ICANN84 | AGM – GNSO: CSG Membership Work Session
Wednesday, October 29, 2025 – 10:30 to 12:00 IST

BRENDA BREWER

Hello, welcome to the CSG membership session at ICANN84. My name is Brenda Brewer and I am the participation manager for this session. Please note 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. If you wish to speak, please raise your hand in Zoom. When called upon, please state your name for the record and speak clearly at a moderate pace. Thank you very much. I'll now turn the meeting over to Philippe Fouqaurt, CSG Chair. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thank you, Brenda. Good morning, everyone, and hello to those remote participants. Welcome to the CSG session at ICANN84. The agenda says Wednesday, so it must be Wednesday. It's been a long week already. Any update to statements of interest? Anyone? Okay, seeing none, any addition to the agenda that you'd like to see? Okay, seeing none.

As you can tell, there's probably that will be an update on topics that have been discussed over the course of this week, but given that there have been meetings on some of those topics as well, including the review of reviews and development on abuse as well, I think it's worthwhile having that discussion. For those of you who were not there on Friday, you'll have an update on what decisions were taken back then, and we'll have a chat about the CSG charter, because we do have a CSG charter, and there's one particular item that we probably want to discuss in the context of implementation of Workstream 2 recommendations.

With this, let's start with the policy topics, the first of which is DNS abuse. Again, for those of you who weren't around, that's something that we talked about on Day 0. And one particular aspect that I think is worthwhile discussing is that idea of convening a standing committee on the topic, the timeline of which will need to be discussed.

But it seems that during that Day 0, there was some interest from our NCSG colleagues. And we did talk about this during, or mentioned it during the meeting with the Board, although obviously they do not necessarily. They do have a view on the need or the interest of having cross-SO discussions. And I think that would be the main added value of such a body as opposed to the potential PDPs that we'll have on DNS abuse.

Given this, I think in our three constituencies, we do have an interest and support for that notion. So, I think we can take this from here and go through the discussion, and I'll turn to Mason, if you would help us.

MASON COLE

Thank you, Philippe. Good morning, everyone. Mason Cole, Chair of the BC. Philippe, thank you for introducing the topic. DNS abuse has been the flagship issue for the BC now for a number of years. And the reasoning behind this, of course, is that DNS abuse impacts those who we represent very heavily. And we've been asked as a business representative to ICANN to try to help mitigate the problem. Thus, the BC advocacy for tools to deal with DNS abuse.

We're happy to see the current two, either two or a combined PDP, underway in the GNSO to deal with abuse. This is two PDPs out of maybe, I don't remember, 10 to 12 abuse related items that were identified by the CSG as gaps between the current abuse environment and existing ICANN policy.

We do not have a roadmap for how those remaining gaps will be addressed. So what we're interested in is, I'm speaking for the BC, what the BC is interested in, is seeing if there's a mechanism to accelerate or either accelerate attention paid to DNS abuse by the GNSO or keep it on the agenda for the long term. The reasoning being DNS abuse isn't going to go away. It's a long-term problem that deserves attention. ICANN is the steward of security and stability of the DNS, and it's incumbent upon all of us to mitigate the DNS abuse problem if we have the capability to do so, and we do.

So one idea that's been advanced here in Dublin is the idea, as Philippe just mentioned, of a standing committee on DNS abuse in the GNSO, and this was an idea that we stole from the ccNSO. The ccNSO obviously is different in many ways from the GNSO, but the country code TLD operators seem to do at least a relatively better job of dealing with abuse in their namespaces, and part of the reason is they pay constant attention to policies and practices that mitigate abuse successfully.

So I've been in contact with Nick Winman-Smith of Nominet, who is the chair of the ccNSO, to get his advice on how the GNSO may want to organize a standing committee and put it to use productively. I'll note here too that the Board, the ICANN Board, has a standing caucus on DNS abuse. So the ccNSO, the ICANN Board, all are paying attention to this issue.

The GNSO is paying attention as well, but there's an opportunity to ramp up the amount of attention that's being paid, at least over the long term, on the abuse problem. We raised the issue here in Dublin with Board colleagues in our session yesterday with the CSG, and we got good feedback from the Board. They seemed to like the idea. We also raised the issue in the informal meeting that we had, the GNSO Council informal meeting, which was attended as well by SG and C chairs.

We did not get as good a reaction in that meeting as we did with the Board, but that doesn't necessarily preclude us from trying to advance the idea. In terms of functionality of such a panel or a standing committee, these are early days. We haven't really formed the idea to a point of maturity, but what we're hoping for is something that first would not overtax the GNSO or ICANN org in terms of resources.

We've heard clearly from both GNSO counselors and ICANN org that resources are short, and stacking the GNSO with too many PDPs at one time is not a good idea. We certainly recognize that that could be the case, and so we're not interested in creating work for the sake of doing it. This is meaningful work, at least the way the BC is approaching this is that this is work worthy of the steward of the domain name system. We're not interested in punishing anyone or advancing a bad concept. We're interested in mitigating a problem that exists for all of us.

Some of us here in the CSG have batted around a few ideas about what a standing committee might look like. It wouldn't probably be anything that would be the instigator of policy development within the GNSO, but would serve as a panel that would receive information on behalf of the GNSO from others who are expert in the area of abuse, perhaps the SSAC or other security experts who can inform us on current trends in DNS abuse so that we can intelligently and smartly put resources to work where they would be most effective. But as I say, these are early days. We haven't formed the idea about what that might look like, and that's only one idea about how we can all in the community cooperate on DNS abuse going forward.

So I think I've outlined the current state of affairs fairly comprehensively, Philippe, but I know we on the BC are interested in feedback from CSG colleagues on how these ideas can be improved and what we can do to cooperate together to do something about the abuse problem over the long term.

We're concerned that once these two PDPs or the combined PDP or whatever it's going to look like in the end are completed, that the abuse problem will fall off the agenda and our constituents will continue to have problems with abuse, and the steward of the DNS won't take the proactive steps that they're capable of taking to deal with the problem. Did I cover everything fully? Yeah, I'll stop there. I yield the floor.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thank you. Thank you, Mason. And I suppose we can go to the discussion. I have one observation and maybe a couple of questions. I think the concerns that might have been expressed, I wasn't there, but was essentially the potential overlap between the PDPs, PDP or PDPs, and the standing committee. I would just note that at least for the CCs, they have a standing committee, whereas they don't really do policies on that matter.

So clearly the purpose of having a standing committee is not to do things that the small team, the PDPs and let alone Council might have done, if you see what I mean. So I don't really see the overlap. Well, at least we can make sure that there is no overlap. And be there are indeed in terms of being an observatory or a way to share information in terms of how people can combat some of those practices. There's certainly, if not a need, some value in that speaking personally.

So that's the sort of overall comment. The question I have is that since you saying that this is early days, not premature, but early days, in terms of the timeline, I suspect that for the remit of such a standing committee to be defined, you probably need the charters or the charter of the PDP to be available to make sure that there's no overlap moving forward. So that's one milestone. And more generally in terms of timeline to have an idea other than as soon as realistically possible. And I'll go to the queue after that.

MASON COLE

Thank you, Philippe. These are early days. I think the answer probably is as soon as practical that staff and the Council can help us take on the task. You know, we're approaching the holidays and we're approaching the beginning of the new gTLD round, presumably in April if that schedule stays on track. So the BC is very aware that ICANN resources are heavily taxed right now.

At the same time, we owe it to our constituents to continue to work on this problem. So the abuse problem can't be put on hold for years until the TLD program is up and running. So do I have an idea of the timeline? Not firmly. But I would hope that either the idea can get some traction before the end of the year or soon after the first of the year so that we have a roadmap going forward.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thanks. Thanks, Mason. That seemed to make sense. First is Thomas.

THOMAS RICKERT

Yeah, thank you so much, Philippe. Thanks, Mason. Just to be very clear up front, I'm not in any way against the idea of a standing committee. When the ccNSO installed that, I mean, the CC don't make policy on these matters at ICANN. I thought, okay, now they're doing this, so they have this term that's on everybody's bingo card. And for sure the Board welcomes that because they don't have the workload with it. And I'm wondering we have the PDPs coming up, we have the roadmap paper, we have now two, if not three PDPs, if you include the one on DGAs that we have in the pipeline, and there's more based on the paper that came out of the small team.

So my question is, how does a small team, if we install it, impact the dynamics in Council? Because I thought that it was good for this to be a matter that gets the attention of the entire Council when we implement the strategy that came out of the small team, right? And so there might be pushback because we have the PDPs, and then we have yet another committee that needs to be populated with individuals that put time into that. So shall we push for a small team, or shall we push for that to be a standing item on basically every second Council meeting, you know? So what serves our purpose better not to wear down people and keep the energy high?

MASON COLE

Excellent question, Thomas. Thank you for raising it. I think, and I'm speaking for the BC again, but I think we can-- I'm aware of the report that came from the Council, and I applaud that. And as long as we can keep momentum moving on abuse, that's a good thing.

The argument for a standing committee has a couple of aspects to it. One is it would prevent abuse from falling off of the radar in favor of other priorities, or other things that may not be as big a priority. The other would be it would inform the Council on things like emerging threat vectors and other trends that have to do with DNS abuse that the Council may not be aware of.

So though we've identified gaps as a CSG where we'd like to see Council action, there may be smarter ways to move in the near term that would have a bigger impact on DNS abuse. The BC is certainly not interested in creating work where work is not necessary, nor are we interested in creating a committee that's going to take time away from everyone else just for the sake of doing it.

We can debate the machinations of how to go about the best way to tackle abuse. This is an idea that the BC wanted to bring forward to the CSG and to the community to see if it has legs and if it's something that we could take on. It's a concept that we like and we'd like to advance and we think would be effective. But as I say, we're not interested in creating overwork for anyone else. I hope that helps, Thomas.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thanks, Mason. Before I go to Vivek, just an observation on the potential overlap between those two things. I would just note that although I'm totally in favor of small teams at Council, as long as they remain small, and for this particular one, and mindful of the need for transparency, I think it's just as big as Council.

I think there are 17 members on it, which is arguably not that small. So if it gets to a point where you've got pretty much all of Council on the small team, then maybe we-- And given that, again, the remit of this may not be-- Certainly there's a dependency with policymaking, but it's not focused on policymaking, that there may be some thinking to be made in terms of taking it out and making it permanent. That's just my personal observation. With this, next is Vivek.

VIVEK GOYAL

Yeah. Thank you. So this is my second year on the Council. Time and time again, this thing comes up that we don't have resources, that what if we take this up, we don't have resources. And the way I look at it, there are two main resources for any work that gets done in ICANN. We need ICANN staff support, and we need volunteers. Yesterday or the day before yesterday, the days keep mixing in my head now, we had a meeting and somebody asked Curtis about this resource thing, and he very clearly said, if you need resources, ICANN will provide it. That's taken care of now, right?

Second is volunteer. The meeting we had on DNS abuse that day, there was only standing room in that meeting. People were standing there for an hour to see what's happening in DNS abuse. We have no shortage of experts in DNS abuse are willing to give their time.

The challenge, the restriction with small team is that only Councilors can work on that. And not every Councilors are engaged in DNS abuse on a day-to-day basis. I appreciate their support and what they bring in, but they might not know the ground realities. A standing committee gets experts who deal with this day in, day out, can talk sense based on their expertise, their knowledge in technical areas, in IP and everything, and help the Council make informed decisions. Not based on eco chambers where everybody is talking about what each other wants to hear or knows limited about it, and then making decisions.

So I don't think so there's any resource constraint. It's just a self-limitation that we have put on ourselves. I believe if we ask for it, we'll get expert volunteers to work on this. And standing committee is just that. It stood up, did the job and sat down. So as of now, there is no standing committee on DNS abuse because it has moved past it. So I honestly am so glad on this idea of standing committee on DNS abuse. And I'm so glad Thomas is not against it. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thank you, Vivek. All good points. Damon?

DAMON ASHCRAFT

Sure. Thank you very much. Really interesting idea. Just sort of a couple observations. I think to kind of echo Vivek's comments, I think we've got plenty of resources. I mean, we're going to do a PDP on it. There's lots of staff members that are assigned to Council. So I think we've got the resources. One thing I think we'd want to be mindful of is you wouldn't want to have Councilors from this group take any positions on the standing committee that weren't necessarily in tune with the PDP.

So would the thought process be that if you're a Councilor from this group, that you would be on the PDP or you'd be closely managing it just to make sure that things were consistent between the two? I mean, I think that could certainly-- what do you guys think of that?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thanks. I'm not sure I have an answer to that, they certainly need sort of coordination between the current and future work of Council, whether that's through the Councilors or not. I don't know how we can work it out, but I think that's a fair issue. Mason?

MASON COLE

I agree, Philippe. It is a fair issue. And Damon, as I say, nobody's interested in creating extra work or having a standing committee going in one direction, a small team in a different direction, the Council in a different direction and not talking to each other. We have enough of that in ICANN already.

DAMON ASHCRAFT Oh yeah, and I completely realize that. And then also, we don't need to over-complicate things. All the Councilors in this room from this group, DNS abuse should be top of mind. We all should be monitoring it and reporting back to our constituencies. And so calling it, formalizing that a bit and getting some more resources, which I think the Council has, makes a lot of sense. So yeah, I just, I think it's a, I think it's a fine idea. We've got a PDP coming up, which is certainly a good kickoff for it and have my support.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART Thanks, Damon. Next is John.

JOHN MCELWAINE So there's been some chatter going on here and I thought maybe this would be a good opportunity to focus on at least some ideas that IPC has, or actually just me kind of speaking personally, taking in mind that this is a new concept to me, although you just recently stole it from the ccNSO.

But actually, I got onto the ccNSO's website and looked at how they describe it. And it's clearly, it's established to serve as a forum to exchange information, share insights, and discuss best practices in mitigating DNS abuse. They're very clear that the role of the committee is to raise awareness, promote dialogue, etc., but not to develop policy. And I think that that's going to be key to having the standing committee that's not seen as a, shall we say, a threat to resources and to interfering with ongoing PDPs.

The next perspective I'd like to bring is the kind of the distinction that the GNSO has had between a standing committee and a committee or a small team. So I was the last chair of the standing committee on finance and the budget. And that was not a large resource drain on the community. What that committee was built out with was one counselor serving as the chair, and then the community would appoint just interested parties to take part in that, people that had an interest in the budget. And that was another type of topic that required a certain interest, right? Those are some pretty technical, detailed budgets and strategic plans to go through.

So I think if we kind of look at it as a standing committee in the vein that the GNSO Council has done in the past, and one that is serving as a forum for dialogue, sharing best practices, identifying problems, and then making recommendations, that's a good thing. I think that could really get some traction. Thanks.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART Thank you. Thank you, John. And just to pursue that parallel with, I forget the name, the acronym, because we're not good at acronyms, are we? But the point was that there was in that particular standing committee on budget and operations, we had significant exchanges with the CCs. Regularly, there was sharing information, making sure that we identify the commonalities and differences. And their experience, because they were, as far as I can remember, much more professional, I would say, to some extent, on that particular topic. And that was extremely useful. And I think that beyond the substance, we could actually map that sort of cooperation with that standing committee on abuse.

JOHN MCELWAINE

Yeah. John McElwain for the record. Just to hop into, for folks that think, well, that standing committee was eventually disbanded. That was basically because of a lack of interest in attendance. It had gotten to the point where the strategic plan and budget was so detailed that getting people to take part in that from a comment perspective, which was its main oversight, and then commenting on the strategic plan and budget, was just falling by the wayside. So, it wasn't for lack of having it being a good vehicle to help have those dialogues within the community.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Philippe here. And more related to the substance than the way we actually work with the CCs on this topic. Thank you. Thank you, John. Next is Michael.

MICHAEL GRAHAM

Thank you. Michael Graham for the record, and speaking in my personal capacity. I think this is a great idea, and I like the definition or the description of the team from the ccNSO. I think such a standing committee would be outside the PDPs. There's been a problem. We bring up every meeting, and probably a lot of the online calls and such, the definitions of DNS abuse. It comes from many voices in many ways, but there's no focus to it. And because of that, there's no traction.

We've had some interesting opportunities to share ideas and processes between the CSG and the contracted parties, and yet there's nothing ongoing with that. It's sort of a first, we'll have this, we're reaching out, we're doing the good thing, and then it vanishes. Having a standing committee within GNSO that would incorporate representatives from all of the houses, I think would be a great way to go, not only to do things like, well, I made a list of things, what could it do?

Identify threat vectors was brought up, propose definitional changes, and also understanding of the different types of DNS abuse. There is no single definition, I think, any longer of DNS abuse. There are different types. To track abuse trends, and really to provide a focused voice from GNSO on domain name abuse issues that might, in the end, demand further action, maybe a PDP, but that's not its purpose.

And I agree with Vivek, one, the resources, and two, it's really not appropriate, I think, for a small group from the Council. It is something that should be coming from the community and the Council, with experts and people with different perspectives. And I would speak, for example, from the perspective of being in-house Council, what sort of things are coming, and also percolating up from those sources on the BC side from clients and such.

I think it's a great idea, and the primary benefit I see is to have an interchange of ideas that lead to a single proposal or a single voice. And also as we're bringing up the different types of abuse from our side of concern to see how those fit in on the contracted party side with, is there a solution? How can this be approached? And maybe help direct how it's approached in a more consistent and unified type of way thank you.

MASON COLE

Thanks, Philippe. And Michael, thank you for that. That's excellent input. We do need to work with contracted party colleagues to make sure that whatever solutions are proposed don't represent incursions into their business that are intolerable. At the same time, I'm glad you brought up the issue of the definition.

Because I'll point to two sources of information about the definition. One is the SSR2 review, which was conducted back, I think, in 2021, where the SSR2 team called for a CCWG on DNS abuse, specifically on revisiting the definition every so often, where it would be a gathering of everyone in the community, contracted parties, civil society, businesses, everyone that's represented in the GNSO, plus others, who would consider the threat vectors and the evolution of DNS abuse and provide a community-based definition of what that is.

The current definition is embodied in contracted parties' contracts. The SAC has said, they said in SAC 115, there will never be a suitable definition for abuse that covers everything that represents DNS abuse. So, what's in the contracts today is a good starting point. And we're not interested in overreach. We're not interested in trying to sneak anything into contracts that don't deserve to be there. We're interested in actual solutions that can deal with DNS abuse. If that means redefining abuse every so often, in a way that's palatable to everyone in the community, let's do that. Let's do something productive, not just talk about it. So thank you for raising the definition.

MICHAEL GRAHAM

Yeah, and I guess I would be remiss if I did not point out that with another hat on the INTA hat that I'm wearing partly this weekend that INTA did put forward an alternative definition that goes beyond. It's not the contractual definition, but it's one that we thought aligns with NIS2 and some other definitions that are out there. That's more inclusive, but not as specific. Thanks.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thank you, Michael. And thanks, Mason. And that issue of the definition being aligned or misaligned came up during the discussion with the Board as well from SSAC as a potential hurdle down the road. So probably something to think about. Next is Susan, I think. Susan.

SUSAN MOHR

Thanks, Philippe. This is Susan Mohr for the record, speaking in my own capacity as well. And having gone last, it looks like I'm probably going to just pile on to a lot of the comments have already been said, but I think it's worth saying.

So first, I think that there does seem to be a natural evolution to move from the small team to a standing committee. And that's demonstrated, as folks have already said, with the additional issues that are raised in that working paper that aren't going to be addressed in the PDP. And I would expect that there's likely going to be issues that come out of the PDP through those discussions that could be further expanded upon, but wouldn't be addressed within the scope of those PDPs that can also be added to that list. So having that continued dialogue, I think would be helpful.

I also think that, I agree with the notion of partnering in some way with the ccTLDs. I sat through their meeting and as Vivek said it is interesting to see that in the DNS abuse session, it was standing room only. There was a lot of people standing in the ccTLD meeting as well. So definitely a lot of interest. I thought they have sort of an interesting perspective because they obviously have a different structure and the way they address DNS abuse is different than the

GNSO, but their ability to address it is demonstrated by the numbers that they have less DNS abuse.

And so I think there's really a learning opportunity. We may not be able to do everything that they're doing for obvious reasons, but I think there's a lot to be learned there. And I might even take it a step further to do more than maybe information sharing, but find a way to really partner and expand, bring in the SSAC. And so that you do bring all the experts to the table and have a good discussion.

The ccTLD is also… they're not bound by the DNS abuse definition. And so that allows them to have discussions that go beyond what we're able to have. And even though they're not relevant to us right now because of the contractual constraints with the DNS abuse definition, we all want to talk about it. You know, we want to learn about it. We want to understand it. And so that partnership might actually open a door to have those conversations, even if they're not relevant on the contracting side. So, thanks.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART Thank you. Thank you, Susan. And just to put a positive spin on the notion that the degree of abuse is not as significant on CCs. And I would hope that there's a reason for that. There are many reasons for that, but some of which may be an inspiration for future work within the G-Space. Next is Marie.

MARIE PATTULLO

Thank you. Obviously, I fully support the idea of this, but to me, our specificity is practicality. There are a number of discussion fora within this wonderful ICANN world, which are discussion fora. It's academic. It's theoretical. DNS abuse is practical. It's affecting as much the businesses that the BC represents as my nephews or my grandmother. This is a practical subject. Some things may need policy. To get to a good policy, you need a defined subject that you're trying to address.

So one of the many things the Standing Committee could do would be to bring together people looking for practical solutions who have practical experience in how things can practically be addressed, some of which could roll out through best practice and simply speaking with people and understanding how others are dealing. And if we do need to go to policy, it would then inform that policy.

And by that, I mean the production of a report that would in essence be the status report that would be used for the scoping of a charter. But that's only part of it. A lot of it is practical solutions. What works? This might be a great idea, guys. We tried that. Don't work. So I'd very much support this with the, I keep underlining the word, practical outcome. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thank you, Marie. Next and last is Thomas.

THOMAS RICKERT

Yeah, I think this is a great discussion. And I think that we are converging on a couple of themes that we seem to be aligned on. And I think that when we further advocate for this or present this, there are a few things that we should probably put into this presentation.

One is that we see this very much like the idea that Susan presented as an evolutionary step from the small team to a standing committee, because that's something that we already had. And so there should be less resistance if we take that as a starting point for the presentation. Then that we want to basically model the mandate along the lines of what the ccNSO standing committee does. And that makes explicitly clear that they are not doing policy.

So I think we can highlight that the standing committee shall not interfere with the policymaking in the GNSO PDPs, nor in the role of Council in overseeing the work of the PDPs that we plan to interact with the ccNSO on these matters. And that a work product of the standing committee could be further versions or advanced versions of the roadmap document that the small team produced. So that we basically inject proposals into the Council's deliberations for further policy work, contractual work or whatever the outcome might be. Is that a fair reflection of what we discussed?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thank you, Thomas. Yeah, I think it is. I think what I've heard is that there's certainly traction and interest for pursuing the notion of a standing committee in terms of this considering practical and non-policy-based solutions to the problem, as well as cooperation with the CCs. There are two items of vigilance, whilst not necessarily intractable. That's the question of the resources and the potential overlap, as well as the need for liaisons between the various groups. But this not being intractable, I think that's something that this group would support moving forward.

Can we, in terms of sort of action-- I'm sorry, is that a new hand, Thomas? No. In terms of sort of action item, moving forward, Mason, can we rely on you or the BC to sort of-- and the practicalities of how we can suggest this to Council, coordination between our new Councilors for this new term, new year, and on the timeline as well, just to come back to us as to the next steps?

MASON COLE

Yes, and I can't believe I'm saying this, but the BC will take on this work on behalf of the CSG. So, yes, we're happy to do it. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thank you, Mason. Anything else on this topic? Oh, okay. Quick time check. We have a bit less than an hour. So, I think we're in good shape. Next, with a question mark on next steps is RDRS. John, standing committee and all that, would you help us with this?

JOHN MCELWAINE

Sure. So, I think that obviously the discussion that I planned on having has been overtaken by events with what we're hearing the Board is doing. You know, admittedly, the IPC took position that the RDRS in its current form was not fit for purpose in our comments. I've been trying to analogize, and it's not the best analogy, but to the extent that people thought that we were saying kill the RDRS, it was more put it out of its misery, is really what we were trying to say.

And so, as I mentioned, we're pleased to see that we're talking about mandatory participation, that we're talking about including PPSAI, so in the results, but there's still a lot of work left to be done, and I think we're committed to undertaking that.

One aspect to keep in mind that I think is new to everybody's sort of radar is, and as I was describing in the IPC open meeting, the RDRS really runs, the policy that it runs on is a registration data policy. So, we had a presentation on that, and I was really using it as an educational opportunity to let people know about that, and then brought in ICANN compliance to talk about its enforcement efforts.

So, maybe just really quickly, show of hands, has anybody made a request for disclosure citing the registration data policy? Yeah, I mean, it was enacted just at the end of August. It's not well known, and so I think there is some educational components that are left to do, so that even, by the way, on the registrar level, because there are some registrars that have not yet implemented those requirements. There's requirements of a link on the website that they must make a decision within 30 days, some really clear-cut examples that we can point to.

So again, in terms of next steps, I think it is that the IPC, and I would encourage all of the CSG to be involved in helping improve upon the RDRS. There's going to be, lastly, what's being described as, I guess, a gap analysis. I'm still not sure what it's analyzing the RDRS and comparing it to what. I think it's the EPDP requirements concerning registration data disclosures. Perhaps it's really a comparison to the RDP, but that's yet to be seen, but I just would encourage people to be mindful of that and involved in the process. Thanks.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thank you. Thank you, John. Any questions for John? Maybe a question for me. There was a reference on Day 0 of the notion of this being mandatory moving forward. I'm just wondering whether that's actually, and we've heard this during the joint meeting with the Board. I was wondering whether that's mindful that it's only one dimension to this, whether that's an idea that's getting traction, having followed the discussion on this with the contracted parties. I have a comment after that, but on this.

JOHN MCELWAINE

Yeah, I don't know much more other than what you've heard as well. I mean, I think that there is a clear message from the Board that they're going to accept some of the EPDP phase one recommendations and send the others back for supplementary policy work, but that mandatory participation and involving the PPSAI and then the gap analysis are the clear outcomes coming from the Board.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thanks. Thanks, John. Anything else? There's another aspect that is being discussed I think is sort of, and more generally the notion that as we move along with this proof of concept, we're trying to align what it provides with phase 2a and the sort of, at least the spirit of all of this, if not the complexity. There was that notion of having some sort of federated authentication mechanism for special agencies, etc. Mindful that, and even speaking personally, having seen this being implemented or not in intergovernmental organizations, and those systems are never perfect. In itself, the problem is intractable pretty much.

So I was wondering where that was, whether I think I understand that that's one of the plans. I don't know how far people want to pursue that idea, but I would just note that the fact that the problem is not tractable, to me at least, is not reason enough for doing nothing, if you see what I mean, double negative. But it's just as well as we could do as much as we can, I guess that's what I'm saying. John?

JOHN MCELWAINE

Yeah, I agree with the direction you're going. I unfortunately missed a big chunk of the RDRS discussions, day one and day two, so I don't know. Thomas has been involved, like I know the urgent requests, and Margie, maybe I can turn it over to you because I know you attended that, but if there's any updates from those issues, that might be good to get.

MARGIE MILAM

Is there an answer? Yes. It's Margie for the record, Margie Milam. I understand there's going to be the urgent request angle and the authentication for law enforcement is on a separate track, and I believe there's going to be a public comment maybe associated with that. So it seems as though it's going, there's the RDRS continued pilot, which we were just talking about, and then there's the LEA authentication issues.

And in response, I had my hand up because I also wanted to talk a little bit about the pilot and some of the features of it, and I guess we'll see more after the meeting tomorrow and the document that they publish. But it's interesting that it talks about voluntary participation by ccTLDs, but it doesn't mention gTLD registries. And gTLD registries have obligations under NIS2 to disclose the information in accordance with requirements of NIS2. So we're creating a weird system where you've got a place to go for registrars, but the registries are outside of it, but ccTLDs can participate in it.

So one of the things I think as the compliance with NIS2 evolves, we may want to revisit the pilot and include the registries in it as well so that there's one place where you go for all of this information and it makes it clean for the requester community and makes it easier for the registries as well.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thank you, Margie, that's very helpful. Next is Thomas.

THOMAS RICKERT

Yeah, so the urgent request document is out for public comment at the moment, and I encourage everyone to take a look and submit a comment if you wish. So the compromise that has been struck in the IRT was to have up to 24 hours for response for urgent requests, and you can ask for an extension under exceptional circumstances.

And then there is the issue, if you wish, of authentication where the, and that was in addition to the document that came in very last minute. So in the public comment document, the question is asked whether the community thinks that policy work is required to embed the authentication mechanism into the policy or whether that's seen as a matter of implementation. So that's something that you should opine on and comment on.

I think that hearing you speak, John, I understand all the frustration with the RDRS and putting it out of its misery, but I really urge you, along the lines of what you said, Philip, let's not try to kill it, both because I think that we can make it better so that it is of better use, and also because I think if we are asking for it to discontinue, we will really upset the government and the law enforcement community that's working hard on the authentication mechanism. And those two projects, the RDRS and the registration data policy process for facilitating disclosure requests go hand in hand.

You know, so I think we should put the emphasis on what we think needs to be improved. I think a great example of that is what Tucows representatives described that Sarah Wyld, or you may know that Sarah Wyld has been very active in the Standing Committee. Still, Tucows has pulled out of the pilot because they were pretty frustrated with the way it worked. And what they saw is that if requesters are using TACO, which is their own disclosure mechanism, the disclosure rates go up. They get better quality information from the requesters. And I think that deserves more analysis to make sure that we embed that into the ICANN RDRS.

So in terms of narrative let's not speak to make it worse than it is. I know that it's not perfect, but I think it can be made something useful over time, and we should encourage the Board to put more money into this. And I'm also no one of us has seen the document that ICANN is going to publish later this week, but I have good hopes that they're going to allocate the resources to this so that it can be better in future.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thank you. Thank you, Thomas. Yes, and for those of you who were attending the joint meeting with the Board, I think it was clear that the intention was really to capitalize on this and not consider putting all of this to the bin. Now, there's certainly a balance between doing that and spend good money after bad, as we say, but it seems that there are a number of avenues where people say if this improves, then we're going to get better results. Next is Michael.

MICHAEL GRAHAM

Yeah, real quick, and I think I agree with what you've been saying about not killing it. I think we've had the MRI, we've identified that's been at least a minor stroke. And thankfully, the doctors have said that they will apply some remedial work on it. And I that's totally appropriate. It's something that probably our administration at home ought to admit to. But I have had a changing perspective based on the agreeability to make some changes now and to look at making some changes so that it is indeed fit for purpose.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thank you, Michael. Damon?

DAMON ASHCRAFT

Yeah, I mean, I think we are seeing this program is definitely getting better. And one of the chief complaints from a lot of my colleagues in the IPC was that it wasn't mandatory. And it appears it is going to be mandatory. Do we know all the specifics of what that means? No, but we are seeing improvement. So I think it's let's keep with it. I think that's kind of the consensus around the room from Michael and Thomas and myself. So I'm happy with the results so far at this meeting. Is it perfect? No. Is it getting better? Yes.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART Thank you, Damon. Yeah, sure.

THOMAS RICKERT Just a quick reaction. And I think we should discuss more this issue of making it mandatory or not. You know, we have the question of mandatory versus voluntary in the context of the authentication mechanism as well. In earlier versions of the rationale document of the standing committee of the IRT, non-urgent request, we had language that contracted parties can use their own authentication procedures because we don't have an official authentication mechanism at the moment.

So I think one thing to contemplate is to make it a choice for contracted parties to use their own authentication mechanisms for law enforcement if they have relationships with law enforcement in place, or to use the service that's offered by ICANN through the PSWG. That may take down some of the resistance. I think that the authentication part is one aspect of the contracted parties' due diligence in handling all disclosure requests anyway. And I think most of them will very gladly accept the offer from ICANN to use the service they're offering because it takes some weight off their shoulders.

So let's see how we can navigate this. And my hope is that if we find clever language that we can maybe put the concerns of those at rest that think this must be additional policy work, which I hope we can avoid.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thank you. Thank you, Thomas. And in hindsight of those experiences I was referring to earlier in terms of the problem being intractable, I think, speaking personally, I like the notion that we could sort of make it voluntary for registrars to use their own in-house mechanisms, mindful that I'm sure that those mechanisms have some shortcomings in terms of some countries in particular, and I'm sure that an organization like ICANN can help in reaching out in some of those countries. I know that we've had the same issue on different resources, and it's actually what happened.

So on this particular topic, is there anything beyond? There are a number of people within the CRG who are, as you can tell, already involved, is there anything that this group can do? I think the information was useful, it certainly was useful to me, but I don't see any particular action item moving forward. But if there's just, let us know. I think this discussion was useful, and we'll keep monitoring this.

Okay, let's move on then. Quick time check, we've got half an hour, brief update on review of reviews. I think we've had a discussion with the Board as well as there was a meeting this morning, there was one earlier this week. Osvaldo, would you like to help us with this?

OSVALDO NOVOA

Osvaldo Novoa for the record. I'm one of the two GNSO representatives to the review of reviews cross-community group, Sophie Hay is the other representative. During this meeting, we have been presented to most of the stakeholder groups, a document that's the draft of purposes of the reviews, a general document.

The group has been meeting, has been having weekly calls preparing this document, and the idea is to have comments from the community regarding the documents, what we should keep in the document, what we should take out of the document, or what we are missing in the document. And during this meeting, the only objective, we're happy to receive that feedback. Then we will continue working on the reviews. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thank you. Thank you, Osvaldo. As you could see in our joint meeting with the Board, one thing that the constituency is very interested in is how moving forward a potential thinking around the structure would be possible in that remit. As far as the current questions are concerned, I guess they can be interpreted one way or the other, and that's probably the challenge. But the ISPCP is keen on seeing this being included, not necessarily in the short term, but certainly something that the framework of reviews should cater for. Osvaldo?

OSVALDO NOVOA

Yes, Osvaldo Novoa for the record. Just shortly. Yes, this is at the beginning of the work. The idea is to finish with a set of reviews, it could be one, it could be many, that see that I can fulfil its objectives, its bylaws, and its core values, and that it does it effectively. We think it has to include the review structure to see if it's fit for purpose, and all the different parts of the structure. That's one of the themes we are discussing, the issue we are discussing, but we are just beginning, so we'll see. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thank you. Thank you, Osvaldo. To be very practical, one of the things that we're trying to understand is the notion of-- let me just backtrack, you may remember that three years ago, the GNSO review was deferred because of the holistic review. What we're hearing now is that maybe the continuous improvement program might help with such a GNSO review.

Now, the question we have is, and the challenge is probably that the continuous improvement program might not be enough to consider not only an SO specific review, but also to consider the potential, and bear with me, I'm an engineer, external interfaces and how one SO interacts with others, which is really what we are trying to address as ISPs in this context. By the way, thanks for all that you're doing, Osvaldo, in the group. Any questions? Okay. Thank you.

Moving on to item four, then. And I'll be looking for help from both Mason and John on this, on the Day 0 report and takeaways. And for those of you who may not have been around at that time, just to focus on the main points. I think the, and more generally, I think the Day 0 was really useful, so we couldn't actually have our meeting with the Board for a number of reasons, and despite us asking early enough, it proved challenging to have that.

We've agreed on a number of things that we can do to improve our cooperation. One of which is some sort of informal heads up on how our respective constituencies may approach a vote at council without this being binding. So from a purely practical standpoint, we considered informing other constituencies of how a constituency vote may go on the following council meeting. Obviously, that's not binding, there will be caveat to this, but just in terms of sharing information.

Oddly enough, that's the sort of things that we do when the vote is challenging. We don't do this when it isn't. So as a result, maybe, we tend to think that we hardly ever agree. But it's just because we don't have the mechanism to figure out that generally we do agree within the House. So that's one thing that we considered. The principle of the Day 0 was pretty much reconducted, so we'll ask for it again at the next AGM. We had a similar exchange with our NCSG colleagues on both abuse and RDRS. I seem to remember that the notion of a standing committee was amenable, if that's an English word, to them on Friday.

The discussion that we had was very similar to what we've had today. They had one on abuse, they had one, unsurprisingly, one particular concern over, what I would call the false positives in a DNS abuse related policy, and especially for those users that relate to civil society, for example. So that's one thing that they'll be keen on pursuing in the policies. I don't think we've ever had any concern on this, and that's what we told them.

And we had, as planned, I don't know whether it was long, but a discussion on onboard seat 14, as per the agreed procedure, that says that in October, November, we should consider the question of whether the incumbent is reconducted in that position. So we've shared our thinking on our side of the house. On their side, I guess both on the principle as well as the substance, they were in favor of broadening the set of potential candidates.

My reading of this is both of principle and substance, if you see what I mean. But we've heard this two years, we heard this two years ago. So I think there's probably not only a question of out of-- by principle, we should open every three years we should have, and that's not what the procedure says. We should consider all potential candidates, including the incumbent. That's not what the procedure says. The procedure says, let's consider the incumbent first, and then if there's a need to open this, we should.

Now, regardless of what the procedure says, our colleagues said that they would like to open, and to be very practical, open the search committee moving forward. So on that basis, we had an action point with Rafik to inform Chris of this. We did that on Sunday, I think. And his sort of immediate reaction was that this is something that, for example, is very common in environments he's familiar with at RIPE and elsewhere.

So now, this being said, beyond the position of principle, I don't know whether, where we go from there. There was some, my word, grievance on potential attendance to their meetings, which one would argue could have been raised earlier. But, and on that basis, again, to be very practical, there's an action point for the group to develop an evaluation grid of the incumbent, and for this to be filled in on an ongoing basis to make sure that any such grievance is not raised at the 11th hour.

Speaking personally, the concern I have is that, as we say in French, we've been here two years ago. There is no what we used to call tiebreaker in the process, and as someone who did mathematics in the past, this process does not converge. So we shall see. Now, I'm optimistic by nature and pessimistic by method, as we say. So we'll see.

I'm sorry I've been a bit long, but this is where we are. The action point for us is really to convene the search committee that's, as I think we've said repeatedly, is not in charge of making that decision, but to determine the set of potential candidates. The

NCSG was very clear that the incumbent should be part of that, but it's our respective action point moving forward to determine this. We've done this, we've started this within the ISPCP this week. The deadline is end of next week, and we're confident that we can have both a member and an alternate. So each constituency needs one member and one alternate to this search committee.

I'm sorry I've been long. I'm sure maybe John and Mason, you have something to add. There's a queue forming, but I'll stop here. Next is Damon.

DAMON ASHCRAFT

Sure. You know, I was on with you, Philippe, and also with Marie. I was on team 14, and one of the key things we recommended was reviews and trying to give incumbents sort of a heads up as to how they were doing. It doesn't quite seem like that was followed in this instance, and I am concerned that we've just developed this whole team 14 in this process. We're already way off the reservation with that, just from a process standpoint.

And then just also just from a governance perspective I chaired the NomCom. I was on the NomCom. The Board will tell you over and over again that continuity is important, and just from a governance standard, constantly rotating Board members in and out is not good for the organization. And I would certainly hope we would consider that as we go forward, because it is important we set up our Board members for success, and more importantly, that we set up the organization for success and not just rotating people in and out. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thank you. Thank you, Damon. All good points. I would just add that, as a side note, that that's something that was an issue that was raised with noncom's decision this year. Also note that it is detrimental to our call for interest if sort of by design, we would say that they would not be focused on the performance of the incumbent, but that by design would be reconsidering the position every three years.

And even more so, I would say, given the directors that this house has appointed over the years, and in particular with Chris, because we realized that there was a learning curve. He was very adamant that there would be at the very beginning. The odds are that somebody with a similar profile would have the same challenge. Speaking personally, I think that would be a pity to change for the sake of changing and go for the same profile with the same learning curve. That just sounds ludicrous to me, my personal opinion. Next is Michael. I'm sorry.

MICHAEL GRAHAM

Thanks, Philippe. I have the same similar experience as Damon being on the NomCom and the need for consistency on the Board. I'm not aware, because I have not read deeply, the process that we came up with for Chair 14, whether or not this is a requirement that we participate in this or if this is a proposal.

In terms of the proposal, I'm quite concerned, however, because I know of at least one person who has been approached by the NCSG as a potential Board candidate, which suggests to me that this is somehow a maneuver, that not only do they want to have a search committee, but they want to have who they want to be presented and or a straw man or two that they can knock down.

Whether or not they have a problem with Chris's representation, I've not heard any. I'm not aware of any. The discussion before that that would be a first step, I think that's extremely important, that that be put in place and reviewed and discussed with Chris before there's a determination to move forward with a search committee, which obviously is going to take a lot of time and effort and resources that you, Philippe, and you, Damon, had to put in in discussing the new process. I'm, again, a bit ignorant of how we came up with the process, but I'm extremely leery about the proposal that came up just now, as it were. Thanks.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thanks. Thanks, Michael. To your point, although I'm supposedly, and having been part of that team, supposedly familiar with, and I guess I am with the process, that doesn't mean that I'm very confident on this. As I said, to converge in due time, both because of the procedure and the way it may lead to endless circles of consultations, but also maybe for reasons of substance. I'm not aware of people having been approached, but that's an interesting information. As to the way you characterize the intent of that position, I probably have some sympathy with that, that may be the reason. Susan, you're next.

SUSAN PAYNE

Thanks, Philippe. So, I'm not going to rail against this too much, because we are where we are, but I'm disappointed that we went into Day 0 and didn't know that this was coming until that point. I think it was verging on late after the deadline that the procedure sets out. As I say, we are where we are, but perhaps what's important is to have that kind of, I can't think of what you called it, but in my mind, it's the kind of appraisal grid.

Part of that needs to assess things like what progress has the Board member made on the Board during his three-year term, because I think one of the things that, for me, is really disappointing is that Chris is just going to take up the chair of the OEC, that's the Organizational Effectiveness Committee, at this meeting.

It would be, obviously, that those committee chairs and terms get reshuffled regularly, but clearly on the Board, there's a great deal of trust in him in that capacity. Come next AGM, potentially, Chris is off the Board. It's disappointing. I think, at least insofar as kind of appraising the incumbent, that kind of aspect needs to be part of the appraisal.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thank you, Susan. All good points. On how he fared with our expectations, although that was not formal, I think that's fair to say that over the course of the number of meetings we've had on our side of things, and we've met him a number of times, I think we've made our expectations clear.

I think that had there been any strong reservations, he would have, at least as far as we are concerned, he would have known this very early, and although there's always room for improvement, we consider that indeed continuity at Board level is really important, that we are where we are, and he was a candidate that was ultimately offered by the NCSG, so we appreciate the need for a consensus on the name, and for all these reasons, we supported continuation.

But as you said, Susan, we are where we are, and we'll try to do as much as we can. But I would just add that this is unfortunately, that's not only something that we see on Board seat 14, so if there's an issue with continuity on a couple of seats, I guess it's manageable. When you see it happening on a number of others, it becomes critical at Board level, so including skillset management and all the rest of it. Marie, you're next.

MARIE PATTULLO

Yeah, thank you. I had the joy of being with you, Philippe, and with Damon on the team 14, as we called it. I agree with the gentleman to my left. I agree with the gentleman and the lady to my right. Now, I would like to point out that we as the CSG had made it clear to our colleagues and the NCSG that we were happy. We met our timelines. We were not given any indication prior to Friday that the NCSG was unhappy. That's their right. I'd also like to point out we are not a junior partner in this partnership. Now, if it is felt within the CSG that we are happy with Chris, in particular, given the role that Susan has just outlined, we have every right to be just as vocal about that as we do.

Also, last time around, for those of you that had the unfortunate experience of being involved, there were numerous candidates who were discussed, with whom we met, with whom we discussed, all of whom were thrown out at the 11th hour. Chris was brought in as a compromise candidate by the NCSG. All of us said, yep, fine, okay. Because by this point, we were being pressured, and quite rightly, we were being pressured by the hierarchy, by ICANN org saying, guys, Board member, hello.

So, after everything that we, all the work that we did, I would strongly advocate for two things. Number one, the CSG is happy with Chris. If you, the NCSG, are not, we need to know why. We need to know your new candidates, and we need to get those dates from Brenda and Andrea, so we get the exact. We need to know by the nth day of nth month, because the timing really matters.

And another thing I'd like to check out there that we keep throwing out, and everyone keeps ignoring, wouldn't it be a great idea if we changed the way that the Board is appointed, so that the NomCom doesn't choose quite as many, but the GNSO, from whom over 90%

of ICANN's funding is generated, has four Board members, one for the registrars, one for the registries, one for the CSG, one for the NCSG. And would that not solve this rotating circus we have every two years?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thank you. Thank you, Marie. On this, I think there was a similar discussion, was it yesterday, at the meeting between the GNSO and the Board. But there are so many things that the review of reviews moving forward might sort out. I think our expectations should be reasonable in that respect. What I mean by that, the notion that that effort would solve everything and anything. But I'm with you.

Oh, and on the timeline, by the way, we're not that late. We're not that late. On the fact that we need to convene the search committee, we're slightly late by a week or so. But we've started, luckily enough, much earlier than last time when we started in January, I think. Now, mindful of what you just said, Marie, it doesn't mean that all of this will converge in due time, nonetheless. Next is Thomas and Susan.

THOMAS RICKERT

Yeah, just one quick note. If you continue the conversations with the entire house on Board seat 14, I think we need to make very clear that if we don't stop these shenanigans, it will be increasingly difficult to find high caliber candidates because they don't want to be, exactly, they don't want to be exposed to such abuse, to be quite honest.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Yeah, very true. And that point was made yesterday as well. It's very discouraging. Susan? Marie, you have your hand up. I suppose that's an old one. Susan?

SUSAN MOHR

Thanks, Philippe. This is Susan Moore. Just following up on Marie's comments, I think you're right. We're not a junior partner. I think we also have a challenge, though, that even if we, and we are 100% behind Chris, I fall back on the comments that Philippe continues to remind us of, and that is that we don't have convergence in the process.

And so even if we go through the process, I think, and they put forward a candidate, and they like that candidate, and we want to stick with Chris, we're at an impasse. There's not process to solve that. And so I'd encourage us to start thinking about that now. What does that look like? So we've got something in our back pocket. I don't have an answer, but I think we need to start thinking about that now.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thank you, Susan. And possibly think about the various scenarios. And one that is not unlikely is something similar to what happened two years ago, whereby by May or June, we did not, the process does not converge. Margie.

MARGIE MILAM

Really quick. This is Margie Milam. Do we have to accept a new process? I mean, I think we're playing into their hands by agreeing that the current process doesn't work. Like why? This was an agreed process. We're sticking to the agreed process and leave it at that. And let them tell, I mean, I guess the process is evaluate our current Board member. Let them say they're not happy with the current Board member. I think that would put them in a very awkward position. And I just feel like we're going to waste a lot of time and resources in another fight, a new process. And I think we should just stick to our guns and say, no, we're sticking to the current process.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thanks. Yes. And the selection of the Board seat 14, I forget the term we use, Damon, but anyway, the procedure was approved through Council and it's somewhat biding. The process itself now, indeed, the spirit of this is that the evaluation and the reservations be made explicit. And it's not that clear, to be honest, in the process, but it's something that we can certainly push for just to make sure that we compare like with like we compare someone who's been here for two years, for more than two years and some somebody else who might be totally new to this business. Michael and Osvaldo, I'd like to wrap up and say a word about.

MICHAEL GRAHAM

Yeah, yeah. Just really quickly. And this is not a Board seat 14. I don't know what the number of this is, but just to bring this to everyone's attention, because the application will for the Board before the NomCom. And I believe there'll be two positions open coming up. But just to point out that one of the current Board members, Sarah Deutsch, will be termed out. And she's been an important voice on the Board. And I just wanted to point that out in terms of our consideration of other people, we might, I don't know, coerce, whatever suggests that they consider applying for a Board position that will be before the NomCom this next round. Thanks.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thank you. Thank you, Michael. Osvaldo?

OSVALDO NOVOA

Just a quick question regarding the procedure. I understand that if we don't reach an agreement, Greece continues, or is the position vacant?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Well, unfortunately, that's something that we discussed within the team. And there was no agreement as to what the default decision might be. There are elements that are explicit in the procedure, whereby the skill set, the geographic diversity were elements that should be taken in determining the sort of the default path, the default choice. But something like what you're saying is not explicit. If we don't agree, the incumbent doesn't stay. I mean, there's nothing of that nature.

OSVALDO NOVOA I understand from the bylaws that it stays.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART Absolutely. Good point. And I would argue that the bylaws prevail. Yeah, thank you. I thought you meant Board seat 14. But yeah, you're absolutely right. I hope that was helpful. It's just the beginning of the process. Bear in mind your action point. I know that the BC has done that already. And we're in a good shape on the ISPCB side.

Yeah, item five, just a quick word. We've undertaken a review of the Workstream 2 recommendations. There are two that I'd like to say a word about. One, which is the second one on the screen, the notion of an annual report for this stakeholder group, which we sort of said, well, that's not useful. Let's not do it. I just wanted to make sure that people were happy with that. And the first one relates to charter review.

I think it'd be good for us to have a look at the charter. No, obviously not now. But there's one item. And quickly, Brenda, if you could bring up on the screen, 6.2.1 of the charter, because I'm not sure. I must admit I hadn't read it. And there's an article in our charter that relates to geographic diversity for Councilors. And it so happens that over the last two, that was approved in 2011, maybe 2012. And there's one.

So the article says that there should not be more than three Councilors from one region. I'll cut it short. We did not respect that over the course of the last 15 years or so. Just because that's in practice, I'm not sure that's just practical. Every year we have elections that are uncoordinated. We've had years where we had four Councilors of the same region. So maybe that's something that would, I don't know how we fix this. Either we need to geographic constraints in each and every election, which maybe that's something that we don't want to do. Thank you, Brenda. Having such restrictions in, at the CSG level. I think it's 6.1.

BRENDA BREWER Sorry, it's 0.4, not 0.6. Thank you. 4.2.1.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART So anyway, there needs to be some thinking around that, because it's, we have uncoordinated elections and having global geographic restrictions is challenging for this. So I don't know how we can fix this. See, 4.2.1. That three out of the six. And we did in the past in 2020, 2021, I think, at least I haven't looked at the other

Council members, but in the past, but that's challenging. Susan, we're over time, but.

SUSAN PAYNE

Susan Payne. I mean, why don't we just have geographic sort of diversity best practice at the constituency level? Some of us probably do already, some of us maybe don't. Because we aren't coordinating on our individual constituency elections. I personally believe we also need to build in a bit of flex because sometimes you just may simply be unable to find the necessary geographic diversity, but I'm not sure why we have it at the CSG level.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

I don't know either. I would just note that we're not compliant and that's not a good thing. But yeah, best practice could be a way forward. Marie?

MARIE PATTULLO

I find 80% of what I was going to say Susan just said. Also in real terms, I don't think we're going to come across that very often. I think 25 years ago, perhaps now, but now I certainly look at the makeup of the BC. It is very diverse. So yeah, best efforts, whatever the ICANN terminology is, best endeavors, we will try to be, but yes, let's change the CSG charter to reflect that.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART Okay. Certainly fine with me. I would just note that this ultimately will be reviewed by the Board committee and, to the outsider, it looks less demanding. I'm just saying, but. Brenda?

SUSAN MOHR Very, very, very best efforts. Honestly promise we're trying really hard.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART Brenda, maybe a point in AOB. Oh, hello. Welcome.

BRENDA BREWER I have just a quick AOB and I brought Mary Wong along with me. Mary?

MARY WONG Yes. So staff raises an AOB item. And the reason I'm here is because I have a very bittersweet announcement to make to the CSG. After many years of dedicated service and the highest standards of professionalism, I promise I wouldn't cry. We've already done this, Brenda. Brenda has decided to retire effective in January. Yes, I know. In a way we're very fortunate she agreed to come to this meeting so that we could tell you all in person. We still have a couple of months with her.

I want to pass the mic to her, begging your indulgence for a few more minutes, but I think you'll agree with me and with Russ and with all our colleagues that we all not only miss her tremendously, she's probably one of the most genuine people you could ever hope to meet in your life. It's not just that she's a consummate professional. She's a genuinely wonderful person. She stays calm in everything. You cannot rattle her. We've tried. So we have another couple of months left to maybe succeed in that regard. But Brenda, you know we'll miss you. You know this group will miss you. I'm going to stop talking and pass it to you.

BRENDA BREWER Thank you, Mary. Thank you all. I'm sorry to keep you late from lunch, first of all. And it's just been a privilege to work with you all. I consider myself not your mama, but your fairy godmother. I'm blessed to work with each and every one of you and know you. I've been with you, this group, CSG, for the last five years. So we're kind of like family every Thursday and Monday, every monthly on Mondays, all that good stuff. So we can talk later, but we'll let this be the end for today. And I am here through January 30th. Thank you. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART I don't know if I should say thank you, but that was not an AOB, by the way. So we'll have time to express our gratitude for all your help and support over the years. Thanks on behalf of the whole group. And we'll have time to, I don't know if the word is celebrate on our end of things, but just to express our gratitude. Thank you, Brenda. Thank you. With this, I think we can adjourn the meeting. Thanks very much.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]