
ICANN84 | AGM – Joint Session: ICANN Board and NCSG
Wednesday, October 29, 2025 – 10:30 to 11:30 IST

WENDY PROFIT

Hello, welcome to the joint meeting of the ICANN Board and the NCSG. My name is Wendy Profit and I'm the participation manager for this session. Please note the session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Community Participant Code of Conduct, ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior, and ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy.

Interpretation for this session will include English, French, and Spanish. Please observe the following guidelines to participate in this session. I'll also post them in the chat for your reference. This is a meeting between the NCSG and the Board, so we will not be taking questions from the room during the session unless we have time at the end.

For remote participant members of the NCSG, if you would like to speak during the session, please raise your hand and zoom. When called upon, you'll be able to unmute, and on-site participants can use the physical microphone here at the staff table in the front.

Please state your name for the record, the language you will speak, if speaking a language other than English, and speak clearly at a moderate pace. I'll now hand the floor over to ICANN Board Chair, Tripti Sinha.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

TRIPTI SINHA Thank you, Wendy. Welcome, everyone. This is our second bilateral meeting with the NCSG. Welcome, everyone. I'd like to start with a round of introductions, so if we could start right with you and then go around the table, please.

MANJU CHEN Thank you. My name is Manju Chen. I represent the NCSG on the GNSO Council.

AMITABH SINGHAL Good morning. Amitabh Singhal, Board member.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN Maarten Botterman, also on the Board.

JULF HELSINGIUS Julf Helsingius, on the Council.

BRUNA SANTOS Bruna Santos, GNSO Council and NCSG.

CHRIS CHAPMAN Chris Chapman, ICANN Board Vice Chair.

RAFIK DAMMAK	Rafik Dammak, NCSG Chair.
CHRIS BUCKRIDGE	Chris Buckridge, Board member.
TRIPTI SINHA	Tripti Sinha, Board Chair.
KURTIS LINDQUIST	Kurtis Lindquist, CEO ICANN.
BECKY BURR	Becky Burr, Board Seat 13.
CHRISTIAN KAUFMAN	Christian Kaufman, Board member.
JAMES GALVIN	James Galvin, SSAC liaison to the ICANN Board.
SAJID RAHMAN	Sajid Rahman, Board member.
FARZANEH BADIEI	Farzaneh Badiei, member of NCSG. I'm also representing NCSG on the Council. Good morning. I'm glad it's not 9 a.m. session.

TRIPTI SINHA

Welcome, everyone. So, on behalf of the Board, Chris Buckridge will be chairing the session, so I'm going to turn it over to him right away. Chris?

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Thank you very much, Tripti. And yeah, welcome, everyone, to this session, this discussion between the Board and NCSG. We have had some questions and some discussions sort of foreshadowed in our documents, and we have a pretty full agenda, actually, so we'll move straight into it.

I think I'll lay out first, this is the question that the Board asked the NCSG, and I think it's quite a broad one and probably also frames some of the questions that NCSG came back to us with, but I'll read this out just to frame it.

It's what does the NCSG believe should be the board's and the ICANN organization's policy priorities in 2026, taking into consideration the new five-year Strategic Plan, the WSIS+20 review, and the recently launched cross-community group on the Review of Reviews. So, Rafik, I'll pass over to you, and perhaps we can hear the NCSG response and also some of the questions that came back from NCSG to the Board.

RAFIK DAMMAK

Okay, thanks, Chris. In terms of priorities for us and NCSG, it's within where we are sitting, it's within the GNSO in terms of policy

matters, and so we try to have some prioritization, because we are also thinking in terms of how we should prepare at NCSG level, because maybe you could hear us, like we can have concerns in how to participate in some of the PDP Working Group if they are initiated due to the resources. But other than that, we are also trying to think what is needed for those PDP. Sorry, I'm trying to find the list.

So, I mean, it's not an order of kind of some sort, but I'm trying to mention some of them. Yeah, we understood about the DNS Abuse mitigation, so that's in our radar. And just for information, we elaborated a discussion paper. We will be happy to share it later, since it summarizes some of our thoughts and the direction, we believe it should be taken. We had like, I believe, the EDRP review, but I think that might not be going to start soon.

Other things that you probably heard with regard to RDRS urgent request, we are following that closely. So, we have some position about it that can be shared by other members of NCSG.

Okay, I'm trying to not go through the whole list, but also about the initiative around that something we are following, and particularly the issue of applicant support, and we had some question before. We will have discussion, in fact, tomorrow with the team from ICANN Org and on that matter.

So last, it's maybe not a policy per se, but since we had a session in Saturday meeting, it was about DNS blocking that's following the SSAC document. So, I'm just here sharing quite a list of what we

believe regarding policy priorities. Is there anything else you wanted to clarify? Sorry, because I cannot see the question right now.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Sorry about that. I think we will have sort of a chance to dig into some of those issues as we go through the questions that NCSG has posed, but I just wanted to quickly check with my Board colleagues if there are any responses to the priorities that Rafik's discussed here as an initial point. Well, we'll move to the NCSG questions, but just in terms of those priorities. Okay, well, let's keep moving and we can dig into some of these discussions a little bit more deeply.

CHRIS CHAPMAN

Well, I'd be interested to know how you're mapping against, from the NCSG perspective, how you're mapping against the Strategic Plan. One of the most encouraging things I've picked up in the last few days is the number of constituencies have zeroed right in on it and have identified particular sweet spots where they can add value. And if you've just got a moment to reflect on that, that would be terrific.

RAFIK DAMMAK

Okay, thanks, Chris. Okay, I found out I'm surrounded by two Chris. So, about Strategic Plan, not necessarily about that in particular, but what we are trying to do for this year when we start thinking about our priority is how we can get involved more effectively in

the process for the ICANN budget and operating plan, because at the end, that's what implement or operationalize the strategic planning.

And so, we had several sessions with the ICANN finance and the planning team to understand about the process. And they also give us kind of overview about all the strategic initiatives. That's quite a long list. And from that, we know based on what we have those priorities, and we try to map to those strategic initiatives.

And as I tried to say at the beginning is we try to identify what term of resource we need and see if what's possible to get factored in the operating plan and the budget. And also, what can be needed for those policy topics that we think that we need to work on or we know that are coming.

So, things like if we need some study and so on. But for us, it's kind of really not going to say first time, but it's first kind of in first experience to go through this exercise to do planning to see how we can influence the budget operating plan.

We are trying to get some expertise or familiarity with the process. And we're engaging with the ICANN Org team to help us to identify when we can do that. It's not just waiting till the Public Comment proceeding. So, yeah, we are trying to do that. And that's one of the ideas to do the mapping. So, I hope that respond to your question.

CHRIS CHAPMAN

Well, thank you. That's very encouraging. And the honesty that's in that response, and the fact that it's initially baby steps, build up comfort, bearing in mind the Strategic Plan is what they call a living document. It's revised annually. And there's the opportunity through that and the current prioritization exercise to input and to seek accountability against it. So, I appreciate what you just said.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Okay. Thanks, Chris. We might move on to the first of NCSG's questions. Rafik, please.

RAFIK DAMMAK

Okay. Thanks. Farzaneh, do you want to add something on this topic?

FARZANEH BADIEI

I just wanted to add that our priorities are aligned with the values that we are trying to advance at ICANN, such as Human Rights, holding organizations accountable and also carrying out Human Rights impact assessments. And the PDPs are now going to have to do Human Rights checks. So, we want to have enough budget for that work to happen properly. And we also like to see more programs for protection of registrants' rights and educating them and also streamlining their access to domain names. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK

Okay. Thanks, Farzaneh. So, before maybe moving to the next question, just I want to take the opportunity to thank Xavier and Becky Nash from the finance and planning team for engaging with us. We find it's quite supportive. So we can move to the topic coming from us. So, we try to categorize them, just to help. And sorry, I think those are the latest versions. So, it's quite long, but I think we will give maybe a better introduction, kind of to set the context. And with that, I think I will ask Bruna to go ahead.

BRUNA SANTOS

Thank you. Bruna Santos, for the records. I think you guys should look at these questions as part of NCSG's concerns with the sustainability of ICANN's multistakeholder model and also some concerns with how we're going to move forward in terms of like policy decisions and implementation.

Both the RDRS and IRT are processes we're looking very closely and that NCSG feels that GNSO Council in general and our policy positions could be further respected or at least uphold. And in this context, I think it's also important to highlight that something we have been pushing forward in the past years is for us to avoid using mechanisms such as advice and the conversations we have in broader PDPs to re-dispute topics that have already been closed and so on.

So these questions are really about how the Board is envisioning your own role and the Org's role for protecting the integrity of our multistakeholder model in the coming years. And also having in

mind the external pressures that will arise from the next round and have been arising already.

So, I won't read the questions through. I won't take your time in that. But Farsi, if you want to add anything to that, we were supposed to call it this point. So, that's it.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Okay. Thank you very much. I mean, the three ABC that fall under this are, I think, quite distinct in some of the topics that they're addressing. I want to first give Maarten the floor to respond really to some of the issues that fall under the part A of this question.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN

Maarten, yes. Now, thank you. Thank you very much. And of course, I can set up to protect also the integrity of its processes in line with the bylaws. And as Chris has alluded to in previous sessions as well, the Strategic Plan helps us to put on the horizon. So, what are we aiming at together?

And I think the new Strategic Plan that emphasizes that opportunity very well. So, with that, the Board is listening to the community and at the same time aware that together we need to improve the multi-stakeholder system as we also emphasize in the Strategic Plan.

The Review of Reviews is one step in that direction. It was clear that we need to progress because if we stay where we are, we will not get there. And we're committed to that. So, whereas it's clear that

the policies continue to come from the community, are informed by the ACs and other parts of the community.

And the Board is listening to all of that at one hand to make sure that's also happening in an effective way is something we're also committed to. And that side in side should make it possible that we continue to do so. Dare I say, we're all committed to making it successful in the end. And the Board is to ensure that that has been happening in a good way.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Thanks, Maarten. I'm looking to see if other colleagues, but I mean, I would draw a very direct line between these concerns or these issues and the Board readiness work that we also discussed with council in one of the sessions earlier this week, and which is ongoing to make sure that there is this open communication between the Board and GNSO council throughout the process of policy development so that we don't end up at those situations where there are recommendations, which the Board feels it needs to reject for various reasons.

So, I think working together, open channels of communication, understanding the points of concern is really essential in doing this. And I think you raise a good point in that it is critical for ICANN's process that we not keep running into these situations where the Board is rejecting what was a community developed policy for reasons that it sees as necessary. So, we'll continue that work.

I know Board members are participating with the GNSO in their strategic planning session and elsewhere. So, looking forward to that. So, that was, I think, Maarten responding to points A and B in that question. There is point C as well, which is looking at, sorry, just reading this quickly, what mechanisms will ICANN deploy to ensure policy priorities reflect the needs and realities of underserved regions in areas such as Capacity Building, language diversity, and digital inclusion.

I know a couple of colleagues, Sajid and Amitabh, both had comments on this. Amitabh, please.

AMITABH SINGHAL

So, thank you. And that's a very important question when we look at issues around Global South. And I belong to Global South. Sajid belongs to the Global South region. And these are issues that are close to our heart. And thank you, NCSG, for raising this question.

I think, as ICANN, we are committed to recruiting and bringing in participants from across the world to ICANN. And I think it's reflected from our capacity development opportunities that we enable, and we enable this participation in various discussions, including policy development across ICANN. And I think we are also pretty diligently ensuring that policies are reflected and the needs are reflected on the regions, especially those that are underserved or underrepresented.

So, though, I think through its regional offices, ICANN Org and its global stakeholder engagement teams and programs such as ICANN Fellowship, NextGen ICANN, and ICANN Learn, ICANN builds local capacity, supports participation, and broadens understanding of the internet ecosystem.

So, ICANN also provides travel support to community members to help them attend public meetings and advance ICANN's work. This support is intended to offset travel costs for individuals from underrepresented regions by providing funded travel, accommodation, or DM support, for example, helping ensure that global perspectives are represented in ICANN's policy discussions as well, and its decision-making process.

So, I think while these examples are not really exhaustive, there are so many other initiatives that the ICANN Org carries throughout. It illustrates our commitment, ongoing commitment, to ensuring that its policy priorities are reflecting the needs and perspectives of stakeholders from all regions. So, I'll stop right now here, but Sajid, you want to add something to this?

SAJID RAHMAN

Thanks. Amitabh mentioned all the good things we are doing, right? So, what I did is, before coming here, I did a bit of a Google search, an AI search, and see how the participation from Global South has changed over the last five years. And the trend is actually downward. Slightly downward, but it's downward.

So the question then is, how can we change from at the call, from at the menu to at the table, Global South participation? And that, I think, is a critical factor that we need to address. One of the big challenges, while we do all the Capacity Building and everything, there is always this question of this participation depends to some extent on the venue of where things happen.

And all these online participation, virtual participation, sometimes get affected, right? So, the question probably also to you, to the NCSG community, is do you have any more ideas that we need to do to really move the needle?

FARZANEH BADIEI

So, these are really great answers, and we are very grateful for all the Capacity Building programs. Our members really care about this. I just want to go back to the first question that we asked. I don't think we got a concrete answer. What sort of accountability and transparency?

We know that we have processes in place, but what sort of commitments can you make so that you don't cave under pressure to make hasty decisions that can get into the territories of policymaking that the GNSO is in charge of, just to expedite and go ahead with the launch of the process of the New gTLD?

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Becky, please.

BECKY BURR

So I think that the Board has been extremely careful, particularly over the last couple of years, to be very thoughtful about implementing the GNSO Council-approved policy recommendations and to think thoughtfully about the new issues as they arise.

So, I don't think that there's any evidence that the Board is caving or rushing to launch the next round. You probably know how much time people are spending in the IRT. It may not be clear how much time the Board is devoting to consideration of the next round issues as they come up. We have a New gTLD next round caucus that has been meeting at least every week.

The Board is fully informed about issues as they arise. We have very robust conversations, discussions in the caucus itself and in the Board on all of these issues. The caucus leadership, which before Avri rolled off the Board, included me and Avri, now has been for the past however long we've been desperately missing Avri, has been me and Alan. And with my stepping down will be Alan and Tripti. This is getting attention at the highest level and I can assure you there is no rush to get this out the door. What there is a determination to work through the issues as they arise thoughtfully and expeditiously.

We also have been striving to be as transparent and clear and communicative as we can be about those. I understand that you felt that the Board shouldn't have had an opinion or expressed an

opinion as early as it did, but we had a very fulsome discussion about the issue of those names, those specifically protected names, Red Cross, Red Crescent and the Olympic Committee, and had very clear thoughts on that, but also wanted to be clear to the Council, which I hope we were, but apparently we may not have been completely clear to everybody that the decision as to whether it was policy or not was up to the Council and the Board is prepared to defer to the Council on whatever decision it makes.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Yeah, Bruna, please.

BRUNA SANTOS

Thank you. Bruna, for the record. Just on the global majority points and opportunities for engaging different individuals, I think at NCSG we're highly interested in getting some support for research capacity and many of the things that would help bring a lot of our members to the same level playing field as any other groups within ICANN. Like, we do see that there will be many challenges arising, especially from a possible two PDPs on DNS Abuse running at the same time and many of the challenges ahead of the next round.

So in that sense, replying to your question, Sajid, would be a good interest in having support for policy research and any sort of, like, support that helps us raise our capacities in that sense. And just to note as well that NCSG has a rather diverse composition on its

leadership right now. I think the majority of us at this table either comes from the global majority or has had experience in the global majority and we do look forward to continuing engaging our leaders and bringing new leadership in that sense, as well as part of our broader commitment to diversity. That's it. Thanks.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Sajid?

SAJID RAHMAN

Thank you. I think Capacity Building to help policy research is an important element. Of course, it ties very well with the Capacity Building and I don't know, I mean, we have the usual initiatives, but I guess when you are talking about Capacity Building at a research level, we probably need to do something significantly more. So, thank you.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Okay, looking around, I'm not seeing any other hands on this question. So, Rafik?

RAFIK DAMMAK

Thanks, Chris. Yeah, I think it's good since we are the half here to go to the next topic under Human Rights. So, I believe this will be with Michaela.

MICHAELA SHAPIRO

Thank you. Michaela Shapiro. For those of you who don't know me, thank you so much for the time today. I have the pleasure of raising a few questions related to Human Rights and where we'd just love to have the board's input.

So, starting with the first question, we would love to hear more about what concrete steps do you envision ICANN being able to take to embed Human Rights impact assessments into its Policy Development Processes? And we highlighted a few issues of particular interest, such as the risk of the DNS being utilized as a tool for content moderation, DNS Abuse mitigation, and access to registration data.

Shall I also read the Part B? Yeah. And separately to that, but building on it, how could ICANN balance contractual compliance and law enforcement access with the privacy rights of registrants, especially as the registration data policy nears its finalization? Thank you.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Okay, thanks, Michaela. I'm turning to Tripti for the answer here.

TRIPTI SINHA

Thank you, Chris and Michaela. Thank you, Michaela, for the question. So, as you know, the Policy Development Process belongs to the community, specifically to the GNSO, and you, the NCSG, are happy to be a member of the GNSO as well. So, the Board understands that the council, the GNSO council, has committed to

including Human Rights Impact Assessment and a global public interest assessment in its PDPs going forward.

And in particular, this will be a first with the Latin Diacritics PDP. So, because of this commitment, the Board understands that if the council is to initiate a PDP on DNS Abuse or a PDP on any other topic, performing the Human Rights Impact Assessment and the global public interest assessment are requirements for the Working Group.

The Board believes that as a manager of the PDP, the GNSO council is best positioned to ensure that the PDP properly takes into account Human Rights as well as, of course, the global public interest. And as the Latin Diacritics PDP is the first PDP to integrate these aspects into its charter, we look forward to the outcomes and also potential improvements as you go along the process. So, we fully support this. We're very happy that this has been embedded into the process and we look forward to outcomes. Do you have any questions Buckridge?

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Yes, Michaela, please.

MICHAELA SHAPIRO

Thank you. Now, just to acknowledge the response, thank you. I think we're very excited that that is something that's being integrated. Just one element that I might flag is we hope that this is something that can be integrated throughout the PDP process

rather than, my understanding is it's at the beginning, it's at the inception of the PDP, but please correct me if I'm wrong.

So, I hope that this is the kind of the potential impact on Human Rights is considered both at the inception, duration and at the implementation phase as well. So, thank you.

TRIPTI SINHA

Thank you. And we assume since it's been integrated into the process, it will be from a cradle to grave type integration. And on the second question, as you know, ICANN's authority is derived from the agreements that it has and the agreements that we have with the contracted parties are in two forms, the ICANN accredited registrars and of course with the registry operators.

And they come as the registrar accreditation agreement and the registry agreements. And we, of course, there are policies embedded into these agreements, including the registration data policy. ICANN enforces the requirements that are set forth in those agreements, as well as the policies that are developed by the ICANN community.

So, under the registration data policy, contract parties are required to review and respond to requests for disclosure of non-public data. And they're called disclosure requests that meet their respective required formats. A contracted parties must assess whether to disclose the data in response to a disclosure request, considering the specific circumstances of the request.

Part of this review may include balancing the privacy rights of a data subject with the interests of the individual or the entity seeking access to personal data, of course, including law enforcement. The contracted party is responsible for making the disclosure determination and ICANN does not perform any applicable balancing of rights in a privacy or anything else related to that, nor does ICANN examine the results of the contracted party's disclosure decision or enforce any specific outcome.

ICANN Contractual Compliance Authority is limited to enforcement of compliance with the applicable requirements related to the disclosure itself, the process itself. This includes, for example, requirements related to the publication of a contracted party's disclosure request processes, required content for valid disclosure requests, timelines for acknowledging and responding to this request and the content of responses to the request.

And contracted parties are responsible for ensuring their processes comply with the applicable law and regulations, which may include balancing privacy rights of registrants with the interest of those seeking access to personal data.

ICANN contractual requirements are always reviewed within the bounds of the law and regulations are applicable to each contracted party. So, that's an in-depth response. Do you have any other questions?

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Manju, please.

MANJU CHEN

Thank you very much. Okay. Sorry, I raised my hand before you answered the second question. So, my question was more related to the first, well, Human Rights A, to be specific, your answer to that. And thank you very much for acknowledging the Human Rights Index assessment we have embedded in our PDB processes. I guess I'll tinyly, proudly own it because I was the chair who kind of put it into the PDPs. But I guess, sorry also for, I guess we kind of didn't frame the question correctly because as you have rightfully explained, the PDPs are owned by the community and it's our job to ensure Human Rights aren't invaded in the PDB processes.

So, I guess since implementation is owned by the ICANN Org, how do you envision in the implementation that the Human Rights Impact Assessments, their recommendations are faithfully, in a sense, implemented?

And how do you envision community when we form the IRT can support in the implementation process to ensure these recommendations carry with the Human Rights Impact Assessment, are fully and faithfully implemented and kind of fulfill its original purpose in a sense, because I guess we have been having this kind of back and forth of, there have been different interpretations of the policy recommendations when it comes to

implementation. So, how can the committee help more and how do you think will be a better way that we do it? Thank you.

TRIPTI SINHA

So, for a more detailed response, I'm going to eventually turn it to Kurtis because he owns implementation. But when a PDP comes forward with recommendations that comes to the Board, once they're reviewed and approved, they would be approved in the format that they were sent to us, right? And then you've factored in Human Rights and global public interest. So, those should be implemented because they're embedded in the recommendations. But for more details, I'm going to turn it over to Kurtis.

KURTIS LINDQUIST

No, thank you. I mean, I think there's two parts to what you said, if I understood. I think there is the Human Rights impact on the policy development. And that should be addressed in that policy development. And we can have a separate discussion about how we refine policy development for all input and make sure that gets covered, including Human Rights assessments. But once the policy is passed, it's approved by the Board, it goes to implementation, we set up the IRT and you're right.

We do have these discussions back and forth every now and then on what that means. I don't actually think that we should be treating this different than any other implementation recommendation. I think we need to resolve it. We need to have

high quality implementation of the policies we have. And in this case, if it's a Human Rights interpretation discussion, we should have that. And we should bring clarity on that just as we do with other policies. And I've been saying this in quite a few sessions.

One thing that we are working on is actually to highlight when it comes to both policy development and policy implementation, what is it that we get stuck on? What are the issues that are blocking implementation? Highlight this. And if we need to go back to the community and we need to have clarity on that, then we should do that. But I mean, fundamentally, if a policy is adopted, implementable, and we have no issues, we should implement it, right? But again, I also realized that I think we're running this the first time.

So, we're precluding what these issues might be because we don't know them. We haven't seen anything yet. So, it's a little bit hard to talk about what this would look like in the implementation phase. We have never seen one of these yet. So, I think we're going to have to come back where we better understand what might arise.

So, I mean, my response is based on implementation in general, right? Because we haven't actually seen what this looks like. So, it's a bit hard to speculate on exact what could arise in a Human Rights implementation concern and where there would be misalignment. I would be guessing, and I don't want to do that.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Thanks, Kurtis. And first, and Manju and Farzi, my apologies. I wasn't following the queue in Zoom. So, I am following that now. But Farzi, please, go ahead.

FARZANEH BADIEI

Thank you. So, I think that some part of our question is also about Board initiatives, your correspondence with us, your resolutions. And a few meetings ago, we asked if you can do a Human Rights Impact Assessment of your resolutions and consider that before, not before passing the resolution, but just a lightweight Human Rights Impact Assessment to see if any of the resolutions have Human Rights impact. And you kind of throw the ball in our court and you said, you do it.

So we can, at NCSG, go and do a Human Rights Impact Assessment of your resolutions, if that's something useful. But also, what we are doing is that we are also undertaking Human Rights Impact Assessment of GAC communiqué. That, we started in Seattle. That Human Rights Impact Assessment might actually be of use to your work and to your deliberations. And I'm not saying that you have to consider it, but if you want to know more about how to consider and have that kind of, yeah, so that's it. We are discussing at the PDPs.

We are trying to do the Human Rights checks and contribute to the process and help with the design of this Human Rights Impact

Assessment. And from the Board side, I think Board in its different operations, perhaps can consider Human Rights as well. If I'm not mistaken, there was like a few, I think this might have been years ago.

It was a couple of years ago that you actually sent a letter. And that was like one of the first time that we had data subject rights in it, which pleased me. And I think that like, if you do these kinds of like Human Rights Impact Assessment, we might see more languages like that in your letters and resolutions.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Becky, please.

BECKY BURR

So, let me just say the Board would certainly welcome any input the NCSG has, including Human Rights looks. We have for many years gotten input from the GNSO Council on the GAC communique and in putting together our scorecard. And as part of our interactions with the GAC, all of that input is considered. So, we happily welcome input on to aid our review of the GAC communiqué wherever it comes from, including NCSG.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Okay, thanks very much, Becky. I'm not seeing any more hands for this particular question. So, Rafik, please move to the next one.

RAFIK DAMMAK

Okay, thanks, Chris. I think we're moving to the last topic, the Review of Reviews. Maybe one idea if we can change this Review of Reviews to meet the review of something else to make it easier for everyone. So, yeah, here we have this question about Cross-Community Working Group in the view of reviews. And I believe this one will be led by Manju.

MANJU CHEN

Thank you very much, Rafik. So yes, we're just wondering, because this is like a kind of, in a sense, innovated review that we're doing now. So, how do we kind of ensure that this review really leads to more effective and community responsive accountability mechanisms, rather than we're just shortening everything and cutting down things into one or two review instead of 10, because this is more time efficient.

And then as a consequence crisis, we might actually lose accountability and transparency of the reviews we had. This, I know it's a very general questions because I guess in a sense, we're all still expecting our goals. But do you have any, I guess, primary thoughts on this? How you really envision this will lead to and what kind of great plans, I guess, to be realized by this Review of Reviews? That will be our question. Thank you.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

All right. Thank you, Manju. Certainly, the question of the meeting. I'm going to throw to Jim, who's one of our Board members of the CCG.

JAMES GALVIN

Yes, thank you. And I like the emphasis on members as a reminder to all of us. The CCG in the large is based on participation from everyone. And I think one of the things to emphasize here is it's kind of a unique group in terms of how we've done things in the past. Because Board members are participating as individuals actively in the group.

And I share that responsibility with León Sanchez as the members to the CCG. And that includes ICANN staff. I mean, normally when we've done these things, they've just been from the community base.

So, we are encouraged and welcome as evidenced in part by our commitment to put members on the group, to the opportunity to collaborate directly with the community to address the question of how to ensure that ICANN maintains its commitments and maintains accountability in a way that the community agrees to so that we can all work together to do that.

I think what's important is that the Board is open to whatever that becomes. We are even leaving the door open for starting from a clean slate. And Leon and I have both said that in the meetings. It

certainly has been a part of the development of the purpose statement.

We should not be afraid to rethink what would work best at this point and what we need to get to. But key part of that in starting with a clean slate is also thinking about what the purpose is. And although that work is going on at the moment, I'll highlight one particular thing that the Board would like to see come out of this is make sure that we are accountable to our Strategic Plan. And let's not lose sight of that.

The Strategic Plan is really what defines what we are all working towards in the large. The community has had its role in developing this Strategic Plan. The Board has made its contributions. And that's our guiding light. That's our North Star in terms of what we're doing.

So, in some way, the purpose and whatever mechanisms we come up with has to cover that. Starting from a clean slate, I think those are the two most important things that we want to bring and see being discussed in the CCG. Thanks.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Not seeing anyone in the Zoom, but looking around the table, are there any responses to that or further comments on that? Manju, please.

MANJU CHEN

I'm just very intrigued by the word clean slate. Do you mean we're getting rid of all the reviews that's mandated in the bylaws? So, the clean slate means we, I don't know, re-envision reviews for the different purposes of the reviews that we had or clean slate as in, yeah, I'm very interested in this word. Thank you.

JAMES GALVIN

So to be clear, thank you for the question. Very important to make sure we're all talking about the same thing. In this context, clean slate just means that it is open for us to examine all of the things that we do now and consider whether or not they are applicable to what we need going forward. So, there's an opportunity to replace them with something else or do something completely different.

And I think that's been emphasized in the purpose discussion that we had in our first plenary session. We will have one again tomorrow, right after lunch also. I think that's something for us all to keep in mind and know that that's available to us. But there's no requirement that we have to remove what we already have. It's just that we have that opportunity, maybe tweak it if that seems to be what works.

So, I think the process that the charter has laid out makes all of that an option. And we just want to remind folks that the Board is not presupposing a decision here. This is a collaborative effort with the community to figure out what really is going to work, what we need in order to realize a different future or maintain our future. Thanks.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Yeah, Chris, please.

CHRIS CHAPMAN

Just want to add to that. Jim talked about a clean slate and I'd call it reassessing from first principles. 4.4 and 4.6 of the bylaws, there the draft outline that Jim referred to has been very elegantly put together, very nicely put together as a starting point. But in a prior session with ALAC today, Jonathan asked, what is the intent? What's the purpose?

So, when I talk about first principles, go back and assess really how we want and why we want and how frequently we want and in what way do we the community seek accountability? Is there given the lessons of 20 years a better way to articulate that and achieve that in a way that is sustaining, in a way that makes sense, in a way that gives rise to constructive discussion as opposed to occasional destructive so that it has a cadence, it has a natural point.

These are the things that present themselves as wonderful opportunities. I'm not talking down the current draft. As I said, I think it's been very nicely put together. I just think that this is a wonderful opportunity to have a look at 4.4 and 4.6, deal in the Strategic Plan, realize the Strategic Plan is capable of evolving each and every year, realizing the Strategic Plan has the opportunity to bleed into it, selective reviews as and when they're appropriate to

make sure under the Strategic Plan objective of organizational excellence.

That's just not organizational excellence about ICANN Org or the Board. It's about all the community. It's speaking on behalf of all the community and we should be forever seeking to keep those component parts living, focused and fit for then purpose. So, I just think that, I just wanted to add to what Jim said and give you, my perspective. Thanks, CB.

RAFIK DAMMAK

Yeah, thanks for all those comments. Maybe I will make some few points. I understand that clean slate is opportunity and I get the comment like how we can give us the way to maybe do a lot of changes and bring new opportunities.

But I'm speaking personally here, I'm always kind of worried about those, maybe not sure about the wording, but it's kind of constitutional change that people want and try to change in term of structure or how we organized or all those great ideas. But I'm just not sure how long it will take and if really, we'll at the end fix whatever I think there is a problem. Because here, maybe going back to the initial comment from Manju, she mentioned about the effectiveness, I believe in the implementation.

I don't think we will have to wait till then for the outcome of the review of refuse to fix that. That's kind of long-time issues. Don't know how many times we discussed this during our Board meeting.

There was even the previous initiative like the multi-stakeholder model effectiveness and so on. So, the question here, what is done right now to improve effectiveness?

Since even we talked about the strategic goals and so on. And yeah, so I think this is the maybe we have to think about addition to that, we have all the continuous improvement. If we take like the GNS or something for several years, we worked on with the PDP 3.0 and then the follow-up that was led by Manju.

I'm not going to say the name of that standing committee. But the idea was really how we can improve about the PDP and so on. But always the issue because GNSO can only fix one part of the whole process. It's about Policy Development Process. But when it goes to the implementation and then go to the Board approval, it's kind of, I'm not going to say a black hole, but it's kind of the limbo of ICANN there that things can stay for too long to make decision.

And that's why sometimes we are renewing, we try to change the policy discussion outcome. And that's impact at the end, the implementation and effectiveness. If you have a whole pipeline, you cannot just fix it locally. So, just I want to bring this, as we have the continuous improvement, that's a lot of efforts done, but there are things about effectiveness implementation that need to be fixed to improve before waiting that will be the outcome of Review of Reviews and sharing my caution about this big idea that that's big changes, I get that. We can see it in many spaces, even like for states, et cetera, but it doesn't necessarily end up well, so.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Thanks, Rafik. I have a bit of a queue and we have only five minutes left. So, Jim, Farzaneh, Maarten, I can ask you all to be concise. Thank you.

JAMES GALVIN

Thank you. Then I will just quickly say, you put a lot on the table and we certainly as the Board have heard those kinds of issues many times, especially related to effectiveness. In the context of Review of Reviews, I just want to tease this into two parts to keep in mind.

The Review of Reviews is, I think that the suggestions that you make would be something that the reviews would do. So, the Review of Reviews is about setting ourselves up to be able to examine those sets of issues. They're not part of the Review of Reviews Cross Community Working Group. And I'll just leave that there for right now, but happy to talk more about the details. Thanks.

FARZANEH BADIEI

Sorry, I keep going back to the other conversations. We were talking about Capacity Building. This meeting was supposed to be held in the Middle East and it wasn't for reasons. And the DNS study for the Middle East was canceled a few years ago because of lack of budget. We need equal attention to all regions, even the ones that are dealing with conflicts and wars.

I mean, probably more attention should be paid to those regions. So, I just wanted to raise that with the point that we probably have to do something about it. Thank you.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Maarten, please.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN

Yes, and thanks for that. We've seen over the years that going to a different place also brings in new people, which is why we all are committed to it. And sometimes the world turns in ways that we make things impossible. I distinctly remember also the time that COVID disturbed our ability to do so. But that's noted. But on Rafique, things are not perfect, right?

In the multi-stakeholder model, we very much agree that. But let's also recognize that steps have been taken to improve. When I started nine years ago, the habit was that a PDP would come to the Board and we would send it back because it wasn't consistent with advice.

Now, what we've done in the meanwhile is that we see much more interaction beforehand, before a PDP is concluded with other parties who have opinion. And that is a way that has expedited part of the work. We all realize that we need to continue to improve upon it. At the same time, we're not a top-down organization where the Board can mandate this.

So, this is why it's also continuously high on the agenda of improvements. And with you, I agree that more can be done. The thing we share in ICANN is that we all want ICANN to be a success. And maybe that is our guide with the Strategic Plans, the commitments to ensure that that happens. How quickly, I can't make promises either.

RAFIK DAMMAK

Yeah, thanks, Maarten. Yeah, I mean, there are improvements and that's why I talked about the GNSO because they took the lead to try to see how we can improve that interaction. And even when there was the ODP, some of us thought it should happen before and should feed the discussion in the Working Group. But still, kind of the concern is, take time in terms of approval by the Board. Even if we are adding liaison, we have the ODP and all kind of participate in the process. But I mean, what I was trying to say, it's a whole work stream pipeline.

GNSO is trying to solve and what it can solve, but still the implementation doesn't really control it. And so that's the question, how we can improve on that area. Is even, because I had discussion yesterday about some of the recommendation of the work stream tool from the IANA transition, they still didn't finish. So, it raises a lot of question if that takes so long, how much is effective at the end of the day?

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

I think we're at the end of the session as scheduled. So, Rafik, maybe that final closing words.

RAFIK DAMMAK

Yeah, thanks for this opportunity every time to discuss with you. And maybe I can speak on behalf of our members to thank all the outgoing Board members thanks for your service and also looking forward for the new Board members joining and to work with all of you. So, thanks again and yeah, see you soon.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Thank you, Rafik. Pleasure for us as Board to talk with NCSG, as always. I'll hand it just back to Tripti for some final comments.

TRIPTI SINHA

Thank you. This was a very good exchange of ideas and topics, and thank you for acknowledging our outgoing Board members. If we could give them a round of applause, please. Thank you. This meeting is adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]