
ICANN83 | PF – ICANN Board and Fellowship, NextGen@ICANN Participants
Wednesday, June 11, 2025 – 13:45 to 15:00 CEST

FERNANDA IUNES

Hello and welcome to our session. My name is Fernanda Iunes and I'm a participation manager for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN expected standards of behavior and ICANN community anti-harassment policy. During this session, questions or comments will only be read aloud if submitted within the Q&A pod or in the chat as I've described on the Zoom. Interpretation for this session will include English, Spanish, and French. 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. On-site participants will use a physical microphone to speak. Please state your name for the record, the language you will speak if speaking a language other than English, and speak at a reasonable pace. And with that, I'll hand the floor back to Siranush.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN

Thank you, Fernanda. Welcome back to the Fellowship and NextGen Joint Session, and this one is special because this is a joint session with ICANN Board, and it's my pleasure to introduce Tripti Sinha, Kurtis Lindqvist, and Leon Sanchez, who will give some brief welcome speech for you all. And then we'll go and open the floor for Q&A, and I hope that you prepared some interesting questions

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.

to our panelists. But before that, I also would like to ask our other board members who are here to stand up so you know who are with us. And thank you for coming. Thank you. I know you have always have a very busy schedule, but we all appreciate, especially Fellows and NextGen participants, that you find this time to come and talk to us and for this interactive session. They always appreciate. And with that, without further ado, I would like to give the floor to Tripti to start.

TRIPTI SINHA

Thank you, Siranush. First, I'd like to extend a very, very warm welcome to all of you. This is one of our, the remarkable programs that ICANN has put in place many years ago to bring in the next generation, and I'd like to comment on something in particular that's happened at this meeting, which is our schedules, the board's schedule has been enabled such that we were able to attend the presentations yesterday and today, and we also had the pleasure of having lunch with some of you. And I must say, I was extremely impressed with your presentations, very, very impressed. The kind of work you're doing resonates very well with the mission of ICANN, and you covered the spectrum of being deep down in the technical weeds and up at a higher level talking about governance issues, and you're right on the money, and you're right exactly in the space that we need to be in, and we need this next generation thinking. And I couldn't think of one particular constituency group that you did not touch. So once again, a very warm welcome to all of you, and I'm delighted that you're

engaging, and from the presentations that I saw, I was actually doing associations in my head that this particular individual could closely align with the SSAC or the RSSAC Caucus or the GNSO or the policymaking wing. You covered the entire spectrum, and it was fresh thinking, innovative thinking, and we asked you some questions. I noticed there were lots of questions asked, and your delivery and your responses were so elegant and eloquent. You're thinking deeply, so we're delighted to have you here, and please embrace this experience completely. So with that, again, welcome, and I turn it back to Siranush.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN

Thank you, Tripti. Thank you very much. And, Kurtis, the floor is yours.

KURTIS LINDQVIST

Thank you. I'd like to echo what Tripti said. I mean, we had yesterday the lunch together with the executives and the board, which is the first time we've done that, as I said yesterday, and I think it was a really exciting exchange, and I'm really glad we managed to do that, and we'll keep this going to have this chance to interact with each of you and hear more in a smaller setting of the work you do and the presentations we've seen. Today I had a chance to attend the before lunch session, and now again, I think it's really, really interesting to see the work you're doing and the presentations, and as Tripti said, I mean, you're really struck by the breadth of topics and how that relates to, and how Tripti was

saying, said that she was trying to link this back to current topics. I was actually linking this back to my own journey throughout the years of how we ended up here and how I recognize a lot of the work that you are doing and saying and where I was in that journey doing that. I'm young enough to have been to the creation of many of these organizations, but again, a lot of what we did is what you are doing now, and it's really engaging and stimulating to see you guys doing the same journey, so that's really, really good, so thank you all.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN

Thank you, Kurtis, and as always, it's my great pleasure to introduce Leon Sanchez, and those who don't know, Leon came through the fellowship program, so he's our pride in the board, so I, and always, he's coming with pleasure to our session, and he's always ready to talk to any newcomer, very supportive to both programs, and Leon, the floor is yours.

LEON SANCHEZ

Thank you very much, Siranush, and I'm so happy to be here with you guys. I must say that this must be my favorite session in all ICANN meetings, and just as a fun fact, I happen to have started my journey within ICANN as a fellow for the first time in Prague, so this has come to full circle now, and well, I think that the best use of the time that we can have is for you to ask questions from us, so happy to answer any questions, and also happy to share my ICANN journey if you're interested in, and if you want to listen to it, yes, I'll

be happy to share it with you, and welcome. Yes, I agree with Kurtis and Tripti that the fresh thoughts that you bring into the community and the fresh views definitely help us, you know, just step out of our bubble and to get new views and new ways in which we can solve old problems, so you are most welcome.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN

Thank you, Leon, and yes, as we have only one hour, 15 minutes for this session, and I know we always have great questions to our board members. I will open the floor now for the questions, and let's start with whomever you want to ask your question, feel free to tell, and as we usually know, introduce yourself so we know who you are. Please. Yes, Kunle. Let's go.

KUNLE OLORUNDARE

All right. Thank you very much. So I think this is going to be an icebreaker, and as a matter of fact, you've already set the tone. I'm looking at you. So sincerely, I really want to hear your story, how you started as a fellow, and now you navigated the, you know, ecosystem, and here you are today as a board member. I think that's going to be inspiring. Please.

LEON SANCHEZ

Well, absolutely. Just as a reminder, once you're a fellow, you're always a fellow, so I continue to be a fellow, right? And well, or a NextGen participant, of course. So I mean, it all started with me coming as a fellow for the first time back in Prague, again in 2012,

and as you know, being a fellow is a privilege, and a NextGen is also a privilege, because you are literally grabbed by someone's hand and taken through the whole ICANN ecosystem, and as soon as you get to any constituency or any working group or any caucus or whatever space you get into, and you mention that you are a fellow, like, doors open immediately, right? And people is always willing to lend you a hand and to explain things to you and to listen to you and to share thoughts and exchange ideas, and I think that's, again, a privilege that us as fellows, as NextGen participants shouldn't take for granted, and we should actually cease the opportunity to be able to find our place within this community and to start working, to start working hard for this community to solve problems, to provide ideas, to find ways in which we can better collaborate in a respectful, civil way. We might have some points in which we can disagree, but as long as we, you know, disagree respectfully and listen with good faith to others, we will find ways to solve those problems that are on our table, and, well, after that, I joined the ALAC, the At-Large Community, and the ALAC, the Advisory Committee, and, well, at some point, I was given the responsibility of co-chairing the CCWG on accountability that was almost ten years back when we were working on the transition from what we call the Ayana transition. And I was in charge with some other colleagues and of course a larger group of people on designing the accountability mechanisms that are embedded into our current bylaws. So that was a very interesting work that I was entrusted with. And well, after that, it opened, you know, the opportunity to put myself up for election within the At-Large

community as a member of the board for seat 15. I got elected. Then I got reappointed. And then I got reappointed a second time. So it's in a way I've had this privilege to serve our community because I am convinced that if you work for this community, if you deliver on the mission, and if you commit yourself to giving your very best to the ecosystem, you will eventually get to leadership positions. And once you are there, you should take advantage of being a leader to give back to the community, to serve the community. So I see leadership positions as an opportunity, again, to serve our community, not to serve ourselves. If you are looking at it from a perspective in which you see leadership as a goal and not as a mean to serve, then you're looking at it on the wrong way. The right way to look at it is to see leadership, again, as an opportunity to serve our community.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN

And I would completely agree with you. Yesterday, we had a session how to enhance your further skills in tech career. We were speaking about the leadership, that leadership is not just a position. It's a set of skills, communication, networking, and facilitation, and these type of things which lead you to the leadership position, as you want to say. But Kulle, who asked this question, actually, he's the one with his third and last fellowship this round, who is a second fellowship, who is coming back, actually, as a mentor for the other next year, nominated by his own community. So I'm looking

forward to working with him in his new capacity. Okay. Who's next?

Yes. Yanli, one of our adopted fellows for this round.

YANLI

Yeah. Yanli is a fellow from Taiwan, and I'm curious about the long-term outcome of the ICANN fellow and NextGen program. So I'm curious about how many board member has attended as a fellow before ICANN fellow or NextGen fellow. Thank you.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN

So, so far, we had two fellows. One is here, actually, previous board member, former board member, Leon, Lito, is here, and Leon is current. So we had two.

LEON SANCHEZ

And also, to highlight that Lito was actually the first fellow to come into the board.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN

Yes. Lito was the first one. We do have a lot of fellows who are currently on the leadership positions, like ccNSO chair, GAC chair. Those are current chairs who came through the fellowship program. We have a lot of chairs of working groups who are fellows. We have in non-commercial stakeholder group a lot of, and At-Large, I mean, about 60 percent of At-Large structures are led by

fellows. So those who had been through the fellowship program, who came through the fellowship program.

LEON SANCHEZ

We also need to remember that the current head of the fellowship program was a fellow too.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN

Yes. And myself, I came through the fellowship program, correct. And we have 13 ICANN staff who came through the program as well.

LEON SANCHEZ

Yeah, that's true. I think that the return of investment, if I may say, from the fellowship program is very good, as Siranush was mentioning. A lot of us that have gone through the fellowship program not only stay and get involved, but of course, I don't want to say climb, because that's not the right word, but we go through the ICANN structure and processes and eventually get to leadership positions in different areas, right? Including the organization as staff. So I would say it's a great program in terms of how many people become involved and engaged through it.

KURTIS LINDQVIST

Can I also, I mean, I think this is also what we just mentioned, is that maybe a number of more board members alone isn't such a good measure, but I mean, this entire phenomenal outcome that we had

from the program is also why it's so important, I mean, the lunch we had yesterday for the board and executives to get to know this, because you are the future leaders of the community, right, we're in the community, and we really want you to feel welcome about that. We really want to work with you, and I think that's why it was so important to build this and have it included as well, because as Leon says, it has been a phenomenal success, right?

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN

And actually, we had 53 NextGen participants who became fellows, and then now we have several in leadership positions who came through the NextGen, that fellowship, and then now are ICANN community members. Yes, Pravan, please, go ahead.

PRANAV TIWARI

Thank you. Pranav Tiwari for the record. I am a second-time fellow from India. We just discussed that being a board member comes with a lot of leadership skills, very important decisions, sometimes which are also difficult conversations. I wanted to understand how you navigate such important questions and discussions, and here I also wanted to take an example so that one of the important discussions that I have been hearing about now that I'm part of the community and I'm understanding, getting feedback from everyone on the changes in the languages with respect to DEI, I also read Kurtis's blog, and of course, there'd be so many things that you must have done, there would have been a reason for the change, there would be communication afterwards, efforts to

ensure that there is transparency, trust is maintained, so I just wanted to understand how did the board navigate this discussion, and what are the steps forward from here?

KURTIS LINDQVIST

If I could take a second point first. So the change on the website language was there's two pages that were changed. The first one is a page that's called, that relates to employment at ICANN, and it's under the careers of ICANN area. That page reflects our, so ICANN has employment obligations in a number of countries around the world where we employ staff, and we need to, our employment policies are an amalgamation of those responsibilities, and when laws are updated in any of the countries where we have employment obligations, we need to update those policies. There is something in the U.S. called EEOC, and I forgot the abbreviation, it's the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission, that sets the employment law in the U.S. for discrimination or other equal, at least the other way around is the equal opportunities, and they changed the guidelines, and this page is fundamentally based on that guidance, because most of our employees are based in the U.S., and when the guidance change, we have to update the page to be in accordance with those guidelines, and that's what we did, so there was a, if you want the legal obligation to ensure that we remain compliant with employment law in the countries and territories we operate, this particular change was around wording and how you describe this, it wasn't actually about practice or policies, our practices and policies didn't change, but we had to

change it to match the language of the guidance, I mean, that's the change we did. The second page was related to this, because it could be inferred or read as it related also to including to our actions as an employer, and we couldn't, again, the guidance was that we couldn't do that, and that was really the only change, is all the policies of ICANN, all the community developed obligations, there's 12,000 pages on the ICANN website on diversity, none of those changed, we only did what we had to do as an employer in a certain jurisdiction, and those, we do update policies as employment obligations change, and, you know, this particular change, I mean, you have to follow law, so that particular decision wasn't very hard, because we have to follow employment law and the rules where we have contracts, but you're right, if this would have been a wider discussion, it would have been a very difficult discussion to be had, because at the end of the day, we have community policies, and we haven't had that discussion, so I don't know how it would have gone, but I suspect that, in my experience, what is a community-developed policy is a community-developed policy, we have no right to overstate, that we can't, we as an organisation or board can't set ourselves over that, except following the due process, and that's actually one of the important things about being ICANN, is that our actions are within the framework of the policy and the development that we have as ICANN, and the obligations we have under bylaws, we have to follow that, so that might not have been such a difficult discussion as you thought it was, because, you know, it's an employment law, we have to follow it, but I think you actually raise a very interesting

point about this, someone else said this, about how do you become leadership and evolve your leadership experience. I mean, I started in this way before I had any leadership experience, working in the IETF mostly, and in RIPE, which is one of the RIRs, and I eventually became a chair of working groups, I learned, I watched others, how you lead, how do you have, you know, as a working group chair in this, both in the IETF and RIPE, and as in ICANN, you have to moderate very different voices, and there are very conflicting views, and you have to, at the end of the day, all we do is built on a consensus-based principle. And consensus doesn't mean that everybody gets what they want, it just means that you reach a consensus, right? And you have to build that consensus, and that is a skill. It's something you have to learn, is to moderate, and most importantly, not inject your own opinion, because as a chair, you're actually neutral in it. And it's a phenomenal chance to learn and practice these skills for many years, and something I think has been very useful in my other career, but I've gradually started becoming an executive in other companies, in telecom, and what I did before this. It's something you take with you, and it's something that helps you gradually progress through your leadership career, and when I eventually went to study leadership, it was phenomenal, because I recognized a lot of the practices used in building consensus, and how you work this, and in a workplace, and as a manager, that might be very structural and formal, and you get very formal training. What you learn in an environment like ICANN or the [inaudible], it's much more practical, because you're standing in front of these people, and you have to form a consensus, and that's

your role, right? So I think it's a phenomenal opportunity to build on that.

JAMES GALVIN

James Galvin, I'm the liaison to the ICANN board. To turn this around and make maybe, I hope, a more concrete suggestion to NextGeners, your question teased out the question about, you know, being a leader, and how you get there, and Kurtis just explained, you know, all of that, and it's sort of obvious, you know, you get there by doing, and Leon, in his opening remarks, commented about finding your own place and your own space here, and I think that's what's important. One of the things that's most important about being part of the board, in particular, when you get to this end of it, is learning to listen to the community, which means we need each of you to get engaged, find your place, have your own opinion and insights, and be willing to bring that and talk about it. That's what Kurtis was talking about, the multi-stakeholder model. It's about everybody getting together and finding that consensus, but it starts with you. It starts with you having your own voice, and you having some insight that you want to bring to the table, and that's what we want to encourage. That's why the board is here. That's why ICANN has this program, and doing this, and just want to remind you of that and encourage that, and bring that along to everything that you do. Find the community here. Find the space here that you can actually feel most comfortable, and don't be afraid to ask questions of anybody. In particular, board members would love to answer any question that

you might have, but around here, you have to learn to ask questions and step up. Thanks. Yes, and challenge. That's right. Very good point. That's what Kurtis said. And challenge. Feel free to disagree with somebody. Just don't be militant about it.

LEON SANCHEZ

Thank you. Back to your question about how the board deals with difficult issues and discussions. I think that one of the essential or fundamental strengths in the board is its diversity, right? We have a very diverse board that has, I mean, all the individuals that are in the board are extremely professional, knowledgeable, and with a huge load of experience in many areas. Now, that doesn't mean that everyone is capable of everything within the board, of course, but that's why we work as a team. Yes, we have committees, subcommittees, we organize our work, and those that are more talented in certain areas, you know, take care of those issues, then they bring them back with recommendations to the board. And we have discussions within the board, within the full board, and we all are able to express our views, our opinions, our suggestions, our, you know, proposals and recommendations. And we finally coalesce into consensus, and then we formulate our resolutions. That's how it essentially works. But that wouldn't be possible if we hadn't this amazing group of individuals committed to ICANN's mission. But I don't want to, you know, monopolize the microphone. I would invite my board colleagues to also share their thoughts on how we deal with issues and things.

TRIPTI SINHA

I think Leon hit on most of the points. But it really is what a resolution typically in board language means a decision. You arrive at a decision, and prior to any decision, it goes through, as he said, all these different bodies. They're called committees of the board, and they are subject-oriented. And whatever the issue of the day is or of that particular moment is put into that committee is deliberated and then brought forward as a full decision to the board. And it's as we are very, very diverse, different backgrounds, different experiences, and arrive at a consensus, which means, yes, this is the right decision for the board. Now, I would like to point out the board has a slightly different role, it's slightly elevated, which is called we have fiduciary responsibilities. So we cradle the mission of the organization basically in our palms. And our role is to ensure that the corporation remains financially stable, remains within its mission, and we are unafraid to make decisions that ensure that there is corporate resilience, and we are on the right track. So every now and then, we have to make some hard decisions, like you've probably heard about reviews recently. And so that's been getting a lot of attention. And there have been various and sundry opinions around the table and around the community about reviews, and why did the board do this, that, and the other. And in the end, people are understanding the decision we took. Our commitment to accountability and effectiveness and transparency remains very, very, very strong. But clearly, the vehicles that we use today to conduct reviews are not delivering

the outcomes that are needed. So we decided to defer it, and in the meantime, put together a working group that will look at how we can better design these processes. So when we make our decisions, one of the themes, prevailing themes, in all our decision making is our fiduciary responsibility and our obligation to our mission. Our obligation to our mission is to ensure that the Internet's identifier systems remain stable, secure, and resilient for the globe, for the whole world. So there's a global perspective that is at play as well. Thank you, everyone.

ROLLA HAMZA

Thank you. I am Rolla Hamza from Egypt. This is my third time as a fellow. My question is how you develop a policy that is make sure that it's proactive, not reactive, especially that the technology is moving in the fast pace and also with the challenge that we have reaching for the consensus. So how is balancing between all these challenges? Thank you.

TRIPTI SINHA

So you said, how do we develop policy? So we is the operative word. Policies are developed by the community. And there's something called an acronym that you should learn if you're going to be part of this community. It's called PDP, Policy Development Process. And it's a very complex, extremely detailed process where there's community engagement. And another word that you should know is bottom-up policy development. So it starts at the very bottom with the community and moves up the stack. And then

by the time it comes to the board, it's ready for ratification, which means approval. And the organization, I'm going to turn it over to Kurtis next so that he can add more color to this. The organization follows the policy development process very, very closely and ensures that it doesn't go off course and stays within its guardrails. And by the time it comes to us, it's a matter of making sure that it's hit all the right marks and then we approve it. But I'm condensing it to what appears to be a very simple process, but it's far more complex than that. So Kurtis, over to you.

KURTIS LINDQVIST

Thank you, Tripti. Tripti got the easy part of the question. I was trying to look around to see how many people from the IETF is here because I'm about to say something that might get slightly controversial, but it's only Jim, so it's okay. So in the distant past, I was on something called the Internet Architecture Board, and there was an eternal discussion. It's exactly the question you asked, and we started laughing because it's a phenomenally good question. Because partly, inherent by nature, policy is in response to something, right? So already when you have that idea, you're actually reacting. It's very rare that you're proactive. And this comes to the controversial side is that we think of technology being standardized as being proactive. Reality is that it's mostly reactive, right? And Jim will probably be going to disagree with me because today, I'm going to talk to you about the ICANN context, and I'm going to talk to you about the ICANN context, and I know I'm oversimplifying, but even then, you already have an idea to

something you want to solve, right? The problem has occurred. In the ICANN context, a lot of the policies we develop are, again, by nature, reactive, because we are reacting to the identified issue or problem or observation. It doesn't have to be a problem, it can be an opportunity. And that's really where the difference lies, is that do you develop the policy in response to an opportunity or to a challenge, right? And that's what you have. And in the ICANN context, I don't know the percentage, but I think a lot of policy development is reactive, which is not necessarily a bad thing, right? We are trying to manage ourselves in the environment inside the mission that ICANN has, and that's what guides the policy. But fundamentally, I strictly describe the PDP, the policy development process, is initiated by the community, either because they have seen an opportunity or something that needs to be addressed, right? And we then manage it through that PDP. Now, really at the heart of this question is how do you do that effectively, which is a very hot topic being discussed here this week as well, is that how do you ensure that there is efficiency in this PDP? And how do we... And there is a lot of discussions this week around making sure you will hear the words saying tightly scoped, narrowly scoped, as in that you actually describe what you're trying to do, rather than necessarily being reactive or proactive, is that whatever it is you're trying to develop the policy around, that it's framed in a narrow and clear way enough that you can actually execute on it. Because one big risk of policy development is that you make very large discussions. You take very high level views of what needs to be addressed. And then it becomes very hard to have a discussion, it's

been very hard, even harder to implement it. And we had a question about the hard decisions for the board, is that if you have policies that are very large, very broad, maybe therefore not spec'd out enough, then it becomes harder for the board to have that decision, how do we agree with this, do we agree with the outcomes? So really the heart of that is that the community will identify what they need the policy for, they will initiate the policy development process, being it proactive or reactive, and we as orgs support that process to make sure it progresses. But it's really not us who are making the call whether there needs to be a policy, that's really the community who initiate that and who observes that.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN

May I add a little? There is a proactive part, which is the strategic planning that we do together as a community and in which the board has a leading role. So if you look to the strategic plan, you will find what the different parts of the community also reflect upon or working on towards the future. So this is good to follow. Every year we'll also check whether we're still on track with the strategic plan. If there's anything you miss, bring it in via the community you're supporting.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN

But just to remember that policy is developed by ICANN community. Yes. Suncica.

Suncica Rosic

Thank you. I'm Suncica Rosic and I'm an NextGen participant. I would like to reflect on the presentation we've heard yesterday, which addressed the importance of accountability and responsibility. And that reminded me that being an NextGen participant is not only about a sense of belonging and the opportunities, but also about the responsibility it entails. And I was wondering what are the differences in responsibilities when we compare fellows to NextGen participants? How do they change? How do they evolve? So any thoughts would be very valuable.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN

I probably will take this question because these are two different programs with two different objectives and goals. And we will talk separately, actually, for this, but briefly, the NextGen program is for students who are in their study or PhD related to Internet Governance Forum to come here with age limit. And fellowship program is a global one, which is capacity development for professionals who are 21 and up and who are engaged in the Internet ecosystem already. So this is briefly, but more details are on our website. Definitely, you can read about both programs and we will continue with other questions. Okay, but if you need more, we can talk after the session.

TRIPTI SINHA

Just one quick note. The NextGen program is also region specific as well, so it has to be the NextGen are always living and studying in the region where the ICANN meeting is taking place, whereas the fellows can be from anywhere in the world.

LEON SANCHEZ

Thank you. And also, I think that the NextGen can then become fellows and not the other way around. So you have an extra advantage.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN

Okay. Bibek, please.

BIBEK SILWAL

Thank you. Hello. Namaste, everyone. My name is Bibek Silwal from Nepal and I'm a third-time fellow. My question is to the board regarding the delegated IDN top-level domains and their availability to the end users. So recently we did UAD Nepal, it was a UA adaptation event as well as a hackathon to integrate the IDN emails. So to register for IDN TLDs in Devanagari script, the easy thing is that India and Nepal share the same script, which is Devanagari. And during the label generation rule, also there were two teams from Nepal in the script-making process in the IDR. Now presently there are three top-level IDN gTLDs in Hindi. One is .net, another is .com, and another is .org, out of which two is assigned to very signed .net and .com, and one is assigned to PIR. The PIR one, which is .org, it is available to register for only Indian citizens,

because the language is multilingual and it's shared by the region. It is only available to Indian citizens. They need to have an Indian ID card to register for the top-level domain. And .com and .net, it is only delegated and it is not available to the general public. So we are able to register through the help of our Indian friend, but it was also a challenge to ourselves in registering our IDN TLD that is already delegated and that too of .org and of a larger scale. So there will be very less number of people from developing regions coming and telling, okay, we have our language, but why are we not able to register? So my question is to the board, how in the days to come this kind of process would be eased? And the TLDs that are already delegated, specifically IDN TLDs, will be available to register for the end user in a very eased way, so we can promote the domain industry locally. Thank you.

KURTIS LINDQVIST

So unfortunately there is no distinction between registrant obligations, whether it's IDN or non-IDN. They are uniform, so the rules for a label under .com or .net or .org, for example, are the same, regardless of if it's Latin script or Hindi or any other script. They are set by the registry or the registrar. Could there be a way to stimulate that and ease it? I don't know. I'm not really, I think that's a discussion to be had with the registrars and the registries about the rules for particular scripts. I suspect not, because we also have some abuse requirements, which is actually what is driving a lot of the criteria around identification of registrants that you just raised. Could it be a way around that? I don't know. That's actually what's

driving this. It's the same rule, regardless of the label type. And there are requirements with DNS abuse protection that drives a lot of these identification requirements. I understand that it's an issue. I see, yeah, that is a topic. And that's true also for IDN CLDs, so if they have the registry agreement with ICANN at the point when they get delegated, and that's what controls that. And again, if it's a ccTLD IDN, then it's guided by the ccTLD rules, which again is set by the ccTLDs. With them, we as ICANN have no oversight over that, well, or limited oversight. We have not known, but it's very limited. But then you have other gTLDs in IDN, and again, that's up to that registry defining the rules for under the registry agreement with ICANN. But again, it comes down to the abuse requirements of having the identification, so it's a bit of a hard, it's a good point, maybe we could investigate. I don't think we'll ever allow registrants without identification, because that would be, again, that's feeding DNS abuse, and actually, I think we're going the other way, to require more identification to limit DNS abuse, which might have some unfortunate consequences, as you say, around IDNs. But to protect the internet and protect the public good, then that's the way it is going.

AMITABH SINGHAL

May I just add, for clarification, I heard you ask the equivalent of .org, that is .sanghatan, by PIR. You said it was available only to the Indian citizens?

BIBEK SILWAL

The ID was required to register for the TLD.

AMITABH SINGHA

Okay, so let me clarify, because I was on the board of PIR when we delegated .sanghatan during the first round, 2012. I don't recall any requirement of nationality around .sanghatan. PIR is not an Indian registry. It's global. So if there is a suggestion that there might be a confusion about registration processes around registrants from different countries, maybe I can get you in touch with somebody in PIR and they can clarify. But I don't think it is true that .sanghatan from PIR was restricted to any particular country's citizens.

TRIPTI SINHA

I'm going to ask a follow-up question. I'm going to make sure we understood this question correctly. So when you said you required an identity card, was that to register the top-level domain or to get a domain name? Or I didn't fully understand the question.

BIBEK SILWAL

So it was required to, for example, .org. So it's bibek.org. I required an ID from the Indian citizen only. It might be because of the registrar only.

TRIPTI SINHA

Yes. OK, so you're saying the registrar is restricting sales or domain names to a particular country, in this case, India. Houldn't be the case, but OK. But it may very well be true.

KURTIS LINDQVIST

I'm on thin ice now, because I don't know that all the registrar agreements by heart. But I don't think there is anything there that forces us to be completely—I would have to go back and check that. I don't know if that's the case.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN

Jose.

JOSÉ RENATO

Thank you very much for taking the time to talk to us. My name is José Renato, and I'm an NextGen participant. And I have two questions, if I may. The first is, I think we're starting to also get to know ICANN better, and so on and so forth. So for me, it's very interesting to know more about how you maintain your resilience through time, especially considering challenges to fragmentation of the internet, and so on and so forth. And now I think that maybe these discussions may come back because of the discussion on sovereignty as a whole. So this would be a first question. And the second would be, if you're currently implementing policies, what are the policies to enhance diversity within the ICANN org, especially in terms of regional, geographical region, but also of youth, and so on and so forth? We saw at least, I didn't have a clear

picture about how it is, but I saw many people, even from the org, mentioning this, like, oh, it would be interesting to have more diversity, and so on, that they're struggling, that you're struggling for that. But yeah, just to understand a bit more how the policies work, thanks.

KURTIS LINDQVIST

So on the resilience of, let's just take a step back on a high-level principle. So you're right. I mean, there is this almost eternal risk of the splintering of the internet, or segmentation of the internet, because of national legislation, decisions, et cetera. I personally have a little bit of an issue with the word talking of the sovereign internet, because it's a rather misnomer. Buzzword. It's a bit of a buzzword, you're right. Maybe even worse than a buzzword. And when a sovereign is used in this, it's very poorly defined, what it means, right? And it's a little bit like, can mean a lot of things. And a lot of the time, when it's talked about sovereign internet in nation states, what they actually mean is a resilient, robust infrastructure, which is slightly different. I mean, I'm not quite sure how that relates to sovereign, because if you think about sovereign, it means that you're independent, self-sufficient, right? And reality is that in today's world, there is no such thing. The entire point of the internet is that it's a network of networks, and that network doesn't have borders. And if you start unpacking this, we're all dependent on software, hardware, assembly lines. Depends on what layer, from the machines making the silicones, which is made in one place in the Netherlands, all the way up to the software, there's a

phenomenal tech stack. And so when you talk about sovereignty, what do we actually mean, right? This becomes very blurred to me, and very watered down buzzwords. And so I think it's rather unhelpful to talk about the sovereign networks, because networks aren't sovereign. They are networks of networks. They know no borders. And so that's the first observation, is that I think it's not very helpful. There is a risk of a split internet, or segmentation of the internet in many layers, from applications down to the network layer. And there are certainly nation-states out there who believe we should do that. And I can be promoted against this. We try to explain why it's poor, and why it's a bad choice.

I think one of the key things is that the success of the internet over the last 30 years, or 35 years in commercial terms, and much longer, is really the permissionless, bottom-up innovation that is allowed, right? And I think we, and I say we as the community, that use the internet, has not really been strong enough to explain that that is really what created the success. That's what's created a phenomenal economic growth that the internet has generated, right? And that's enabled and unlocked. And that was because of that principle of the permissionless, bottom-up innovation. That never would have occurred in a different model. And I think any changes to try to make it sovereign, to use the buzzword, right, or splintered, or segmented, is gonna destroy some of that potential value creation for the future, right? I mean, and I remember a phenomenal ITU presentation. This might get a bit geeky, but it was someone who, so the ITU is the UN agency in charge. It's only

nation-states sitting in a room and decides policies, and that's how it used to be. For the telephone network, and I was at this presentation 20 years ago, and someone rather provocatively asked this entire room of ITU engineers, ITU policymakers, what was the last innovation in telecom that was done bottom-down, top-down? And everybody said SMS. And actually, that's not true, because SMS was actively fought by the telcos. If you're old enough as I am, they tried to price it so high as the people wouldn't use it, and it turned out people used it anyway, and they lost that debate. Actually, the last real innovation was Hash Store. None of you are probably old enough to actually remember that, but that was one of the few things the ITU actually pushed down. And if you compare those two innovations versus the bottom-up principle of the internet, it's a little bit different, right? It's a phenomenal innovational culture. And that's really what we're losing out here, and I think that's the real risk, and that we as ICANN is trying to proactively explain to government stakeholders that this is the risk with this. And I forgot what your second question was. Oh, diversity, that's right. So, what is, sorry? Oh, fragmentation. Oh, yeah. No, no, well, I'll just say quickly about the offices. So we have offices around the world. I personally believe that they are very, very valuable and very important for us to fulfill our mission as a global organization, and I'd like to see them strengthened, and I think that's on us to do that. I think that's very important to use those global offices and be a global organization, because that is who we are. That's our mission, that's our promise.

TRIPTI SINHA

I'd just like to add to the question you asked about fragmentation, and just build upon what Kurtis just shared. So, fragmentation occurs at many layers, but I believe what, within ICANN's remit, as you know, our mission says we are the caretakers of a resilient identifier, unique identifier systems. An operative word, and that is unique. And our tagline is One World, One Internet. So fundamentally, at a very, very base level on the internet, what's going on, packets get from point A to point B, right? From source to destination. That depends on the integrity of the unique identifier systems, and that is what we have to preserve, to ensure that we don't fragment at that layer. Now, at higher layers, you know, people can create walled gardens of services, and it's happening at the application layer, with TikTok, Facebook, and all the others. And there's also, coming to digital sovereignty, one way to define digital sovereignty is there's some countries that might want to create a firewall around themselves. Yeah, just create complex rules of routing and so forth, so they don't leave particular areas. But that's a difficult and complex thing to do when you look at how interrelated the world is. If you've ever done a packet trace of a packet that travels on the internet, it's got quite the journey, and it's different every time. If you do a packet trace on a packet that goes from point A to point B, it doesn't necessarily take the same path every time. And that's the beauty of the internet, is it picks its route depending on congestion and all these various, the vagaries of routing, and how it gets to the other route. So I 100% agree with

what Kurtis said. We really gotta define what nation states mean by sovereignty. Yeah, thank you.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN

Thank you. As we have only 25 minutes left, and we have about 12 people in the queue, please have your questions briefly, like phrase it properly what you want to hear, and let's move forward. We'll go with you. Thank you. Thank you. Okay, me.

LUCIA PACHECO

Thank you very much. My name is Lucia. This is my second time as a fellow, and I also come from Hiperderecho, which is a civil society organization in Peru. And something that we have noticed is that nowadays it is impossible to think of a policy or a regulation that is not related with a digital ecosystem. And we are worried that there is a lack of understanding on how the infrastructure of the Internet works, especially for policymakers or legislators. And for instance, about two years ago, there was a law approved that made mandatory for a whole industry to use a specific generic top-level domain that was already registered and owned. So my specific question is, if you found that ICANN has a role or there is a way in which can provide advice or assistance in legislative processes, because we as a fellow can try to do that, but sometimes it's really difficult to be heard or to be seen.

KURTIS LINDQVIST

I'll do a very short response. I mean, yes and no. We do try to monitor legislation around the world that relates to the domain name system or our mission. We try to educate and help and support organizations who work that we believe there are – that there's legislation done that is contrary to what we believe the technology should enable. We are not always successful, even in many jurisdictions. But we do try and work with that. And if there are – we have both our government engagement team, we have our GSE teams that try to monitor or follow this. All the regional offices follow this evolution in their regions. If you become aware of this or you think that you would like to get talking points, then please do engage with them and they will engage with you to the extent we can. We have knowledge and it's within our mandates. We will happily to support them. Thank you, Luthier.

LEON SANCHEZ

Well, that – I believe Kurtis has said in regard to the role of the organization according to your question. But I would also like to, you know, expand the scope of the answer. We are a community that's made up by stakeholders coming from pretty much everywhere, right? And as stakeholders that come and sit at the table within ICANN, we also go back to our countries and communities, et cetera. And I think we have the responsibility to try to educate those decision-makers back in our homes. And I think it must be not necessarily a coordinated but a collaborative effort that we, you know, do both with ICANN.org and our local communities. And for example, I can give you the example of the

At-Large community. It's formed by At-Large structures. And those At-Large structures go back to their places of origin and, you know, engage with the decision-makers and with the academy, with the civil society, with, you know, different parts of the society. I believe that the business constituency does the same and so on and so forth with each constituency. So I think that as much as we can expand our reach, taking advantage of the community that actually forms ICANN, the better for us in trying to educate those decision-makers and try to help them not break the Internet. Thank you, Leon.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN

Hanna, please.

HANNA FRANK

Thank you so much. Hanna Frank, for the record, third-time fellow from Argentina. What do you consider are the main challenges for the ICANN community regarding to the strengthening of efficiency of the multi-stakeholder model? Thank you.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN

The response might take about an hour.

TRIPTI SINHA

It's funny. Kurtis and I are trying to decide who's going to take this very hard question. So you said, how do we strengthen the multi-stakeholder model? So, I mean, the multi-stakeholder model

means exactly that. You bring different voices to the table, different stakeholders to the table. And how do you strengthen it? One element of strength is you ensure that, indeed, you've got all the voices that need to be at the table out there. And the second way you strengthen it is you ensure that all the opinions that need to be expressed are expressed, right, that are relevant to the topic at hand. And the third, which is always the hardest, is that people have their positions and they don't want to move. I call it a meet-me point. We all have to get to a meet-me point, which means everyone has to give up a little bit. You know, you're not going to make everybody happy. And that's what makes the multi-stakeholder process so difficult, is everyone has to give up a little bit. And you have to do that through discourse, through dialogue, through a back-and-forth. And emotions get high, you have to tone the emotions down, and everyone has to see how we win. You know, it's a win-win-win-win place that we arrive at, where everyone sees a benefit to it. And then you put on – since we have a global mission, you have to put on your global hat and say this is the right thing to do for this global service. I hope I answered your question. Kurtis, would you like to add to that?

KURTIS LINDQVIST

I think Tripti said a lot of what I thought about it, and I think the only thing I'd add is that the multi-stakeholder model – you know, when this was – what we call the multi-stakeholder model essentially came out of something called WSIS+20, right? And it was – sorry, out of WSIS in 2005. I mean, it had existed before in the IETF

and the creation of ICANN and so on, but it was really articulated and formulated as a result of this UN process called Business. And someone called Marcus Kummer essentially came up with this – not the name necessarily, but the concept. And back then – I mean, I was there, and I think, you know, the difference between then and now is that we had this idea that we thought sounded phenomenal, but we had no idea what it was going to deliver, right? We all believed it was the right path forward. We all believed it was the right model. And 20 years later, we had this phenomenal success to show, and it was released early in the week, a paper that highlighted all the success of this. And I think to the question that Tripta was saying, I think that highlighting this, that this is really what we have delivered, and we want to continue to build on a very successful model. It is a robust – I mean, no model is ever perfect. Are there things we can change and modify? But as Tripti said, bring in more diverse voices. Absolutely. There are many voices to be heard, and we need to continue to ensure that those voices are being heard, because that is what has delivered a success so far, and I think that's really the key of what we need to do.

JAMES GALVIN

I would like to add something and turn it around to all of you in this, okay, strengthening the multi-stakeholder model. I mean, there are certain obvious principles that Tripta just here talked about and Kurtis represented, so, you know, you have to get all the voices at the table, you got to get them all out there, and then you have to find consensus in that. But I think what's important here is you are

part of that, and the question is how to strengthen it. Let me ask that question to you, something to think about. We've mentioned the IETF here a couple of times. Kurtis has. We're a half-sister organization, if you will. We have two different multi-stakeholder models. We don't do multi-stakeholderism in exactly the same way, ICANN versus IETF, and yet we're both very successful in what we do. So I think what's important is keep in mind, as the next generation, you know, we're trying to bring new voices, new ideas, new concepts here. What do you think? And it's important for you to bring that to the table to help us advance where we are and what we need for strength. We're still moving forward on old principles we've had for a while. Thanks.

TRIPTI SINHA

Just to add one more principle, if you will, is that when you arrive at consensus, agree, okay, this is the right path forward, not everyone walks away with an equal share of the pie either. You arrive at a decision that's the right decision for whatever policy you're trying to articulate.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN

And to your question, how you support this process, just to add from my end, one of the steps is also supporting the programs like NextGen and Fellowship, as James mentioned. So you have the voice here also to move forward. I see Sarah also wants to respond, and then we'll come to you, Sophia.

SARAH

And I think another great role for this group, the NextGen participants and Fellows, would be to look at issues where ICANN's been stuck for many, many years. And you guys are – you have fresh voices, you have no baggage, you have no conflicts. You can help this community get unstuck, I think, by brainstorming on some of these issues and sharing your views with the whole community. I think that would be a really great way to support the model.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN

Thank you. Sophia, please.

SOPHIA LONGWE

Thank you very much. Sophia. I'm also a NextGen participant. I have a very abstract question and a very specific one. One is, do you think the internet is political? And in what way, if yes, does this manifest, especially with the layers that concern you? And then my other question is, what do you think about term limits in certain positions at ICANN, especially in working groups when chairing them? Because my experience with internet governance has been so far that a lot of people have been around for a longer time, and sometimes it's also time to make space. So how do you feel about that thought?

KURTIS LINDQVIST

I mean, the short answer is no. The Internet is a network of networks. It shouldn't be. I was going to come to that. I mean, the short answer is no, it isn't, right? Now, there is a but coming here, and that is that it might be perceived as a politically aligned or a vehicle, and honestly, I think that's quite dangerous, right? We talked about the middle stakeholder model, and one of the things that is, you know, if you read the report I mentioned that we released, it has this clause that we talked about, is that the Internet is governed the way it is because it's fundamentally a technical construct. The technical community has a unique voice to ensure that this is an operational platform. There might be political elements delivered by the Internet, but the Internet itself is a unique platform, and I personally certainly don't think it should be political. I don't think it is political. People might want to label it political, and Chris is going to tell me something else, but I mean, I think that that is very dangerous to go down that route because it is a technical platform, right? We have the technical communities put in place to safeguard and to provide input on exactly why the Internet works and what the risks are by making it political.

TRIPTI SINHA

I'm going to add to that and take it to a slightly different level that, yes, would we like it not to be political? Absolutely. But has it become political, and will it become political? Probably. And I will explain to you why I say that. When you look at any global good or global service, look at the environment. Has it been politicized? Yes, it has. When you look at the beginning of the printing press

hundreds of years ago, it became a modality of communication for the world, and then did it get politicized? It did. So I think it is bound to become highly politicized because it is a primary service vehicle now, and it produces information, it produces services and goods for the world at large, and there are political governing bodies at play, and they want to control the kind of information you consume. So will it become political? And, of course, there are layers to the Internet, so it can be politicized at all levels. But of course, do we want it to be political? No. But it's human nature. It's the way life is. I would be surprised if it could ever be classified as nonpolitical.

CHRIS

I'll take a bit of a different position here. One is to say I think all of the answers here, and perhaps your question is using political as a bit of a dirty word, which I don't think it is. I think politics is how we manage our relationships as people. And so I think when we say the Internet is not political, that might be true if we could take people away from any contact with it. If there weren't people at either end of the connection exchanging information, then yes, maybe the technology itself is not political. But the fact that that's not what it is. That technology exists to connect people, to allow us to communicate, to allow us to exchange information and ideas, and I think that is always going to be a political act. And we kind of need to embrace that a little and understand that that's the work that we do. But it's the technology that is political, and we try to do it in a

way that lives up to the principles that have made it successful and that we see as essential to it.

JAMES GALVIN

So I'll speak a little bit to your term limit question and observe the following. It's a difficult question to answer without more information. As far as I know, most of the organizations – could be all, too – all actually do have a term limit for a particular role. And it's practiced that way, and some have them actually documented. But the issue that you spoke to about it always seems to be the same people, I think part of what happens is leadership moves around. People find other roles to take on. So they seem to not have a term limit, but they've changed roles and they're doing something different. So need to be careful about that. But I'm actually pretty sure most everything has a term limit here for a particular role. Thanks.

TRIPTI SINHA

Term limits are very good. It brings in fresh ideas and ensures that we're not stale. Thank you.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN

Heidi, please.

HEIDI HERNANDEZ

Thank you very much. My name is Heidi Hernandez. I'm from the Guatemala ccTLD, and with the intent of understanding how the

board understands their own community, my question is what would you say are the main challenges ICANN is currently facing, and how is the board approaching them?

TRIPTI SINHA

There are so many challenges. Sorry. Oh, my God. We're getting hit from all fronts. I mean, well, right now the board is not very popular because of reviews. As I told you, we had to make a fiduciary decision. Yeah. What? Okay. We're very popular with some, not so popular with others. But I just heard hot off the press that I think we're moving in the right direction and people are beginning to accept the decision, and I think there will be a good outcome. But there are all kinds of, where do I start? We have a big signature program around the corner, the next round, so we have to make sure that that is launched on time, and it's barely 10 months away now, right, April? April. Yeah. And then, as you know, the world order is changing, if you will, and someone brought up the world sovereignty, digital sovereignty, and control of the internet, and this is 2025. It's a year of internet governance where governments are coming together to talk about how should we manage and control and administer the technical substrate of the internet, and thus far, at least one component of it, which is what is within ICANN's mission, is administered by this multi-stakeholder body, this community. Those things are coming under question now, so that's another complex issue. Hopefully we will prevail and convince the world community. This is the right way to do it. We've done it well. There's room for improvement, and we will continue

to do so and preserve fidelity towards our mission, and there's the problem with ensuring that we bring the internet to the global community in more than one language, and we were talking about the internet being politicized. Well, you know, who asked that question? You asked that question. So that's another element of it, potentially. You could call it, I heard the term digital colonization earlier in a presentation. Why is the internet all in the English language? It all goes back to what has now become the de facto language of science and technology, which is English, and if you take that back in history, why is English that language? It's because of colonization, correct? If someone else had colonized us, let's say someone from the Asian empire, all of science and technology would be in that language. So anyway, I'm kind of deviating, but my point is we need to bring multilingualism to the internet and so forth. So we've got lots and lots of challenges, and Kurtis can add to some more. I mean, RDRs and others. Kurtis, you can add to those.

KURTIS LINDQVIST

Look, there's certainly no shortage of challenges. I think, you know, we're not going to be bored anytime soon. I think that there are, you know, Tripti spoke to the board challenges, but I think, you know, this is, on a board level, the work, this is the change in the world order, as Tripti said, is one thing. Of course, one other thing is we as an organization need to do is to deliver on the strategy that Maarten talked about earlier, that is being, coming in force on July the 1st. We need to deliver that, because that's the expectation of

the community. But I think, you know, we have to deliver the next round. I think there are, that's the strategic decisions. There will always then be tactical challenges that we have to respond to as a board, as part of a board that we have to work on, you know, whatever the world will throw at us, we will have to deal with, you know, and that will change, as Tripti mentioned, some of the more recent events, and that's a work item. But that's all in support of the strategy, even that is actually under the strategy of what we have to deliver, right? And then we have whatever happens in December with WSIS, we will have to manage and work for the best possible outcome as part of that, because that is a very fundamental threat towards the internet, you know, it's not just the internet, because remember, this is much broader than just internet governance. There's a lot of fundamental principles in our digital lives that hinges on that, on the outcomes, and that's a very large priority at the moment, and we need to deliver it.

JAMES GALVIN

And I also want to turn that question around back onto you, and I think that's important. I mean, I appreciate that folks are asking questions of the board, and wanting to get the board's point of view about what it's paying attention to. But let's not forget that part of the reason why we're here is we have this program to bring new people in, new voices. Just because we have things that are on our agenda, doesn't mean that they're right. So coming back to something that Sarah said earlier, Today, I'm going to talk to you about how to move forward in an area in which we're stuck. So,

don't forget to take that question on yourselves and think about that. Find your space in this arena. Find your voice in this place and bring that here and help us. Maybe we're not paying attention to everything that we need to. Thanks.

AYOUB GHAMAS

I'm going to make it much related to what we're discussing right now. So, I mean, I love the interaction of Maarten right here because he's talked about the board and that they control the strategy. I just want to ask, I mean, if you need to choose one specific, I mean, strategic risk that ICANN is facing, that it needs a little bit of youth-led thinking in that sense. What would that be? And I mean, how – we're talking about – yeah, so strategic risk that ICANN is currently facing. I mean, that it needs a little bit of youth-led thinking. And we're asking about the interaction of youth and everything. So, how about, like, maybe making it a little bit more structured? Why? Because he couldn't actually ask the question, but I was just relating it to his. He, I mean, suggested, like, youth special interest groups within ICANN. Yes, the programs are amazing, but what about actually just having youth interest groups within specific kind of aspects, I mean, and just structuring it over? So yeah.

KURTIS LINDQVIST

I'll give a very short one. Because the WSIS+20, this is your internet that's being decided in December. We all here are going to be retired. We don't have to live with this. You guys will do. You know,

this is shaping your future internet in the coming months that you will have to deal with. And I think that's really, really important to stress, right? That that's something that really having your input on would help.

NIKESH SIMMANDREE

Nikesh from Mauritius. ExAFRINIC and ICANN fellow. So we do have the guidance of our NextGen leader, Fernanda, fellowship leader, Siranush, and also our respected mentors. From yesterday's session to today's session, NextGen did an amazing work and presentation. Even the fellows are learning from the NextGen, and vice versa. So my question to you, Leon, as a previous fellow and board member, what is your advice to us, both NextGen and fellow? How could we continue to contribute the great work of ICANN as I believe we are the future of the internet evolution and its continuity? Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ

That's a great question. You have to work a lot. That's the short answer. But no, in all seriousness, I think you need to find your place within the community. One thing that I did, and I think it proved very useful to me at least, was to try to get out of my day-to-day work, right? To give you some background, I am an intellectual property attorney. So my first inclination was to go to the IPC, and I joined the IPC. But then I found that it didn't really give me, or I couldn't add value to what they were discussing, right? So I was also, in my free time back at home, I've also been an

advocate for users' rights. So I dived into the At-Large community, which represents the end-users' interests within ICANN. And there I found my space. I thought, okay, this is where I can add most value. So again, if you come from a technical background, you might think that maybe the SSAC or the RSAC could be the place in which you belong. My advice to you is get out of that box. It might well be your place in the community. But don't be afraid to test new things, new communities, new constituencies. You might get surprised how much you can learn and how much you can contribute to a different space from that in which you think you belong naturally. So that is how I think you could seize the opportunity and the advantage of being within the ICANN community. Experiment. Listen to others. Contribute with good faith. And work a lot. And that way, I think you will be able to contribute.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN

Thank you very much. And I appreciate all the questions. And I would like to thank our guests and colleagues and board members, all of you. Thank you for your time being with us. Some board members might stay here longer. I know that Kurtis and Tripti are running to another session. But your last like whatever you want to say to this group, please.

TRIPTI SINHA

Well, first, I will say the last few days where you have presented and you have had lunch with us in this meeting have been very, very

good. I've enjoyed every minute of it. And as it has been said, you are the future. Please embrace this community. Find your niche and begin to contribute. even if you don't end up at ICANN, whatever your careers are in the future, embrace it 100% and make sure that you realize that your contributions matter no matter which part of the world you're gonna contribute in. So thank you.

KURTIS LINDQVIST

Yeah, I'd like to thank you very much for these two days. They've been really, really valuable and really interesting and I'm really happy to see all of you here and engage with you. And I think the internet is in good hands with all of you, so thank you very much.

LEON SANCHEZ

Thank you. Thank you, Siranush. Well, it's, again, refreshing to be here with you guys and I'm very grateful for you having us. And just don't be afraid to ask questions. Keep curious, keep open, and keep learning.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN

Keep challenging. Thank you very much. The meeting is adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]