
ICANN82 | CF – Joint Session: ICANN Board and NCSG
Tuesday, March 11, 2025 – 09:00 to 10:00 PST

WENDY PROFIT

Hello, and welcome to the Joint Session of the ICANN Board and the NCSG. Please note this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior and the ICAN Community Anti-Harassment Policy. This meeting is between the Board and the constituents of the NCSG only, so we will not be taking any questions from the audience.

Interpretation for this session will include English, French, and Spanish. If we do have any participating members of the NCSG in the Zoom room, you can raise your hand or speak audibly to join if you have any comments to include. And just a reminder to all the speakers, please state your name for the record, the language you'll speak if speaking in language other than English, and please speak at a reasonable pace for our interpreters.

Everyone's welcome to use the chat. Please note that the private chats are only possible among the panelists in the Zoom webinar format. So any messages sent by a panelist or a standard attendee to another standard attendee will also be seen by the session host, co-host, and other panelists. I will now hand the floor over to ICANN Board chair, Tripti Sinha.

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.

TRIPTI SINHA

Thank you, Wendy. Good morning, everyone, and welcome to day two of ICANN82. This is the joint meeting as Wendy just said with the Board and the NCSG, and my colleague, Chris Buckridge, will be facilitating this session. So, Chris.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Thank you very much, Tripti. Good morning, everyone, good afternoon, good evening, goodnight, wherever you are in the world. Yes, this is the constituency day between the Board and the Non-commercial Stakeholder Group of the Non-Contracted Party House. And yes, I'd like to welcome all colleagues from the NCSG here to join us, and Rafik as Chair of the NCSG, welcome.

We have a number of questions that the Board have put towards to the NCSG and that the NCSG have put to the Board, and so we're looking forward to going through those discussing today. We have actually here, first up, perhaps the questions from the Board, sorry, from the NCSG. I think we were perhaps going to do the other way round. So if we can duck to the next one maybe. Yes, that's the one. So we can introduce the questions.

The first one is something we're asking a few of the constituencies and which is building on the session that we had on the first day regarding how we meet. And so we're interested in getting input on ICANN's meeting structure from non-commercial stakeholder group. So Rafik, perhaps I can hand that over to you and for the discussion.

RAFIK DAMMAK

Okay. Thanks, Chris. This is Rafik speaking. So first thanks for this opportunity to have us and to discuss between the NCSG and the Board. So we try to review the question and have some internal discussion, trying to get feedback and try to understand also the Board intent behind those question. So starting first with about the meeting structure.

First, I will start about the comment about the process. We have a concern that it was through that small team. We are not present there, so we didn't really participate in that kind of proceedings or discussion in that group. But we could share our input at the end when [00:04:03 - inaudible] person document and we try to respond to the different option quite simply to express when we are in favor or not, and also maybe some comment.

But I do believe that's quite limited way to participate in the meeting structural proposal that it'll impact us in the long term. Not sure like how that the group was set, but just we made that we wanted to make this point about the process and to highlight and thread that point.

Going to know more to the substance. So just to be brief, I think we might be open to several of the option that was proposed there, and we are looking to see how those option will evolve. But we also want to make the point that the cost reduction should not drive the whole process.

We understand from the document that was shared that you wanted to highlight the increase in cost, we heard the same yesterday, we got that, but it should not be driven by that because

the most important goal to discuss about the meeting structure is to think about what we are expecting as outcome, of course, in effective and efficient way. But that should be our main goal, it's not just to try to cut by any means, and I think in some proposal that what we could sense there. The other point, like there are options, we are really against in particular about the field.

There is no way that we will accept something because that will change, I think, the whole dynamic of the ICANN meetings and definitely, kind of hinder hindrance and a hurdle for who we are represent to participate in ICANN meetings. So those are the point I wanted to highlight.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Okay. Thanks very much, Rafik. Are there colleagues on the Board who would like to respond to any of the points here? Becky.

BECKY BURR

I just want to say that this is not-- cost concerns are obviously an issue, but we're very much aware of the importance of meeting face-to-face, and times have changed, it's been many years since we looked at meeting structure. So it may be that the cost thing comes out as the noisiest piece, but it is not the noisiest piece for the Board.

TRIPTI SINHA

And just to add to what Becky just said, it has been over a decade since we've looked at our strategy, and in the last 10 years the

modalities and tools available to us have evolved and matured quite a bit. And during COVID, we did learn that we were able to accomplish quite a bit online without meeting in person. So by no means are we saying in-person meetings should be replaced because they're not effective, it's just we're looking to just bring our meeting structure into the current age, and that's one of our motivations.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Bruna, please.

BRUNA SANTOS

It's Bruna for the record, and just adding something that on my personal capacity also. I think that's the-- my voice is terrible today, but the point that I brought yesterday about looking at it from an equity perspective, it's really relevant to that point because the introduction of fees or the restriction of translation into a lot of the ICANN materials, they do affect certain parts of the road, mostly looking at the global majority more than others, especially when you have a community that's as I said yesterday, doesn't make its money either in Euros or in USD.

So it's really important to look at those things and think of ways of supporting civil society or other parts of the community in case you do decide to implement these changes. Also, throughout the last years, we have seen a considerable reduction in the number of meetings that we can have.

And if we opt eventually for a smaller meeting, that also affects us in our capacity of convening, and I'm talking explicitly about NCSG right now. So when we do think about those solutions, again, it's important to think about balance and what are the needs of different parts of the community and so on. So thanks.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Thanks, Bruna. I think Kathy had a-- is there a mic we can-- yep, perfect. Thank you.

KATHY KLEIMAN

Hi, Kathy Kleiman, longtime NCSG. The lessons that we can take from COVID are limited and I wanted to tell you why. I was co-chair of the Rights Protection Mechanism Policy Development Process Working Group along with Brian Beckham and Phil Corwin.

And it was hard, it was hard to go online and finish our work, but we went online for the last quarter of four years of work and we also, the SubPro Policy Development Process Working Group, which I was a member of also, was finishing up its work. It would've been much harder guys to start our work online. Because we had the face-to-face meetings for about three years before that, we knew each other.

We had that trust, we had gone to lunch, we had gone to breakfast, we had built the relationships and the trust and kind of the personal knowledge of people's children that continue over the COVID, over the lockdown, over the shutdown, over the remote. It's much harder to build those relationships, it's much harder to start

a working group, a policy development process without being face-to-face.

TRIPTI SINHA

Oh, Kathy, couldn't agree with you more. We are not saying by any means we're taking ICANN virtual, it's just how do we supplement, compliment the current meetings more effectively with other tools. We're just looking to modernize it, that's all. But no, I think we all loved seeing each other after the hiatus that we all we're on. No, it's not going away. Trust me.

KATHY KLEIMAN

Happy to hear it. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK

Okay. Thanks for those comment. Just about the virtual meetings, I mean it can be acceptable, but I think we need them to go more into the details and also some criteria or some point that we need to be sure that they are satisfied. Like the issue of time zone, to be sure that we are not putting the burden on some parts, the speaking time of someone living in the Asia Pacific, it'll be really difficult in many aspects to attend the virtual meeting.

So we can be amenable maybe to this option, but we need really to go into details how it'll work and how we can ensure that the burden is shared between all the parties. Does anyone want to say something? No. Okay. Kurtis, did you want to-

KURTIS LINDQUIST

I was gonna ask in the process, I mean there was a small group that was convened to come up with the topics or discussion as we're having now, but the idea was presented already yesterday that this is part of the wider discussion to get input from the wider community and to form an opinion, and this will be a process that goes on and we will revise this based on the feedback we heard yesterday, the discussion the Board workshop had over the weekend, and throughout all of these sessions, the Board and I had with SO/ACs, we will also ask the same question to get further input.

Say this is not meant to be an exclusive process, supposed to actually gather feedback and thoughts on what the community and different groups think about the how we meet, what's the value, what's the different proposals around it.

RAFIK DAMMAK

Okay, thanks, Kurtis, but that's also the point. The first point I made, we understand there is this process, but we're not there. It's quite limited way for us just to participate by giving input or being consulted at the end. So we are not in that group, so we don't have a representative that can really participate in making those proposals. Just we get whatever end up, and it's quite limited way to influence the outcomes.

KURTIS LINDQUIST

So there is no limited, ultimate decision is mine because then I get it to me from the Board, but I want to have hear all this feedback. We'll take this back to the Board and have a discussion on this. There's not gonna be any closed room discussion beyond this, this is an open discussion. And what you're doing now is the feedback mechanism on this. I understand that there must be some frustration about the small group. I wasn't there, so I can't comment on that, but the process now is not to have a closed group that's gonna reroute this. We're taking all this feedback in, and we'll look at this.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Okay. Thanks, Kurtis. Thank you everyone for the comments there. Well, as Kurtis says, it's not the end, not even the beginning of the end, so we'll have many more discussions to come, but I think we do need to move on here. The second question we had here, and I know we in the Board did our own little work on in sort of perhaps revising the language, looking at what this question is about.

But I think sort of we'll still fit with I'm sure what you've planned. And it was essentially asking how can we work with governments to encourage that public policies are created with an understanding and an awareness of ICANN policy and the ICANN multi-stakeholder model. I think it also ties in a little with one of the questions you asked us, but I maybe can throw it to you first and then we can build that sort of discussion into a single one.

RAFIK DAMMAK

Thanks, Chris. Yeah, we understood, maybe there is some overlap, and just avoid confusion, we all try to merge those two points. And so just to be sure, I think Farzaneh and then Bona will introduce our position or comment on this question.

FARZANEH BADIEI

Thank you, Rafik. Farzaneh Badiei speaking. Hello everybody. Good morning. So we thought we are going to merge our question with your question and going to discuss why we do internet governance in a multi-stakeholder approach and not using other governance models and what are the benefits of the multi-stakeholder approach?

And we believe that by putting down the success stories of the multi-stakeholder approach and by being issue specific, we might be able to encourage the government to collaborate and also to promote and defend the multi-stakeholder approach. So some of these issues that we have discussed with the Non-commercial Stakeholder Group the internet is global and unfragmented at the moment due to thanks to the multi-stakeholder governance model that we have, we build consensus through dialogue.

We have different and dare I say creative governance mechanisms at ICANN that ensures that all voices are heard, including those of the governments through the Government Advisory Committee. And discontinuous perspective might seem might seem kind of cumbersome, but it has proven to be effective in preventing deadlocks that often paralyzed intergovernmental negotiations.

And we also believe that multi-stakeholder approach brings legitimacy, trust, and ownership. Decision made through these processes has a high level of acceptance because stakeholders feel a sense of ownership. And let's look at the positive side that it has tangible impacts on internet stability investors and innovators and businesses behind AI and IOT.

They trust the internet and confidently use it because of this stability that we provide for them partly due to the multi-stakeholder approach. Addressing digital divide: the multi-stakeholder model has also played a crucial role in narrowing the digital divide ensuring that civil society can directly participate in policymaking and has amplified the voices of regions that are not usually in traditional diplomatic processes.

ICANN's accountability measures and human rights recommendations have been shaped with input from diverse global stakeholders. And let's face it, I as a civil society member, I can participate at ICANN on equal footing with the government, a representative, something that does not happen in other venues. And resilience in times of crisis, the resilience of the internet during times of war, conflict and even global pandemic further underscores the strength of our model.

And the ability to maintain security and access to domain names globally despite geopolitical attention highlights a system that is robust and adaptable. Unlike intergovernmental framework, which can stall in moments of crisis, ICANN's multi-stakeholder has shown it has quickly adapt and it can quickly adapt. Wow, I'm so

positive today. So now, I pass it on to my colleague Bruna to add to the points. Thank you.

BRUNA SANTOS

Thanks. Bruna, for the record. I think in terms of additions, when we're talking also about policymaking and so on, the main goal or the main win around multistakeholder is really ensuring that every single perspective and knowledge is at the table. That's why we do it. When I have been doing advocacy efforts whether here in Brazil, anywhere else, I think that's the main point we need to bring to governments.

If you want long-lasting policies and long-lasting policies for the internet, you need to include different expertise and especially the technical community one, which is where we are speaking from. And also, because with technology developments, the chance that most of these policies, laws, regulations, they might grow old in two to three weeks to a year is very high, so it's important to consider these types of expertise and also try to leverage what part of the technology you're actually regulating as opposed to try to make one-size-fits all kind of efforts.

And we've seen this throughout a lot of moments. The other point I would just add is something that Farzaneh has been saying and said it yesterday at our GNSO and Board meeting about the documentation of processes.

And I would just use this to highlight the Sao Paulo multistakeholder guidelines, which I think they offer a really good

way from the NETmundial community and suggestions to the improvement of these processes and also talks about this relationship or so-called need for coordination between multilateral and multi-stakeholder processes and how things like transparency, open participation, and many of the things we already do at ICANN can help leverage both sides of the process and so on. So I'll stop here.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

All right, thanks, Farzaneh and thanks, Bruna. So I'm the one responding from the Board to the question, which is now on the screen from the NCSG, and which I think merges very nicely with the question that we had for you. So it's in terms of how does the Board plan to ensure continuous improvement vis-a-vis the transparency of decision emanating from the GPI framework [00:21:47 - inaudible]. No, that's the one.

Sorry, it's the other question I think, regarding the multi-stakeholder model and acknowledging that it's under threat on the one hand from increasing nationalism, isolationism, and that implies a shift back to a multilateral bilateral world order and the dominance of tech giants. Does the ICANN Board have any ideas of initiatives that would help unite technical business and civil society communities that all need to work together to defend the internet as we know it?

Now, I think both points here I think, speak very much to that. I think I would start by noting that when we're talking about the multi-stakeholder model, we're potentially talking about a number

of different things. Obviously, there is ICANN's multi-stakeholder model which is a very precise and contained process and model. More broadly, there is the multi-stakeholder approach to internet governance, which is broader and includes institutions like the internet engineering task force, and the regional internet registries.

So I think we're understanding that this is addressing the latter, the broader context. And that is a very strong network and partnership of different organizations, different stakeholders that has successfully addressed and supported the internet for many years.

I think the point, Bruna, that you raised about it being different expertise necessary to the decision-making process is really fundamental. And that links into what I know has been a very strong point from ICANN Org on the necessity to have the technical community represented there. And that can be a challenging definitional process because a lot of those in the technical community are coming from private sector, they're coming from civil society, et cetera.

But it's that focus on the technical expertise, the technical perspective, and the need to have that in decision making, which is important. I think we need to recognize that this multi-stakeholder approach has been very agile, robust, collaborative, and has been able to continue to meet the needs of the growing internet. So when we talk about concerns about moving ICANN or these processes under some sort of UN or ITU umbrella, it's important to note that the current model has allowed us to get where we are, has ensured the stability and robustness of the internet.

We've heard already in this meeting about the work that ICANN is doing in terms of updates, briefings, the WSIS+20 outreach network, the SO/AC, discussion group on WSIS+20 and other, other efforts that are ongoing. So I won't go too much into those. I think we can certainly discuss those further if you would like, but I think we've heard a lot of details there.

On the WSIS+20 outreach network, the latest figures I have is it's 570 people from 88 countries, and I think even in the last few days, we've seen some very healthy and robust discussions happening on that list. So I think it is proving itself a really useful venue for community discussion.

There are other activities that ICANN's also engaged in, such as the Coalition for Digital Africa, which is building broader relationships with governments and with other countries around the world and making sure that those relationships are robust.

I think when we look at sort of how we can continue to build more initiatives and the issues that we're looking at, internet fragmentation is one that the Board is aware of, the Org is looking at, and I know has been very actively discussed, but I think really plays into our narrative and our position on the importance of a global unfragmented internet. There's been work I know in internet governance forum, which has been very extensive.

I know NCSG representatives have been involved in leading that work, and ICANN has also been a contributor to that. So that's been a really useful opportunity for us, and I think we can build on that. I'm gonna stop there because I realize I've said a lot there and there

is a lot more that we can say, but it'd be really good to hear from others on this. Looking around for others who might have points they'd like to say.

CHRIS CHAPMAN

Chris.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Yeah, please, Chris.

CHRIS CHAPMAN

I have said this a number of times, I'm gonna say it again, but at a time when there is such, to quote the words, increasing nationalism and isolation, this is the time for us to double down on the ICANN model. And I've also said this, that I detect a real appetite across the ICANN community to come together to collaborate in a way that has been sort of unnecessary to date.

Our time has come, the model's time has come, and we should do it with confidence and conviction. We've spoken in recent gatherings about the need to declutter the gridlock that we have in the system, the reviews. Maybe there's a need to have a substantial look at the bylaws to see what can be updated and what is now outdated. And the punchline to that observation is that I want to reiterate my impression that you have a board and a president and CEO who's determined to do that.

And so it's propitious moment and it's an opportunity for us to all come together. So, to quote somebody famously said, we go high

when they go low, and I think quite genuinely, the time is right for us to move ahead into the community, global community with great conviction and confidence about the strengths of our model. So I just wanted to put that on the table.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Thanks, Chris. I actually thought you were going to lead in with something that I had forgotten to mention, which is that this is also very much part of our strategic plan for the coming five years, and particularly strategic objective one, evolve and promote ICANN's multi-stakeholder model to sustain its inclusive approach to internet governance.

CHRIS CHAPMAN

C1 and C2 are a great pair.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

See exactly, playing off each other. It's great. But no. So there is absolutely that very strong and very well documented commitment from the Board and the Org on these issues.

TRIPTI SINHA

And I just wanted to add that, we are speaking to a like-minded community, so I don't think we need to convince each other that this is the right model, but what we can do is ensure that we are faithful to our model and do our work efficiently, effectively, quickly, be agile and all the other things that show that this model

works. So I don't think we need to really convince each other that this is a good model. So thank you.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Fazi, please.

FARZANEH BADIEI

Well, I agree with you, but we need to tell the outside world how we are doing things and how we are contributing and why the internet is resilient now. And it's, dare I say, because of our work and we have contributed to it and to the DNS stability and security, and we need to really jot down the issues that we have tackled and the good work that we have done, and tell the world that, because we are talking to each other and in a way it's very obscure. So we need to tell the world why we are so good at this and why this is so good for the internet. And probably talk to our people that don't believe in this, and by telling them, by showing them the cases of success.

TRIPTI SINHA

You're absolutely right, Farzi, we have to do a better job in telling our story, and we don't do as good a job. It's taken for granted. A lot of the stuff that we do, especially things like the underpinnings of the internet and so forth, you just expect it to work, but you don't realize there's a lot of magic that goes behind it, and the magic is this community and the work that this community puts into it. So yes, agreed.

KURTIS LINDQUIST

I agree with everything we've said. I just want to say, I mean, one of the things, especially this year that we had this workshop in Geneva with the ITU, and one of the things I said, because I think I said this before, but we had Marcus come around the stage and it was of course, the father of the IGF and the father of a lot of what we thought was his idea, a lot of, these thoughts.

And one of the things I said is that, and I think this is true, is that I got asked what was the difference between 2005 and today? And one of the main differences is in 2005 when the IGF and the WSIS process was launched, we only had Marcus's idea of what this would mean. Today, we actually have the outcomes of what that idea meant. And I think we really had to showcase those ideas and what it led to.

And I think one of the things that Tripti alluded to is this fact that it's not just that the internet is an enable of so much, this is what these principles have actually allowed us to create in those 20 years that might not have been there unless it was for these principles. And really show that this was the underpinnings of what we have.

And I think to the point that Farzaneh said and it's not about, and the question is that we unite us, we are united, and there's actually that very thing that enable all this, that there is no divergence. And I think we need to really highlight that, that this is what enables it, to Farzaneh point is that it's the multi-stakeholder group of all of us who enable this, and I think that's really what we need to underline that without that, this wouldn't exist.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

I'll just add one other thing that's different now from 20 years ago is that 20 years ago, we wouldn't have had that kind of close collaboration between ICANN and the ITU on this kind of communication, this kind of capacity building.

And I think the WSIS review and the discussions around that have really served to highlight some of the commonalities that we see between all of those different WSIS partner organizations, partner institutions, and building on that as we go forward in the discussions this year around the WSIS review is really important. Stop there. Oh, sorry, Bruna, I see. And Becky, Sorry. Okay, Becky. Bruna, please.

BECKY BURR

So, especially since Farzi has been so positive this morning, I don't want to beat Debbie Downer, but I would like to add that we also have to do our work. We have to get our work done, we have to be listening to the frustration that we hear coming out of the different parts of our own community. And this is not just cheerleading, it is demonstrating the success of this model through real accomplishments and work.

BRUNA SANTOS

Just adding to the conversation, a couple of friends have been telling me I've been living on panic mode, but I guess that's the times we live in. But in any case, I think it's also important that I

can, whenever you guys are advocating for the model, you also bring the advocates with you.

One thing is to have the Org talking about its missions, and maybe a much better thing is also to have some of its long term supporters, newer generations, the youth, and a lot of the fellowship move like folks that you've got here helping advocate for this and also showing that there has been some renewal and there has been some like longer term influence of the internet and of ICANN and it's all of the internet governance institutions as the enablers they're supposed to be.

So it's also just adding that, that it's really important to also bring the advocates to help ICANN advocate for its mission. And maybe just as a side note, it's really, really nice and important to see right now this race in the technical community coordination.

Efforts like TCCM, they're really relevant, but again, we need to be talking to each other and we need to be breaking our own silos for the thing to work. So I think that part of the job is also make sure that there is cross pollination within all of the stakeholder groups and make sure that we're all talking the same kind of points and advocating for the same thing, so yeah.

PEDRO LANA

Also to add the conversation, Pedro Lana, RIPE NCC and NCSG executive committee, when talking to the outside world is also really important to have some especially in talking to authorities that are not then involved in the internet governance debates, to

have some tools that help to explain the very basics of the technical workings of the internet because when we are dealing with them on those advocacy works, we see a lot of confusion even on those basic parts, and getting this through this barrier is really hard to end some of these discussions.

So having some materials that could help talking to them from such an important authority in this internet space is really helpful to show that's not just an opinion, but how things really work?

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Sorry. Yeah, no, thanks. And I do think that that's something that Org is very aware of. I know some of the staff that I work closely with in the internet governance space I know have worked on that kind of material, but making sure it reaches not just Org, not just Board, but also those advocating for us and for this model in the community is really important.

So I think, yeah, thank you for that highlight. Looking around, I'm not seeing any further questions. We have two more-- sorry, further comments. We have two more questions, which we had in this, so we maybe we can move to those. The first one, well, maybe we can move to the next one from-- sorry. Oh, yes. No, no, no, sorry. Yes, there's one on the budget from-

RAFIK DAMMAK

From the Board and also you asked us another question. We have two other questions.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

We have three questions. Now. I'm confused. We answered two of them I think, and we have a third one. So we have one and they have one. So we have two questions left, and I think I was going to suggest we could do the GPI.

RAFIK DAMMAK

Just to clarify, so there is another question from you guys, which is I think about the challenge. This one. Budget. And I understand there was additional question that come lately and you wanted some of our feedback, so.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Okay. No, I think we had discussed if this is time to discuss the reviews, which I think is something we're keen to discuss with everyone. But I also don't want to--

RAFIK DAMMAK

We can go with this and go to our question and then we leave the last at the end.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Okay, perfect. Well, let's go with the challenges in regard to the Board-- sorry, in regard to budget and ops plan discussions. So I'll pass it to you, Rafik.

RAFIK DAMMAK

Yeah, thanks Chris. And for this one kind of we have Pedro, he will go through the several points and try to respond about what we are perceiving as challenges to contribute in the process. Pedro.

PEDRO LANA

Thanks, Rafik. I'll try to be brief here. We'll be focusing more on the public comment about the ICANN operating information plans. The obvious part of it is that those are very large documents and they are not very friendly to people who are not experienced in analyzing budget documentation. But we know they need to be detailed, they need to have that amount of information.

So what we would like to suggest is improving on something that's already being implemented with the highlight documents that was published within this public comment. But the documents still a little bit focused on descriptive summary of the main documents instead of prospective actions regarding those most pressing issues.

So it would be useful to have some specific questions without limiting the scope of the answers to those questions as it was done, for example, with the invitation to the community to provide feedback on the clarity of the term strategic initiatives this time. And to be more concrete, other important issues that could be the object of those guiding questions are, for example, the proposal on the plan of increasing fees or the cost saving initiatives that were being implemented, which seemed to be mentioned only in the longer budget documents.

Remembering other good initiatives that facilitate comments from the community, we could mention also the supporting visual map that was published for the strategic plan and operating plan framework back in 2024, or the How We Meet approach that was a directive example on how to consult the community about similar complex issues.

But in regarding to this effort, it would be really useful to have more data on the overall impact of the measures that we are being asked to comment on. So we could analyze not only the immediate results on the experience of participants, but also on the potential financial results. At last, and most importantly, it also seems fruitful to previously scope financial and planning questions that particularly interest different groups on the community and highlight them.

NCSG, for example, is especially concerned about parenting the participation of the community and its diversity as to guarantee productive policy work. So this would surely attract more comments from our side if we saw something related to that highlighted in one of those consultations. So asking ICANN Finance to engage in a more tailored way with community groups instead of focusing engagement in broader webinars may bring good results. That's it. Thanks.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Thanks. I think we have Xavier in the room who's happy to lead the response on this.

XAVIER CALVEZ

Thank you. And thank you for having read the documents and therefore recognizing that they are very long, and you're right, and we do acknowledge that. As you know, it's also a matter of balance between being able to provide a lot of transparency and therefore a lot of information, but then the documents are alone. So it's a constant endeavor to be able to try to be very transparent and provide a lot of information.

Also, because the diversity of the community also means a diversity of interests. And therefore, in order to try to cater to everyone's interest, we need to provide a lot of information. We also need to both offer summaries for those who have little time to spend and more details for those who have interest in those details. So we try to do that in the forms of the document, there's a summarized document, which is about 10 pages for those who want to spend a few minutes.

And there's a lot more detailed documents, which is what you were pointing at. But therefore, your comments are extremely important and helpful, and we continuously gather them, because for us, it's really important to try to gauge how much information we provide in the form of it.

Thank you for the points about specific questions that help guide the input or at least solicit the input without limiting it. We have tried in the past to ask more specific questions, which was both

welcomed sometimes, but also felt like a limitation of the public comment and the input.

So we want to be careful with that, but happy to think more about highlighting some areas of the plans to solicit or to make them more visible, and therefore easier to comment on. And thank you for mentioning diversity and ways of participation so that we can put more efforts on that in the future. This is really helpful. Thank you very much.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Thank you very much, Xavier. I feel like there's probably conclusion to that, but we can just-- if anyone has further comments. Okay. Well, then let's move on to the question around global public interest framework. And this came from NCSG, I believe. Becky, you are going to respond?

BECKY BURR

Yes, and thank you very much. We really appreciate NCSG's attention to and interest in the global public interest checklists that has been circulated. The Board is looking at-- so the Board in all of its resolutions talks about and considers sort of whether the action is within ICANN's mission commitments and core values, that's a part of it.

We do think we need to articulate it more clearly, and I think the global public interest checklist for the Board will be a very useful tool to have by our side when we consider policy recommendations coming up from the community or from cross community groups.

We very much hope that the community will also use the checklist as part of the policy development recommendations to the extent that that is transparent and sort of in our faces, that's very useful.

We also expect that SOs and ACs may want to use it in their comments on various recommendations and the like. So what we're hoping is that we become trained to have a robust discussion about the global public interest as we do our work as a normal, a natural part of our work. And the checklist hopefully will make that a little bit easier.

With respect to the privacy, the fast-evolving regulatory landscape demanding privacy and accuracy, how can the global public interest framework be fundamental to preserving registrant's privacy? So I think as all of the folks who work in the privacy field know, the privacy regulation always comes with a requirement of proportionality.

Whatever measure, whatever you do, it needs to be proportional to the, the goal that you are seeking to achieve. And if you can achieve a particular goal by using a less invasive privacy approach, then you should be doing that. Proportionality and the global public interest just requires us to, to speak more directly about proportionality in that.

And of course, this always comes up in terms of access to data. On the other side of access of the privacy issues, there are issues about consumer protection and crime prevention and other things that go into the proportionality mix. All of that is to say there is no bright line test for it, but using the global public interest and the

fundamental concept of proportionality in the privacy context, we should be able to do a better job navigating that.

It is very hard in a world where the laws are principles in terms of privacy regulation, to know sort of what the answer is, and to the extent we can be engaged with regulators who are enforcing those laws, it would be very helpful to us.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Farzi, do you want to respond?

FARZANEH BADIEI

I don't have a respond. Becky has all that answers.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Sorry. Misunderstood.

FARZANEH BADIEI

No, I wanted to make a comment.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Oh, okay.

FARZANEH BADIEI

Yes. Becky point taken. For the global public interest, so this kind of like aligning human rights with the global public interest, we believe that human rights is in the public interest, and the matter of proportionality, we do all of those things when we do human

rights impact assessment in other policy. And as you know, there's a PDP human rights checklist that is in place now, and for the PDPs, the community is going to do that.

We just want to ensure that when there're conflict between the values, like some kind of apparent conflict, we talk about it and we consider human rights as well. In the matter of accuracy, we repeatedly hear from some community members that the domain name registrants data should be used to identify them and that is how they define accuracy.

And we find that we need to come up with a solution by using this human rights framework and also the GPI to look at these turn issues that we have disagreements among the community so that we can preserve privacy, we also can preserve anonymity, but we can also bring security.

TRIPTI SINHA

I agree completely. We should be asking carefully. The question is not identifying somebody, it's identifying them for what purposes. It is the purpose to prevent them from engaging in speech that a government doesn't like. That's a problem. Is it for the purpose of identifying and stopping somebody who is engaged in consumer fraud? That's a different question. So the issues are more complicated than just identifying somebody.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Okay. Thanks, Becky. I'll just use the moderator's prerogative. I think there's a really clear link also between the use of the GPI

framework back to what we talked about in relation to the multi-stakeholder model, and also with the council yesterday of really enunciating clearly the rationale behind whatever policy decisions are made by the ICANN community and putting that in context. So I think in the sense of how can this ensure continuous improvement? That's a very practical link to that.

Looking around. We have nine minutes left, so we can perhaps go to the question about reviews. So the question about reviews, which was not on our list but is something that the Board has been discussing quite intently and also the organizational effectiveness committee within the Board has been looking at regarding the work currently on continuous improvement, the work on a pilot holistic review, and then also looking to the ATRT4, the accountability and transparency review, and really wanting to get feedback from the community on how these, how the community groups see these different work streams interacting, how you would like to see this progress, what priorities you have in relation to all this. So throwing this open really with apologies for the last minute inclusion, but hopefully a good use of this time today.

RAFIK DAMMAK

Okay. Thank, Chris. I think we understand about maybe the reason, but I mean, my answer here, trying to respond for NCSG, it'll be quite brief that we need really more discussion to understand the impact and the implication of trying to prioritize or change the timeline and so on. So I cannot really have firm answer to that right now.

And also, we need to check about our own readiness and how we will handle or participate on those reviews. So it's good reminder for us, so we will have internal discussion and hopefully, we can come up with better response. But on the other hand, also to take opportunity here, since we are talking about reviews, and there are also that in going public comment about the operating standards for specific review.

And putting this in relation to what we are talking here about the prioritization and planning exercise, we do have some concerns about the scoping. And we understand that the kind of will be task and maybe for the staff to do it.

So this is a question here, who will do the scoping and who will own it? So that's using this one concern so we can understand about the prioritization and planning. That's something we need to discuss. But on the other hand, just taking opportunity to raise some maybe concerns about what is put as proposal.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Okay. Thank you. Farzaneh, please.

FARZANEH BADIEI

This is my personal opinion. So I always struggled with the outcome of the reviews, and when they came out, the communities were very agitated by the outcome and they didn't want to implement some of them and they felt that some of the recommendations were not applicable to them.

So I'm just wondering what we're doing for the effectiveness of these reviews, if we are doing all these reviews and then the recommendations are not even implemented. So I think that maybe being more issue specific and have like smaller review processes and not just like on the whole SO or AC, I don't know, I'm just coming up with ideas. And these are not NCSG ideas and position.

I wanted to also ask if-- so I really like gathering with the Board and hearing your questions and putting forward our questions, but I also wanted to see what we can actually do after these meetings so that they won't be like just one-off meetings so that we can be a little bit action oriented.

We see that, like as a result of this meeting what sort of actions we can take in the future, not just for NCSG, but it can be for example, we discussed the GPI and HRIA. So what are the next step? Are we gonna discuss it in our next meeting? A little bit action oriented would be good. I just don't know how to come up with it, but designing the meeting would be good to have some kind of outcome.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Tomslin, please. Or Tripti, did you want to respond? Okay, please, Tomslin.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR

Thanks, Chris. Tomslin for the record. So with regards to the reviews, I understand ATRT4 is paused for a limited time, and there

are reasons for that, one being the implementation of ATRT3 and capacity in the community. So I had a question for the Board which is, what happens after this period of pause and the community still doesn't have capacity and some of those recommendations are still not implemented, what happens? And what if we find ourselves in the same situation post ATRT4 as well?

TRIPTI SINHA

So I'd like to just add some color to this conversation. And the Board has had some extensive discussions on reviews. We're currently paused, as you said, Farzaneh, lots of recommendations come out. Some are implemented, some are not, some are still on the shelf. Let's go back to ground zero and look at the motivations for why we put these reviews in place.

Of course, one of the motivations is ensuring that we are accountable and we are transparent. But 27 years have gone by since the creation of ICANN and over 10 years now since or close to 10 years since the transition. It's just time to look at how we do reviews, what motivated us, and how could we evolve it.

So we really want to start that conversation, and going forward, put in a process that makes sense, that is fit for purpose and serves us well to ensure that we are accountable and that we are transparent. So to answer your question, what happens next? We're thinking about exactly that, we don't know yet, but we think it's the right time to have this conversation with the community. Hope that provides some context.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Okay. Thank you very much, Tripti. Looking around, not seeing any more flags up, and aware that we're now into the final minutes, so probably we'll wrap it up here. I think just I would personally respond quickly to Farzaneh's point about some follow-up, and I think that's something I don't have a strong, solid answer on right now, but I think a really useful point to highlight and maybe we can look at how what follow-up might look like, say in Prague, or then looking to Oman later in the year when I guess we'll have our next constituency meeting in this format. I think ensuring that continuity is certainly important. Looking to Rafik for any final comments.

RAFIK DAMMAK

Okay. Thanks, Chris. Yeah, thanks again for the discussion, it's always a good opportunity to share our thoughts on some of the topics. And we start talking about meetings and Farzaneh kind of try to end about talking about meetings. So I concur about this, really, we should be kind of outcome, action oriented.

Discussion is important, dialogue is important, but like how we can follow up, how we can have an outcome that is really to be that effective, efficient and so on. That's what we are talking a lot about, but that's maybe how to be more concrete, and yeah, just wanted to say just again, say thank and hopefully to see you again. Yeah.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Thank you very much Rafik. Thank you everyone for taking the time today to be part of this session, some really good discussions. Enjoy the rest of the week, and I'm here by closing the session.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]