP, one of my favorite acronyms here, trademark post delegation dispute resolution procedure, these apply more or less in the same way, I think in the same way than they did in 2012. Two more slides, Brenda, please. A couple of evaluations here that may be of

interest. So the first is spec nine. This is the code of conduct exception evaluation. So if an RRO registry essentially comes down to being a brand and if they are essentially planning to not offer this as a public TLD but using it for themselves or their affiliates and it is not a generic term, their brand name. Then they get the spec nine exemption. This is existing already for current TLDs and that will be added in a similar way and assessed in a similar way for the next round as well. The next slide, please, goes to spec 13. Thank you, Brenda, which is the brand eligibility evaluation. This also comes in, by the way, for the brand string change option. So it's not sufficient, maybe to no one's surprise, that you can just say I'm a dot brand and then I want to change my string. Essentially you're only a dot brand once you pass the spec 13 evaluation. Usually that evaluation happens during the applicant and application evaluation period. You may remember this at the end of the process. However, if you are in contention and you are a brand and you want to change your string, then your spec 13 evaluation will occur earlier. You basically pull that forward on a need-to basis so that if you pass that, you're then free to change your string in accordance with the requirements in the guidebook. The next slide, please, Brenda, that talks about the string change for the brands.

VIVEK GOYAL

Can you go back one, please? So does a dot brand also need to do the one before the spec? There was one before this?

LARS HOFFMANN

Spec nine, no.

VIVEK GOYAL

Yeah. Do the dot brand need to do only this one? Will it suffice the code of conduct also?

LARS HOFFMANN

For the string change?

VIVEK GOYAL

No. If a dot brand applies and they apply for spec 13, that means all their domains will be registered for internal use and will not be sold. So do they need to also apply for the spec nine?

LARS HOFFMANN

Yes, they would have to apply for both as well. Thank you, Brenda, 17 exactly. So the brand string change request happens, you saw on the slide, essentially 30 days is the window that they can do this in. This is to not unnecessarily hold up contention sets. So the brands obviously at that moment will know already whether they're in contention or not, so they can make that decision hopefully in those 30 days. Quick side note, I didn't say that the outset, all days that are listed here on these slides and in the guidebook are calendar days. So these are business days, they're all calendar days. If the brand applies for a string change, you see the bottom here, then it will be subject to additional input periods, essentially it opens, automatically triggers an objection period,

application comment period, and of course also a singular and plural notification. The next slide please, Brenda, thank you. These are the requirements for string change. So while the replacement string as at the outset does not have to bear any resemblance to one another, you can have any two strings as you apply for a replacement string, the brand string change is very much limited. So here the brand would have to add a word or words to the original applied for string. So it has to be the applied for string plus something, probably hyphen is okay, but essentially you have to add a word or several words to it, and that word or words must appear in the description. You see them at the top there of the goods and services in the applicant's trademark registration. That is the document that is also used to obtain the spec 13. We discussed this with the IRT as well, and there was a suggestion made that we incorporated. Some brands may have different trademark registrations and they may rely for the spec 13 on one, but that word they would like to use maybe is not in the terms and services of that trademark registration, but they may hold another trademark registration where that word is contained in so they can use a separate or different trademark registration document for the purpose of this. However, it would still have to then undergo that second trademark registration document, the spec 13 evaluation again. So 13, the fee, I think is \$500, I think \$400, so they would have to pay another \$400 if they wanted to use a different trademark registration document than they used for their spec 13. The translation of the words that are contained in the registration document are not allowed, so it's really only the words in the

language of that document, and this is based on the policy that came out of the PDP. And I said that I think before the new string must not create a new or join an existing contention set. The next slide please, Brenda, thank you.

I'll be quite quick here. This is the legal rights objection. There's other objection processes as well. As with all of these objections, not everybody can make those. You have to have standing that depends obviously on the type of objection for the legal rights, essentially it's the rights holder who can make that. The source and documentation, you see then the bullet of the existing legal rights the objector is claiming, and fringe by the applied for gTLD string must be included in the filing. You can look at the document as well in the applicant guidebook, and you see on the top there as well in orange the number 3.5.1.3. That's the section of the applicant guidebook where this is detailed, so you can find that hopefully easily. It's a lengthy document, but the index I think in itself is 20 pages, so it's maybe helpful to find things more easily. I've got five more slides. I'll be as quick as I can to forward, please, Brenda.

This is the financial and operational evaluation. Essentially, this is whether the applicant is able to have the financial means to operate a TLD. These are both conducted by a third party evaluators. And I think what's the difference to the last round is, last time, I think if you're a portfolio applicant who had 20 or 50 strings applied for, the financial operational evaluation would be conducted 20 or 50 times. This is not the case here. So an applicant who has applied for multiple strings, whether it's two or 200, they

will only be evaluated once. It is also the case that depending on what kind of entity you are, if you go to the next slide, please, Brenda, thank you, the requirements of what you have to submit may be slightly different. As you can imagine, maybe if you're a multi-billion dollar stock market registered company, the financial scrutiny that needs to be applied is maybe somewhat different than if you're a startup. And so that is reflected in the application questions and the requirements of the documentation that needs to be submitted to pass these applications. What I will say is that we will be dealing, obviously, I'm going to say hopefully, with applications from a wide variety of jurisdictions. We understand that financial statements, sales application, operational planning documents may differ in different jurisdictions. We will be working with the applicants to understand what is the standard in their respective jurisdiction and then make sure that that is the equivalent of what we would see in the U.S. or in California more precisely. Two more slides as a quick overview of what is new, and I'll be very quick here because we talked about the replacement string already, so that didn't happen last time around. I won't go into that again. And on the final slide, I talked about this as well, is the no private resolution. Oh, it's actually one more after this. I'm sorry. No private resolution. We talked about that as well. Steve, you see at the bottom, I can take action against applicants for violation of the rules, including disqualification from the next and future rounds of the need to do the program. And then the final slide, the summer promise is true. We have a strengthened, more robust applicant support program. The registry service provider

evaluation program obviously has launched already. The first window has closed. I think we have 41 RSPs who applied for this. And the second window here will open in April, together with the round. So those that didn't make it in time or were under work still have an opportunity to do so in April. And finally, we have 27 scripts available for the next round. These are the scripts that are in the root zone. And finally, maybe it's actually a very complex issue, just the shortest bullets here. But entities will be able to apply for ID and variant and variants of TLDs. This is also true for TLDs that are already delegated. They can also apply for allocable variant TLDs. And that breaks me to the end. I hope I didn't take up too much time to answer any questions.

MASON COLE

Thank you, Lars. We do have a question. Paola, you have a question.

PAOLA

Oh, yes. What's the rationale behind no private negotiation? Why both companies, contenders cannot negotiate privately? It would be faster, I imagine, I suppose.

LARS HOFFMANN

I will not disagree with the speed there. I think the concerns that the board tried to address came essentially from the community. I think what we saw last time around was that a lot of applicants negotiated their private solution. In fact, last time it wasn't just

allowed, it was encouraged by the applicant guidebook to resolve privately. It resulted, at least anecdotally, and I think some of you who may be involved may know more or less about that, in deals between applicants, some use their funds to finance auctions for other higher valued strings. But in general, I think the underlying concept is that the revenue of the program should go for the use of the wider internet community and not be transferred from one applicant to another applicant. It's a decision that the board made and felt strongly about. It also prohibited the use or the creation of joint ventures. And so the money that will be generated by the auctions will not go to ICANN or our operating budget. It will go to the auction fund, which currently is being used for the grant program. It will be up to the board to determine whether that's the same use they want to have for the funds going forward. But the idea is essentially that the money should not be split to applicants because the value doesn't belong to either of the applicants. The value belongs to the wider internet community. I think it's the underlying argument.

MASON COLE

Thanks, Paolo. We have in the queue Asteway and Crystal. Asteway, please.

ASTEWAY NEGASH

Thank you for the record. This is Asteway Negash. Thank you for the presentation. Can you tell us a little bit further about the kind of entities that would be eligible to apply for a new gTLD, particularly

the possibility where business organizations might partner with government entities or the possible types of investment possibilities, such as the possibility of joining with an angel investor or other kinds of joint venture initiatives that might be allowed. I'm asking this because I'm a bit worried about the low number of applicants, particularly from Africa. In the last round of gTLD applications, we have recorded a total number of 17 out of a total number of 2000 applications. So probably due to investment capabilities. So thank you.

LARS HOFFMANN

Thank you for the question. That's very good. I just talked about joint ventures not being permitted by the board, and I need to be more clear about that as well. So joint ventures are not permitted to be formed to resolve contention. What is permitted is that joint ventures are being formed at the outset. So essentially what is not permitted is for an individual person to apply for a gTLD in their own capacity. And I think there was another every Doria mentioned that in the term was. Yeah. And sole proprietorship organizations also are currently not permitted to apply. But a joint venture certainly that contains what you thought, whether it's government agencies or other organizations, if they want to partner up with one another and create essentially an organization to apply here for this, there would be no concerns around that. The terminology that's out in the beginning talking about corporations and organizations, we appreciate that these are anglicized terms. In different languages, there may be different legal forms and entities

that exist in the business world. And so I can will obviously accept that also the equivalent of any other jurisdiction. [inaudible] and myself, we have a GMBH that obviously is not listed here, but that would be something that would obviously be allowed to apply. I hope that answers your question.

MASON COLE

Thank you, Lars. Thank you for the question. All right. Thank you. Crystal, please.

CRYSTAL ONDO

Thanks, Mason. And to address the previous question about why no private decontention, one aspect that wasn't hit on in Lars's response is that I think one of the goals is to avoid people applying just to get paid to remove their application. So last time we saw lots of people apply, make money on the private decontention and then not end up being registry operators. So I think one of the goals there is also to discourage that behavior in the next round. My question to Lars is the we're going through RSP. right now. And per the terms, everything we submit is allowed to be made public by ICANN. Is that going to be the case for applications? I ask because companies—obviously I work for Google—have a lot of information we don't want to make public necessarily. Financials want being one of them at the large corporate level other than what's already been made public for being a publicly traded company. I ask that you sync with your legal team to really think about how you want to address confidentiality, public disclosure, because the current

RSP terms honestly kind of scare me and other companies should look at them. Be sure that what you're submitting to ICANN through the application is something that you feel comfortable making public to literally the entire world.

LARS HOFFMANN

Thank you, Crystal. First of all, thank you for adding that on the private resolution. You're absolutely right about that. I appreciate that very much. On your concerns on the privacy and confidentiality of information, I believe on the specific example you just mentioned about financial statements, for example, for an organization like Google, I would have to triple check, but I'm as sure as I can be, that the publicly available information here that Google would have to publish in any case or any other company that's listed in the stock market, for example, would be sufficient in that case. What I would encourage you to do is to look at the application questions that are listed in the annex of the applicant guidebook, which indicate on every question whether or not they would be published or not. And if there's concerns around any of these, it would be good to hear from you in the public comment why there are concerns, and so that we can address them and look at that again before we finalize the guidebook.

CRYSTAL ONDO

Thanks, Lars. Just to follow up, and that's the case in the RSP as well, will it be published or will it be private? But my understanding is the RSP terms kind of trump the individual determination of

whether the question is public or private. So I guess I'll just try to get to the bottom of that in the background.

LARS HOFFMANN

Can I get back to you? I'm going to take that and I'll be sure to reach out back to you about that. It's not my exact forte, so I want to make sure I give you the right answer there.

MASON COLE

Okay, thanks, Crystal. Steve Crocker.

STEVE CROCKER

Thank you. The Applicant Support Program is strength, and you say a bit more what that means. And to put a little context there, my impression from the original one was that it looked good on first, you know, presented well, but when you scratch the surface, it wasn't really a sufficient amount of support to really make the difference when you consider the overall, I mean, it's so much money that you have to pay a certain amount of money in order to apply for the string. But the amount of money you really need in order to stand up a new registry is substantially more than that. And so the amount of support that was available didn't, at least from where I was sitting, didn't really make enough of a difference.

LARS HOFFMANN

Yeah, thank you, Steve, you make a very good point. So my colleague, Kristy Buckley, is not in the room, unfortunately, who is

the lead for the ASP program or the Applicant Support Program. So we have, I think, a higher reduction in fees this time. We have also a reduction, I believe, for the operating registry fees once you become an RO that applied for all the evaluations that may apply to a string are also subject to the reduction in the fees and that is up to 85%, depending on the amount of applicants we get. I think we have a funding for over 40 applications this time. In addition to that, the applicants also receive a 35% bid credit if they face an auction. That didn't happen last time around. We are also working with applicant counselors that will help those applicants through the process. However, what you referred to additional financial support for costs that applicants have and will have to make, that was, I think, something that the PDP Working Group was hoping for, but something the board didn't feel comfortable ultimately, because it would mean handing out money to applicants and I think the wording was that ICANN is not a grant-giving operation for the gTLD program, which is a self-funded program. And so the help that ICANN provides is, I think, a substantially more robust, I'm going to say, outreach program. We provide the IRT, the Implementation Review Team, with monthly updates. There's one tomorrow on the ASP program, so our global stakeholder engagement team and the communications team are working through the various regions, especially in Africa, Asia, and Latin America, to make applicants aware of the program, not just the gTLD program but the ASP as well. And we hope that that will lead to more applications than we had last time. But it is true what you say. It is a financial undertaking. It's also a very complex issue,

right? This is not just running an industry, this is running a business, and so maybe understanding of what that requires and what is needed here to make that successful, I think, is a long-term period. Personally, if I may add that, this is not something, I think, from the program, but my own personal opinion is I think the community was very clear that there should be, you know, and I think all, including me around the table, think that the gaps between rounds should be less than 14 years. So the hope is also that the ASP program, maybe even if we don't get the large number that some would like to see this time around, the run-up here to make people understand what a TLD can be useful will hopefully lead to more applicants being aware of this and using the program going forward in rounds that, I'm just going to say that it's not going to be another 14 years after this.

MASON COLE

Thank you. We have Lawrence in the queue, and I'm going to cut the queue at that point because we're over time. So, Lawrence, go ahead.

LAWRENCE
ROBERTS

OLAWALE Thank you, Chair, and thank you, Lars, for your presentation. Speaking to the last issue we're talking about, which is the ASP, at the end of the course of the week, following what was happening in the GAC room, got to understand that we currently have about four applications that have gone through the ASP pipeline to a point of being evaluated, and we had about 20 that were more or

less stuck. I believe that looking at those numbers, it definitely shows that there is a problem, and from my own personal experience navigating the ASP portal, any time there is, any time one needs to, in the process of filling out the forms and all that information that needed to be provided, where there was an error and one needed to go back to fix something of some sort, one always got stuck. So the platform itself isn't so user-friendly, this is just some kind of feedback, and I think it's also one of the reasons why we also have such low numbers that have been able to go through to the point of being evaluated. But aside from the fact that when you get stuck, maybe there's an error or something, you press a button, you want to go back, and it kind of freezes, the system might also need, I mean, where there's also some kind of real-time support, maybe a chat or a bot or something that can easily report the issue and get support to continue, I believe it will also help the application process. But I think with the few months left in the pipeline for the ASP, we might need to redirect efforts to get in those 20 applications that are stuck far into the evaluation line with some more support and maybe personalized help.

LARS HOFFMANN

Yeah, Lawrence, you make a good point, I appreciate that feedback, I will also pass that on, and I might in fact ask colleagues to reach out what the technical problems there were specifically. What I will say is that, so we are aware of that, that there's some applications that don't seem to be moving forward. The team is going to, I'm going to speak frankly, it's a difficult situation, right?

So I think what probably nobody wants is for ICANN to go into the system and look exactly who these people are, who they're applying for, where they're coming from, that doesn't seem to be appropriate until they have submitted the application. However, Lawrence raises a good point, others have done that as well, we also want to help them, if they are stuck for some reason, it would be good to help them obviously to move forward. So the team will, I think in the coming weeks, start sending out surveys to the, just to the contact information that's been provided by the organization or by the applicants to the program, to send a very short survey to them, three or four questions, to see whether they are still interested, what the issues are, if they need help and put them in touch with an application counselor, obviously if there's any technical issues that I have encountered and we hope that that will trigger response from those applicants and hopefully move some of these forwards. What I will say as well is there is obviously also a scenario whereby some of, I'm not saying all of them, but some of those could quite legitimately be members of the community or just generally people who are interested, who create a profile login and never had the intention to actually going through with this, that will not show. If they haven't deleted the application but just left it there, then that will be a statistic that looks like they may be stuck, but in fact they never intended to apply. I'm not saying that applies to all of them, but there's a possibility as well that some of these at least that may apply to. But we hear your point, we would like to see the numbers go as high as possible as well and we hope that through the survey mechanism, this is a good way to kind of

not infringe on essentially private and confidential information but also contact these applicants with the opportunity to be in touch with us and hopefully get the help that they need. Thank you.

MASON COLE

All right. True to my word, I'm going to cut the queue there because we are over time. But Lars and Elisa, thank you for spending so much time with us today. It was a very thorough overview and I think enlightening for the BC, so thank you.

LARS HOFFMANN

Thank you for having us any time.

MASON COLE

We'll see you hopefully in Muscat.

LARS HOFFMANN

We'll see you there. Thank you. Thank you both.

MASON COLE

All right. Thank you, Brenda, for putting the agenda back up. We do not have a finance and operations review as I mentioned. Tola is not on the call. Tola is on the call. Oh, there's Tola. We have only 35 minutes left and we have you and Segunfunmi to get through. So if we can be efficient, that would be—and then I'd also like to give the BC a quick update on DNS abuse as well. Vivek can help me with that. So Tola, over to you, please.

TOLA SOGBESAN

Okay, I'll run quickly as I can. Just a quick rundown. Firstly, our greetings to members and Prig. Apologies for coming on quite a bit late. Again, another apology for not being on ground in the room, attending the meetings. Okay, firstly, let me start by congratulating Lawrence and Hafiz for the election, stepping forward to volunteer to the vacant roles, and thanking members of the BC for giving them the endorsement to represent us at GNSO and NomCom respectively. The results of the election were announced and the two of them were successfully endorsed by members and we want to thank you for your support.

I want to say that I like to thank members who have been responding to BC invoice for FY26. We've got quite a number of responses from members, so I want to thank you and we look forward to the remaining members to send their payment through. We'll be glad to receive them as soon as you make it available. For emphasis, we do not receive a check at the McDonald office any longer. So if you want to send a check, we probably would request that you, if you must send a check anyway, we'll request that you please send it to the chair. Or best scenario, if you can walk into any Wells Fargo branch nearest to you. Other than that, I think every other payment has been coming through the proper channel and we've been receiving quite a number.

In terms of committees, we intended running committee volunteering requests alongside that of election. We had to step it

down so that it doesn't conflict with the ongoing election at that time. Once we're out of Prague, we should be expecting some messages from Brenda for volunteers to step into some of the committees as required by the bylaw. So please look forward, look out for that. We'll appreciate if you have some of you stepping out to staff in the committees, essentially the Credentials Committee to attend to some of our new applications and other relevant committees as well. As such, today we got our account in good shape. The figures stand at the level we had envisaged and at the next closed business meeting, I'll be able to disclose further details on our banking position.

We have a meeting next week with our bookkeeper designated to be recommended by Steve Crocker. Thank you for the recommendation. We've had an extensive meeting with the proposed bookkeeper and hopefully at the meeting next week on the 18th, we have for that clarity on a deep dive of what we need. They clean up the work to help us do and what we may be doing on our own. Subsequently, we may not need them for a very long time. They just help us clean up what we currently have, have a robust platform that we be updating by ourselves and they are supposed to be finding out a few things that they'll be doing on our behalf at some point. But we'll have more clarity when we're done with our meeting on the 18th next week. Once again, I thank Steve C for having that introduction to the organization, a very competent organization judging from the conversation we've had in the past

and they've been around supporting organizations like the BC and so they have experience to draw from.

Okay, I'll quickly touch on ICANN 84 at Muscat. Two things. One, for those of us who are not able to get onto Prague, we hope we begin the processing of our necessary documentation to travel as soon as we're done with ICANN 83 so that we don't have a repeat of what has happened in ICANN 83. We'll be able to be present at Muscat. And the second leg of Muscat update is our planned outreach, thanks to Imran who has submitted a very good presentation on an outreach. We're in the position where we seek membership. Membership is not improving, it's rather dwindling. So everything that we can put in place to ensure that we have new membership coming through will be much appreciated. And that's why we need to thank Imran for putting through the proposal for an outreach at Muscat. Hopefully we'll be able to have some retention of some of the members that will turn up at the outreach. Business members attending will be invited and if your businesses have offices or branches around the Middle East and you want to encourage them to attend the outreach, we'll so much appreciate that. I think that'll be pretty it at the next business meeting. Yeah, I'll need to state that we are at the committee level, the finance committee level, and the ExComm, we're putting final touches on the FY26 budget and we should be able to have it for the BC at the next meeting. Once the ExComm has made it on it at the next meeting. There is a proposal I have put about the newsletter. We don't have newsletter for ICANN 83 and it was deliberate. We are hoping that we can switch

to an annual newsletter in order to encourage our finances such that we can limit the expenses to just one instead of three. And that's why we don't have newsletter for ICANN 83. And so it's still a proposal. If it is endorsed by the members, then we'll just stick to having just one per year. I think that will be it for me, Mason, unless I have some questions to respond to. I'll yield the floor back to you, Mason. Thank you.

MASON COLE

Thank you, Tola. Questions for Tola, please, quickly. Anyone? All right, Tola, I think the queue is clear. Thank you for the report. All right, let's move to Segunfunmi and a policy calendar review. Segunfunmi, over to you and let's be efficient, please.

SEGUNFUNMI OLAJIDE

Hi, everyone. Glad to be joining you from the beautiful city of Abuja, Nigeria. I'll proceed to share my screen so that I can have the policy calendar. I'm going to zoom it so you can have... Great. All right, I wish I was there with you all in Prague, but due to visa issues, I couldn't make it to Prague in person. But I'm also committed to ensuring that I serve you as your vice chair for policy calendar or as your vice chair for policy coordination. Moving on to today's agenda, we'll have, since the last time we met, we've only filed two public comments and thanks to Hafiz Farook for drafting comments on customer standing committee on the 2nd of June. Also, we submitted a comment on the Africa region plan, regional

plan for the fiscal year 2026 to 2030. Special thanks to Omoloshio and Asteway Negash for drafting this comment. Okay, quick one.

STEVE DELBIANCO

Yes. This is in response to what you said at the top. Which is the fact that you, Lawrence and Tola, were once again unable to get a visa from the host country despite applying early. That is something the BC needs to lead the way with. In any interactions with the board and with staff, some of whom are listening now, we desperately need ICANN travel to do more. To give four months or more of advance notice for the purpose of travel dates. And I realize that the travel dates might change by a day or two, but we've got to get it in early enough. And then we need ICANN to work with the embassy itself of the host country and provide all the information they can to expedite the approval. I mean, honestly, this is ridiculous that for the second meeting in a row, we are lacking three of our officers. I know you didn't make a big noise about it at the beginning, but I understand why you guys are not there. What I don't understand is why ICANN is unable to do more to help. Thank you.

SEGUNFUNMI OLAJIDE

Thank you, Steve, for that intervention. And it's a critical one that we strongly encourage BC members to help also advocate for our case, particularly for those of us who are BC officers and members who reside in Nigeria. Yes, Steve has clearly articulated that they need at least three to four months of providing a supporting document to help us move fast with the embassy. And the second

option will always be that organizations who sponsor their staff to travel abroad usually have agents on behalf of the organizations who are like us with the embassies to process the document. So those are the two main recommendations that we may want to push for us always represent the BC and the trust of ICANN at all times. I don't know quickly if Lawrence or Tola has additional comments on this before I go on.

TOLA SOGBESAN

Thank you, Segun. Let me thank Steve for stepping into the conversation. I'll take a... Let me say, yes, ICANN travel have been tried a bit. Maybe from what Steve has said, they probably need to do more, but I think they do a bit of what they're supposed to do. They've introduced... I know in the past we have used agents. There's NeoChase or something that we've used that have assisted in the past that assist travelers for the application. I don't know any method they could use, but because we don't have time, I'll probably defer for that conversation on this at our next meeting. Thank you.

LAWRENCE
ROBERTS

OLAWALE Just to thank Steve for bringing this up too, and definitely queue up behind whatever it is that the BC can do to help going forward. In this particular instance, the country in question was even running a lottery. So when they open the opportunity for you to send in your visa, they get to select out of the applicants, those who they will grant visas to or not, which makes it even more difficult.

Out of the three officers, only one got selected based on their system of running a lottery. ICANN really needs to check this kind of visa requirements for its delegates. Where there are such special requirements, we expect that ICANN will need to step in to maybe provide some kind of documentation or work with the GAC officers of such countries. But from my personal experience, nothing was done, even while reaching out to people who resided in the country. So more can be done, definitely. And thanks for whatever it is the BC might be able to do going forward.

STEVE DELBIANCO

Mason, I would ask whether, as chair, you could make a comment at the public forum. It's near the end of the meeting, so there's less of a risk of upsetting the host country. But the board needs to hear about this in front of everyone, that we should not use a host country that's going to limit the number of visas.

MASON COLE

Thank you, Steve. I'd be happy to. There will be no public forum at this meeting, but I'll be glad to raise it with ICANN leadership because it's valid. So thank you. I'll take that action.

SEGUNFUNMI OLAJIDE

So moving on to open public comment, just to be in consciousness of our time. We have one which is available for reading. Thanks to Zak Muskovich and Arinola for drafting our comment on the Transport Policy Review Working Group final reports for board

consideration. So this one would share the BC membership, kindly check the mailing list so that you can provide your feedback, if you have any feedback, because we'll be submitting these on the 12th of June, which is two days from now.

Secondly, we have a new opportunity to comment on this one, which is updates to ICANN Community Participant Code of Conduct concerning SOI. This closes on the 13th of June. And in this one, I've highlighted key questions that are expected to be addressed in the comments. Also noting is that in December 2024, the BC has filed a similar public comment on community participation on code of conduct concerning SOI. So on this, we'll be seeking volunteers to draft a BC comment. So if you're willing to draft or put pen on paper, kindly indicate by a raise of hands or contact in the comment section. Okay. As I watch for that, we'll move to the next open public comment.

This one closes on the 13th of June, which is the PSR on expired domain division and expired registration recovery policies. On this particular one, the GNSO Council requests policy status report for this expired domain division and an expired registration recovery policies in the comments of the comment. Okay. Omoloso is indicating his interest to volunteer to draft the first comment on SOI. All right. That's well noted.

So at this point, ICANN is also inviting individuals or organizations with interest in this PSR to provide comments with ICANN in the evaluation and assessment of the [ADDP and ARPP.] I also want to

note that Hafiz Farook has indicated interest to draft this comment. Also noted, and I will add you up as a volunteer to draft a BC comment, should any other person be interested in volunteering, kindly indicate or reach out their emails so that I can add to this comment.

Moving on to NIS2 directives, we got a report in May 2025 that the EC took the former warning to 13 member EU states for failing to fully transpose NIS2. These countries now have two months to comply or risk being referred to the EU Court of Justice.

Let's jump quickly to the council activities so we can get feedback and directions from our councilors. The next council meeting is supposed to be 11th of June at 5:00 PM UTC. And on this, we have items that are of interest to the BC highlighted in our policy calendar review. And I'll be calling on our councilors, Lawrence and Vivek, to have the floor. Either of you wants to go first.

LAWRENCE
ROBERTS

OLAWALE In the interest of time, I suggest Vivek, you just give a one minute overview so that we can move to other agendas on our program. Thank you.

VIVEK GOYAL

Thank you, Lawrence. But Mason, would you like to start on DNS abuse and then I'll jump in because that is the key. Okay. So there are two small groups' work that are important to the BC. One is the accuracy small team and one is the DNS abuse small team. For the

accuracy one, there was a presentation done by the chair of the small group, Paul McGrady, who was very well outlined that talks into three buckets. Topics that there is no agreement on, topics that there is agreement on, right? They're completely opposite. So one is saying there should be 100% validation of every registration data and one is saying there should be no validation of registration data. Then there are topics which there is some agreement on and the ability to move this forward. After this, I will share links in the chat so everybody can look at that data. So the aim is to have the report from the small team out before the next meeting of ICANN. So they want to move very quickly. They have meetings every week and I think there is some progress that will be made on that. On the DNS abuse small team, gaps have been identified based on study by Infernal, by different groups who have produced different kind of studies on DNS abuse. So a gap matrix has been created as to where there are gaps in the whole DNS abuse thing and that has been circulated to all the constituencies. As BCs, we also have received it and Hafiz and myself have put some comments on the same. I would request all members to please look at that and share your feedback. This is one place where we absolutely need to share all our concerns about the DNS abuse part being done in ICANN and make sure that we are starting with all our concerns and drive whatever we can towards the policy. Mason?

MASON COLE

Thanks Vivek. I just wanted to raise DNS abuse back to the BC again because it's been such a focus of our policy work for more than a

year now. The good news is ICANN org and the GNSO council are coming around to very much wanting to do something about DNS abuse which is good. It's going to be helpful to prove the model to the outside world again after the model has been broken for many years now and it will bring relief to the businesses that we represent who are suffering from DNS abuse. So what the CSG has done is starting in Istanbul we put forward some ideas to the community about tools that would help combat DNS abuse. Those have not yet been incorporated with the GNSO's gap analysis but Vivek and Lawrence will take care of that problem for us. But those proposals need to make their way into that group because chances are very high that what we're going to find is whatever ICANN org is not willing to negotiate with contracted parties about, they'll deal with a PDP. Now you might have your doubts about a PDP, I know that I do, but we're being told that everyone in the community is very interested in tightly scoped, very short PDPs. The proof will be in the pudding on that so we'll see. But we've got an opportunity now to really use the energy of the community to drive some solutions toward DNS abuse mitigation and that's what we intend to do.

VIVEK GOYAL

It's not surprising that while there is some hesitation on the CPH to not agree with everything that is being pushed in, there is alignment and we have had so many sessions with CPH. One, we had one in this morning with registrars where we looked at different cases of DNS abuse and how they can be handled and

processed. We are seeing a lot of resistance from the non-commercial side on moving anything on the DNS abuse. The first topic today in the council was about prioritizing the work on the council and while there was a lot of agreement to prioritize DNS abuse and accuracy as the things that should be done quickly and all, from the non-commercial stakeholder group side it was like no DNS abuse is not a priority for us. We do not believe it's a burning issue so we should not put on a priority. So any bridges we can build on that, any help we can get, maybe with Marie's help to bring this in the fold, we'll really appreciate any help we can get on that. Yes?

PAOLA

What do they think that is a pressing issue for them? What do they consider a pressing issue?

VIVEK GOYAL

A hijack of domains and working on the transfer policy is a priority for them.

MASON COLE

Segunfunmi, Vivek has concluded.

SEGUNFUNMI OLAJIDE

Yes. Okay. Thank you for that update and I think that is one that the VC really cares about. So if there's anyone who or any other actions

we think we can take to make sure that attention is given to DNS abuse, I'm sure that's the direction the BC will always take.

Moving on to the next activity, we have an update on RDRS, which DelBianco and Dr. Steve Crocker has been VC rep. And at this point I would like to turn it over to Steve DelBianco to give us the update of the previous meetings and engagements we've had on RDRS.

STEVE DELBIANCO

We met twice this week as working sessions for the RDRS. Again, this timeline reveals sometime in August the report will go out from the working group to the public comment and then goes to council. It doesn't go to the board. The board still regards the big \$100 million SSAD as deferred recommendations with policy consensus. So they deferred it while we did this pilot called RDRS. Now that the RDRS is over, presumably we'll come up with a consensus-based report on which elements of it should be preserved and whether the SSAD continues. But it is going to be up to council to make those recommendations to decide whether to launch new policy. For example, should there be a new policy that requires contract parties, registrars to participate in an SSAD or requires them to participate in some interim solution? Should there be requirements about response times and response criteria? There's a whole host of things that are policy. And within the small team, the standing committee, again, the noncommercial do not want to see any new policy, but the rest of us are understanding there may need to be new policy. It's very similar to the situation that

they just described, is that when things get to council, we no longer have votes from the GAC or the ALAC. When things get to council, contract parties combined with the NCSG can block anything from proceeding. That has got to be a concern right now. And I don't really know how we overcome that unless we broaden the message that we need to start over. We don't want to adopt a \$100 million SSAD. We need to start over with something that, as Steve Crocker says, fit for purpose and maybe use DNS abuse as something that drives that since that's an area that's achieving some consensus. Steve, anything to add?

STEVE CROCKER

I appreciate you making it clear sort of what the hurdles are along the way. If the process with the GNSO council is effectively closed or constrained, to choose a polite word, the next step up is the board. And perhaps we ought to figure out what messages and interactions with the board ought to take place. Just to add one small piece of substance, perhaps, the \$100 million SSAD is, I think, a fair way to look at it is that it's multiple things packaged together. It's a mechanism. It's a bunch of policies and perhaps some other things. Those should be broken apart. The interesting parts about SSAD perhaps are what service is being provided and what the rules are. The method for providing that is a very substantial subject, but it should be separated completely from what the desired of what you're trying to accomplish from a policy point of view. Thank you.

SEGUNFUNMI OLAJIDE

All right. Thank you, sirs, for those contributions. Any other questions or comments for Steve on RDRS before we move on? All right. Thank you. Moving on, we have a BC comment on World Intellectual Property Organization, WIPO, and ICA, on UN [inaudible]. And then we have special thanks to Zak Muscovitch for drafting this particular comment. We'll be submitting this on the 11th, and we'll share this for BC review. Kindly check so that you provide your feedback before we proceed to file this comment. Moving to CSG activities, I'd like to turn it to Marie. We have a quick update for the BC.

MARIE PATTULLO

Thank you. There's been a lot of conversation about DNS abuse. I would really ask you to try to review the transcript of this morning in particular, which is already public, of course, not the transcript, the recording of the session. I would also ask you to remember that we've not finished yet. It's only Wednesday. So tomorrow morning, we have the non-commercial party house meeting at 9:00, meeting with our non-commercial friends, after which we have another session on abuse, which ALAC is putting together with various parts of the community, including the one, the only Mason Cole. We don't have any more time. If anybody wants to know anything about the CSG, you know where I am. Thank you.

SEGUNFUNMI OLAJIDE

All right. Thank you for that quick one. And also for reminding, for the reminder on the sessions that are of interest to the BC. So we

encourage our membership to watch out for those sessions and then join them so that we're able to follow up with activities as we've got areas of our interest. Should there be any questions, contributions, or any other business as regards the policy calendar review? I'm watching for a show of hands or comment. All right. The queue is clear. Thank you once again for the opportunity to serve as your Vice Chair for Policy Coordination. And at this point, I will turn it back to VC Chair, Mason Cole.

MASON COLE

Thank you, Segunfunmi. I appreciate you being so efficient. We have five minutes left. Paolo, you had an issue under AOB that you wanted to share. Can you do that quickly, or do we need to defer to a different meeting?

PAOLO

Yes, I would like to. Just to refresh the information, the Brazilian Software Association has 2,000 members, employs 260,000 direct employees. Our companies made \$20 billion last year. We are around since four decades. We are the main software association in Brazil. A few years ago, we started combating online piracy, focusing on removing illegal content from the internet. And we have a group doing this. In the last three years, we were able to take out about 200,000 contents. But this was until now mainly focused on piracy and intellectual property. Now we are changing and expanding to also fight DNS abuse. In this year, we started a couple of months ago in March, we also are getting reports from our

customers, from our associates, and then from the whole community. We will start doing educational webinars. We are already preparing some marketing and educational materials to send out to the public and to the press. As soon as we get the reports, because it's very complicated for the end user to report to the right registrars or registries and so on. So we take care of that. We get, let's say, an email, and then we fill the forms, and we give follow-up to our customers. Initially, we're going to do this for Brazil. If we have any help from ICANN, we do this worldwide in English and Spanish, and not only Portuguese and Spanish. Thank you.

MASON COLE

Thank you, Paolo. And thank you for fitting that in so quickly in a three-minute time period. That was excellent. Well done. Thank you. Okay, any other business for the BC, please? We're almost at time.

MARIE PATTULLO

I would like all of you, please, to put a note in your calendar, which is extremely serious. At some point on Sunday, the 15th of June, I need you all to raise a glass to Mason Cole as it's his birthday.

MASON COLE

Thank you, Marie. Appreciate it. Yes, thank you all. This is one of those rare ICANN meetings during the summer where my birthday doesn't fall during the week. So it's actually nice. I'll be home for

my birthday. So thank you, Marie. Okay, any other important business for the BC? All right. Brenda, we have two weeks until our next meeting, correct?

BRENDA BREWER

Yes.

MASON COLE

Well, very good. Brenda, thank you for the support and BC's adjourned. Thanks everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]