
ICANN84 | AGM – Joint Session: GNSO CPH and CSG
Thursday, October 30, 2025 – 15:00 to 16:00 IST

SUE SCHULER

Hello, and welcome to the session of the Memberships of the Contracted Party House and Commercial Stakeholder Group. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Community Participant Code of Conduct, the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior, and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy.

Please observe the following guidelines to participate in this session. I will also post them in the chat for your reference. Only questions posted in the Zoom chat identified as a question will be read aloud during this session, as time permits, and when directed by the chair of the session. If you wish to speak, please raise your hand in Zoom or otherwise as directed. When speaking, please state your name for the record and speak clearly at a moderate pace. I will now hand the floor over to Beth Bacon, Owen Smigielski, and Philippe Fouquart.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thank you. Philippe Fouquart speaking here. Good afternoon, everyone. As Beth was saying, what an incredible turnout for the last day of our meeting. Welcome to this. As usual, it's a pleasure to have this joint meeting. We put together an agenda, mindful that

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.

there's been water under the bridge since the beginning of this meeting, but we'll try and cover that in the best possible way.

I assume that, as usual, we need to go through SOI updates just for the sake of it. Okay, seeing no hand. First topic is an update on, would you believe it, DNS Abuse. We thought that'd be useful to share our respective views on the approach that's going to be taken on the policy before we do this.

As an introductory note, Owen, Beth, do you want to add anything? Okay, so let's crack on then. The first is really to discuss about the layouts of the PDPs or PDP that we see coming. For this, we have Mason remotely, and we appreciate your participation. Given the circumstances, Mason, the floor is yours then.

MASON COLE

Thank you, Philippe. Can you hear me? Are we there? Can you hear me?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

We can't hear you.

KEITH DRAZEK

I can hear you. I'm remote, so unfortunately you can't hear him in the room.

MASON COLE

How about now?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Yes, we can.

MASON COLE

Okay, very good. Thank you, Philippe. I apologize for not being in the room. I'm a bit under the weather, and I decided to stay here so that I wouldn't get anyone else ill. So, pardon me for not being with you, but I want to say thanks to the Contracted Party House and our colleagues for making time for this discussion.

So, I think we can deal with this issue quickly. The CSG is particularly interested in talking with our Contracted Party friends about next steps on policy work on DNS Abuse and specifically about how we should handle the two issues that are now being developed as PDPs and getting feedback on how we can cooperate to get these moved through the PDP process as quickly and as efficiently as possible.

So, we've had a few discussions on the CSG side about the approach. Our point of view is that it would be advantageous to pick. If you're picking between either two PDPs or one converged PDP, our preference obviously would be whichever one is quicker, but we've had a number of informal discussions about this and think that it may be advantageous to have one merged PDP simply for the reason that it's easier to manage dependencies between the two.

And if you have two working in parallel, you may not have the benefit of cross-pollination or what have you. But I wanted to introduce that topic. I see there's a queue already building. So, Philippe, allow me to turn the queue back to you, and we'd love some feedback from the Contracted Party House on this. Philippe?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thank you, Mason. This is Owen.

OWEN SMIGELSKI

Thanks, Philippe. This is Owen Smigelski. Thanks for bringing that up, Mason. I know ICANN's been discussing a couple of different ways that they could possibly move this forward, whether it's one PDP, two PDPs, three PDPs, a bunch of them, parts A, B, or whatever.

One of the concerns that I wanted to highlight first is I think we really need to make sure we're not doing anything parallel because there are certain groups that just won't have the bandwidth to be able to staff or to have people volunteer for those.

So, we just need to make sure that we do have them individually. And however ICANN does, I know they were mentioning about how there's cost to start up a PDP and bring it down and do these different things, whatnot. I don't think that should be a concern.

Our concern is if you finish work on one topic, say API access, that's not really dependent upon what's going on about the pivot or the associated domain check because those two are completely

independent topics. And so, say we finish the API stuff first, that should be allowed to continue down the path towards becoming a policy while the other stuff is being worked on.

So, whatever the secret sauce is called on how we're going to be making it or the recipe or whatever. But I think it would be important to have those things go in a line and allow one to continue while because you have the Public Comment period and the other things like that. I don't think that should be seen as a way to delay what the other work is being done. Thank you.

MASON COLE

Philippe, may I?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thank you. Certainly, please do, Mason.

MASON COLE

Thanks for that feedback, Owen. That's really useful. I appreciate that. We did have a discussion with staff earlier today, and I won't say that we've been assured that resources are completely available, but that's a calculation that we want to figure into the equation. So, I appreciate that feedback. That's very helpful. Philippe?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thank you, Mason. And in addition to this, Philippe Fouquart speaking, I think our concern and mindful of that there's always so

much you can do in terms of squeezing the PDP and the work, the general working procedures with all those necessary steps that you have to go through. Then that was our concern.

We weren't speaking personally. I was trying to get my head around those overlaps, potential overlaps and dependencies. If indeed by nature, by substance, there would seem to be very little, I think we would certainly support the notion of having separate ones, separate sites. Oh, Michele, you had your hand up at some point, or was that? Okay.

MICHELE NEYLON

I think Owen managed to articulate what I was going to say. So, for once, I'll let him speak for me. This won't happen. He better not get used to it. We won't use it as a precedent. But it's going to be this kind of thing where he's now going to go, my fellow Irishman something, but we'll let him off.

OWEN SMIGELSKI

Thank you, Michele. Thanks, Michele. I'm touched, yeah. Thank you.

BETH BACON

What a last day treat from Michele. Love that.

MICHELE NEYLON

Now you've broken it.

BETH BACON

Do I get to speak? We all get to speak for Michele now. Drunk with power. So, I think part of what is going to really, really help these PDPs move along, whatever structure they take, although we very clearly do support the two PDP approach, and not in parallel, but perhaps consecutively, is making sure that we as participants are working together and making sure that we don't grind the process to a halt by not coordinating and kind of like dragging issues out, out, out, out, because we can't find consensus, but to pull ourselves out, have conversations as groups and really do that work, not just in the meetings, but as a size as well.

So, I think what's really going to make this move, and I look forward to working with the, with the CSG quite a bit on this, is to make sure that we are all working together and make sure that we are not just grinding the process to a halt because we are only talking in meetings and going down rabbit holes that we are not necessarily, that are not necessarily productive.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thank you, Beth. All good points. And, and indeed, just the fact that we, certainly we had many occasions to have a chat informally over the course of this week, but just as a side note, the fact that we only have a session at the very end is telling there's always so much we can do during a meeting and, and, and in between, so, so that's a bit of a hurdle. Next is Keith.

KEITH DRAZEK

Thank you, Philippe. Hi, everybody. Keith Drazek, Verisign, Registries. Just a couple of comments. One, and thank you, Mason, for your comments, you know, clear indication that the CSG is looking to support and engage in these PDP Working Groups or Working Group, whatever it turns out to be. And Mason, I hope you feel better.

I think I very much support that, look forward to the engagement of, you know, all parts of the community that are interested in this during the PDP working sessions. I heard, I heard at the DNS Abuse meeting that took place earlier in the week, the community-wide sort of update and discussion on the next steps on DNS Abuse mitigation, suggesting that we, you know, because these are such narrowly focused or targeted issues that they should, that we as Contracted Parties should just go off and negotiate it with ICANN and let's get on to other work, right?

And so, I just want to sort of reinforce that when we did the contract amendments for the RA and the RAA, that was the bilateral negotiation that sort of took the very first step. And our commitment at that time, as we communicated, was to support the bottom-up consensus-based policy development process within the GNSO, that we were committed to that, that we were committed to working with the rest of the community on the follow-on policy work.

And that's what this is, right? And so, we're, you know, happy to be getting these PDPs started. The issues report, I think, was quite comprehensive. But we also recognize there are other issues in the issues report, other topics that folks are, you know, anxious to get to, and we understand that. And we're going to start the process of, I think, looking to prioritize what comes next after these two PDPs.

So, just to make clear to everyone, these are the first two topics that we're tackling, and they are narrowly focused and targeted intentionally so we can achieve results in a timely manner, meaningful and timely results. But absolutely committed to follow-on policy work after these two.

So, just rest assured from the Contracted Party perspective, we are, you know, fully committed to this, as we stated when we initiated those bilateral contract negotiations a couple years ago. So, thank you very much.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thank you, Keith. That's very useful. I, for one, was one of those who, at least at the very initial stage of those negotiations, was slightly puzzled because that PR communication element to it may not have reached me by that time. But obviously, it all makes sense. But that's a very good point. Thank you, Keith. Next, Roger.

ROGER CARNEY

Thank you. Just to maybe add a little clarity. Well, first off, thank you, Mason, for not coming here. We love you, that you're on the phone, but we appreciate you were on the phone.

Second, the whole parallel and everything and how many, I think it's clear that the Contracted Parties want multiple ones. And when people talk about successive or consecutive or however you want to say it, the goal isn't to do one and then complete it and then start the other.

The goal is to maybe be a little more efficient in that looking at it once the final report is done, starting the next one, not waiting for counsel to deliberate on it, not waiting for the board to deliberate on it before we start the next PDP. So, I think that we're not looking for years before we start the next one. We're talking about finishing the first one and then moving on, you know, finishing the work and then moving on and letting the process work its way through while we're working on the next one.

And to that point, I think the general consensus has been, I think Mason called it the pivot or the additional domain check work. Seems like it'll be the most laboring, I guess, the least labor-intensive. So, I think that that was our suggestion anyway. I think that one we can get through it much faster than for the API or bulk, whatever anybody wants to call it. So, just that. Thank you.

MASON COLE

Philippe, may I add on that?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Please do, yeah.

MASON COLE

Thank you. Roger, excellent feedback and I appreciate that. I appreciate that preview of how we might manage the PDPs in process. So, that's a very good input from you and I appreciate the spirit from the Contracted Parties House on handling this efficiently. So, thank you very much. I appreciate that.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thanks. Thanks, Mason. And maybe that's food for thought for our councilors moving forward to make that clear at the outset when I presume the two PDPs will be at least defined. Well, if not, as we say, they might be back-to-back or not quite back-to-back. I think that was Roger's point. But I think the layout of those could be clarified upfront before the first starts. Next is Vivek. Yeah.

VIVEK GOYAL

Thank you. I'm so glad that we are all here and agreeing to this. You know, there have been painful points where things have been said like there is no DNS Abuse. It seems to be going down. Why do we need to do anything about it to come to a point where we are all in agreement that let's do this music to my ears and really looking forward to working with people who handle DNS Abuse on a day-to-day basis, either as people who report it, who get yelled at by

their clients on why this is taking so long, or people who receive DNS queries and get yelled at why is it taking so long.

Really looking forward to working with experts and getting this thing done quickly. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thank you, Vivek. Jen?

JENNIFER CHUNG

I thought I wouldn't have to talk about DNS again in this meeting. But just to give us all a little bit of reassurance, at least from the Council point of view, because we had that really good community session that we surfaced a lot of concerns and issues that all the SO, ACs, SGs and Cs have. Council is expected to talk about it more during our November call.

We're then expected to hopefully look at confirming a vote somehow about this in our December meeting. So, we hear a lot of concerns about the sequencing, the prioritization, the resourcing, and rest assured everything is being taken into account. So, I think where we can streamline implementation in a way that doesn't hinder additional work or work that needs to be going on, that will definitely be taken into account. So, just wanted to give us all this assurance. Thanks.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thank you, Jen. Coming back to, and it's a candid question, coming back to your comment, Beth, on sort of future discussions between these two groups and mindful of the small team, the fact that ultimately policy work is beyond Council's authority. Is there anything we can do or you think we should do between those two groups before the next ICANN meeting?

BETH BACON

So, let me clarify the question. Between us to coordinate? Okay. I thought you meant between the Council and Small Group. Thank you. This is Beth for the record. Sorry. So, yeah, no, I think that once we hear a little bit more of the feedback from the issues report, I think in the Public Comment, I think then we absolutely should get together.

The Registry Stakeholder Group and the Contracted Parties both have together and then separately DNS Abuse Working Groups of our dedicated folks who are focusing on DNS Abuse and have been for quite some time. So, I think I will, I'm going to give Dennis, and Chris isn't here, but I'm going to give Dennis a look. He's one of our co-chairs. And I think that might be a really great point of contact to make sure that we have some cadence to that.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Yeah. That'd be great. Thank you, Beth. So, we have an action item on this. Good. Yes, Lawrence.

LAWRENCE
ROBERTS

OLAWALE- Thank you, Lawrence for the records. I just wanted to flag an issue that I think we might need to give some further thoughts to. We currently have these two PDPs slated. And if the thinking or the general consensus is that we run each one through before starting another, just wanted to highlight that I think we had about 12, Jennifer, I don't know how many gaps we had identified.

And if we will need to run PDPs for, even if they are narrowly scoped PDPs for each of the identified gaps, taking possibly a year to get the walk through the point where there is some kind of report that will be written before starting another process, , at that rate, we might be looking at another, maybe eight to 10 years to get all the current walk that we currently have before us dealt with.

So, there are definitely some that might not take too long a time, possibly, hopefully maybe some six, seven months before we are able to start the next process. But just saying that we might run into, while we are trying to manage the risk of not delivering those who might, resources that might need to work on this, by eventually extending the timing of getting this work out of our calendars and all the works, we might be sitting some eight, 10 years doing this. Just thought to put this out for some further consideration. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thank you, Lawrence. And to your point, I think that was exactly our initial concern. Coming back to what Roger was saying earlier, those two PDPs could be taken not back-to-back, that they might

be at the very last stages of the initial one, a way for the second to be started nonetheless.

I don't know if I'm thinking loud, but maybe considering similar teams, for example, I don't know if that's feasible with the PDP, but I'm sure that there are ways we can take to expedite this. Because indeed, if the result of all of this is that by 2030, we'll still be here discussing that particular PDP, it's really not the point. Or at least from our perspective, I'm sure from yours as well. Owen?

OWEN SMIGELSKI

Thanks, Philippe. This is Owen Smigielski. I'd like to just respond to what Lawrence said. I think that's kind of like the old way of thinking about the way PDPs operate. I don't think we need to have something that starts and goes through a process and blah, blah, blah, and then is approved by the board before the next part starts. There are some gaps that are built into the ICANN process. So, I think a 45-day Public Comment period is required.

So, we can't shorten that or speed that up anyway. But while that is going on for one report, you could possibly start another one in there as well, too. And to be honest, some of these, at least the two or three ideas that are out there now, some of them could probably be worked out in maybe two or three months. I don't think we need eight, nine, 10, 12 months to discuss how to do API friction.

I think these are things that could be really done, especially, and that's the importance of keeping these so very narrowly scoped so

that it's not, in the US, we call them Christmas tree bills. They put something in Congress, and the next 178 different things have been added onto it, and that's what could take the problem. As long as we keep it on that one little topic, I think we can really push them forward. And again, they don't have to run one after the other.

There can be a little bit of overlap, I would anticipate, in there. And as for the things in the issue report, there are some things in there that may just not be fit for policy. I mean, that could just be a gap or something that might be outside of our scope or remit or just might be something we couldn't do. So, I am hopeful that we don't have to spend the next 27 years of our lives working on this stuff. I don't know how much longer. I would necessarily stay in the industry, but I would hope that it could be all wrapped up within my time at ICANN. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thank you. So would I. Next is Catherine.

CATHERINE PALETTA

Thanks. This is Catherine Paletta from Identity Digital and Vice Chair for Policy of the Registry Stakeholder Group. Unlike Mason, I decided to inflict my sick self on you, but I do have a mask, I promise.

I was just thinking, we have talked today and this week, and I think you'll continue to hear from Contracted Parties, the way we want to think creatively about moving these things through quickly and

are not waiting till final reports, not waiting for board adoption, certainly not waiting for implementation to keep things moving.

And we are really committed to that on the Contracted Parties. We are blessed with lots of volunteers, some areas of the organization. And I think our two stakeholder groups and you guys are a stakeholder group. Anyway, these three stakeholder groups have a lot of volunteers. Some areas of the organization or ICANN don't have quite as many readily available. And then thinking about ICANN staff.

So, I won't speak for any of those that aren't here, but I think we are committed to continuing to think creatively about ways to move these things forward, but want to acknowledge that what we've heard from other areas of the ICANN community is that that in itself may cause trouble. I don't want you to hear that from a Contracted Party right now and say, like, we're pumping the brakes.

We are committed to moving forward and would love if you look at the PDP manual, which is a thing I have heard referenced but never actually read, and find a place where you think is the right place to start that second PDP. I think you've got Contracted Parties will support on any of that kind of creative thinking. Thanks.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thank you, Catherine. Beth?

BETH BACON

Thanks. This is Beth Bacon, Registry Chair of PIR. Just to build on - Catherine said a lot of what I was going to say. To build on that, just to note also, there's a lot of options within the PDP process and without the PDP process. There could be best practices. There might be something in the identified gaps that we could do offline to get either a preliminary something in place that is voluntary or a best practice before it then goes to a PDP process and matures.

So, I think there's a lot of options. And just building upon that goal for creativity, we aren't trying, we're not trying, we very actively don't want this work to slow down. We want to keep going. So, thanks. I think it's a great point. There's a lot to work on, but let's be creative.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thank you, Beth. And finally, Michele.

MICHELE NEYLON

Thanks, Philippe. Michele, for the record. Luc put it in the chat and I think it articulates it quite clearly. A gap may or may not merit policy action. Some may be a better address for best practices or no action at all. Like the gaps thing is a wish list. It's a long list of things that people decided were things that they were interested in that they thought might be good to do.

Not all of them require a PDP. Some of them are terrible ideas. They might seem like a good idea at a very high level, but they're not. They're a terrible idea. And some of them are things that are

interlinked with the topics that have been agreed to go to move forward with PDPs. And as for the timing and everything else, I mean, it's in our own interest to get rid of some of these issues ourselves, because DNS Abuse, you might have an issue with it on one level.

We have an issue with it on a whole other level. I'm sure Owen would happily tell you over the beers that you'll buy him later, how much his company has lost in the last couple of years through to domain deletions. Or I could tell you about the same kind of thing or about how Cisco love to charge me hundreds of thousands of euros every year for massive firewalls so I can deal with traffic that is absolutely no value to anybody.

So, we do have incentives. But to say that just because there's a list with 30 or 40 or 50 or 100 issues on it does not mean there will be 30, 40 or 50 PDPs. Thanks.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thank you. Okay. I think we're all aware of the cost implications that handling, managing, combating, whatever word we want to use, abuse, incur for Contracted Parties. But thanks. Thanks for this. So, moving forward, I think we'll be waiting for the sort of conclusions from and recommendations from the Small Team that is actually put forward to council.

Based on this, we'll see how between now to three stakeholder groups we can put something together to make sure that we

approach this as quickly as possible. Thank you. Next topic is RDRS. John, would you like to kickstart this?

JOHN MCELWAINE

Thanks. John McElwaine for the record. I think I can only really kickstart it. I'm probably one of the least qualified of the committee members in here to talk about it. I missed the weekend. So, that ended up being the only two sessions that we had.

And also, I think there's been some circumstance of events overtaking what we all thought we might be talking about with respect to next steps. If I'm not putting Sarah or Roger on the spot, could you provide sort of your thoughts or an update as to where the final report is? I know I've seen some traffic on our list on that. Great.

ROGER CARNEY

Thanks, John. This is Roger. And actually, I'll sum up what you missed because it wasn't real exciting. It was Public Comments. We worked through all the Public Comments this weekend so that we could get to a final report. As John mentioned, there's been a little bit of chatter just to clean up the report. And I don't know if Seb's here or not. I think Seb's goal was next week to get that out to council.

So the other things that John mentioned, I think we didn't know when we got here that the Board was going to do. It's not a gap

analysis anymore. It's an alignment analysis, which we're hoping for.

Sarah's depending on it so she can read it on the plane tomorrow. But I've heard anywhere from today to next week. So, we'll see when that comes out and what that leads us to as far as the RDRS, but I believe the Board is actually voting on funding RDRS for two more years, not as a pilot, but it is a system. And I think they're doing that this afternoon still at the next session so I think that's where it sets. Let me know if anyone has questions. Excellent.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thank you, Roger. Any, any questions on where we are. Thanks for this. That was useful. Okay, seeing no hands, I think we can move on. Thanks. The next item is, is on the SOI, the new SOI policy.

BETH BACON

Thanks very much. This is Beth Bacon, Registries Stakeholder Group and PIR. Long intro. We just wanted to bring this up, simply because this is something that we've been discussing especially as registries and Contracted Parties for quite a while. We now have the code of conduct, and we've done that, we asked the SSAC about this, we talked to the registrars about it.

We are as registries, going through some due diligence to go through the code of conduct, and, and as well as the kind of scenarios and an explanation of enforcement to make sure that we are all in a good place and doing everything in compliance. And we

just wanted to bring this up to see if there's anything that you that your group is particularly concerned about questions about any suggestions things that you might be thinking about.

And we're happy to share any of this, anything that we've come up with but we are just trying to go through our due diligence, make sure that we do have a very specific opportunity for registries to submit the SOI for their participation. In addition to our regular GNSO ones, and have a plan for any questions that might or complaints that might come up before that happens, because I don't want to fly by the seat of my pants on that.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

I think no one wants that. As far as, well, I suppose we can go around the house for this I'll just speak for the ISPCP mind for that sort of by design is, we're not the group who might have the biggest challenge on this. We intend to go through the changes and what that might entail moving forward. Speaking personally at this stage I do not expect any issue with this. Given the way the code of conduct is phrased, but I'll turn to maybe the IPC and the BC for this, John.

JOHN MCELWAINE

So, John McElwaine for the IPC, we've been going through the code of conduct looking at it from like an ethical standpoint. So we're having to, as you know, have a lot of members that are lawyers and

the code of conduct could implement or could implicate some of our violations of some of our ethical codes.

So we were going to really need to pay close attention to that. We've even kicked around; do we need to ask for a human rights assessment of it? So, you know, obviously we're taking a very, very close look at this code of conduct. Do we need to get a bar opinion, et cetera, to comply with it? But, you know, obviously intend to comply as we look into it.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thanks, John. Sarah, you've got your hand up.

SARAH WYLD

Hi, this is Sarah Wyld. A hopefully helpful suggestion. If you are considering doing a Human Rights Impact Assessment, there is a template that if you ask Michael Bell and really nicely, he might show you a template that you could use because the Latin Diacritics PDP has been working on that. And so, there is a process. So, that could be available to you if you want to pursue that path. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thanks. That's useful and probably not only for the IPC for that matter, probably for the others. Roger?

ROGER CARNEY

Thanks. Roger. And this isn't necessarily straight at the SOI, but maybe I can say pleasantly surprised when I went to update my SOI a couple of months ago. It's not the same system anymore. So, if you're going to go in and update your SOI, give a little extra time because it used to be a couple of clicks and done. And now you'll have to get used to a new way of doing it. It's still once you get used to it, a couple of clicks, but you got to get that new system out of the way. So, thanks.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thank you. I'm glad someone else had the same sort of experience, but I know I was not the only one. I would hate to put you on the spot, Mason, but given that the question was asked for all SGs and Cs in the room, would you on the code of conduct, even if there's no issue, would you like to chime in?

MASON COLE

No, not right now. Right. I don't have anything to add today. Okay.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Okay.

MASON COLE

Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Okay. Moving on then. I think that's good input. Review of Reviews. We thought we'd have a quick check on our respective approaches on this. I'll turn to, I don't know if Sophie is in the room, but Osvaldo is, so I'll turn to Osvaldo for this first.

OSVALDO NOVOA

Osvaldo Novoa for the record. Sophie Hay and myself, we are the two GNSO representatives in the Cross Community Group. The group has been meeting weekly. We have weekly calls. To ICANN84, we brought a draft purpose of review document, which has been distributed to the community, and we have received a lot of feedback from the community.

We are collecting all the feedbacks, and the idea is next week to have a call and analyze and see if we can change the draft, if we have to change or not the draft of a purpose of reviews, and determine the purpose of reviews. And from there, began to work on the reviews in itself, what we have to review and how. And there is a proposed, we haven't yet discussed a proposed schedule for the reports.

There will be like a webinar, strictly speaking, it's an open call on 18th of November, I think it is, to have opinions of people that have participated in previous reviews to see what the problems they had and what solution they, if they had any, the experience they had with previous reviews, so that we can consider that in our work. So,

it's starting the work. We are defining the first steps. The idea is to, by ICANN86, I would say, we will have the report. Let's hope.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thank you, Osvaldo. I would just add that as far as ISPs are concerned, there's one thing that we feel strongly about is the need for the mechanism that, so that's a two-stage thing. The mechanism that this Review of Reviews will come up with makes it possible for a structural review to happen down the road.

I think it's question, is it two questions, two or three or whatever the point that Avri was making the fact that we're not talking about a structural review for the short term and then it's sort of making sure that this can happen. And that's something that the ISPs feel strongly about. Osvaldo, do you want to respond to this point.

OSVALDO NOVOA

Yes, Osvaldo Novoa for the record. That was a point of discussion at the beginning of the, of the work, because there was ATRT3 recommendation that replaced the organizational reviews with the continuous improvement program. And that was understood by some, some participants like there were no organizational review, but the structural review was included in the holistic review. So, it's included in the work, there is going to be some kind of structural review. We haven't agreed yet what type or how. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thank you, Osvaldo. Yes, I guess it's fair to say that a number of us, including me, we're trying to get our heads around the CIP, how that relates to the Holistic Review and how one or the other or both could actually take on board the structural thinking that we're referring to. Hopefully it gets clearer as we, as we move along. Michele?

MICHELE NEYLON

Yeah, thanks Philippe. Michele for the record. Am I the only one who finds the titlers thing absolutely farcical? And can we please give it a better name? Because no, seriously, I mean, trying to explain internally to my team what I do when I come to an ICANN meeting. And the idea that I'm spending a time talking about the Review of Reviews, and for them not to look at you like you've got three heads and have way too much spare time. I mean, wow. So, I mean something, something, some other name would help. And no, I'm not joking, I'm actually quite serious.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Yes, Michele, I'm smiling because it's, as you say, there's, I wouldn't call that farcical, but anecdotally, it's one of those things when, when I go back home, I never mention. But for that reason, there's just no way I can tell people that I'm working on Review of Reviews. It's just a non-starter.

MICHELE NEYLON

It's a total non-starter. I mean, we both work for businesses. And we have people who look at things like, you know, this is a good time to do a good use of your time. This gives you ROI. This is bureaucracy on asset. Red tape.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Yes, absolutely. So, if a different term could be used, it would certainly help. And it would help beyond by all means, it would help to get inputs as well as a side note, point taken. Beth, I'm sorry.

BETH BACON

Well, now I'm just sitting here trying to think of a better name, and I'm coming up empty. This is Beth. I wanted to flag, registries have talked about this a little bit, but we don't have a full consensus at the registry level. I'm happy to share some, some thoughts of PIR if that's helpful. I do think that with regards to the relation to the CIP, that I think it's bullet B, and it's very upsetting to me that I know this at this point, that it's bullet B.

I think that still needs some clarification in that it's a, you know, it's the continuous improvement program should do its thing, which is to review, review the continuous improvement. And then I had asked the question, you know, how, is it the review of the outcomes of that? Is it the review of the process of the actual CIP? And I understand that the CIP itself will not be reviewed. That's not in scope, but the output.

So, I think that's where that might shake out. But I think that it is really important, not just at the start. I know it's just a statement of purpose, and everyone's getting, gets a little testy when you try and get to the end. But I think that A, tying it to things that are very measurable, as opposed to very subjective, like the Strategic Plan, lost my mind there for a second, and other existing things that are meant to be measurable.

And you can then go back and say, well, you know what, this didn't work, but also the Strategic Plan was pretty bad. What do we do? So, we can fix both of those things. And also, again, as that degree of kind of quantifiable rather than subjective. And I think that's going to be very important. And then also noting that while the review needs to be well scoped, as does the kind of impact and power of the outcomes or recommendations, it's unclear what that'll be.

And again, that's a PR perspective, what we are thinking about when we're looking at this. But I think that we should all be very active in it because it is a lightning-fast timeline, and good luck Osvaldo.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thanks Beth. That's really useful. And I think a number of us, including my affiliation is struggling with this. We're trying to put some meat into or concrete outcomes in mind. As you say, it's always difficult to start in the solution space, but if we do this,

maybe at least we'll understand that we get it wrong. Do you see what I mean?

And that's essentially what we're trying to do with the ISPs, trying to come up with scenarios and see whether what we understand actually fits in or doesn't for that matter. And we'll see. Thanks. But yes, I think we all need to weigh in on this. Anything else? Okay, let's move on then.

Next, maybe it's the AOB now. I've got two. We've got 15 minutes to go but if we adjourn early that's sure people will appreciate. Q&A. Anything else that people would like to raise? Sarah?

SARAH WYLD

Hi, this is Sarah. I am glad that we are having this meeting. It is so good that we talked to each other. Thank you everyone for showing up and talking to each other.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Likewise. Thank you, Sarah. Michele?

MICHELE NEYLON

Well, since you're all being terribly quiet and I can't stand silence, it drives me crazy at the best of times. Just as a practical bit of advice for those of you flying to the U.S, there is pre-clearance at Dublin Airport. So, just allow extra time. I've heard from other people flying out that there haven't been any delays. But generally

speaking, for flights to the US from Dublin, three hours at the airport.

There is no lounge once you go past pre-clearance. Depending on who you're flying with, they might suggest you use the lounge in T2. But if you do that, you won't have gone through fully. So, I wouldn't recommend it depending on the time of your flight. For those of you flying to the parts of Europe and other parts of the world, depending which airline you're with, so the T2 or T1. And there are lounges of various kinds and shapes and what have you. If you're getting a flight before 9am, between say 7 and 9am, it can be very, very busy.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thanks, Michele. Catherine?

CATHERINE PALETTA

Sorry to bring it back to policy stuff after that. This is Catherine Paletta from I.D. Something I wanted to reiterate; the conversation moved along that Beth said about the SOIs is that I think the whole community is looking at this and figuring out how to deal with it. The registries have dedicated some time to talking about it. And I think we want to learn from what works with your groups and maybe share what works with ours and all of that.

And so, I think maintaining a conversation about it, of what have you done, what has worked. We're talking about, I mean, I was just sitting here in this meeting at the start of this meeting, knowing this

was on the agenda. Got 20 minutes into the call and was like, oh, I don't have my affiliation after my name or anything like that in the Zoom room.

And I was like, oh, I should do that as not required under the policy, but under the philosophy of the policy. And sitting here talking, we do so much of assuming we know who each other are and the good practice of reminding ourselves to say who we are and who we're affiliated with.

I think we just want to keep sharing that dialogue of what works because, man, Sue reminds us every single Registry Stakeholder Group meeting to add our affiliation to our names in Zoom. And man, I don't do it half the time, even after she reminds me. So, like what works, what doesn't. And just maintaining that kind of line of communication about that topic, not trying to prescribe either way between our groups. But we're all trying to grapple with this policy. And so how can we figure it out together? Thanks.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

We all do. Thank you. Thanks. Habits die hard. I'm Philippe Fouquart. I work for Orange, by the way. But all good points. And it's the same for us. Michele.

MASON COLE

It's Michele from Black Knight. Catherine, you know there's a setting in your Zoom account where you can set that and you never have to touch it ever again.

CATHERINE PALETTA

You know I literally don't know that, Michele.

MASON COLE

Okay, well, I've just told you. I think I set mine like six years ago and I haven't touched the configuration since. So, if I ever change jobs, then somebody will have to tell me to change it because I probably wouldn't have been able to find the setting.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

There you go. So, our join session is even more useful. Anything else? Q&A? I've got one item, which is probably something we can take back home, but a question on an issue that we're struggling with within the NCSG on diversity and a clause that for diversity on council. And given that we've got three constituencies and three elections running in parallel, we've got a must in the NCSG charter that we sometimes do not abide by, which is not good. But I was just wondering how, given that you've got two stakeholder groups, how you manage that? Is that a must or is that something that is just best practice? Beth?

BETH BACON

So, we do, because I'm going to speak for Owen, he can speak for registrars, but we separate a lot of that for us. On our ExCom, in our bylaws and operating procedures, we do have a requirement for diversity because everyone has to. But we also have some language in there that I'm not going to quote because I can't, about

making most reasonable best efforts. And if there are no candidates or if it's just unattainable, then you can fudge the diversity requirement a bit. But we really do try and make very transparent and aggressive efforts to hit those diversity requirements.

At the council level, we have the same sorts of requirements. We have for rotating for our regions. Again, I think we've on occasion have missed those. But again, we have our registry councilors and our registrar councilors. And the diversity requirements for us, I don't think are linked to each other.

So, we individually try really hard. But we do have that little bit of, you know, in a case of emergency, break glass language in our charter and operating procedures, just for that reason that sometimes you don't have a candidate or you just can't find that, get that done.

We also have staggered, our elections are in line, are at the same time or appointments for councilors. But for our ExCom, we have two staggered, two elections, two positions, two positions. So, we're never really rolling off an entire 50% or entire board at the same time.

So, we can pay more attention. It's a little easier to do that. So, we have a couple of different things that happen, but a lot of ours work in the same timeline, but we don't have to do it together.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thanks, Beth. Yes, Owen.

OWEN SMIGELSKI

Sure. And I'll do from the registrar side. I don't think we have diversity requirements for the ExCom specifically. But we certainly do. That's an internal procedure where we do try and do that, whether it be geography or other considerations as well, too. So, that's certainly something we do strive for.

If we don't have somebody volunteering, people who we're not saying we're telling them to become it, but encouraging them to run, we do try and say, okay, where do we have a gap or something like that. But we do have that also for the GNSO Council, where that is a requirement, where we have to have the diversity for geography.

And we also have similar to the registries where, in case of emergency break glass, where we can, after a certain period of time or best efforts, get in case we're not able to find somebody from whatever region that's not available. Also, like the registries, we try and stagger our elections, which was set up when they first started doing this type of ExCom rotation 10-ish years ago.

And, of course, this past election, we ended up having basically everybody being due. So, because we had people either leaving or through consolidation or moving to other roles, where we just had terms that were misaligned. So, we've been trying to rejigger that as well, too.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thank you. That's very helpful. Michele, you had your hand up at some point.

MASON COLE

Yes, it was Philippe -- Michele, for the record, from Black Knight -- Catherine, just in case you were wondering. Thank you. ICANN generally has the geographic diversity rule. When you go beyond that, it does open up a whole other kind of conversation. I think it's one we all need to be definitely having and looking at. But I'm not sure how you can solve it. And this is where it becomes interesting.

So in another space that I'm active, we had a Working Group on diversity and inclusion. And it was down to things like hiring practices. So for example, my own company, we will happily hire whoever. I mean, we don't really care. As long as they can legally work in the country and are obviously qualified to do the job. Don't give a damn beyond that. That's pretty much it.

But as a tech company, you do tend to end up with certain roles seem to kind of end up with a much higher number of applicants from particular backgrounds. And then the geographic thing for us, even within Ireland, because I'm not based in Dublin, I cannot attract staff of a certain demographic. Because they want to be in Dublin, Cork, Limerick or Galway. And they want to work for companies that are kind of perceived in a particular way. And what we do is not that exciting.

I mean, you can try and make it sound exciting, but really exciting is the kind of stuff that people working for certain companies about DNS issues last week. That's not the kind of exciting you want. But I think it's an interesting thing. And I think it's something that we all should be looking at. But I mean, I think we need to look at how we phrase the frame things. Again, on our internal Slack this afternoon, I mentioned this thing about the Review of Reviews. And my lead developer, who's a very smart guy, he will not come to our meetings. He will not engage in this space.

I've offered to fly him to cities around the world for ICANN meetings and for other things. And he will not go. And the reason he will not go is because of things like a Review of Reviews. Because when he sees a comment period there and he looks at it and he goes, I have no clue what the hell they're talking about. Because the terminology is really, really hard. I think this is something that when I came into the space 20 odd years ago, it was worse. It has got a little bit better, but it still hasn't got much better.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thanks. Thanks, Michele. And what you just said on the sort of demographics and the kind of people we attract, including for the ISPCP, resonates with what we have. And that's why we, to some extent, we're struggling. What I'm hearing is that you don't actually coordinate the sort of geographic constraints that you might have. Whereas in our case, maybe it's out of reach.

We could do this locally within our respective ExCom and we do this. But maybe having some best practice at stakeholder group level, in our case, would be much better. So, thanks for this. That's really useful. We'll take that forward. It may, you know, raise a few eyebrows when it comes back to the whatever that's called governance committee of the board. Because we sort of, you know, we'd be less demanding than where we are today. But we are where we are.

I'd rather have that than something that we can't actually meet down the road. Thank you. I've got an AOB, but before we close, anything else?

BETH BACON

No, just really appreciate you taking the time. I know that we did, we got the last slide of the last day in the last minute. But so, we'll just get one of these. But I think going forward, if we do have things that we want to coordinate on, especially DNS Abuse, we can do that in the interim over Zoom and all these meetings. And so, I think that we can make that time that time work. And I just really appreciate it. It's nice to be able to work together on these things.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Owen?

OWEN SMIGELSKI

Thank you. Pass on to Beth.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Likewise. Thanks. Thanks to you both. We'll try and do better next time as far as the agenda is concerned. But it was time well spent anyway. So, we take your point about trying to have some discussion between now and the actual start of the abuse related PDP.

Before we adjourn, I want to mention that this is the actually the last in-person meeting with Brenda, who announced that she'd be retiring. So, the last ICANN meeting ever or there never is a long time. Thanks.

BRENDA BREWER

Thank you, Philippe. It's been a fun ride. I'm just going to get on a different bus. That's all. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

I've got a card for you, Brenda. So, don't leave too soon with this. The meeting is adjourned. Thank you very much.

SUE SCHULER

Thank you. We can end the recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]