
ICANN84 | AGM – Joint Session: ICANN Board and CSG
Tuesday, October 28, 2025 – 13:15 to 14:30 IST

WENDY PROFIT

Hello and welcome to the joint meeting of the Board and the CSG. My name is Wendy Profit, and I'm a participation manager for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Community Participant Code of Conduct, ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy. Interpretation for this session will include English, French and Spanish. Please observe the following guidelines to participate in this session. I'll also post them in the chat for your reference. This is a meeting between the CSG and the ICANN Board so we will not be taking questions from the audience during this session unless we have extra time at the end. For remote participant members of the CSG, if you would like to speak during the session, please raise your hand in Zoom. When called upon, you'll be given permission to unmute in Zoom, and onsite participants can use the physical microphone here at the staff table to speak. Please state your name for the record and the language you'll be speaking, if speaking a language other than English, and speak clearly and at a moderate pace. 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. Welcome, everyone, to the Board's third bilateral meeting between the Board and the CSG. Before I turn this over to Chris Buckridge who will facilitate the meeting on behalf of the Board, I think it would be nice if we did introductions, if you don't mind, if you could start and go around the table please. Thank you.

MARIE PATTULLO

Good afternoon. My name is Marie Pattulo. I'm the CSG representative for the Business Constituency.

MASON COLE

Good afternoon, Mason Cole, Chair of the BC.

JOHN MCELWAINE

John McElwaine, IPC President.

JAMES GALVIN

James Galvin, SSAC liaison to the ICANN Board.

CHRIS CHAPMAN

Chris Chapman, Vice Chair of ICANN.

BECKY BURR

Becky Burr, Board Seat 13.

TRIPTI SINHA

Tripti Sinha, Chair of the Board.

KURTIS LINDQVIST

Kurtis Lindqvist, ICANN President and CEO.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Chris Buckridge, member of the Board.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Philippe Fouquart, chair of the ISPCP, acting chair of the CSG.

SUSAN MOHR

Susan Mohr, vice chair of the ISPCP.

OSVALDO NOVOA

Osvaldo Novoa, ISPCP, councilor to the GNSO.

TRIPTI SINHA

Thank you. And welcome, everyone. And we've always looked forward to this dialogue. Chris Buckridge is going to manage this for us. Thank you Chris.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Okay, thank you very much, Tripti. We've been doing these Board-meets-X-constituency for a while now, and I think we, with the CSG, have had some really good discussions in this format. This time around, we're taking that to a bit of a new extreme of really a very

open, free-flowing discussion. I think this came from ... Well, the Board posed a question to the CSG as we all want to do. And I'll read it out here just for the context. And it's, what does CSG believe should be the Board's and the ICANN organization's policy priorities in 2026, taking into consideration the new five-year strategic plan, WSIS+20 review, the recently launched cross-community working group on the review of reviews? And so CSG has suggested that this is enough meat for that conversation to proceed and that we can have quite an open discussion. So looking very much forward to that. And I'm going to hand over to Philippe to perhaps introduce that a little bit further.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thank you. And to this point, we've discussed it informally, but it's probably the right time for me to say that the reason for us doing this is that we've had so much material put together for this discussion that indeed the question was broad enough for us to provide those inputs. Indeed, that should not be (and I know it won't be) misconstrued at us having some disinterest in those dialogues. I would just note that indeed it's somewhat unusual, including for the sessions that you've had with other constituencies, but we don't mind being a bit specific in the community. So with this, what we did is that we've reviewed a number of topics that would be relevant to the questions. We will go around the table within our stakeholder group before we do this. And again, reviewing the material that we put together, I think, speaking not only for the ISP but also for the stakeholder group,

what was striking is that a number of those things actually fall under strategic objective number two, the excellence of the organization with a capital O, I guess. And most of those fall under sustainability and resilience—not from a technical perspective, but moving forward for the middle term of how we remain relevant. I note that, for this morning, there was a reference to performance-based metrics during the dialogue with SSAC, which I found, speaking personally, very interesting concepts. I don't know whether that's applicable to a policy development process, but I thought that, as a side note, was a very interesting idea. With this, I'll then turn to the BC first, maybe to address the Board's question. Mason?

MASON COLE

Thank you, Philippe. Good afternoon again. Everyone on the CSG appreciates the question put to the CSG by the Board. What we tried to do as the BC is organize our input as it relates to some of the priorities the BC is trying to advance through the ICANN model and tie that to the question that the Board posed. So I'm gonna speak from notes for just a moment. So you'll forgive me. The first piece of input that we have is that in the strategic plan, ICANN Org identifies as a priority, the need to improve on the policy life cycle. And priority 1.2.4 says “incorporate flexibility and agile methodologies into the policy and advice development and implementation life cycle.” We think this is an immediate opportunity for ICANN. It's an area of focus for the CSG as it relates to (and this is no surprise) DNS abuse, which is sort of our flagship

issue, and it's something that's squarely within ICANN's remit. The CSG is becoming I'll say concerned that the existing policy development framework may not be nimble or flexible enough to deal with such a rapidly increasing and evolving issue like DNS abuse. So even with an extremely narrow focus on two agreed-to areas of policy development, for which we're very grateful that the community is paying attention, the PDP apparatus, when you include policy development, Board consideration, implementation review, and all the steps that are involved in ratifying a policy, that policy won't result in a year or more. Meanwhile, the DNS threat vectors that are out there and flowing through the DNS continue to widen and strengthen. So [on] a two-year PDP and when PDPs are sequentially handled, we're concerned that that'll just sort of nibble at the abuse problem. And the abuse problem severely impacts those that we represent, which is why we talk about it as often as we do. So as ICANN noted, as a risk, prolonged PDP timelines impede ICANN's ability to keep pace with external events that may impact its mission. And rigidity impedes decision-making processes which may cause delays and poor strategic choices that affect ICANN's performance. We're concerned about that as well, which is why we brought it up in the context of this question. The second point that BC wanted to bring out is on priority 4.1.2, which says that ICANN must identify and mitigate security threats to the internet's unique identifier systems and take measures to address and minimize those threats. So we think this is yet another opportunity for ICANN. CSG members are experiencing the damages that are inflicted by DNS abuse, and those incidences of

abuse are increasing. The CSG has been advocating now for more proactive abuse mitigation for several years, and we need to insist that attention be paid to this. We're now working on DNS abuse through the PDP process, which as I said is welcome, but this is a long-term problem that's only going to expand. So the CSG believes that ICANN Org should take a long-term approach to abuse identification and mitigation. Therefore, we're advocating for a standing ... This becomes a standing issue within the GNSO. And much like the ccNSO, we're advocating for the development of a standing committee on DNS abuse that would deal with DNS abuse over the long term. We think that would be a tool that the entire community could use to keep abuse on the radar, make sure that threat vectors don't outpace ICANN's ability to deal with them. And the CSG would like to cooperate with the community to make sure that it doesn't adversely impact ICANN Org and its resources or the community's resources. That was a very long way of making two points that we wanted to advance, so I'll stop there and I believe we'll all welcome your questions. So thank you, Philippe.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Well, thank you, Mason, for that. I'm just looking at my Board colleagues who might want to ... And I see Jim, I think, probably keen to make a response here.

JAMES GALVIN

So let me focus on the sort of DNS abuse topic in general at first in everything that you offered there. It is true that concerns around

DNS abuse is a shared priority between the Board and the community at large. It's certainly always on top of mind [:support RADAR]. You commented about the ccNSO having a standing committee that deals with it. The Board has its own working group, a standing working group, on DNS abuse, so we have that too. Speaking for myself, I think that might be an interesting thing for the GNSO Council to consider, that they should consider doing that on that side. So maybe that would help get some alignment between all of us in terms of making it a priority. That would be an interesting thing. But it's not for us as the Board to make that happen. I acknowledge that simply as a suggestion that certainly has some merit. And on the topic of PDPs, especially related to DNS abuse, I think the hard part in all of this is none of us as individuals really controls that process as a whole. I think we should acknowledge that we all want to see the PDP process improve. We all have some role and responsibility in all of that. The Board has, as its part of the responsibility when recommendations come, to be moving them along as expeditiously as possible so they can get back out the door and move to implementation. There's certainly a role in the community there in the development of the recommendations, in moving that along expeditiously. And that's on the community to control and to manage and develop. And that's a fair bit of process too. And we all have a role in implementation issues; so the IRT and where all that happens and how that goes. We certainly have to sort that out, and I know that it is a priority. I'll let Kurtis speak to the Org side of their priorities in wanting to move this forward. So that's a concern that we all share

too. I think I spoke significantly to all your DNS abuse questions, but I apologize if I missed something. If you want to ask me to say something more, I can. Thanks.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Mason, if you want to respond, and then Kurtis.

MASON COLE

If I may quickly, yeah. Thank you, Jim, for the input. That's very informative. Two points. I think everyone shares the concerns about PDP timelines and the impact of PDPs on ICANN and the community's resources. You know, we've heard loud and clear this week that resources are stretched. We need to be careful about how much work we take on. And I think the CSG understands that very clearly. To that point, my second piece of input in reply to what you just said is if we are, for example, to consider a standing committee on DNS abuse for the GNSO, the CSG hereby volunteers to do the work. So we'll take on the organization work and whatever else is necessary to bring this to the community because we think it would be a valuable tool and one that would have a positive impact on the DNS and would benefit those who we represent. So I appreciate your input, Jim. Thank you.

KURTIS LINDVQUIST

I think, as I said, if I start with DNS abuse, I think everybody shares the concern that we need to address this and we need to develop the tools in the community to address them. And ICANN Org will

support the community in all the ways we can. We have just completed, I think, the fastest ever issue report in weeks because of the urgency that we believe that this had, right? I think it's also worth just this reflection is that the more narrowly scoped policies, the easier it is to make it progress faster because it doesn't become a boiling-the-ocean problem, right? And we will help work on that and we will support any policy development that comes to it. We know that DNS abuse is a priority for us as well, right? We have done a lot of work on the tooling and other domain metrics and a lot of the other works around this, and that is helping the community with DNS abuse and how we address DNS abuse. On the PDP and policy development, I'd like to just start with reiterating something that Jim said: policy development is ICANN, right? It's not ICANN Org. ICANN Org does not develop policy. I just want to remind everybody here that we support and facilitate that process, but ultimately it's the community who develop policy, right? We do implement the policy, and as we said in some of these sessions, something that we are working on that we want to present before Mumbai is that we want to actually showcase and build an easily understandable presentation of where all policies are, what the next steps are, where have they been spending time? This is part of the strategic objective of improving the policies, actually highlighting and understanding what issues do we see, where have we seen issues, not just to highlight the issue with individual policies, but also so that we can start addressing the overlying issues of policy development and how do we improve it? And the same on the implementation side to showcase where have we run

into issues that made this completely transparent, what are we working on, what's holding us up? Again, both are to showcase the understanding of individual policies, but also for transparency to the community and what we can do to help improve the actual policy. But I'm going to come back to this. The policy is not done by ICANN Org. We're implementing the policy, but it's set by the community. We will support the community to develop the policies needed in that. We will commit to that. That's our role.

CHRIS CHAPMAN

Just whilst you've touched on, Kurtis, what ICANN Org is not doing, I just wouldn't mind seizing on the reference to the strategic plan, just so that everyone again has context. It's not an ICANN Org document. That's not said harshly. It's just that it gives me a good opportunity to remind everybody. The strategic plan was ... Certainly the ICANN Org management team made a wonderful contribution to it, but the Board had fought ... The Strategic Plan Committee of the Board had 28 meetings over the course of nearly a year and a half, and we had 14 separate community consultations. And ultimately it's a document adopted by the Board and presented to the community seeking its imprimatur. So at the end of the day it's ICANN- or Board- developed but only after ICANN community multiple opportunities to fine-tune and shape it, and then is owned by the community. It was just an opportunity for me as the co-chair of that to get that in.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Thanks, Chris. I will say just as input for myself here that I think two things can be true. One is that there is progress being made on this DNS abuse issue. And echoing Kurtis, I'd really applaud the speed with which both Org staff worked on that issue report and also which the community, the Small Team, worked to develop that. So I think that urgency is evident in all parts here. But that being true, it's still true that it's important to keep the pressure on this, to keep raising this. So, I respect and appreciate the BC's perseverance in this and keeping us honest on it. So thank you. And Mason, please.

MASON COLE

Thank you, Chris, and thank you for that acknowledgement. You're right, two things can be true at the same time. For the BC (and I think I can safely say for the CSG), it's been rewarding to see the speed at which the community has responded with the first two PDPs on DNS abuse. But you're correct. We wouldn't be doing our jobs as representatives of our part of the community if we didn't highlight the fact that it's still a problem, and it's going to need long-term attention. So that's why we talk about it as often as we do. So I appreciate you acknowledging that. Thank you.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Okay, thanks. Philippe?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

And on this, just to come back to where I started from, I think we all appreciate the sort of split of responsibilities between the Board

and the GNSO on this. But for this particular topic, and beyond the PDP, I think the topic of abuse (and that will come as no surprise to you) is for some people, a number of people in the internet ecosystem, seen as a sort of credibility test for ICANN. And that's something that is not limited to the PDP, if you see what I mean. And it goes well beyond the simple remit of ICANN. And the anecdotal evidence is that that confidence is ... I wouldn't say depleting, but it is somewhat failing on that particular topic such that we think that's worthwhile raising this within the context of this discussion. Coming back to what I said about sustainability and the number two, resilience, I think that's important to raise in this context as well. Thank you.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Jim, you want to respond?

JAMES GALVIN

At the risk of trying, I do want to try to keep this as just information sharing and discussion. I don't want this to be interpreted as being defensive or anything like that. The hard part about DNS abuse is we often complete a separate set of things. And when people say DNS abuse, they often mean different parts of it. There certainly is an issue of definition of DNS abuse. So what does it actually look like? The DNS abuse amendments that we have are very clear about what that is for now and what's well within the remit. I would hope that we can all agree that changing that would certainly be a policy development process. And so that's one side of things. There

is then the issue of mitigation and whether or not anything is actually happening. So once you've agreed on what it is you're paying attention to, there's a separate question of mitigation that happens and what has enough evidence and credibility that warrants some kind of action to happen. We certainly do we have definitions of that. That's built into the requirements that are set forth because of those amendments, and Compliance has been doing its part. And I think we're all seeing that. We've seen the blog posts, and of course they're doing their audit right now of registrars and sort of digging in there for the first time. Be interesting to see how all of that plays out and what comes. So we're learning a bit as we go, and hopefully we can improve some of that. I do think it's important that even the existing amendments leave the actual act of what you do up to the where the report goes; so the registry or registrar in particular; some of those things need to go to a web-hosting company. There's some bit about process about who takes the action. Right now the reports are going to the right place, so we've kind of improved all of that. But what you actually do with it is still up to the registry or registrar that gets it. And that's an important part of us. So maybe there's an opportunity there for other discussions in the community at large to make that happen. I think the last big space in all of this that's important to keep in mind, which we haven't paid a lot of attention to but is something that comes up in security discussions, and in SSAC, one of the areas that we focus on when it comes to DNS abuse, is the timeline. Now we're into this question of how do we reduce the opportunity for leveraging things? How do we shorten that time to live on that

domain name? And that's another space to look at. That's tightly coupled with whether or not you take action and when you take it. But clearly the greatest benefit to the victim, if you will, is being able to get rid of that abuse as quickly as possible. And that's a difficult challenge. We certainly have tools that are coming into existence to help us with that, but when to act on those and how to act on them is certainly an open discussion opportunity. So I just think there's a lot of opportunity there for community discussion, and I would encourage sort of separating things into those three parts. I think that's my immediate response to what you're saying, and I hope that that's helpful.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Thanks, it is helpful. Thank you. Thanks, James. To the last point, just to illustrate why we are, generally speaking as the CSG, I think, struggling with this, there are so many cases where we realize that it would take probably a handful of seconds to register a domain name when it took us six months to take it down for something that arguably wasn't even contentious as an abuse. So that's where we come from. I think that sort of reasoning is somewhat taken on Board on one of the PDPs. I'm using the protocol here. Mindful that it may change. That will be launched. So I think that's, as you said, promising. Yeah.

JAMES GALVIN

So a little bit of a quick follow-up, just digging in a little bit to the details of the timeline. It's easy to cherry-pick examples of you just

offer the take six months, right? Domain name came around. It was six months till it was taken down. But it is important to understand what you're measuring, what's the start time and what's the end time of how you're measuring things and when you do all of that. A report has to come in for something to happen. You know, then it has to be assessed. I've got to gather up the evidence and then I've got to take the action to make something come down. Yeah, I don't know. There are just elements in that that require some additional thought, maybe some additional policies. Some people are better at these activities than others, in part because they do tend to be proactive, but clearly not everybody is. There's an open discussion, policy discussion, about how far to go and who's required to do what and when. So tools exist, but we should continue that discussion. And I want to be careful. My main point here is about, when we're going to measure things, it's important to be clear about what our start time was and what our end time was, because that's another fuzzy area, ambiguous area, when we're having open conversations. People often leave those details out, and so it's hard to evaluate the examples that come up. Thanks.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Okay, thanks, Jim. We're coming up to the halfway point, so Philipp, maybe it's sort of opportune moment to move to some other ...

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Yeah, absolutely. Thank you, Chris. I'll leave it to Mason as to whether you want to address some of the other points that you may have, but given that it's already a half an hour, I'd like to turn to the IPC if that's okay. And John may help us go through some of the other points.

JOHN MCELWAINE

Sure. So it's kind of going to be the second verse to the song here, but I think it's important with an ICANN community to understand where there's consensus. So the IPC has a slightly different take on this, but we agree with a lot of the points that the Business Constituency made. The first thing is to champion and improve upon the multi-stakeholder model in global internet governance. With WSIS+20 reshaping the future of internet governance, the IPC believes that ICANN must remain steadfast in preserving one global interoperable internet and multi-stakeholder decision making model. The Board should prioritize engagement in international dialogues to ensure that ICANN's role and policies are recognized and upheld in any outcomes. The IPC supports efforts to resist internet fragmentation, but to do so ICANN must begin to act quickly on common-sense reforms and policies such as DNS abuse and legitimate access to registration data. This ensures that policies continue to be set by the community through a community-driven ICANN process rather than opposed by governments alone. And this reflects ICANN's strategic commitment to global collaboration and governance excellence. So in terms of some of those specifics, the first thing we need to be

involved in is mitigating DNS abuse to protect consumers. The IPC, as you know, consistently advocates for aggressive measures against DNS abuse. And I use that with lowercase. And it's really because the reputation and trust of any of these brands are what makes these malicious acts effective. In other words, a phishing scam is going to be much more effective when it's using a trusted bank brand than if it was just a made-up bank name. The IPC views DNS security abuse mitigation as top priorities for 2026, echoing the recent community efforts to address this issue. The Board and ICANN Org forced the new abuse provisions in the contracts and swiftly support policy developments such as the newly launched DNS abuse PDP initiatives we've been discussing to curb abuse that harms users and infringes upon intellectual property. With respect to the ICANN strategic plan, this directly advances the security and DNS stability objectives. And with respect to WSISs+20, this aligns with global calls for secure, trustworthy internet environments. The second point along the same lines is to improve domain registration data access and accuracy. The IPC has long maintained that accurate and accessible whois data, now registration data, is vital for IP enforcement and security online. In 2026, ICANN should prioritize delivering an effective system for registration data and enforcing data accuracy requirements. We're pleased to hear some of the announcements so far on the RDRS. The IPC has noted to the Board that the new EU regulations (I'm referring to NIS2 explicitly) require complete and validated domain data, something that ICANN should not be ignoring. I think I actually mentioned this in Prague. The Board should ensure that

any registration data request system or its successor meets the community's needs, including law enforcement and IP owners, and that registrars verify and maintain accurate records. This supports ICANN's strategic plan, goals of institutional trust, and a reliable DNS by enabling responsible data use. And with respect to WSIS+20, this aligns with global policy trends, balancing privacy with public safety and fostering cooperation on cybercrime and IP protection. Lastly, we think another sort of priority ought to be maintaining or strengthening the rights protection mechanisms in domain name policy. By this I mean ensuring robust protection for trademarks and other IP rights in the DNS. This remains a core IPC priority. The IPC urges the Board to carry out the recommendations from the Phase 1 RPM Review IRT, which is going along fine, and to ensure that any review of the UDRP, if undertaken during this year, is done in a manner to ensure that the successful consensus policy is not undermined by fringe detractors. So you can see it's very much aligned with what you've heard before, but I said in this community it's always good to know where consensus is lying, at least amongst the CSG. I'm happy to answer any questions.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Okay, thank you very much, John. I'm looking to my colleagues here if there's any comments or thoughts in response to any of this. I think we've had certainly some discussions, as you say, about RDRS in the preceding sessions with other stakeholder groups. I think there is obviously progress being made in discussing that

issue. I see Becky moving her microphone, and I'm taking that as perhaps she's willing to say something on this.

BECKY BURR

Well, since we're having an open conversation, let's talk about the messages that we've been getting on RDRS. I think we're hearing significant skepticism (is that the right word?) about it. And the Board will be considering a resolution on Thursday to continue funding and operating RDRS for up to two years, simultaneously publishing a sort of policy alignment document to figure out how we get from where we are today with the package of EPDP Phase 2A, SSAD recommendations, the RDRS Standing Committee report, and a lot of conversation that we've had based on things that the community has asked for; the policy recommendation in the SSAD package of recommendations, for example, that all registrars be required to participate in a data request system. And so we think that we need to figure out sort of the path which will, in some cases (we hope a lot of the cases), require using the process that the Board has very successfully used with the GNSO Council, as you know, John, in the next round context where we talk about supplementary policy to help us bridge that. And in some cases, new policy will probably need to be developed. But in light of that, I think we are hoping that we make effective use of the learning that we have learned through to the RDRS system and get to a system that gives us mandatory participation by all registrars, consistent with the community recommendation that [inaudible] policy recommendation that exists, access to privacy and proxy data

through that same system. And so we think that that is important and necessary to move us forward on this group of issues that have been complicated. But I think we feel like RDRS needs to move forward in that direction, and the way to get there is to continue operating it for the next two years.

JOHN MCELWAINE

So one thing I wanted to make sure that I communicate is that the IPC does appreciate the Board listening to the issues. And I think that the Board does understand from a requester standpoint some of the problems because you're hitting on a number of the issues. The mandatory participation was needed. There needs to be a simple process of going through the, the forms. And to the extent that as we were in the IPC open meeting talking about the rules that the RDRS operates on top of, which is really the registration data policy, we as a community [need to] start coming to an understanding as to what needs to make up a good request and what needs to be contained in a good response to that request. And if we make those steps, we're coming a long way to having a more usable system to make registration data requests. So that's very much appreciated at the Board level.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Thanks, John. Jim, I think you had a point.

JAMES GALVIN

I want to add a little bit of a related issue, because you spoke about IP abuse and its relationship into DNS abuse. Obviously, as you've said, there's a whole discussion around RDRS and providing uniformity, homogeneity about requests and how they're processed, and that's an important thing too. A question that I put to you to keep in mind as we go forward and we do this work, is, at least speaking for myself, I've always wondered about IP abuse being part of enhancing the definition of DNS abuse within the amendments for right now. I think that it is fair to say that the Board is well aware and well versed in the problem space of IP abuse. But right now the tools aren't there to make something happen and force something. And I think that I would simply offer that it would be a policy process, it would be a community process, to understand and accept and create the rules around IP abuse being part of DNS abuse and making that happen. Just something to think about as we go forward here and move on that. Thanks.

JOHN MCELWAINE

I recognize that there would have to be some sort of policy process for that. It's not a simple issue, which is granted. And it's really getting to Mason's point, which is if there could be a standing committee with a diverse group of opinions and thoughts coming into making those types of determinations, that might be a task that this community can tackle to come up with a definition of DNS abuse that takes into account intellectual property infringement being a vector to allow that DNS abuse to occur. Thanks.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Kurtis, please.

KURTIS LUNDVQUIST

And I guess I stress one thing you mentioned before, though, because this came up in the GAC session yesterday as well. The usability of the system is one thing. The policies that underlines it is something else. And I think you alluded to that. I just want to highlight that because that [came up] in the GAC session as well: I think there are a lot of feedback about the usability of the tool, and we can work through that, but before we do that, we need to know what the trajectory of the entire system and therefore tool is before we start investing in that. That's what I acknowledge there.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Okay, not seeing any other hands up here. Philippe, I'll hand it back to you for the next topic.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Sure. So the last, the third, point that we intended to cover was the ongoing effort on review of the reviews, and our expectations, both in the initial holistic review effort as well as the ongoing work. [In] the ISPs, but also, I think, within the CSG, we're hoping that we could at some point take a step back and consider the structure—but not only the structure within one silo, but also beyond the interactions between the various SOs. And certainly we appreciate some of the reservations around that, but that's talking about

substance. At this point, we would certainly favor some [why form] to at least discuss this, always coming back to the point I made earlier on the relevance of this organization moving forward. It would seem that there might be arguably some disconnect between the organization in the broad sense of the word, obviously, here and the internet ecosystem. That's at least our standpoint on this. So for this, I'd like to turn to Osvaldo and possibly share, if not the frustration (it's a strong word) but at least some of the expectations that we originally had in that holistic review effort and the current ongoing work.

OSVALDO NOVOA

Thank you. One of the issues we have is specifically the structural reviews. They are not seen as important as others in the group, at least for some of the members. We consider that on one side the review is a fundamental instrument for the managing of any organization, but not only looking to the past, seeing how it is fulfilling its objectives, but also looking forward and in particular the structure. Is a structure adequate to its purpose? Is the architecture adequate to the evolving environment we are in? So we think it's quite important to look at that. And that's something that for us, at least the ISPCP, has been a bit frustrating for some time. And that's why we are trying hard in the group for it to be considered as important and more important than the others. Thank you.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

So thank you for this point and for raising this. Two years ago, I think when I had my first interviews for this Board seat, I was asked what my thoughts and opinions were on the holistic review. And I really at that point had little idea of how vital and diverse and complicated that question was. So it's been an education the last two years to realize that. And I want to acknowledge this has been a discussion in CSG working sessions in recent ICANN meetings, and I've been able to be part of that. And so I'm certainly aware of the importance that's placed on it. I would also want to highlight the principle that ICANN as an institution needs to be able to evolve, and I think that's something we need to keep an eye on and certainly not let ossification set in because it's too hard. But I don't want to speak to the specifics of this moment and this review of reviews. I am ... Well, Becky, please, if you want to jump in.

BECKY BURR

Well, I think Jim's going to speak to the general issue. I just wanted to speak to that one particular issue, and maybe it's a good clarification to start with because my recollection of the list of things in the Why Do We Conduct Reviews was that the structural review was still on the list. And—

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

May I?

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Philippe?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thank you. Thanks, Becky, because that was exactly my reading. When we had ... When was that? During prep week? Or even this week? I wasn't at this session. But that was exactly my reading. There was one question as to whether indeed a structural review was in scope given the framework that was put forward. And the feedback I've received is that it wasn't. The question was essentially whether the framework was good enough to determine whether the structure was enough to proceed with the reviews. I'm splitting hair a bit, but you see that subtlety there. So I think maybe a number of people have read it the same way we did, but it seems that there's a subtlety there. So the feedback we have received collectively is that that reasoning around the structure is not part of it.

BECKY BURR

So, let's be really careful here to make sure we're all talking about the same words. I don't believe that a structural review is part of the actual review of reviews. I don't think there's disagreement on that. The point is sort of why do we do reviews? Let's make sure we're all on the same page about that. And then going forward, how do we do them? And I think we all have ideas about it. But when you looked at the “why do we do reviews?”, one of the four main bullet points, I believe, included to ensure that the structure is fit for purpose. So I took that ... I don't have the document in front of me. Jim may know it off the top of his head, but my view is

that there's nothing about that document that says structural reviews are off the table.

OSVALDO NOVOA

No, right now it's included: review of the structure and components. There was quite some discussion at the beginning of the group regarding what is included there and the concept of structure. But right now, it is in one of the purposes of the reviews. I wanted it to be more detailed. That is the first, 1A, that has all those bullet points. It's the only one that has bullet points, but it was decided to leave it like this. Thank you.

BECKY BURR

For what it's worth, I would get rid of all of the bullet points and just have those four points.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Jim, please.

JAMES GALVIN

So there is an important distinction that I would like to make here from my point of view, as I understood the issue of the structure. The purpose of the CCG is to look at a set of things and make a decision about whether or not they go forward, right? And also part of the CCG is the purpose of reviews and what those include. What's important to me is that the reference to the review of ICANN structure is something for the CCG to include as input and decide

whether or not that will go forward. At least as I understand it, it's not a commitment that a review of ICANN structure will be included in what the outcome is of this discussion. So the purpose of the CCG is to review all of the past outcomes that have been reviewed and done, and that included the structure of ICANN. But I don't believe that the draft purpose actually says anything about the structure of ICANN yet. It's certainly not in the high-level bullets that are there. It'd be interesting to see what comes out of the detail in phase two when we have our discussions. So let me start there. And you look like you want to respond.

OSVALDO NOVA

Yes, you're totally right. Right now we have a draft of what the purpose of reviews are. Nothing else. We have to define then what to review and how to review them; the following steps. What we find that's personal (it's not the group but personal) is that there is a certain resistance to structural reviews. But that's a personal feeling. It must not be shared by a lot of the group. Thank you.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Jim, you want to respond briefly and then Leon?

JIM GALVIN

Oh, okay, yeah. And I do think it's important to keep in mind that it is a draft currently: the purpose of the reviews. And so I personally expect that that draft will evolve as we get into phase two and we start talking about the what's and the how's, because that's what

phase two is all about. We may actually want to tweak some of what the purpose is. So the purpose is a guiding document at the moment and where we are. That's the way that I see it. It'd be interesting to see if Leon has a slightly different or related view or wants to add to this. So thank you.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Yeah, Leon, please.

LEON SANCHEZ

Thank you. Thank you, Osvaldo. Let me try to share what I've sensed in the discussions within the CCG and our mailing list. I don't share the impression that there is resistance to include structural reviews. What I've certainly sensed is that there is resistance to jump ahead of ourselves at this point and start talking about whether we are going to include or not structural reviews. As it has been said and as we have discussed in the list and both in our meetings with the CCG, at this stage we're trying to define the purpose of what we're going to review. And in phase two, as Jim has rightly said, we might go into defining the set of fresh reviews that we want to undertake as a community. But I feel that the resistance right now is to jump ahead of ourselves and start talking about what we are going to review when we haven't yet defined the purpose for the reviews. So I do see a resistance, but not to include the structural reviews so as to jump ahead of ourselves and start

talking about something that will be discussed later in the process, I think.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Okay, thank you. I know as Board members we're all following very closely and with great intent the work of the CCG. And thank you to Leon and Jim as our representatives in that and also obviously to the community discussions that are happening this week. I think there's another one on Thursday, so I direct anyone who's listening in and who's interested in that make sure you're in that session. We have only a few minutes left but, Philippe, I'll hand back to you

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thank you. Thank you, Chris. I think we have pretty much covered all the inputs that we intended to provide. So maybe in closing on our side, well, obviously, I want to thank you for the opportunity. That's always most useful. Again, I hope you didn't mind the format of not adding to the agenda. And in closing, I don't want to forget to express our gratitude to the outgoing Board members, Becky, Chris, and Maarten as well, for the good relationship that we've had over the years (always appreciated), not only in form but also the substance. So that's what we're most grateful for with this. Over to you, Chris. Thank you.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

All right. Thanks, Philippe. I don't have much to add to that. Thank you. It's always a pleasure speaking with the CSG. Thank you all for

the very frank and open comments and questions. And yeah, I look forward to doing this again in Mumbai. Thanks very much. Tripti, I don't know if you want to close this out.

TRIPTI SINHA

Now I join you in thanking for this conversation. It's been great, and thank you for acknowledging our departing Board members. We keep doing this meeting after meeting. It's like I don't believe it's happening. So thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]