
ICANN84 | AGM – At-Large EURALO Round Table
Tuesday, October 28, 2025 – 15:00 to 16:00 IST

MICHELLE DESMYTER

All right. This session will now begin. Please start the recording. Thank you. Hello, and welcome everyone to the EURALO Roundtable, Rethinking ICANN's Legitimacy Internal Politics, External Pressures.

My name is Michelle DeSmyter, and I am the remote participation manager for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior and ICANN Community Anti-Harassment policy.

During this session, questions or comments will only be read aloud if submitted within the Q&A pod. Interpretation for today's session will include English, French, and Spanish. If you would like to speak during this session, please raise your hand in Zoom. When called upon, virtual participants will be given permission to unmute in Zoom. On-site participants will use a physical microphone to speak. Please state your name for the record, the language you will speak if speaking a language other than English, and please speak at a reasonable pace.

And with this, I will hand the floor over to Sebastien Bachollet, EURALO chair.

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.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET

Thank you very much. Yeah, I know that you are coming for this EURALO Roundtable, but as it's the only session organized by EURALO and we are in Europe, I wanted to give you a few information.

First of all, I would like to thank Frédéric for the chocolate going around the room. I guess, they are coming from Belgium. Thank you, Frédéric. Next time, bring something with no chocolate for me, please. And next slide, please.

It was just to show you, we signed with the Vice President for GSE in Europe, Global Stakeholder Engagement in Europe. In Paris, the 16th of September, so EURALO Regional Fiscal Year 22 Outreach and Engagement Strategic Plan. It's why I wanted to have this photo. It was a good moment. And the work was done by Natalia. I want to take this opportunity also to thank her for the hard work done to establish this strategic plan. Next slide, please.

Just to remind everybody in this room that we have different documents, organizing documents at EURALO, and that there are links. It's why I try to put it each time in the presentation just to keep the link alive and inform everybody about that. I guess, its next slide, please.

Thank you very much. I wanted to take also the opportunity to thank all the EURALO board member who participate the activity of EURALO the last few months or few years. Thank you very much. And now I give the floor and the wheel of the truck to Pari

Esfandiari, who organized this roundtable. Pari, the floor is yours.
Thank you very much.

PARI ESFANDIARI

Thank you very much, Sebastien. Let me start by a warm welcome to everyone, those joining us in Dublin, and those participating online from around the world. My name is Pari Esfandiari, and it's my pleasure to moderate this EURALO session. Rethinking ICANN's Legitimacy: Internal Politics, and External Pressures, Part II.

Part I of this discussion took place in September as a roundtable that explored how ICANN's legitimacy is being tested internally by governance drift and externally by rising geopolitical tensions. Today, we continue that conversation with a different purpose, to invite community feedback and move to action. Next slide, please.

Our session today will unfold in several parts. First, I will briefly walk us through the courses of events that led us here. Then we will open the floor, first to our invited community members, and then to everyone, to exchange ideas and proposals for the way forward. Next slide.

As you can see on the screen, we have invited distinguished community members, they're familiar faces, and need no introduction, so I will forego the introduction to save time. Now let me begin with a quick framing thoughts. Legitimacy is a complex concept encompassing functional, legal, sociopolitical, and other interrelated dimensions that examine not only performance and

governance, but also the very right to govern. ICANN has historically relied on the functionalist argument that its legitimacy drifts from technical competence and its role in maintaining a stable, secure, and interoperable internet.

Over the past 27 years, ICANN has indeed delivered on that promise, combining operational stability with a bottom-up consensus driven multistakeholder governance model that has earned global trust. Today's discussion narrows the lens of legitimacy to focus specifically on accountability, not only as a procedure or requirement, but as the means through which ICANN earns trust, and demonstrates that multistakeholder approach works in practice as well as in principle. Next slide, please.

A confluence of circumstances makes this conversation particularly timely. Under article 4.6 of ICANN bylaws, the ATRT4 Accountability and Transparency Review was due within five years of ATRT3. Yet the board twice deferred its launch. In April 2024, and again in May 2025, citing workload and review fatigue. The ALAC viewed this as a breach of ICANN accountability obligations and filed a reconsideration petition on 17 June 2025. However, the empowered community declined to act, deepening concern about ICANN's accountability culture.

Our discussion today also comes as the board prepares for WSIS+20, which will reassess the multistakeholder approach to internet governance and ICANN inevitably be under scrutiny. This is particularly significant for end-users who directly experience the

consequences of ICANN's ability to maintain trust in its governance system. Next slide, please.

With that broader context in mind, let me turn to some of the key insights from the EURALO Roundtable Part I, where we heard from Michael Palage, Olivier Crepin-Leblond, Philippe Fouquart and Sebastien Bachollet alongside a thoughtful exchange from the floor. The discussion revolved around three central themes where ICANN's accountability was tested. Next slide.

So, we had three themes, internal accountability versus agility. The discussion emphasized the need to restore trust through consistent accountability, timely execution and cultural discipline. Of course, there was far more points made that we can see again some of it on the screen, but there is no time to go through them. Next slide.

External credibility and governance culture. Participant underscored the importance of transparent, inclusive and balanced governance that ensures all stakeholders have an equal voice and influence in ICANN's processes. Next slide.

Geopolitics and the future of legitimacy. The conversation highlighted the importance of maintaining technical competence, accountability and transparency while reaffirming the multistakeholder approach as the foundation of ICANN's global legitimacy. Building on that foundation, the goal today is a call to action, to test, refine and build consensus around the most important steps ICANN can take to address real or perceived

accountability deficiencies ahead of WSIS+20 and beyond. Next slide.

To guide our conversation, we will focus on two overarching questions presented on the screen. And I would now like to invite our community contributors to share their perspectives. Let's begin with our first question, which focuses on the practical dimension of accountability. What concrete steps can be taken in the next 12 months to demonstrate measurable improvements?

Becky, from the board's perspective, what specific verifiable actions do you believe would best demonstrate improved accountability in the next 12 months, particularly in the light of the recent review deferrals and workload considerations?

BECKY BURR

Thank you, and thank you all for coming to this very important discussion. I think that the issues are pretty straightforward in terms of what we need to do. As always, ICANN needs to deliver on its mission in accordance with its commitments and core values. With respect to specific things, we have a strategic plan, a new strategic plan that has been adopted, that has an operating plan for the year, and we have to perform against that. That's a document that is available that creates benchmarks for all to see, and it's there.

We have to have a successful review of reviews that comes out, produces in the end a time-proofed method for testing, reviewing

whether ICANN is delivering on its mission in accordance with its commitments and core values. And we have to have a flexible system that allows that to test in digestible pieces where we deliver implementable ideas. Ideas that can be implemented in a reasonable amount of time with reasonable resources and that are supported by the community.

The review of reviews is not going to get past that first stage, but creating the framework for doing that going forward into the future is a critical piece of that. The other thing is we are likely to have some policy development processes come up. We're waiting to hear from the GNSO Council whether they recommend moving forward with the PDPs on abuse, but assuming that one or both of those PDPs are approved and move forward, we have an important test of whether moving to tightly scoped policy development processes enable us to get policy developed in a timely way and then implemented in a timely way.

Now obviously, implementation is unlikely to be done in the same year that the policy development process moves forward, but step one of this is the policy development and that is an important piece of that.

Then the final piece is a launch of the next round in April of 2026, so I guess we're not calling it the next round anymore. We are calling it the 2026 round. All of that is a lot of work, but it is work that is spread out. There's policy development policy process and there's the review of reviews, but all of those things require investment

from the volunteer, the community volunteers, but also, delivering against the strategic plan and launching the next round go to org and board efficiency. So, there's something for everybody to do, but we have a pretty clear roadmap for what needs to get done.

PARI ESFANDIARI

Thank you very much, Becky. And you mentioned review of reviews. With that, I would go to Jonathan as ALAC chair and as a member of ROR CCG. What verifiable actions could strengthen ICANN's accountability and transparency in the coming year, Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK

Thanks, Pari. That's an expansive question. I think we're working hard to try and figure out as a community the balance between self-reflection and execution. Those two things have gotten jammed up together, and I think that's what's caused a lot of the consternation, that how much time should we be spending on thinking about whether or not we're doing a good job, and how much time should we spend on trying to do a good job?

I think that our accountability spans both of those things. In other words, if we've made decisions and we've implemented policies, the execution of those policies is part of the measurement of that. And so, making sure that when we put different kinds of recommendations or policies in place, what comes along with them are some sort of benchmarks or metrics associated with them

that allow them to be measured and judged later on for whether or not we executed on the policies we developed, while at the same time leaving room for the implementation of orthogonal recommendations about how we make decisions or new policies that need to be put in place.

I think we've just gotten ourselves jammed up between making recommendations and executing on them, and both are going to be critical, I think, for the organization to appear accountable. Whether or not we are accountable is always a tougher question to answer, and I'm not sure that a whole lot of people are paying attention to these things, and that the community itself may end up being the judge of that, because when people step outside of the mechanisms that we've put in place to hold the organization accountable and zip directly to the Attorney General or NTIA, even though we're not tethered in the same way, that demonstrates, it communicates a lack of confidence in the organization in which we're all engaged.

And I think we need to be as careful as we can be as members of the community, not to communicate a lack of confidence in that accountability to the outside world, but instead making sure that we're part of executing correctly and making reforms where necessary.

PARI ESFANDIARI

Thank you very much, Jonathan. And on that note, I think I will go to Avri. Given your leadership role in the review of reviews CCG,

what a specific verifiable action could emerge from the current review structure or the CCG processes to restore confidence in ICANN's accountability mechanisms within the next 12 months. Avri?

AVRI DORIA

First of all, I'll sort of say, I don't know yet what will come out of it that will reestablish confidence. I'm finding myself in an interesting position of having been one of the earlier ones to sort of shout that the sky was falling in terms of accountability and finding myself now in the position of being one of the co-chairs of the group that is doing the review of the reviews, so that we can find our way back to some notion of accountability.

And it really is a very interesting, fascinating, and difficult problem in that we've gotten okay of doing reviews, although lately we've been sort of either delaying them or failing to fulfill all the obligations and recommendations that come out of them or postponing them. So, claiming our legitimacy, claiming that we are accountable becomes more and more difficult as time goes on. And so, now we have the problem of, how do we sort of put it back all together.

We still have a gigantic backlog of applications, I mean, of recommendations from previous reviews that we somehow have to deal with. ATRT 3 did give us recommendations on how to deal with them. Those were indeed approved by the board, and yet we did not necessarily follow through. How do we get to the point

where we can do reviews, we can do reviews that fit within our capabilities, that fit within our bandwidth, and give recommendations that we can actually implement, that we can actually see coming forward.

And it would be impossible for me as one of the co-chairs of a group that needs to find consensus on this program to say, other than I have a very pragmatic optimism that of course we will succeed, and of course we will find a solution that gets us to this almost a nirvana of the ability to be accountable, to have a review, to make a recommendation, to implement that recommendation, to implement that recommendation well enough so that by the next time we review it, we don't have a guilt about what we didn't do, is really quite an exciting problem to have.

One of the things that always makes me happiest in life is having an impossible problem to solve. And at the moment I look at this, as I say, with very pragmatic optimism that of course this community will succeed at doing it, but it's really going to take a lot of people agreeing to be optimistic, agreeing to be pragmatic about what they're going for. If we all insist on our own personal nirvana, we probably will not find it. And so, I don't know if that answers your question, but it's the position that I'm in now as one of these three of trying to find our way there, and it's kind of an exciting process to be on. Thanks.

PARI ESFANDIARI

Thank you very much, Avri, and we all need this pragmatic optimism around us. So, with that, I would go to Winnie. From the perspective of ICANN org's engagement, what specific verifiable action could reassure intergovernmental partners that ICANN's accountability commitments are being upheld in practice? Veni, over to you.

VENI MARKOVSKI

Thanks, and I hope you can hear me.

PARI ESFANDIARI

Yes.

VENI MARKOVSKI

Actually, I can even hear myself in the echo. So, thanks again. I'm sorry, I'm in Dublin, but I don't feel well, and I had to keep my hotel room not to spread viruses if I have some virus infection.

So, the geopolitical question, part of the question that you have put on the screen, is very interesting because you're right. We are in the midst of the WSIS+20 negotiations. The co-facilitator from Kenya and his colleague from Albania, the expert, is also in Dublin. They are meeting with community members. I think some of you may have met them already. And you may be surprised to find out that actually the member states are not talking about ICANN when they talk about WSIS+20 review.

It used to be different when the WSIS+10 was happening, the WSIS+10, 10 years ago in 2015. ICANN was going through the IANA transition. And there were some comments back then including support for the transition expressed by diplomats from the permanent five members of the UN Security Council. But it's also very clear that when the conversation around ICANN was driven primarily in the WSIS itself in Geneva and Indonesia, the interest towards ICANN has faded away.

And in fact, the part about the internet governance is a very small part of the WSIS+20 Zero Draft, which is, by the way, still open for comments, and we have submitted a comment. So have done other members of the ICANN community and of the technical community. So, I think we have to be careful when we are discussing the issues about ICANN's accountability, legitimacy, et cetera, in the context of the WSIS+20 because WSIS+20 are really not about ICANN anymore. And they haven't been for quite a while. Thank you.

PARI ESFANDIARI

Thank you very much, Veni. With that, I go to Fiona. Drawing on your policy experience, what specific verifiable actions could ICANN adopt to demonstrate not just compliance, but a renewed culture of accountability to the broader internet community?

FIONA ALEXANDER

Thank you, and thank you for the invitation to participate today and offer some views on the topic. And ICANN's accountability is an important topic and one that I spent a lot of my time working on in my previous lifetime. So, I have particular interest in this particular area. So, I think, for this conversation, important to maybe take a step back and do some framing around that. And remember that the original construct of the reviews were from a moment in time, right? The moment in time was 2009, and the conversation was, how do we evolve the U.S. government's relationship with ICANN pre-IANA stewardship transition.

And the idea of these reviews was to share what was a real or perceived accountability tool that the US government have. And as one of the authors of the affirmation, I can clearly tell you that was the purpose of these reviews. And again, the reviews and the way they were put forward and constructed and enshrined in the affirmation and later incorporated into the bylaws reflect a moment in time. And I think it's healthy in ICANN, and it's one of the things I've enjoyed about ICANN over the years as compared to some of the other work that I did in other institutions, is that ICANN has the ability to evolve, and ICANN has the ability to adapt.

That's the whole point of the flexibility of the system versus a much more constrained intergovernmental system. And so, the fact that the ICANN community and the board and everyone sort of has taken a step back, and you can argue and you can quibble over how it happened and if it happened the right way, I won't point on that. But the fact that we're having this review of reviews and we're

taking a step back and we're going to assess what structure works, what structure hasn't worked, I think that's a really good thing. And I think that's actually a demonstration of ICANN being accountable.

So, unlike others that think what unfolded this year is a bad thing, I don't think it is from my perspective. Again, it could have happened in a slightly different way, maybe have been less challenging for people. But the fact that we're saying, a review structure that was put in place to meet a particular political need in 2009 with particular timelines for particular US domestic policy considerations was then incorporated into ICANN and we now find ourselves ten years later jammed up on reviews and we have maybe too many reviews, maybe we can't keep up with the reviews.

And maybe the reviews and the people on the review team and the processes, I mean in particular the issue specific reviews, I think personally have strayed in some instances beyond the remit. The remit of these reviews is supposed to be to review ICANN's execution of tasks, not to inadvertently or purposefully in some cases try to put your finger on another ICANN process. So again, I don't think what's happening is a bad thing and I think it's a good thing. I think it's important and I'm glad that Avri and Jonathan and others are involved in the review of the reviews. And I think that's where the energy and focus should go to deal with this.

The other thing that I would like to kind of chime in on, and I think Jonathan brought this up as well, I lost track of the amount of times

people came into my office when I was at NTIA to complain when they didn't get exactly what they wanted in an ICANN process, and that's bad, right? People in this community need to work within this community to solve their challenges and problems. Oh yeah, sorry. I'm going too fast, as always.

So, I think the issue of accountability is everyone's accountability. It's just not an ICANN board accountability or an ICANN staff accountability. It's an ICANN community responsibility as well. So, the fact that people somehow still feel the need to go outside the system to solve their problem, I think that's a conversation that we should be looking at as well and why is it that community members continue to do that on different areas and aspects versus just solving their problem within the structures that they're a part of.

So, I think the accountability and the question that's up here, what's specific verifiable actions and what could happen, it has to be a community specific question too. It's not just about what can the ICANN board do, right? There's lots of things they can do and Becky spoke to that and I agree with all the things she said, but I think everyone in this room that's part of the ICANN community should be asking that question of themselves as well.

PARI ESFANDIARI

Thank you very much. So, shared responsibility. With that, I go to Jan. From a global governance perspective, what specific verifiable action would you consider meaningful indicators of improved

accountability within ICANN multi-stakeholder approach over the next year?

JANIS ARTES

Thanks very much. I think I just want to say three things, but each of them becomes complicated. The first thing is that accountability is tricky. The second thing is that accountability is important to legitimacy. And the third thing is, how would you demonstrate that accountability for legitimacy?

So, on the accountability is tricky, if you remember, those of you who have hair that is my color, ten years ago we were here and we struggled immensely during the IANA transition, stewardship transition to secure accountability. It was the question that ran and ran and ran and ran. So, it's not surprising that ten years later it's also with us still. I think it always will be because accountability is both very important but also very difficult to secure.

Accountability is important to legitimacy. Yes, legitimacy means that people regard ICANN as having the right to rule, to make rules and govern in its area. So, that right to rule has to be based on something. And we know from research that there are very significant associations between perceptions of accountability and perceptions of legitimacy. So, if you don't have accountability, your legitimacy is going to be in trouble at ICANN. Now having said that, ICANN's legitimacy at the moment from what we can do on

research seems to be relatively robust. Not sky high but nowhere close to crisis.

So, no matter what stakeholder group you look at, no matter what part of the organization you look at, no matter what age group you look at, what gender you look at, et cetera, et cetera, it's pretty secure. As I say, it's not sky high 100 percent but any time legitimacy is 100 percent, you're in trouble because people get complacent. But we do know that accountability is really important to legitimacy. So, if ICANN gets lazy or sloppy with accountability, there are risks that they could hurt the legitimacy. So, it's important to keep an eye on it for sure.

Question is, I guess, now what do you need for accountability in ICANN at the moment? And there, I would ask maybe four questions. I'm only asking questions. I don't really necessarily have answers. But if you look at accountability today, in respect of what issues is accountability looking weaker? So, is it about certain substantive issues? Is it financial accountability? Is it operational accountability? If you do perceive that there's a weakness in accountability, can you pin down where in the organization it actually lies in terms of the issues that are dealt with?

And also, whose accountability in ICANN is inadequate? Is it the board's accountability that's perceived to be wanting more? Is it the staff's accountability that's perceived to be wanting more? Is it the community or certain SOs and ACs whose accountability is seeming to be like... So, who? Likewise, to whom is accountability

do there appear to be weakness? Because accountability, you are accountable to somebody. And so, who on the receiving end is suffering to the perceptions? Is it certain world regions? Is it certain social groups? Is it certain stakeholder groups?

I would try to get all of that clear in one's mind because if you just say blanket terms, accountability is in trouble, there's so many things that could be meant by that. I would try to be careful. And then finally, once you've identified where is the accountability weak, whose accountability is weak, and to whose accountability is weak, then you can ask, well, what kind of mechanisms do you need? And I think in that, finally, you get to the issue of the review of reviews.

So, I would say when one does the review of reviews, ask the questions. What kinds of adjustments do the reviews need to be made in the light of ICANN's legitimacy today, and in the light of these questions about the accountability? I think that might be a little bit more systematic, and hopefully that would help to get to answers that are helpful for everybody.

PARI ESFANDIARI

Thank you very much, Jan. I think, first of all, thank you for so systematically laying down what needs to be done. I think that's very helpful. Of course, this conversation started based on certain problems that community faced, which I explained in the introduction. So, that was because the deferral happened and also,

the impoverished community didn't act on that. But what you mentioned, I think, is very helpful for review of reviews.

With that, I think I will go to our second question, and one that looks outward to ICANN's global environment and how it maintains legitimacy amid increasing scrutiny of the multistakeholder model. I know Veni said that that doesn't really apply. Personally, I disagree. I think there is scrutiny going on within the internet governance ecosystem. I come back to you, Jan, again, giving your work on global governance. How can I live up to and demonstrate its accountability amid broader international discussions about internet governance?

JANIS ARTES

Yeah. In the current geopolitical situation, global governance in general is in trouble. It's not the multistakeholder system, per se. Multilateral regimes are in trouble, and multistakeholder. To that extent, I'm not sure that we're really facing a struggle or a crisis of multistakeholders. I think we're facing a bigger crisis of global governance. I don't see, but I'm ready to be contradicted by others, but I don't see that the multistakeholder model or models, or multistakeholder processes as such are under particular scrutiny and under particular critique relative to global governance in general.

What you can see is that between the 1990s and 2020, there was a major expansion of multistakeholder processes. So, the numbers of multistakeholder institutions increased, their staff size

increased, their budgets increased, their mandates increased, and so on. After 2020, it flattens out. So, the general situation is that, after a major, major rise during 30 years, it's kind of flattening out. But I'm not sure that that is a problem of the accountability in multistakeholder processes itself. It's a problem of the geopolitical shifts and the general backlash against global cooperation.

PARI ESFANDIARI

Thank you very much. And with that, I go to Fiona. Based on your experience, bridging internet policy and international diplomacy, how can ICANN demonstrate its accountability in a way that resonates within intergovernmental and multistakeholder context?

FIONA ALEXANDER

Sure. Thank you. That's a great question. And I would agree and associate with everything you had just said, by the way, in terms of the broader geopolitical world we live in and the challenges that we're facing. And that's more of an issue set than ICANN specifically.

But I will say, like historically, if you'd ask this question 20 years ago, I would give one answer. And if you'd ask this question even 10 years ago, I would give a different answer. And the answer I'd give today is even more different. So, 20 years ago, it was a real challenge. And there are several people in this room that sat in a room and argued for whether ICANN should even exist outside of

ICANN, which was completely bizarre in and of itself. We're not in that space anymore. And even 10 years ago, when we were going through the IANA stewardship transition, as Veni had said, there were still some pushes and takes and people questioning whether this was the right approach and the right thing to do.

I think in 2025, we're not in that space. And I feel like it's not a question anymore whether ICANN exists or doesn't exist. I don't think that's the question that we have today. But the question I think people are struggling within the WSIS process is and has been, how do you take the multistakeholder tools that ICANN uses or the IETF uses or other parts of the internet governance ecosystem use, and can you use them to solve other digital challenges? That has been a challenge and that's a conversation that's been happening inside the WSIS+20 process.

I think as we witnessed and we saw our colleague and ambassador from Kenya do this great presentation Monday, only yesterday, and explain where things were, and I think the co-facilitators are doing an amazing job trying to open up the processes as best as they can to get stakeholders involved. At the end of the day, these discussions in New York revert back to closed-door government conversations, which is a challenge. And I think that becomes difficult because that in and of itself is completely not multi-stakeholder.

So, when you try to sync these things up, I think you start to have some challenges. But how can ICANN in particular demonstrate it's

working and that the multistakeholder model is working and that the multistakeholder model of internet governance as it relates to the administration and coordination of the DNS? By doing its job, right? And that's all the things Becky laid out in her intervention was, all the things that we need to be doing in the next year, whether it's the launch of the new round, whether it's completing the review of the reviews, and all the other things that need to happen I think are happening.

PARI ESFANDIARI

Thank you very much, Fiona. With that, I go to Jonathan. Jonathan, how do you respond to this question?

JONATHAN ZUCK

Well, again, it's a little bit of a tricky worded question because I think—I don't know that the world is out there looking for us to be accountable. I think when there have been folks that were interested in an alternative to ICANN, it was opportunistic more than it was altruistic. Like, oh, no, they're not accountable. We better help out. I think it was more like, is there an opportunity here for us to act in a multilateral fashion that gives different outcomes?

And so, I think the biggest thing that we can do is on the execution side. I think more and more if processes of implementation inside ICANN take too long such that government looks efficient by comparison, then you'll start to see more and more local and national regulations that are meant to address whatever gaps that

are perceived, and, again, sometimes brought on by our own community, unfortunately. And we'll start seeing a patchwork of regulations, and that'll end up being a much bigger problem, frankly, than the threat of a multilateral alternative to ICANN, which is that ICANN will have to exist in a fragmented regulatory framework.

So, I think execution, getting things done when it says it'll get them done, getting things implemented, getting projects off the ground, et cetera. It's about the trains running on time right now that's going to be most important. That's my impression.

PARI ESFANDIARI

Thank you very much. And with that, I go to Avri. Avri?

AVRI DORIA

Thank you. I'm not sure I have that much to add, except that one of the things in addition to delivering, of course, we have to deliver, if we don't deliver, then... I think being a little less boastful about who we are, about our model being the model of perfection, about our own importance and such, I think that that's one of the things that we often go out in the world being very boastful about what we do, about how we will achieve the multilingual, the multi-IDN internet, how we will achieve all of this, and then somehow finding ourselves falling a little short. So, I think more delivery and less boasting about ourselves would probably be helpful. Thanks.

PARI ESFANDIARI

Thank you. And Becky, how would you like to address this question?

BECKY BURR

So, I agree with what everybody said, and I especially agree with Jonathan that the initial attacks on this were opportunistic more than anything else. I think in the WSIS+20, the conversations at the IGF this year, the conversations in Oslo on the WSIS review, I think we're all pretty positive, and we heard the ambassador say the other day at the opening ceremony that we're very good ambassadors. The technical community turned out to be very good ambassadors.

So, I do think it is actually about delivery because the places where we're feeling pressure, I don't think are in these IGO spaces. I think they're at national government levels where we don't deliver on our promises, we create space for legislation and regulation that may not be fully informed by the way the internet works, that may create tensions in sort of cross-border compliance, that may compete with work that ICANN is doing in a way that's not particularly helpful.

So, I think the focus really is on delivery, deciding what it is we can do, saying what we're going to do, and doing it on the schedule that we lay out. I don't know if boasting is the word, but I think sort of overstating our capacity to do work is a problem, because that leads to disappointment. But in the areas where we have authority and the ability to act, we should be doing that, we should be doing

it efficiently and effectively, and we should be making appropriate changes.

PARI ESFANDIARI

Thank you very much. Overstating our capacity, I like that phrase. So Veni, would you like to add anything to what you already mentioned.

VENI MARKOVSKI

Yeah, I think it's important to mention also one other thing which the co-facilitators have said, which is to urge our community to talk to the national government. And that aligns with what Jonathan and—I noticed you are nodding when Becky was talking about national legislation and regulation. The reality is that the negotiations at the United Nations are between member states, and therefore the more we talk to governments in the capitals, the better opportunity we have to inform those member states, so that when they are behind closed doors, they discuss the issues with enough knowledge to understand that if they do something, they may damage the technical foundations of the internet.

And I want to use the opportunity to actually point to a new thing in the Zero Draft of the WSIS+20 document, if before—and Fiona mentioned 10 years ago, 20 years ago, even one year ago, people kept on talking about fragmentation of the internet. The Zero Draft now talks about fragmentation of internet architectures, which is a very new concept, but it also provides us with the opportunity to

talk to governments and mention this to them. And I hope it remains in the final draft, because it's much more precise than just talking generic term fragmentation of the internet, which everybody can understand whatever way they want. Thanks.

PARI ESFANDIARI

Thank you very much. And with that, I go to Christopher Wilkinson. Christopher? If you're speaking, you're muted, Christopher.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON

First of all, hello. Thank you. This is Christopher Wilkinson. I did not ask for the floor, as far as I know. I'm not conscious of having raised my hand. No, no, my hand is not raised.

PARI ESFANDIARI

Okay, thank you very much. First of all, thank you for all this thoughtful insight. And now I would like to open the floor for everyone to participate. Please raise hands or make comments in the chat. Lutz, please.

LUTZ DONNERHACKE

Lutz Donnerhacke for the record. I'm surprised by the positive feeling you are presenting here. I do not share. If I remember the welcome ceremony correctly, for me it sounds like if ICANN work as a spokesperson for the technical community from the site, it would be appreciated if we get some technical comments. But real decisions should be taken by real men and real organizations like

the UN or something like this. This was my impression. And I see that it's going in this direction. And we are unable to fulfil different requirements from different parties.

If the country is going to say we want to have the following rules and not a country want to have different rules. For instance, if you have a Polish registrar for a domain which is primarily targeting to the US from content-wise, it's hosted in, for instance, Germany, which law you want to apply, especially if the registrant is coming from Russia. I cannot have a solution for this simply because it's the wrong body for such a different requirement.

But the real interesting question is, why is ICANN still in place? Where is the [inaudible] for ICANN? Where it comes from? If you are looking in the different constituencies, you could say it's a lobbyist organization, nothing more. Why it represents internet users? I do not have an answer.

PARI ESFANDIARI

Thank you very much. And with that, I go to Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET

Yeah, with my personal hat on top of my head, please. I agree with Lutz. I was surprised that you were also positive. I was hoping that there will be some disagreement and a different point of view. It's quite strange from my point of view.

I want to just push two things. The first one is that, if we want to be practical and succeed, there are still recommendations from Work

Stream 2 who are still not implemented. Either we decide not to implement them and we put them in the garbage and that's one solution or we implement them. We can't stay with all that like that.

And the second, and I am sorry, really sorry, but I come to one of my—what I love more is that when you take the operating plan for fiscal year 2630, strategic initiative, the first one, the first one is a pilot holistic review. We fail altogether and that's a pity. Thank you.

PARI ESFANDIARI

Thank you very much. And with that, we go to Frédéric.

FRÉDÉRIC TAES

Thank you, Pari. Frédéric for the record. I'm speaking on my own. First, [inaudible] this is good to follow the expected code of behavior that I cannot mention in particular countries or regions or whatever. But it's also in my quality of my work is about third-party risk management. So, to evaluate, that's my profession, part of my profession to evaluate. Can we trust third parties? Are they reliable on the longer term? Do they have business continuity plans, et cetera.

And in context of this, I have to remark. The first one is about when people ask, for example, the Sebastien Bachollet mentioned to raise an alarm bell about, okay, we are not following our own procedures, et cetera. Where does this message is going? Is there at ICANN ethics and compliance, for example, to really take that at the

highest level in the organization to have action points behind?
That's my first question.

My second one, and I'm in line also what Mr. Jan Artes said, is that the level of confidence, when we are evaluating third parties, we never checked or really give really full attention if the internal procedures are followed or not. Why? For two reasons, the first one is that we didn't have evaluate if those internal procedures are right, if they are containing everything. It's more internal [inaudible].

And the second reason is that it will steal someone giving opinion on himself or herself. So, the highest level of trust we can give is to have external certifications, like you have many ISO standards on this, like on corporate social responsibility on whatever, or externalize audit standards like SOC 1, SOC 2, SOC 3 more in the US. This cost, however, a lot of money and ask much time. So, what is made as intermediate level of trust is to have three lines of defense, where the third—the three lines, I will just go quickly. It's the entities managing themselves, for example, [inaudible] share is responsible for [inaudible].

An internal review, it can be review of reviews, the four I's principle. And the third one is an internal audit department. And with this question, because I have observed that it's a coincidence, but really strange coincidence. The 19th of May, so when the decision was taken to stop the pilot holistic review, the same day it was also the

deadline for a call of offer to create an externalized internal audit at ICANN.

So I'm wondering if we have a link between those two facts happening the same day, and if it's, how to say that, the willingness of ICANN to take over to create this internal audit to replace several procedures. That's my question. Thank you.

PARI ESFANDIARI

Thank you very much. We had three comments from the floor. Anybody likes to make now from the panel respond or make a comment? Jonathan, please.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Yeah, I'm not exactly sure what I want to say, but I feel like I want to clear up the idea that I was positive. I'm not sure that's what I was trying to communicate. I think to Jan's question is an important one. In other words, this idea of accountability to whom is an important one. I think fundamentally we have different audiences for this. When we talk about optics, we're often talking about those outside the ICANN community. When we talk about accountability, we're talking about those within the ICANN community.

And I think fundamentally, the disbelief of the ICANN community in ICANN's accountability will lead to bad optics. I think that is the greatest danger that faces the organization. Our ability to execute on the things we say we're going to do is part of what creates these opportunities for government that we see are happening. We run

the risk of regulatory fragmentation and trying to operate, as Lutz has put it, in a world in which a contracted party might not even know what law to obey.

And that's I think a feature of a vacuum being left. Again, I'm not sure that I was trying to communicate that everything was hunky-dory when I said that we're in risk of, if not a loss of legitimacy, but a loss of relevance if we can't get our work done in an efficient way. So, we have to make sure that we maintain a balance between deciding whether or not we're doing a good job and actually doing a good job. I say that with all due concern. I don't mean to suggest that everything is hunky-dory by any means.

But I do think that the outside world is not paying attention to how our review of reviews is going. I think we're kidding ourselves if anybody thinks that anybody's watching that. They're watching whether or not we're servicing our community efficiently and effectively, and the way that they're finding out that they're not is from the community. That isn't being watched that much by the outside world.

It is people peeling off from here and saying, "Waah, I'm not getting what I'm wanting. We need another regulation to serve my needs here, there, and everywhere." And that's what leads to this fragmentation. I think we have to really step up as a community and get on the same page if we want to assert our own legitimacy.

PARI ESFANDIARI

Thank you, Jonathan. And with that, I go to Avri. The floor is yours.

AVRI DORIA

Thank you. I just wanted to make a brief comment. We weren't asked what we felt about how things were now. We were asked about how we can approve, how we can be better in the future. The answers might have been very different if there had been a request. How messed up do you think you are at the moment? The question was, how do we move to a better future? And so, I think that that's largely what was answered.

PARI ESFANDIARI

Thank you very much, Avri. Jan, please.

JANIS ARTES

Yeah, thanks. I just wanted to comment on a few positions that have been put forward. And what I say is based—we did work on a random representative sample of 467 regular participants in ICANN. So, what I say is based on that. And from those, there is not a clear relationship between technical competence and timely decision-making and implementation and legitimacy beliefs. So, people may have worries about those things. They may have concerns about those things, but they don't correlate with rises and falls of legitimacy beliefs.

So, I'm not saying that the concerns aren't real and so on, but going to Avri's point, what should we do to improve things in the future. That's not actually something that if you want to improve

legitimacy, it's not actually something, at least by this work, that is screaming for attention. What is wanted for attention is the accountability as such. That is really important. But something else which hasn't been mentioned here at all is fairness. The perception that decisions are formulated and implemented in an unbiased way. And that shows from our work to be actually really, really important, more than technical competence and the like.

And in particular, something that comes out on the fairness aspect is geopolitical inequalities. So, the people say, and I mentioned in this panel also is entirely global North people, and so, it's not surprising that we don't perceive that problem because we're in the advantaged position on that regard. But if you look through ICANN as a whole, then that is a real issue for legitimacy. And if you want accountability, then people are saying be accountable to the whole world.

PARI ESFANDIARI

Thank you very much. And we are running out of time, so I want to pass the floor to Sebastien for his report. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET

Thank you very much. I'm sorry, I will go really quickly if you can show the slide. Just to remember, Stefano Trumphy as a member of our community. He was member of other community in ICANN. Next slide.

He was chair of the Internet Society Chapter. And he was member—
next slide, please. Next slide.

He was a founding member of EURALO. As you can see here, he was signing the MOU with Paul Twomey. Paul Twomey was CEO at that time. And the next slide is to show his name somewhere in this list. And there are very few people still going around in this organization. I guess, Wolfgang and myself. But I wanted to take this opportunity to have a [inaudible] on Stefano Trumpy. We will have other opportunity. It's why I will stop here. And thank you for listening, and I hope that—he has done very well within ICANN and within all his endeavor. Therefore, he was a very good man and I was one of his friends at all people who signed the MOU at that time when in Lisbon we create the RALOS. Thank you very much.

PARI ESFANDIARI

Thank you very much, Sebastien. And with that, I want to thank our speakers, all the participants, the staff support group, and everyone who joined us. Thank you very much. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]