ICANN84 | AGM – GNSO: ISPCP Membership Work Session
Tuesday, October 28, 2025 – 10:30 to 12:00 IST

NATALIE PEREGRINE

Hello, all, and welcome to the ISPCP Membership Session. My name is Natalie Peregrine. I'm 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. Only questions posted in the Q&A pod will be read aloud during this session as time permits and when directed by the chair of the session. If you wish to speak, please raise your hand in Zoom or otherwise as directed. When speaking, please state your name for the record and speak clearly at a moderate pace. I'll now hand the floor over to Philippe Fouquart. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thank you, Natalie. Philippe Fouquart speaking here, ISPCP Chair. Welcome everyone to this constituency meeting of the ISPCP as usual. We will go through the agenda that you've got on the screen. Before we do this, the usual call for updates to your SOI. Anyone?

Okay, seeing no hand. Anything that you would like to add to the agenda?

Okay, seeing no one. Just to note that as Natalie said, this is being recorded. This is an open session. This is one of the three or four sessions where our ASO AC colleagues will give an update. So there may be attendees who are not ISPCP members and that's perfectly fine. The question time will be open to anyone.

In terms of time management, I think we can spend just about half an hour on this. This is an important topic and altogether for the others, we've got 90 minutes. So, I think we've got plenty of time to cover the other items. With this, and unless people would have comments, I suggest we start with item one. And I think we can have an update on where the ASO AC stands at the moment.

And it'd be good, just even for the sake of saving your time, to go through the inputs that we put to the Public Comments, as well as potentially other comments that people might have. And we'll have a discussion if that's okay. So, with this, I'll hand over to Nick.

NICK NUGENT Great. Thanks very much. Oh, it looks like the camera is cued to Esteban's position. So, should we do that one? That might be--

PHILIPPE FOUQUART I don't want to be on screen, but--

NICK NUGENT

Yeah, thank you. So, my name is Nick Nugent. I'm here with my colleague, Esteban, and Akinori. We're all on the ASO AC. Esteban and I are vice chairs. And we put together a presentation, a slide deck that we use for multiple meetings. We use it for the ICANN webinar. We used it two days ago for the GAC meeting. And it may be too formal, right?

We don't have to be this scripted. We don't have to be… we'll use it more as a sort of quick run through of issues, but we don't want it to be just pure presentation. We'd like it to be a discussion. And so, feel free to interrupt. I'll go rather fast, not because I want to rush through it, but because I think it will be pretty digestible. And we'll really just be a smattering of concepts for potential discussion. So, that's how we'll proceed.

So here's the formal presentation. First to note, the ASO AC functions as the NRO NC. It's lovely and confusing. One of the service organizations in ICANN. And we are a 15-member body, three from each of the five regional internet registries. But as you can see, we're currently at only 12 members because of the situation with AFRINIC.

Fortunately, AFRINIC has held elections now and has a Board and has put out a call for nominations for the NRO NC. So we are hopeful that very shortly we will have our ASO AC AFRINIC members back on the council, which would be great.

ESTEBAN LESCANO

Nick, and we have an AFRINIC Board member here, Fiona Asonga.

NICK NUGENT

Oh, fantastic. Great, love to chat. Okay, so just again, to set the context, we are working on a revision to ICP-2. ICP-2, Internet Coordination Policy 2, governs the recognition of regional internet registries. And it was established in 2001, before even LACNIC or AFRINIC were established. So, there were already three RIRs established when ICP-2 was adopted. And it was used to recognize and create LACNIC and AFRINIC. But it's almost 25 years old. And so, it's showing its age. And it needs to be updated for a number of reasons, including the need to better spell out an RIR's ongoing obligations, not merely the procedures for recognition, and spelling out the procedures for potentially de-recognizing an RIR.

We've been working on this project for two years now. And we started off by publishing a set of 24 principles that we thought could animate the next version of ICP-2. We put those out for public consultation. We got a lot of great feedback. We put out a first draft of a new document, which we're not calling ICP-2 or ICP-4. It's called the RIR Governance Document. And we published it, along with the potential for people to provide input. We got a lot of great input. And we revised the document in accordance with that input, and have published the version two of that document. And that is currently in consultation right now. And we're getting feedback as we speak.

This is just a high-level overview of the timeline. All the gray boxes are steps that have already been completed. As you can see, we're on the second Public Comment on the second draft. After this, depending on how things go, there will be a final draft and a final review. And ultimately, we hope approval by the RERs and by ICANN.

I won't go through, I won't read the text on this slide, because this is really just an at-a-glance of the differences between version one and version two. And that really is the heart of my presentation today, and Esteban will present as well. And the main gist of today's presentation is what's different between version one and version two.

A number of changes. And these changes are in response to a lot of great community feedback that we received. So, let's walk you through those changes.

One of the things I guess I should say before we start talking about the specific changes between version one and version two is that we've tried to make these changes as perceptible as possible. So, we've published a document that's a red line of all the changes, text by text, character by character. That's available. As well as what we call a rationale document, which walks audiences through the changes more conceptually.

Here's a topic, here's the feedback we received, here are the changes we made and why, here are the relevant sections. So, I want to make it as easy as possible for folks to see what changes we made and why we made them.

Okay, now I'm going to walk through those changes. Not all of them, but sort of the most important ones. And the first is the most trivial, but we feel like we should point it out. And that is we changed the name from Governance Document for the Recognition Maintenance and Derecognition of Regional Internet Registries to Governance Document for the Recognition Operation and Derecognition of Regional Internet Registries. Not something to write home about, it's just we thought it was a better word to describe what was going on. And we thought we pointed it out so folks said, hey, why is this a differently named document? Just a small tweak.

Okay, the Preamble. Again, this isn't super important, but we wanted to provide more context in the document for what the purpose of the document is, what the document's goals are, and how the document attempts to accomplish those goals. So, we beefed up the preamble a bit. This is an important change. A consistent piece of feedback that we've received is, well, gosh, how is this going to play out in practice? Take, for example, the requirement that the RIRs share data, registration records, RPKI, things of that sort with each other. How does that work in practice? What protocols will they use? How frequently will they sync their data?

And that's a great question, but it's too detailed for this document. We simply cannot get into all of those details. It would bog the document down, and the RIRs also need to be more-nimble. They need to be able to change those things dynamically as suits them.

So what we've said throughout the process when we've gotten certain questions like that is that's an implementation detail, and it will probably live in a separate document that the RIRs will create called the implementation procedures. And they'll create themselves, they'll dynamically update it, and that'll spell out how it works.

And so, some people have said, well, that needs to be referenced in this document that that separate document exists. We said, great, we agree. So, we've added a reference to it here, but we've also added some assurances and terms in the governance document stating that the implementation procedures cannot contradict or override the terms of the RIR governance document.

So it can't be an end run. It can't be a way to get around the community consultation and adoption. It's just to flesh out details for concepts that are already captured in the governance document.

Okay, so we'll talk now about recognition and de-recognition. One of the biggest points of feedback, actually, let me back up. So, suppose a new entity wants to be recognized as an RIR. It submits a proposal to do so. And who decides? Well, the current, or I should say the methodology or procedure we've been using in the document is that the RIRs have to first agree, yes, we agree that you should be recognized as a new RIR. And then if they agree, then the decision goes to ICANN and ICANN also has to agree.

So, two stages, both the RIRs have to approve, and ICANN has to approve. Okay, well, next question is, how many RIRs need to approve? And in the first version of the document, the answer is all of them. Some people complained or provided feedback that unanimity is a hard threshold to attain.

What if there's a single RIR that objects? And let's say there's a single RIR, an existing RIR that doesn't want a new RIR because it would reduce its revenue, or for other reasons, for reasons that have not to do with the health of the internet, but for conflict of interest, some reasons that are not legitimate or that are not ultimately to the benefit of the internet community.

What then? So, what we added in version two is a review process. So, if the RIRs do not unanimously approve, then the candidate RIR can go to ICANN and say, hey, can you take a look at this? ICANN can conduct an independent review. And if ICANN says, we think maybe a mistake was made, can submit it back to the RIRs for reconsideration. The RIRs are not obligated to reach a different result. But if when they reconsider it, there's a single holdout, a single RIR that continues to object for lack of any good reason or legitimate reason, then there is the opportunity for that RIR to be overridden and for the new RIR to be recognized.

And I guess one thing that I should say is one of the reasons why we required unanimity, and one of the reasons why we require this separate review process to override is because once a new RIR comes into the fold, it creates end-to-end business relationships. Each existing RIR is now in a business relationship with the new RIR. And it might be contrary to the laws of an RIR's jurisdiction to have a business relationship with a particular entity.

So we didn't want to create a situation where a new RIR could force the other RIRs to be in business relationships that was unlawful for them to be in. But this provided a way that if there's not a legitimate reason, then an RIR can be overridden. And so, you can have approval on unanimity minus one. Okay, that's the longest I'll spend on any one change, but we got so many comments on that.

Okay, let's talk about Derecognition. And one thing we've tried to emphasize is that the goal of this document and this project is not to immediately derecognize any existing RIR or to be trigger happy, for lack of a better way of putting it. Derecognition is a very serious thing and it should be a last resort after other options have been exhausted. So, we added a few more protections for RIRs that are the subject of a derecognition proposal.

One of the things that we did, I don't think I'll spend too much time talking about this, is who can submit a proposal to derecognize an RIR. We changed some of the threshold language. It can be either 2,000 members of the RIR or 25% of the members, whichever is lower. We also added an option for ICANN to initiate a derecognition proposal against an RIR. But even so, it still requires the approval of the other RIRs to proceed.

Audits. One of the things that we wanted to really bring out in this document is the desire to identify, catch, and address problems early on so that there's never a need to move to derecognition. So, audits play an important role in this document, both regular audits and ad hoc or special audits. So, in the Version 2, we specified that each RIR must be audited at least once every three years. For ad hoc audits, we provided a mechanism for various persons to trigger an ad hoc audit of an RIR.

The other RIRs may trigger that audit by majority decision. Again, 2,000 members or 25% of the members of an RIR may trigger an audit, an ad hoc audit of the RIR, whichever is lower. And ICANN may likewise trigger an ad hoc audit. This is completely new in Version 2 of the document. One of the pieces of feedback we got was, what happens if there's a hurricane, an earthquake, a political unrest, and an RIR is unable to fulfill its duties due to no fault of its own and only for hopefully a temporary period. We don't want to derecognize that RIR just to transfer its services to another entity.

So, in Version 2 of the document, we created a new procedure called emergency continuity. And what it does is it allows an RIR's services to be temporarily and quickly transferred to another operator, which is called an emergency operator. That could be another RIR. And it's a fast process to do so. It simply requires unanimous agreement of the other RIRs and ICANN, but it's time-limited and must be followed by a community consultation.

Just a couple more items on that. This is, it's important that emergency continuity does not function as an end run around the derecognition process. And so, it's time-limited. It can only last 90 days, although it can be renewed for successive 90-day periods. And there must be a post-mortem conducted and a continuity engagement process just after the continuity event is triggered.

Then just a few miscellaneous items here. Rectification refers to what happens if the document is changed such that an existing RIR is not in compliance. Well, then there's a grace period. And the rectification provisions in the Version 2, say, that that grace period must be specified in the amendment. And it also provides an upfront three-year grace period for all RIRs when this document is adopted. If those, if it creates new obligations that weren't already contained in or implicit in ICP 2.

We added a dispute resolution process to ensure that RIR members can adjudicate their rights against each RIR or against their RIR. We added an explicit obligation of good faith and fair dealing. Again, just to put the community at rest that there's no, there's no motivation for gamesmanship here. Everything will be taken with the goal of aiding the Internet community and with fair timeframes and reasonable notice.

And that's it for the changes. I won't walk through the text on this slide because I want to leave plenty of time for questions. But this is just an at-a-glance slide that outlines precisely what ICANN's role is in this new governance document. With that, I'll hand it over to my colleague, Esteban.

ESTEBAN LESCANO Thank you, Nick. Well, the process, the public consultation process is open until the 7th of November. And we want to invite you to provide your feedback and comments. I think that the constituency already submit some comments. We didn't analyze them yet because the full SOAC is meeting in a face-to-face session in Montevideo, the first week of November after the closing of the consultation in order to review all the comments.

And just for you to know that we review each comment received, each comment received. We read every comment and we decide as a group if the comment proceeds or not, if it is useful, if it is appropriate for the document or not. But just for you to clear that for us it's very important the participation of the other constituencies and the full community.

This consultation is in the LACNIC website, sorry, in the ICANN website. But also, we have a rational consultation, rational mailing list in each of the regions. And also, in the different events that each region has, we have a specific session, informative sessions to allow a community to understand the content of the document and also the process. Yes. Next one.

If you want to read the document you can find it here with the QR or the link. It's also available in the NRO website. And with the document you also will find the red line with the changes that is important to compare B1 and B2. And also, the rationales, that is the decision and why that decision or that change was taken.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART Now, yes, we are open to comments.

NICK NUGENT Yeah.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART We're happy to take any questions and answer them as best we can.

ESTEBAN LESCANO And thank you for your participation in the process. As I mentioned, it's very important for us.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART Thanks, Nick. And thanks, Esteban. Yeah, before we go to question time, just to make sure that, well, first time check, we've got about, for this, we've got about 15, 20 minutes. I think we're in good shape. The ISPCP is a bit of a special beast in that area because we, as you could see, we provided comments on this already.

We had a discussion as to whether that was timely, given that we would have this conversation, but we thought that we might as well post it and it'd be available. And B, we'll have a discussion on the substance, but I think I should just preface this by saying that at the very beginning of the input, it's just a couple of sentences, but those are probably the most important, is that we strongly support the current work, the way it's going.

So regardless, oh, regardless, mindful of the questions that will be put, this is probably the most important part. And we're definitely in support of the end product of this. So, what I would suggest now is that we indeed go to questions, hopefully to points that we did not raise in the input, and there are some.

I've got a couple of questions myself, and then we'll go to the document itself, our own input, if only to save your time, you'll then have an opportunity to have a readout of some of the concerns and questions, and we'll move from there. So, if you want to handle the queue, that's perfectly fine as well. Thanks.

NICK NUGENT

Sounds good. We very much appreciate that preparatory comment, and we take the comments now and the questions in the spirit that they were offered, but we're also happy to take any criticism because we want to make sure that the product is good. So, yes.

MALCOLM HUTTY

Thank you. Two questions. One, concerning derecognition, your clause 6.1 says that an RIR may be derecognized if they fail to meet all the requirements of the documents. Is that intended to be exhaustive? Because previously it said that the procedure for derecognizing was just that the proposal was made by the right people and it's proved in the right way and so forth, and doesn't specify actually criteria.

So, can a RIR be derecognized because the right organizations believe that it should be derecognized for any reason, or is it only because they have failed to meet the requirements of this document? Is it a requirement that you are in breach of this document to be derecognized, in other words?

NICK NUGENT

Yeah, you have to be in breach of the document. It's not a catch-all that if the other RIRs simply get together and agree that, you know, RIR X should not be an RIR any more than it could be. But there are, just to be clear, there is a general obligation to operate in the best interest and to ensure the continuity and stability of the RIR ecosystem.

So it could be that there is a situation where an RIR is acting, for lack of a better term, badly, and it doesn't fit with one of the explicit criteria in the document, but it might fit within that catch-all. You're simply acting in a way that is harmful.

MALCOLM HUTTY	So basically, the others have lost confidence in you. This is what I wanted to get at. Is it meant to be something that is essentially justiciable in some sort of way?
NICK NUGENT	Sort of-- sorry, what's that?
MALCOLM HUTTY	Justiciable in some sort of way. It's essentially a political decision that we no longer have confidence in you.
ESTEBAN LESCANO	No, no, no, no, it's not the case. For recognition, the applicant RIR has to comply with the very specific criteria and also has to maintain those requirements and requirements that are connected to the operation, the daily operation of the RIR that has to be compliant. If not, it is the process of, first of all, of solving those issues. As Nick says, the de-recognition is the last resource. It's not possible to reach directly to the recognition and the causes for the recognition is expressly established in the documents. There is no space for political decisions.
MALCOLM HUTTY	Okay, so what I'm getting at is, if there were a de-recognition to occur or to be proposed, there's going to be a dispute between the party that's proposed for de-recognition and the rest of the RIR as

to whether or not they really are in breach. Especially with the new implementation procedures, which seem to be exerting much more finely grained control over RIRs than in the past. I can certainly imagine a situation where an RIR might say, no, we're not in breach.

In fact, on the contrary, the thing that you're saying that we must do would be contrary to our understanding of what this document requires. Almost, you're the ones in breach. That would be the thing. Then the question is, okay, well, how is that resolved? How is that dispute resolved? Is it the case that then would need to be some sort of mechanism and process by which some sort of objective view is taken upon the merits of the arguments that are being put either way?

Or is it just, well, you may say that, but we don't agree. We're the majority here. We've decided to, you know, everyone else thinks that you're wrong here. We've lost confidence in you. We don't believe that you're acting in the best interests of the spirit of the document. So, you're done. Without having to actually objectively prove any particular criteria. Yeah.

I'm wondering whether this is meant to be more something that is evaluated as a sort of, in a more legalistic way as to whether or not this is proven, or whether this is actually a more community style decision. We no longer have confidence in you.

NICK NUGENT By chance, are you a lawyer?

MALCOLM HUTTY Yes. Yeah.

NICK NUGENT I could tell, right? Normal people don't use the word justiciable. And it's a very lawyerly question to be asked, so I'll try to answer it very concisely. The role of ICANN is to provide that third party neutral objective evaluation, because ICANN does not have, we argue the same degree of interest in the outcome of the decision. Now, of course, it's not completely disinterested because it's part of, it's responsible for the names and numbers, but that's why ICANN plays this role.

MALCOLM HUTTY It doesn't say that, unless I've missed it, maybe I missed it, but I didn't see that there was a requirement on ICANN to only approve the de-recognition if it concludes that the party is in breach of this.

NICK NUGENT I believe it says that.

MALCOLM HUTTY If I missed that, then that's an important omission on my part. And I've apologized for wasting your time

NICK NUGENT

No problem. But I'll have to look at the precise language. But my understanding is that there's language in there that an RIR can be de-recognized only because it does not comply with the terms of this document.

MALCOLM HUTTY

That'd be only I was looking for, because all I saw was 6.1, which says it may be recognized if it does not, but that's not only. And it's that only that I'm seeking for here.

NICK NUGENT

Okay.

MALCOLM HUTTY

If that only exists, and it has to be, then we're focused on the factual questions and the proper interpretation of whether this is, as opposed to a community sentiment. Yeah, and that's a very different thing in government.

NICK NUGENT

Yeah, so fair, it says in 6.1, may be de-recognized pursuant to such procedures, if it does not continue to meet all the requirements. You're saying that an only would be clarifying there.

MALCOLM HUTTY Material change.

NICK NUGENT Okay, that's fair. Okay, so we'll talk about that. That is our intent, but maybe we need to make a language change. It's a fair point.

MALCOLM HUTTY Have you actually had lawyers look at this?

NICK NUGENT Yes, many. And we're lawyers as well, for what it's worth.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART Thanks. Another one, which we did not cover, I think, during Public Comment is the notion of emergency continuity. So, what I seem to understand from your slide on the topic is that it's essentially focused on things like disaster relief and these sorts of things.

I was wondering whether what we have on the namespace of the concept of escrow and in the context of a de-recognition and re-recognition of a new, potentially a new regional internet registry, whether there were some thought given to how operationally that may be realistic, given that just for the sake of argument, if we're in a situation where an RIR is in a position to be de-recognized, the odds are that it's set a shambles in a number of respects, including the sort of operational side.

I'm trying to get my head around what are the operational implications of what is here a policy. And I note that it's in the title as well, so I guess it's in scope. Thank you.

NICK NUGENT

That's a great question. It's one we've gotten before. How do we really ensure, guarantee the smooth transfer of service, either with respect to emergency continuity or de-recognition? And the short answer is, there's no guarantee. We've put in place as many protections and procedures as we can, and I'll walk through some of them.

One of them is a general obligation to engage in and continue with record sharing in times of health. There then, is the implementation procedures, which we'll add further detail about. I think one of the goals is that as soon as this document is ratified, that the RIRs get together and create the implementation procedures and game out sort of war games, for lack of a better term, with the participation of all, saying like, gosh, if hypothetical RIR-X goes down, how can we really just flip the light switch?

So, I think there is a general desire and aim to do that. There is also an obligation of the RIR who's being de-recognized to cooperate. But as you say, it could be a bitter divorce, and there's no guarantee.

The answer is there's no guarantee, but there's as much infrastructure and scaffolding as we can think of to make that happen. The RIR system is different in some ways than the TLD system, and so there's not quite the same ability to flip a bit. But I think the goal is to put as many procedures in place to make it happen.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART Any other questions? We have five minutes now. I've got another one, but I don't know whether it's actually, I think, covered in our input. But it's relative to what you mentioned on non-unanimity and the fact that for whatever regional reasons, or even national reasons, an RIR may object.

I was wondering whether, moving forward, given that there is no obligation to have unanimity, what would that mean for that regional internet registry? Say your example about, you know, I can't do this because I can't have a commercial relationship with, I don't know, with another party that's in that particular country, which is sort of the plan for rebuilding an RIR, and if the decision-making process is such that, then, well, point taken. But nonetheless, we'll move forward.

Does that, I mean, from a practical standpoint, does that mean that that particular objecting regional internet registry will be forced to, in fact, you see what I'm getting at. I'm trying to get my head around how, in practice, again, that would work.

NICK NUGENT

Yeah, great question. And this really gets to the text of the document. And I guess I could even display it if it'd be helpful. But this gets at the dissenting RIR, let's call that, use that term, the dissenting RIR can be overridden only if it lacks a legitimate reason. I cannot cooperate legally with an entity in this country, or for other reasons, is a legitimate reason.

So, it would not be possible to override in that circumstance. And there are others. We list some of them in the document, non-exhaustive, would hinder the ability to comply with the document, would not sort of, pardon me, would not positively or otherwise, pardon me. Here's, the RIR has never been convicted of an offense involving dishonesty, including fraud and misrepresentation.

So, there's a non-exhaustive list of legitimate reasons. This would really be after a full internal adjudication, for lack of a better term, that the reasons are illegitimate. There's no good reason.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thank you. That's very helpful. Thank you. What we may do for just maybe a couple of minutes, but there are some, we could have our document on the screen, Natalie, if you might put it on. There are other elements that we raise in this, including things like audits, for example. There's a reference to it, but that's not very specific, as well as comments along the lines of, I forget the term exactly, but the overall support that ICANN may provide in the process beyond this particular policy. But I'd be curious to know how you will approach this. So, thank you. Thank you, Natalie.

So, maybe what we could do would be to go through these sorts of overarching comments. We've got only a couple of minutes for this, but I think that would be time well spent.

On the first point, I think everyone appreciates that the balance between global governance and regional flexibility is always a balance on things like, but we also think that in implementation, and we've got a certain understanding within the GNSO of what an implementation is, and that's certainly not what it means for you.

I think we appreciate that there are things that would be useful to address in the implementation phase between the original internet registries, whilst not being part of this policy. But one example being what we just talked about, this emergency framework. We just noted that, but I think that's an important point. The reference, sorry, if you're not sure.

ESTEBAN LESCANO

One important thing to consider is that currently the RIRs are operating. Then they are providing services to the resource holder in each of the region, and they have its own procedures and its own practices to provide those services. Then the documents is a general framework that in some way respect the independence of each region to establish the better proceedment.

And the only objective is in some way to establish a general framework, a global framework that provide a reference, but each of the registries can maintain his own way of doing the providing services. And that is why, for example, in the question of good governance procedures, we don't have an agreement on which are them for a specific situation. It's just a general principle that has to be respected by each of the registries.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thank you. Thank you, Esteban. In these comments that I think the first one we've addressed it, actually, there is no third party. I think what you said and maybe there's still some work on the language. That third party is ICANN. There's no third party.

Regional alignment, we talked about it. If we could scroll down, Natalie. Control, safeguard, monitoring. Okay. Audit is like a general term that's used in the policy. Maybe there would be value in being a bit more specific in terms of the scope of the audit.

ESTEBAN LESCANO

Here it's true, but the idea is the audit in some way compares the operation of the RIR with the principles and requirements that are established in the same document. It's an implementation issue. Then to define, for example, the KPAs or the thresholds or the minimums or the maximum. But the idea is that the auditing is about the requirements that are established in the same documents.

For example, you have to be a financial independence or you have to be a non-for-profit organization. That's the criteria that is established in the document. And that is easy, auditable when the RIR is on operation.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART Thank you. That's very useful. That's not the way I read. And we've got accountants as well in this group. That's not the way I read the term audit.

ESTEBAN LESCANO But that's why it's not only a financial audit. It's not the more important. It's just how the RIR is performing its duties in comparison with the requirements that are established in the document. Because those requirements were needed to recognize the RIR as a regime.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART And maybe that's just me. I forget the exact language. But maybe you could make it explicit in the document that we're talking about matching the requirements of the policy versus what is actually performed.

NICK NUGENT Sure. I just took a quick look at the draft. And in both with respect to the ad hoc audits and the periodic audits, it says the audit is for compliance with this document. So, it could include financial matters, but only to the extent that those financial matters bear on the RIR's compliance with the document, such as ability to be independently operating as things of that sort.

ESTEBAN LESCANO

For example, one of the requirements is that you have to have a PDP, no? A PDP in force and working, no? A policy development process.

And, well, you have to audit that if it is doing or not.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

That makes sense. I think I, at least I for one, understand what that meant. I missed that. Among other things, and just for the last minute that we've got, there's that notion of community, which a word that we all use, that may be value in clarifying in the document as well.

ESTEBAN LESCANO

But there is a definition of community. Because in the case of the REIRs, we have two types of stakeholders. Stakeholders. You have the resource holders that are members of the REIR, but you have the broad community that is more-wide than the resource holders. That is why we include in the definitions the concept of resource holder and also the concept of community, numbering community.

That is, says, means the community of resource holders and others who participate in the resource management, including but not limited to governments, civil society actors, technical community, private sector entities, and academia. Because it's a widened concept.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thank you. I'm sure we could have gone on for like an hour, but we need to go. Thanks. I think we need to stop here. I'm sure that was, it was certainly useful for us. I hope it was for you as well. And I wish we could have gone through the whole input. But if by any means, if at some point you need to go back, we know each other. There's no issue. We can discuss offline on our input. And I just want to thank you for being here today.

ESTEBAN LESCANO

You're welcome. And thank you for your support and your interest in the process. For us, it's very valuable.

NICK NUGENT

Absolutely, I agree. It's very helpful to get comments like this from folks who are actually not as adjacent to our space. So, it's a very helpful perspective. We really appreciate the time and thought put into this. And we remain available for hallway conversations, for emails, for what have you, for continued feedback and iteration. We really do thank you for the time.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thank you, Nick. Thanks. With this, Natalie, thank you. Going back to our agenda, we've got 45 minutes. So, I think we're in good shape. We now have our usual discussion on the council meeting. That's planned for tomorrow. I think it's tomorrow. And as well as the items that are up for a vote. So, I'll turn to our councilors who would like to take this.

THOMAS RICKERT

All right. Thank you so much, Philippe. Now, the first point is the only vote that we're going to take. And that's the topic that I already sent an email on. And there's been some development since I sent that email. There was an extraordinary council meeting a while back. And now this is on the table for a vote.

Now, to offer you a little bit of context, the issue with this is IGO and INGO recommendations that were made more than 10 years back. At the time, certain protections were granted at the top level for these organizations. We had different categories of strings. We were talking about full names of these organizations like Red Cross, Red Crescent, and many more.

We were also talking about the acronyms of these organizations. You might remember that at the time there was a lot of fear that things like WHO could be going to the World Health Organization instead of the RUB band, the WHO, if they wanted to have that TLD. We had discussions surrounding second level domain names. And there were even requests by the organizations concerned that there should be protections against the registration of singular strings at the second level.

So, that was pretty far-reaching. And this is now haunting us because at the time the policy recommendation was that for exact match full names of these organizations, they should be ineligible for registration. But at the time, they were excluded from the String Similarity review.

Now, things have been mixed up and newly organized. So, we now have new definitions of what makes a reserved name, what makes a blocked name and all that. So, it now turns out that there were discussions in the IRT whether or not under the new regime String Similarity Review should be conducted for the full names of these organizations. And there was a split in the IRT.

Some said it is limited to the identical strings that need to be banned from registration. And others said that a String Similarity review needs to take place as for the other names that were previously ineligible for registration. Because the result would be that if you don't perform the String Similarity review, another organization could apply for a confusingly similar or for a singular string and thereby prevent, let's say, a Red Cross organization from applying for their own TLD in future.

I think that this discussion is highly theoretical because there is probably nobody stupid enough or willing to invest money into a TLD that resembles the string of an international or an intergovernmental organization. So, what I suggested to this group at the time was to say, okay, we're going to stay out of the question whether this is a matter that requires further policy or this is option one or option two. But that we say, okay, it could both be policy or implementation. Because we're not talking about the exact same mechanism as we had at the time.

So you could make the accusation that if we tweak the process for not doing the String Similarity review, it's not the exact process that was in the AGB in the Applicant Guidebook at the time. You could also make the same argument for the other way around. Which is why I said we're down with this. We leave it up to the Board because the Board is responsible for implementation. But we still reserve our rights to chime in in the IRT as the procedures for C.

Now, that didn't get traction. So, the majority of the GNSO seems to be of the opinion that, yes, we need to stick to the letter of what's been suggested in the recommendations at the time. And that is exclude those strings from a String Similarity review. Which I think is perfectly defendable. I should note that the registrars are going to abstain from a vote. So, they want to stay out of that.

I have to be honest. I think we need, and I mentioned this in the council meeting yesterday, I think we need to pick our battles. So, do we want as a GNSO to cause issues with the GAC? And the GAC is highly likely going to be unhappy with the decision that those strings are going to be excluded from String Similarity reviews.

Because then the organizations in question would need to be notified one way or the other.

Then they need to check whether they can do a legal rights objection or otherwise prevent some third party from registering. So, I would have preferred to stay out of that and still keep our rights as the GNSO. But it looks like we're going to lean towards the direction of excluding those names from String Similarity reviews.

And whether we're happy with that or not is for everyone to decide. But Osvaldo and I, I think we're both happy with supporting this option to be voted up in council because the other options that were on the table have in the meantime been withdrawn by the person that proposed the options. So, this is the only option that we have on the table at the moment. And I think what we can least afford is appear to be dysfunctional in the sense that we have had different options and none of the options is actually voted up.

So, I would recommend that you authorize us to vote in favor of this option, which is perfectly in line or perfectly defendable. I think the other option would have been equally defendable. But it is what it is. And I think we should just make sure that we get this off our table and show that we are functional.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thank you, Thomas. Osvaldo, anything to add to this? That's a complex one.

OSVALDO NOVOA

Yeah, I don't totally agree with Thomas. The thing is we had been discussing firstly two options. First, it wasn't included in the PDP. So it should be need, it would need a new PDP to include the string comparison. And two, that it was included in the, it was considered included in the policy. So, it could be analyzed.

Then there was a third option that I think it was based on a proposal by Thomas, that it was very good for me, from my opinion, and that it was left for the Board to decide which of the two options. And we know that the Board would align with what the GAC was requesting, that the String Similarity review would be for these strings.

Now appeared the fourth option that basically says that formally the String Similarity review shouldn't be carried because it was, because the PDP was, the policy was very strict on same now.

My position is that the policy was intended to protect the names of these IGOs from being fraudulent use by third parties. So, it's to protect the users. And the spirit of the policy of debt protection should include also String Similarity. So, I would, I would always prefer option three. We don't have option three. We have option four now.

From my point of view, I'm ready to vote no. But it's up to the constituency to decide. So, that's it. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thank you. Thanks, Osvaldo.

THOMAS RICKERT

Now, I think we're not apart in terms of what the spirit of the recommendation should be, but the original recommendations made explicit reference to language in the then applicable Applicant Guidebook. I think it was section 2.3 point, 2.4.3 or something. And that explicitly excluded those strings from String Similarity reviews.

So the language at the time did not foresee that, right? But the recommendations referred to the AGB at the time. And now the AGB has changed. So, we don't have, did we still have the old AGB? We could easily say, well, certainly no String Similarity review. But the definitions have changed. We don't have reserved names under the same definition as we have now. You know, block names are something different now.

So it's completely… the environment has changed. And therefore, I think it's justifiable to say it's now linked to the new AGB. And if the new AGB foresees String Similarity reviews for everyone, that can be done. So I'm not disagreeing with you at all. I think we need to come to a defendable solution that causes the GNSO the least amount of effort for this topic. I mean, there are enough other topics where we should put our energy, but this is likely not one of them.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thanks. Thanks, Thomas. And thanks, Osvaldo. Yeah. Follow up to this?

OSVALDO NOVOA

Just a small note. One of the things that affected the decision of some of the council members was a letter from the Board that by some of the councilors was interpreted as that the Board was establishing policy, which the Board clearly stated in the meeting that that wasn't their intention. But that, I think, made some of the council's position very strong against the option two.

THOMAS RICKERT

Sorry, can I? Osvaldo, it's great that you bring that up, because that was really a fun one. The Board letter said, we have option A, we have option one and option two. And they specified a preference for one of the options. And when council leadership presented that to the Board yesterday, they said, well, we or the council perceived this as the Board putting its thumbs on the scale.

And that sort of really frustrated Becky Burr, because Becky said, well, you've been begging the Board for years to opine on things and say what they think. And now we say what you think. We don't prescribe what you should decide. But now that we speak up and say what we think, you're still not happy with it.

So, she was pretty frustrated. And that's when I took the mic and said, well, please do continue that route. But for the interim, until we get used to writing letters that might cause misunderstandings, let's pick up the phone in addition between council leadership and the Board if there are any issues. But this just is like hearsay. People make up their own conspiracy theories. And that didn't do us any service.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thank you. Thank you, Thomas. Any views on this? I could give you my personal thought. But just as to kick start the discussion, I was and I wrote it on the list in my personal capacity, I was so much more comfortable with the approach that you suggested on the list, Thomas, to just let the Board do what they have to do. That would have been more sensible. Even more so, because I think as ISPs, I don't think we really care, to be honest.

We do care about the process on the substance. I don't think so. Speaking personally, I don't see us as having a skin in the game in this. I'd like to open the floor for views. I appreciate the notion that by not supporting it, it may put council in an awkward position or in not weighing in.

My personal view, and I'm really totally open, but in this situation, I think we may just abstain. But that's just, take it as a personal view, really. I think Malcolm, you were first. Did you have your hand up? I'm sorry, as you're scratching your head.

OSVALDO NOVOA

No, just a quick note is that in practically abstaining is the same as voting. No, from the practical point of view. I'm not great with that.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART The reason why, again that's just personal, but it seems like by having just one option you're just driving the decision towards a certain outcome and process, why that's not necessarily comfortable with that. I would rather have had a more open process or a set of choices, but anyway, there we are.

Any views on this? I understand that, well, as I said, we don't really, on substance, we don't really have an opinion one way or the other, not like many others. I would just note that, you know, what you just said, Thomas, is perfectly true, but the challenge, and we see this with WHO, the challenge with these acronyms is that people generally choose them because they otherwise mean something else, do you see what I mean? They're easy to remember. So, I haven't gone through the list, but there might be a couple of those that may actually be useful in a different context.

OSVALDO NOVOA But the acronyms are not affected by this, it's just the full names of people.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART Right, oh right, okay, then that's not the acronyms, yeah, fair point, thank you. Malcolm?

MALCOLM HUTTY

I think I would-- I mean, I think for our interest, as you say, on the substance we don't have much of a view, but we do care about the governance and we do care about the process working and not blowing up unnecessarily.

And if it's the case that this not going through means that we're unable to come up with any kind of way of addressing this, and then it's left in the Board who've still got the GAC on their hands saying we need something done about this, we're basically inviting the Board to find a way to say, oh, well, it doesn't need to be a PDP then, it needs, we can find a way as a Board of finding some solution to this that doesn't involve the GNSO.

That's a direction which I think we do have an interest in making sure that they're not, they don't go that route. We do have an interest in saying actually we would rather these things go through this sort of thing, and I don't like the tendency that we've seen over recent, not so recent years even, for the Board to start defining things as, oh, that's not really policy, yeah, that's something else. It's like, no, if it's a decision that needs to be made that affects the whole thing, we'd rather think it should be policy and we should have a say in it. So, for those reasons, I was persuaded by Thomas's recommendation.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART Thank you. On that, and given the, sort of, the number of PDPs that have been put together for that issue, I don't think we-- the GAC will be involved anyway.

MALCOLM HUTTY Yeah.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART And, but vice versa. I don't see the GNSO being out of the loop, if you see what I mean, by design. So, I appreciate that it's a balance, but the notion that this thing could only be addressed by the GAC, which would be indeed out of the PDP, I don't see this as being very, very likely, but maybe that's just something that's, I don't know.

MALCOLM HUTTY Well, I mean, what would the Board do? I mean, maybe Thomas can say, what would, if this doesn't go through and we're left with, okay, we've got nothing, what happens next?

THOMAS RICKERT I think if we don't provide any substantive response to the Board, then I think the Board will proceed to implement the String Similarity reviews to avoid any further clashes with the GAC. Now that, if we vote this up, they will likely install an information mechanism to the organizations concerned and give the organizations some information on what they can do if there are strings applied for that they have an issue with to preserve their rights. I think that the GAC will be unhappy with it and write a letter and bring it up. But I think that the Board is in a position to defend against that, to avoid GAC advice.

But it's just, you know, I expect some hiccups if the-- because the IGO topic in particular-- and I mean, you will have vivid memories of this because we've been working in the PDP together as well as with Osvaldo, is that, I think it was Susan from the GAC that mentioned at the time, these are our creatures, the IGOs, and we want them protected, you know, and then they have jurisdictional issues, they can't just participate in legal lawsuits and stuff like that.

So their status is special, which is why this is very important and emotional thing for the governments. And that's one of the reasons why I would have chosen the path of least resistance, to be quite honest.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART Osvaldo?

OSVALDO NOVOA I want to repeat what Thomas said at the beginning. I don't think there is any possibility that anybody will apply for a Confusingly Similar String in this round, too much money for something that everybody knows is going to be similar to an IGO name. So in reality, there is no… I don't think there is.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thanks. Yeah, in reality… and that's what you're saying, Thomas, even procedure-wise, there's no loophole. I think ultimately it will be fixed at Board level. But any other views on this?

So, given that there were more opinions towards supporting it, I think we may support it. However, there should be on record the nature of the discussion we just had, that there were at least some interventions to abstain on this, is that the reason why we did not do this was not on the substance.

Is everyone happy with that? Okay, let's do that then. Thank you to both of you. So, just a time check. We've got just about 25 minutes to go, a bit less than that. Maybe we could… yeah, Thomas.

THOMAS RICKERT

Yeah, and I have a hard stop at the end of the foreseen time. I would like to speak briefly about the plans with the upcoming small size or bite-size PDPs on the DNS Abuse, just so that we had a discussion yesterday, the day before yesterday, I think it was, where community feedback was sought on how we approach the PDPs, which has been unprecedented.

And I applaud those who have organized that for doing that. I mean, that's unusual for us to ask the community how the GNSO should organize its work, and also to get some preliminary feedback on what it should entail on substance. So, some folks were rubbing against that. They say, well, there are more, including myself, you know, because they said on some of the slides, do you like this, that outcome?

And you go through that list and say, okay, well, those are not the only options. And it is missing some of the operational complexities with contracted parties, but let's put that aside. I think the effort was great. I think that the temperature in the room was that we don't do one PDP with different topics, but that we do several PDPs.

The Org has, I think it came from staff, has suggested that we do two, one on API registrations to prevent folks that are not properly vetted by a contracted party to have, you know, mass registrations that can be used for abusive purposes.

The second point was on establishing correlations. So, if you have one bad apple that you are required to check whether you have other registrations related to the same email address, the same payment method and stuff like that. And those were the other two ones that we discussed previously in the ISPCP.

There seems to be an appetite by the contracted parties to include a third topic on DGAs, Domain Generating Algorithms, to also cover that. I'm not sure whether we can do all that in parallel or however we structure it, but my suggestion with the group was that we let two PDPs run simultaneously and be smart with the way we emphasize the work and we schedule the meetings, you know, because if one is in a, has something out for Public Comment, then maybe the other can do an offsite, you know, staff has suggested, I think Steve has mentioned it, that, you know, the PDP groups should have an intersessional meeting for a few days to hammer it out and get it done with, you know-- and that can, for example, be done while the other PDP has something out for Public Comment.

Let's make sure they can be as fast as possible, because my prediction is that we will have the same set of people working on both, and that we're not spreading them too thinly, but that we're smart with the time. So, just, that's just for you to know what's likely going to come. And also, since I will be term limited on council, as you know, I will have so much more time at my fingertips, and I would be willing to volunteer for the chair position for one of the PDPs.

So I've done a lot of chairing over the years, and you could already sense that the different parts of the community try to put more in these PDPs than should probably go into. So I think we need to make sure that we actually keep it to the minimum effort, because they're considered to be low-hanging fruits, so that we can get done with them in the shortest period of time.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART Thank you. Thank you, Thomas. On this, I think given the past discussions that we had, I think you have our support. The timeline was definitely an issue, the dependencies between the PDPs were an issue as well. If we can find a solution to sort of synchronize those two, our concern was essentially about having them back-to-back, that would, given the working procedures and the PDP manual, there's always so much you can squeeze in that respect, so that would be great

Any other comment on this? Okay, I think we can move on. Thanks to you both. Natalie, can we go back to the agenda, please? Thank you.

We'll go briefly, number four, updates on Day Zero. I'll focus on the, for those of you who were not there on Friday, most of you, I believe, in terms of action items, we've agreed to, within the House, to have some sort of coordination among ourselves in terms of what we just talked about, the votes at Council, so that without this being binding, we agreed that as soon as, or reasonably as soon as such a discussion is held within the constituencies, we would let the others know how our vote would be at Council, and again, without this being this binding.

So, we will do that moving forward. For example, I don't know that applies to this meeting, but for cause that we will have within a few hours, I will notify the other SGCs within the House of our discussion. That's one thing.

We agreed on the interest of having some discussion about a Standing Committee on topics such as abuse and Universal Acceptance, more to come soon, but I think that's useful, as well as a couple of other not so important decisions, but the one that I should not forget is what you have on the screen. It was agreed to convene a search committee for the appointment of Board Seat 14.

So this is a call for participation to this. We have one, so that's a committee that consists of six members per stakeholder group, so that's three plus three in our case, one representative plus one alternate, so we'll be looking within the next, we need to appoint someone by the end of next week, so any of those who would be interested in being on that search committee would be welcome.

Just to be clear, that search committee is not responsible for appointing the Board Seat 14, but it's intended to provide a short list of candidates, okay? So by all means, if you have an interest, please come back to leadership.

Item five now. I think we've got some slides as well. Nitin will help us go through this update on the UA in general and the work of the expert working group in particular. Nitin?

NITIN WALIA

Thank you, Philippe. So, in the interest of time, I will try to keep it as brief as I can. So, as we all are aware that in March 2025, ICANN Board passed a resolution, and based on the Strategic Plan, which was 2026-2030, ICANN President and CEO announced, based on the board's resolution, they appointed, make an announcement for creating a UA Expert Group, which was formally been announced in the month of August 2025. Next slide, please. Next slide. Perfect.

So the appointment was being done, and we have 11 members, which are being, you know, out of which five are being nominated representatives from SOs and ACs, and six were being nominated by, you know, ICANN President and CEO as a representative. Out of them, you know, we have two co-chairs, Edmon Chung and Sarmad Hussain from ICANN, and there's a Board liaison, James, who is, you know, part of this particular committee. Next slide, please.

So, the objective of the UA Expert Group is to develop the guidelines to ICANN about how to encourage and collaborate with the stakeholders towards the UA adoption. So, when we talk about the stakeholders, stakeholders are the various constituencies who are already there and working into the adoption of the UA.

The information regarding this particular group and the purpose of scope is already there into the charter, so the link of the charter is already there, and the charter is also available on the public domain space. And it aligns with the ICANN strategic plan, and in fact, the UA and IDNs are also the key components for the New gTLD round, which is, you know, expected to happen next year.

So accordingly, the high-level timelines which has been given to this particular committee is to, you know, we started the work in the month of August 2025, and we have to finish by February 2026. The document will go for the Public Comment on the draft guidelines for promoting UA adoption. And in March 2026, it will be finalized and published as a guiding force for the promoting UA adoption.

Majority of the information is available into the public space, so, you know, all the work which is happening into this particular group, there's a which has been created for UA expert Working Group, and information is available on that. Next slide, please.

So as for the charter, the UA working group is meeting weekly. We have a weekly meeting which is happening online, and we are working to develop the strategies to encourage UA adoption. And the key stakeholders as per the charter are the big tech organizations, Open Source communities, software development professionals and system admins, DNS industry, including gTLDs and ccTLDs, registries, registrars and hosting companies, public sector and intergovernmental organization and academia.

So all the meeting recordings are being published and posted with all the supporting materials. And as of now, the UA Expert Group has already completed five topics out of 10. So, we are well on the timelines which has been given to us. And the guidelines are being discussed and also published on the GitHub. So, on GitHub, we have two set of, information.

One is which is there for the public login, and second is, for the Internet Committee which is working on that. Next slide, please. So, that's it. Thank you. That's the update from my side, actually. And in fact, since we all know that, this Expert Group, we're going to provide the guidelines by the month of March.

The most important thing which is out there is that, majority of the constituencies, when we talk about GAC, when we talk about ccNSO, ALAC, is already having a UA expert IDN working group fully functional into them. But somehow, this group is still missing in GNSO.

So in fact, when these guidelines are being given to all the constituencies, I think one thing which is important to be seen now and to be recommended within the GNSO is to have a Small Team or a group created which can work on the implementation of these guidelines.

In fact, the UA Day 2026 which has also been announced for, call for proposals. These constituencies already have the group which is supporting their members to file the, UA Day proposals and everything. But somehow in GNSO, we do not have that thing in place. A team or a group who can, guide the members about what are the proposals and how the proposals can be submitted for the UA Day and other things.

So I think one thing which we can say, recommend maybe in the next meeting is to act upon this quickly so that by the time these guidelines are available into the public space, we have something active functional group within GNSO who is working on this. So, that's my thought on that.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thank you, Nitin. That's very useful. And indeed, I'm not sure procedure-wise that would need to go through council. But indeed, I think that would be useful that it goes that way. So, any questions first, for Nitin? So, the proposal to the group is to promote the notion of a sort of Standing Committee within the SO on this particular topic, if only for the purpose of addressing the outputs of the Expert Group that will, as Nitin noted, will be produced by March next year. So, it's only right and proper that we've got something to address those outputs.

So that's something that we can discuss on the list as to the practicalities of suggesting this to council. That would be up to the councilors to make that suggestion. We'll synchronize with staff as well as to what form that might take. I'm sure that we can find a modus operandi for this. And unless anyone would object, that's the way leadership will proceed with the help of Nitin. And all of those of you who have an interest in UA, and there's quite a few people here who were on the ASG. So, we'll take that forward. Okay.

Thank you, Nitin, for this. Okay, I'll turn to Osvaldo for a brief update. I know people have attended the session on this topic, but a brief update on the Review of Reviews and where we are.

OSVALDO NOVOA

Okay, I think I sent you all a copy of the draft of purposes. That's the document that's being presented during this meeting. That's it. I had a bit of a problem in the meeting with this, in particular regarding that literal A has a lot of sub-ballot points and the rest have nothing.

And I was very insistent on the overall structure and components of ICANN's ASOs, ACs and NCs, because there was a big discussion at the beginning regarding organizational reviews. The position of the organizational review had been replaced by the Continuous Improvement Program, so there was no need to go into that. Anyway, I am the dissenting voice up till now regarding organizational reviews.

Anyway, what I was thinking and I'm going to bring up in our next meeting is that according to the charter of the documents, we have to analyze and view is regarding past reviews, organizational specific future reviews. And the only document we have is on a specific review.

The group hasn't even considered the three recommendations on review, the Holistic Review. So, there are a lot of things lacking that are established in our charter that hasn't been fulfilled. And even for this meeting, they should have presented a schedule of the group that hasn't been documented or even talked about in the group. So we are starting a bit roughly, but I think we will get along. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

We will, as usual. Thank you, Osvaldo. And that's something that will be on the agenda of our discussion with the Board this afternoon. This comes as no surprise to you. We've been arguing for a discussion on the structural review for a while now, and we'll take that forward.

I have to say that I misread the output of the group for some sort of Holistic Review to be included, which apparently it wasn't. So, I thought there was some consensus on this and I was wrong. So maybe as a side note, maybe others read that the same way, but we'll take that forward. Thank you, Osvaldo, for this.

We'll then go to maybe a brief word, if you would, Lars, on the webinar series and the discussion we had with SSAC.

LARS STEFFEN

Yes. So, this is Lars speaking. As we have already presented in our last membership call, we now came to the end of the first series of webinars. Thank you again to Susan for the heavy lifting on this. When we did the analysis of the webinar series, it was very clear that topics that had a relationship to security topics were the most well-attended ones. And based on this, we reached out to SSAC and had a meeting yesterday with Ram to discuss what SSAC can help us to bring to the table and to set up the next series of webinars.

And based on this, we would like to pick some of the topics that SSAC is currently working on and also created already material on this just to let you know. So, we discussed DNS Abuse also in the context of AI, New gTLDs in the context of name collisions, for example, but I would also like to see being UA included in this, DNSSEC, alternative name systems, but also internet governance in the context of DNS blocking or the usage of Open Source Software for critical infrastructure. But also, I also just mentioned routing security.

So maybe we can also reach out to the GSA to have one webinar on manners, for example. So, long story short, we have a number of topics that we would like to bring in order and send a proposal to the broader group that we can move forward on this quite shortly. And we were also discussing to have something on site again in Mumbai.

So, Santanu and Ram, I think will be very helpful to set this up. This is also what will be included in the proposal that we will share with you shortly. And I think we are in a good position to move forward with this. And based on the list of attendees that we have collected with the previous webinars, I would now also with a new elected leadership in place to ensure consistent communication with the people and organizations that we will reach out to, that we also now start the outreach to those who participated multiple times over the last series of webinars to hopefully attract and welcome new members to the ISPCP.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART And we will. Thank you, Lars Steffen. Osvaldo?

OSVALDO NOVOA	Sorry, I have been made aware by Sophie Hay, this other GNS representative in the review of CCG, that there is a meeting now at 12. So, I wasn't aware of that. I have to leave. Understood.
PHILIPPE FOUQUART	Thank you. Thanks, Lars. A word on NomCom. Fiona?
FIONA ASONGA	I had shared slides with you.
PHILIPPE FOUQUART	Sure. Okay, okay. We're running out of time.
FIONA ASONGA	I can just speak through.
PHILIPPE FOUQUART	Sure. Yeah, yeah, yeah.
FIONA ASONGA	I'm representing the ISPCP at the NomCom. And this year, the NomCom is having Open slots and we don't have the geographical guidance that the NomCom normally has in terms of where the leaders should come in from. And so, that is fortunate for us because then we are able to bring in a whole new set of leaders in different capacities.

We are looking for two members for the ICANN Board. One member for the PTI Board, two regional representatives for At-Large advisory committee. This one is specific for Europe and North America, they've specified. Then we've got one member from the, for the ccTLD, ccNSO basically, ccNSO council, and this is open, it's not specified, non-geographic. Then one member of the GNSO council, a non-voting member, non-geographic.

So those are the positions that we'll be looking to fill out for 2026 NomCom activities. And so, what we're looking for is to get as many good applications as possible. Our deadline for application is going to be March next year. We've not yet put out the call for announcement, but it should be going out after this meeting.

And there'll be a lot of time for people to apply and to put in applications. We are encouraging the community to get us good candidates because there's very few restrictions this time around. We really just want to have good Board candidates, good leadership in place, as opposed to trying to have the diversity geographic balances. Thank you. Any questions?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART Thank you, Fiona. Any questions for Fiona? Santanu?

SANTANU ACHARYA Not a question, but I have a comment that once you receive the outreach activity deck, that can be shared with us so that we can share it in our webinars. So, that would be helpful to get some good leaders.

FIONA ASONGA Thank you. I'll share.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART Thank you, Santanu. Any other questions? Thank you, Fiona. That's very helpful. And the fact that it's in advance is much appreciated. With this, I think we're three minutes over. Before closing, Santanu?

SANTANU ACHARYA I have one comment to make. Because yesterday after the meeting, I had informed our ministry and NIXI people also, and had a short meeting with the ICANN representative of India and APAC. So, what they have said that they will take care from the back end or so, but one mail has to go to the council for the requirement of the room. So, that mail needs to go first. After that, they will work on that.

SPEAKER 82 Okay. So, we'll need to figure out how we can request that formally.

SANTANU ACHARYA	Yeah, I think Brenda can send that mail to GNSO, and GNSO will send the mail to the meeting committee. That's what I have been told.
SPEAKER 82	Okay. Thank you. That's very helpful. So, we'll make sure in terms of logistics and proper procedure, everything is in good shape. Well, I want to thank you for this. Don't want to forget to thank, well, Thomas has left, but he's completed his final term as councilor. He's not going very far, I think. So, we'll see him next time. I just want to note that Susan is going to council now. I want to acknowledge Lars as our new vice chair and Santanu as ExCom member. Thanks everyone who participated in the discussion a couple of weeks ago. And with this, looking forward to the next… personally looking forward to the next couple of years. And thank you for your participation to this meeting. I think it's been really useful. And have a nice rest of your week. Thanks, Meeting adjourned. And thanks, Natalie.
NATALIE PEREGRINE	Thank you, and I'll stop the recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]