
ICANN85 Mumbai | CF – Joint Session: ICANN Board and NCSG
Wednesday, March 11, 2026 – 16:30 to 17:30 IST

FRANCO CARRASCO

Welcome to the joint session between the ICANN Board and the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group. Please note that this session is being recorded and follows the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior, the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy, and the Community Participant Code of Conduct Concerning Statements of Interest.

Interpretation for this session today will include English, French, and Spanish. For our panelists today, we ask that you please state your name for the record and the language you will speak if speaking a language other than English. Please also speak at a reasonable pace.

This discussion today is between the ICANN Board and the NCSG members only. Therefore, we will not be taking any questions from the audience. Having said that, I will now hand the floor over to the ICANN Board chair, Tripti Sinha.

TRIPTI SINHA

Thank you, Franco. Good afternoon and welcome, everyone, to the last bilateral meeting between the Board and the Constituency, in this case, it's the NCSG. So we look forward to a vibrant conversation, and my colleague, Chris Buckridge, will be

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.

facilitating this discussion, so without any further delay, Chris, over to you.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Thank you very much, Tripti. And as Tripti said, welcome to the Board's discussion with the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group of the Non-Contracted Parties House. I'd like to start with just doing a quick tour de table so that we know who's who. I'll start on this end with Wes.

WES HARDAKER

Thanks very much. I'm Wes Hardaker. I'm the RSSAC liaison to the ICANN Board.

RAÚL ECHEBERRÍA

Raúl Echeberría, ICANN Board.

SAJID RAHMAN

Sajid Rahman, ICANN Board.

KURTIS LINDQVIST

Kurtis Lindqvist, president/CEO of ICANN.

TRIPTI SINHA

Tripti Sinha, ICANN Board.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE	Chris Buckridge, ICANN Board.
-----------------	-------------------------------

RAFIK DAMMAK	Rafik Dammak, NCSG chair.
--------------	---------------------------

WISDOM DONKOR	Wisdom Donkor, NCUC chair.
---------------	----------------------------

TAPANI TARVAINEN	Tapani Tarvainen, NCSG councilor.
------------------	-----------------------------------

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE	Benjamin Akinmoyeje, NCSG councilor.
---------------------	--------------------------------------

JUAN MANUEL ROJAS	Juan Manuel Rojas, NPOC chair.
-------------------	--------------------------------

YAO SOSSOU	Yao Sossou, NPOC policy coordinator.
------------	--------------------------------------

GREG DIBIASE	Greg DiBiase, ICANN Board.
--------------	----------------------------

AMITABH SINGHAL	Amitabh Singhal, ICANN Board.
-----------------	-------------------------------

CHRISTIAN KAUFMANN

Christian Kaufmann, ICANN Board.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Thank you all. I'd also like to acknowledge that we have quite a number of folks online in the Zoom Room, who I think will be taking part in the conversation today. I might not ask you right now to introduce yourselves. I'm sure you will when you speak, but welcome, and we'll certainly be keeping a very close eye on the Zoom Room to make sure that you're part of the conversation. So please put hands up if you want to be part of the queue.

So, without further ado, I think we'll move into the topics that NCSG has shared with the Board to spark discussions. I think we have three, if I'm not mistaken, but I'd hand over to Rafik to lead us through this.

RAFIK DAMMAK

Thanks, Chris. Thanks to the Board for this opportunity to have this dialogue and discussion. From our side, we submitted or we are asking three questions or topics to the Board, starting with the first about RDRS and law enforcement authentication. And then I will ask Farzaneh Badii, which is joining us remotely, to introduce the topic. And then about the ICP-2 and RIR independence. That will be me to ask the question. And then, yes, about the multistakeholder resilience topic. So these are three different topics, and we hope we can cover them thoroughly today. With that, maybe we can start

with RDRS and law enforcement authentication, and I will ask Farzaneh to start.

FARZANEH BADI

Thank you, Rafik. Hello, everybody. My name is Farzaneh Badi. I'm an NCSG councilor. And I'm very slow because it's been like since 11 p.m. and it's now 7 a.m. It's how much I love you.

Okay. Basically, a few meetings ago, we asked the Board to consider human rights when drafting the resolutions, and consider the impact on human rights, and do a little bit of human rights impact assessments. The Board told us, "How about you do that for us? Show us how to do one." Today, I want to go through a very brief human rights consideration of your resolution that you issued in October in which you directed the CEO to encourage the use, to ensure the continuation and promote the use of the RDRS.

So the resolution records concerns about continuity of access, registrar participation, system improvement, authentication mechanism, and it does not reflect the concerns that were raised by NCSG and others regarding transparency, regarding safeguards, against misuse, proportionality, and the rights of registrants. Now, we are not saying that you need to, like, this is like anything new policy that you tell us, "No, we cannot say that because it's new policy."

When you look at your resolution, you go to the community impact and the old community concerns. The only concerns that are laid

out in this resolution, this rationale, is the concerns of people who want to have access to domain name registrant private, sensitive data, and a continuity of access and system improvement, obviously, for the requester.

When you go to the rationale, the part about community impact, the rationale identifies benefits such as continued access for requester, progress on law enforcement validation. It does not mention the potential community impact, if we are a part of this community, potential impact on the registrant and the non-commercial users. Or it does not even mention like any kind of increased risk of this kind of disclosure.

So what we did was that we are going to send you this letter, but what we did was that we went through the resolution that you have, and then in that resolution, you direct the president and the CEO to encourage comprehensive RDRS usage by data requesters and registrars, but it does so without any qualifying language about responsible use. Like you could have said encourage responsible use of RDRS. There's no language about more, for example, proportionality or any kind of act that would ensure that, for example, registrars are not obligated to just disclose the private, sensitive data to the requester.

And outreach. You say that this is a part of your outreach. Outreach is not an independent and neutral act. You are promoting this mechanism, and it would be great if this mechanism is promoted by also considering that the use should be used responsibly, and

that it does not create this kind of impression that they are going to get access to private, sensitive data of the domain name registrant if they use this.

I'm just going to go for—we are going to send you this letter—but we encourage the Board to consider, to reflect in their resolution the full diversity of community concerns in the rationale and have a balanced community impact analysis. Also, it's very important to pair the encouragement of usage of RDRS with responsible use does not create entitlement to disclosure, and also registrars retain independent assessment and review of these requests. Thank you very much.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Okay. Thank you, Farzaneh, for that. I think Greg DiBiase is going to respond to us from the Board.

GREG DIBIASE

Thanks, Chris, and thank you, Farzi. We certainly look forward to the letter. We're always looking to see how we can improve and incorporate all community feedback. Regarding kind of the goals of the NCSG, I think we're very much aligned on the authentication mechanism, for example. I think we're all on the same page that that must be transparent and accountable as it develops, and we'd hope that's an effort that the NCSG would participate in. We also, I guess, want to emphasize that we share the view that registrars have the discretion to deny requests based on their legal

requirements and should consider human rights. So, I think we look forward to guidance on the language, but in terms of the views of the NCSG, I think we're largely in alignment.

Part of the idea of the law enforcement mechanism is to help registrars in their determination to make sure that they are complying with local law and considering the rights of the user. So if they have a better sense that this request is legitimate, that can help them in their determination on how to proceed. So I think kind of bringing those threads together, we're on the same page from a big picture perspective. We're always open to feedback on how we can incorporate the concerns of the community and the resolutions and documents that we put out. And we appreciate the feedback.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Thanks, Greg. Looking around the table and online here for any further comments here. Yeah, Wes, please.

WES HARDAKER

Thanks, Chris. And thanks for bringing up this topic. I mirror everything that Greg just said. I believe that we are aligned in terms of the priorities that the Board wants and the community wants in order to protect registrants. Obviously, the registrant ecosystem is the basis for the ICANN world, and we care, first and foremost, about them.

One additional thing that I would like to point out is that, just as Greg said, authentication doesn't provide authorization, which I think is also in some of the dialogue that I've seen from the NCSG, and I agree with it fully. But secondly, authentication of law enforcement agencies actually does help protect registrants because it ensures that registrars are able to make decisions based on an informed decision of an authenticated entity, and that sort of transparency in what the registrar sees allows them to make an informed authorization decision that they get to make on their own.

So, anytime we increase the information that is available, it actually means that the audit records and everything else will actually help with the transparency and record keeping to ensure that proper legal actions can be taken at a later date.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Thanks, Wes. Farzi, if you've had any response, I give you the opportunity.

FARZANEH BADII

I do have a response. Yes, absolutely. We know that. We know authentication is actually to protect the domain name registrants and the users, one reason we are fully engaged with the practitioner groups. But what we think that should happen is, at the ICANN Board level and at RDRS level, there should be transparency mechanisms. There should be some kind of protocols

in place that the system does not get abused. The law enforcement has its own protocol for authenticating law enforcement agencies, but when it comes to RDRS, we need to have additional safeguards in place as well. They don't have to be anything special, like what we said, like when you encourage the use of the system, please also encourage responsible use of the system. That's all. Thank you.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Okay. Thanks for that, Farzi. I think definitely input to an ongoing conversation here. And certainly, the point on the language the Board uses and the points we highlight is, I think, well taken, it's good to get that sort of feedback, and we noted for our future reference.

Not seeing any other hands. I'm going to pass it back to Rafik to move to the next item on RDRS and ICP-2.

RAFIK DAMMAK

Okay. Thanks, Chris. Usually for NCSG, I'd say our main concern is about gTLD policy. But in this case, we sent, I think, last October the letter about the AFRINIC and Smart Africa to the Board, and we thank that we got quite a swift response to respond to our question and to clarify the situation. Since then, and also because we have many of our members from Africa, including myself, that we got interest to know more about the situation for RIR governance in general because of what happened in AFRINIC.

So, based on the case of the ICP-2, we have this question or we want more clarification from the Board. What we can see maybe as possible issue that the revised RIR Governance document seems giving to the ICANN new powers that initiate the derecognition, conduct ad hoc audits. It can also appoint three parties to override RIR objection. And based on that, the question here, the first question, is the Board concerned this accumulation of institutional authority could undermine the distributed governance model protecting independence of number resource management?

And then the second question here, does the Board consider current consultation that was more or less led by ASO and NRO, and also the public comment an adequate multistakeholder input, given the governance significance of these changes, and also to have in mind that because what's going on in AFRINIC, I think, they could not participate in such process? This is the kind of the question we have, and we'd like discussion on this.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Thank you for that, Rafik. I think we're always happy to discuss the RIR Governance document as it's developing. I'm going to throw to Christian Kaufmann, one of the ASO-appointed Board directors, to field this one.

CHRISTIAN KAUFMANN

Thank you. Well, first of all, I'm glad we got your interest. As you said, you're usually more interested in domains. So, thanks for having an interest in the number world as well.

Coming to your first question, if we are concerned, the short answer is no, not at all. If you look at the document, and if you look at a little bit how the document came together, the document originally was started by the ASOs. But the ASO AC, at a certain point then, we contributed as well. So, the document, if at all, defines responsibilities between the different parties, especially between the RIRs as well, but it doesn't accumulate any institutional authority over the RIRs. All the independence the RIRs have, and I think some very common ones is that they do their own policies, that they have a bottom-up process, that they have their own communities, that they govern themselves. All of these parts are not changing. They stay as they are.

If you go a little bit back, because originally the document was ICP-2, right? They always had a relationship with ICANN, and ICANN had a role there as well. LACNIC and AFRINIC were created in conjunction with ICANN. So if you take that part, then what we have done now with the government's document is not different in spirit at all. So, I think, if at all, again, it fills gaps which we had in the processes, but it doesn't change authority or it doesn't take anything over.

If you look at the second question, if we believe that we have enough multistakeholder input, the short answer, again, would be

yes, very much so. I actually think if you look at the process, which is now around two years, I think it was actually quite exemplary for the ICANN world, with the multistakeholder bringing it together. It was first a document about principles, which was distributed in every community commented on it, and then two rounds of writing the document. So, in total, every region had three public comment phases. They call it differently with webinars and giving feedback, and then at the same time, ICANN had three.

The AFRINIC part was actually something especially we from the Board looked quite close it, because there was a little bit of question with the situation of AFRINIC, if the feedback which we get from the African region is sufficient enough. And if you look into—I think it was certainly the second round where I know the numbers, then the feedback from Africa was actually the second highest after Asia. So, they participated, as far we're concerned, very much to the process and gave feedback. So, I think it adequates multistakeholder input. Thanks.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Thanks for that, CK. I'm looking around here and online as well. It'd be great if anyone—Farzi? Yeah, please go ahead.

FARZANEH BADII

So, Christian, we are actually very interested in IP addresses. Some of us work on those, and quite active at RIRs. The reason we did not feel the need until now to discuss this, we thought that the process

was going well, and there were not much concern about the changes that were being done and RIRs were looking after it. But since the AFRINIC issue happened, and we sent a letter to the Board and received response, but then we looked at the documents that they provided—and you’re right, they really engaged with all the stakeholders—the problem is that, as you mentioned, AFRINIC was not at the table for a while in that issue.

So we believe that some of these things, some of these changes, and the rationale for the change that are in this document, they are quite concerning. But you’re saying that we shouldn’t be concerned, ICANN is not getting more power. But according to this presentation that was done for the GAC, the derecognition proposal and also the various, like the audits and stuff like that, it’s very concerning. And this is not something that NCSG is saying, that there are concerns in the other part of the community. But since you are saying, no, there is nothing to see here, I don’t know what else I should say.

CHRISTIAN KAUFMANN

Well, that wasn’t a question, right? That was a statement. If you look at the document, it is not that one party derecognizes another party, and it is also not that ICANN, for example, does that. There’s various steps how the RIRs and ICANN interact in situations like that.

If you look, I think, the ASO—and we have seen it more from a life cycle perspective, right? We always had with the ICP-2 how things

start, but then there were a couple of implied ideas how they will continue, and how that looks like. But for the case that one doesn't fulfill their function or other aspects, they were not covered. So this is just an extension of the existing document, but it doesn't give a particular party power to close something down or so.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Okay. Thanks, CK. To any other colleagues at the table or in the Zoom Room? All right, thanks, Farzi. Thanks, CK. Thanks, Rafik. And I'll leave you to move to the next question.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Okay. Thanks, CK. To any other colleagues at the table or in the Zoom Room? All right, thanks, Farzi. Thanks, CK. Thanks, Rafik. And I'll leave you to move to the next question.

RAFIK DAMMAK

Yeah, I think we're doing well in terms of time. Next, it's about the multistakeholder resilience, and I would like to ask Farzaneh to explain more about this question.

FARZANEH BADI

This question, actually, can be a response in conjunction to your question, the Board question. Basically, one of the things that we keep hearing is that, oh, there are these urgent issues that need to be urgently addressed, and we need to be effective and efficient. What is not being worked on is this kind of multistakeholder

process, and how can we actually empower this and maintain the resiliency of the multistakeholder process?

We focus a lot on addressing these urgent problems. And in my opinion, we are not a car factory, and we are not building products. The meaning of efficiency and effectiveness in a policy development organization changes. Yes, you should be efficient and effective when there's a botnet happening. Of course, there has to be urgent reaction to that. But when it comes to like DNS abuse, the Internet is working, guys. I don't know about why every day I get online, and my 74-year-old mom does that as well. And it's not like every day we are facing some kind of huge population is just dealing with phishing and scam. If that was the case, we would not have solved that with policy. We would not have sat here. We would have solved it with having emergency things and then come and do policy.

But I'm not saying that we shouldn't do DNS abuse policy and stuff like that. I'm just saying the matter of urgency, we need to be efficient, we need to be effective. It undermines this vision that we have, that we need to make these policies through a multistakeholder model. And how does the Board envision reinforcing the resilience of the multistakeholder model? Because I keep hearing you around the room that you keep talking about ICANN should be efficient, ICANN should be effective, but you need to also consider that we need to define these terms in the matter of a multistakeholder policymaking body. We are not making cars

here. So this is our question, and it can also bleed into your other question.

CHRISTIAN KAUFMANN

Thank you, Farzaneh. I note in relation to this, we had a session with the NextGen earlier today where I think they very astutely characterized it as a need to balance that speed, efficiency, effectiveness with inclusivity with a multistakeholder process. So I think that's something the Board definitely sees as they're all balancing those two aspects. Greg, can I pass it to you, please?

GREG DIBIASE

Thanks, Farzi. I guess, first of all, we are sensitive to the concern that always impressing urgency upon people shouldn't sacrifice being careful with policy considerations. I think that is something we understand. But regarding the resilience—at least I'm going to take my perspective from the GNSO—the GNSO is improving their policy processes, right? We have been taking lessons learned and incorporating them into things like PDP 3.0 that came from the community. So this idea of tightly narrowed scope PDPs, that is an idea that came from the community based on lessons learned from prior PDPs, right? There were some PDPs that got bogged down and they had trouble moving forward. So, from those experiences and surveys from members of the community, concepts like having a tightly scoped PDP that can move efficiently came to life.

So I think that is a testament to resilience that the policymaking process continues to evolve. We're constantly iterating, looking at what went right, what went wrong, the Board readiness initiative on the GNSO Council, I think, is another great example of this. They surveyed people of PDPs like SubPro, which did take a long time, and are coming back with feedback.

That's just my two cents on how I think this is evolving and becoming more resilient. Obviously, there's a push and pull. If community members think we're going too far in one direction, these are good flags to wave. Like, "Hey, we need to make sure we're being careful too." So, yeah, the Board looks at resilience and looks at how policy processes evolve and hopefully improve, and that's what we advocate for.

RAFIK DAMMAK

Thanks, Greg. I do know about PDP 3.0 since I was the chair of that group that come up with those recommendations. My concern here is that, yes, the GNSO is trying to do its best in terms of improving even project management, scoping, and so on. But at the end, it's a whole life cycle or stream because we're talking here about the effectiveness or efficiency.

Yes, GNSO is doing its best. But there are other steps, other phases, including the Board approval, and then the implementation. As someone who was in the EPDP Phase 1 and 2, and seeing how much time we spent there, and to check after so many years that how long it takes us to approve the recommendation, while in GNSO, I

was in the leadership of GNSO Council at the time, we were thinking, “What is the best option? Let’s go with EPDP so we don’t waste time in terms of issue report.” And then in the working group, the leadership of the working group, how we can really go quickly, like people had two calls per week. We even had face-to-face meeting and so on, to come up with this recommendation. And after, if they can kind of stopped, I don’t know, a black hole or the limbo of the approval by the Board, I can understand there are some reason, because you had the input from the ODP about the feasibility and risk.

But at the end, this is kind of one of the issues, it takes so much time to approve, it takes even more time to implement. And so it’s hard to hear about the efficiency and effectiveness, and the kind of the blame is always suited in the first part, which is here in GNSO when we are talking at the PDP. And also, how you can convince volunteers to put more time they spend a lot, like do two years in that PDP, and do not see the outcome after so many years.

So we have just the DNS abuse started, and I understand there are some kind of goodwill, some people maybe seem excited it will go well. My only fear that we will be in the same situation, they will do their best. I heard even in, I think, the Board and GNSO Council interaction as you want maybe more, I would say, aggressive timeline that “Let’s do it quickly,” but at the end, when it’s going to the approval by the Board and then implementation, it will take more, longer time.

Sorry for taking long here in terms of intervention, but that's why, when we talk about efficiency and effectiveness, we need to be careful. It's whole process, and everyone in each part need to take its responsibility here. So the risk, as Farzaneh raised, it's about how we can participate if we are trying to do things quickly. We are dealing with complex matters that a lot of interest and we try to find consensus. Yes, it's not factory. We don't have a recipe how you can reach consensus. And I saw that like for EPDP Phase 1 or 2, how much it was complicated until the end, and people were trying to work on language and so on. So that's just I wanted to elaborate here, and we know we have this discussion, but I think just the opportunity to say it here in this interaction.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Thanks, Rafik. I have a short queue of Bruna and then Greg. Bruna, do you want to take the floor?

BRUNA MARTINS DOS SANTOS

Thanks, Chris, and hi, everyone. I think Rafik already said a lot of the things I wanted to say, but while listening to Greg—and I fully respect your position, Greg, on that and also understanding that you have a good experience in that sense—but I do have a feeling that in the past years, Council has been evolving towards not just improving its processes, but also trying to find a basis for taking on the approach of expedited processes instead of the normal PDPs. That's at least an impression I have. And as Rafik was talking a little bit about the DNS abuse, one, I think that's not just that one PDP as

a good example, but also the whole process of selecting a chair for that PDP, where this rushed argument was so present throughout so many phases of the coming up with that, that the chartering process was a little bit rushed, the selection of the chair was a little bit rushed, and now we have the pressure coming from GAC, from other parts of the community from cutting time from the PDP, when, in reality, or at least it's the way I think we should be cutting from different other parts in order not to preempt the community discussions and consensus building exercises and so on.

So, I do understand the point on improving the processes and so on, but my impression is that we are going in that kind of a dangerous way. And by taking on this rush arguments and urgent arguments all the time, we're also preempting the participation of, let's say, newcomers, civil society members, and others that are not fully working with ICANN on a paid basis and so on, and I'm one of those, and so she's part of this one. So I think it's also important to put that on the map. Thanks, Chris.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Thanks, Bruna. Greg, please.

GREG DIBIASE

Thanks, Bruna. I think that's helpful feedback as we consider this. And then, to Rafik, yeah, I think obviously the Board is part about this too, and we have to continually think about how we improve our processes to make sure we're efficiently addressing community

recommendations and implementing and continuously improving. So I think that's right, we're all part of the same process to make policy that makes the Internet better.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Thanks, Greg. Kurtis?

KURTIS LINDQVIST

Thank you. I think that the question on the screen is actually about how do we ensure that the model is resilient, and I think that that discussion was about timing. I would just underline that I think that the multistakeholder model resilience comes from a timely resolution of issues confronted with it, and that means finding the balance between doing something in time for it to address a problem and doing that thoroughly. There are days of tension there, but I think we need to do both of them, because there's also a risk that if we don't address problems to the multistakeholder model, someone else will address the problems for us. And that's also a problem, right? We had to acknowledge that we are actually developing policy not for policy's sake, but to resolve and address issues that we see. That doesn't mean we should rush them, but we can't also wait too long.

But I wanted to come up by this. There's a lot of discussions in Dublin around the policy development, and I think what is really important is to look, and I think Rafik was mentioning, is that we need to look at this from end to end, that I've been trying to stress

this is that the ability to analyze the process from when there is the idealization of a problem in the community through to the formation of policy, the policy development of PDP, if you want, all the way through to Board approval and implementation, and we need to look at that. Ahead of this meeting, we published the first time the scorecard, so where we see the policies in development, in Board approval and in implementation, to highlight exactly what the status is. What are we waiting for? What's the next step of that so that we can see this? And we're going to continue to do this. We have said before every meeting, but maybe we'll do it quarterly. He said looking at the Policy Team. But we should make some sort of regularity, whatever the frequency is, to actually highlight this is the progress, these are the next steps, and these are the issues that we are seeing as holding this particular policy up at this particular stage.

One, that's the transparency we should have the community. But two, I think, over time, to address what Rafik was saying. Over time, it will also give us an understanding of what is it actually causes issues with these policies? One thing I'm going to speculate is that if you start doing very large, complicated policies or complex issues and many dependencies, they will take a long time to reach consensus, and they'll be hard to implement. If we do this more focused and have more bite-sized pieces, we're probably going to move faster because it's easier to develop them. I'm speculating, but that might be one conclusion we draw from this. But we need to have some understanding of what is the issues and what are the

status and have that transparency to the community, and that's what we started.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Thanks, Kurtis. Bruna, please.

BRUNA MARTINS DOS SANTOS

Just a very small intervention. Thanks, Chris. Again, we get the point on efficiency, but I guess what we're trying to tell you guys is that efficiency should not come at the cost of civil society participation. It's a feeling of a direction that some things might take, like as Farzi highlighted in the chat, you can do things efficiently without the opposition or without civil society, but that's not the goal of the multistakeholder model. And again, if we're failing to include any users' views, civil society views, academia views, that's also a failure of the model.

We should focus on the balance, as you were trying to highlight in the beginning of your intervention, Kurtis, but also not just the balance but... Yeah, in general, it's a balance between the deliverables, but also the participation in a bigger way. And I think we're kind of failing a little bit on the participation end because, I mean, you guys have also heard this complaint repeatedly, and it's not just NCG, it's any newcomer in this community that tries to frame the questions or understand how to navigate ICANN. So yeah, sorry for taking too long, Chris.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Thanks, Bruna. Wes, please.

WES HARDAKER

Thank you. And I recognize we're running late on time, so I'll make this quick. But being more efficient and timely does not imply that we want to rush, and most specifically, being more efficient and timely does not imply we want to sacrifice completeness. And I can sort of give an example that has actually helped from this week, which is that we can increase your effectiveness just by communicating in a better way. Greg and I spent a number of meetings this week and last week meeting with smaller teams to try and come up with resolutions that I think made the community happier in the end, I won't go into the details of those, but earlier communication and earlier cross-constituency communication can actually help bring solutions that everybody agrees to faster, rather than bringing up alternate viewpoints at a later stage. That can actually be done to actually help all of this. I'm not saying it's easy, but it is possible to actually do it right. And not only that, to bring back to the point of your volunteer overhead, right? If we actually increase efficiency, it will actually reduce the volunteer load and the number of hours that they might have to put in to solving a problem. I don't have all the solutions. I'm only bringing up one as an example.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Okay. Thanks, Wes. I'm not seeing any more hands. Oh, sorry. Raúl, please.

RAÚL ECHEBERRÍA

Just emphasizing what has been already said. But this efficiency without participation is not useful and is bad, and participation without having results, as Kurtis already mentioned, that if we cannot solve the problems, it doesn't make sense either. So it's not good for the model. So it's a matter of finding the balances and the trade-off. Of course, that balance or trade off could be different from different perspectives, but this is what we have to figure out together. And as Wes said, nobody says it's easy. But I think that we remain very attached to the core values of ICANN, so that's the warranty that we will do the best.

By the way, if we can add something, that's just a small thing. That's my first official meeting with this constituency as a Board member, and it just comes to my mind the memories that this is where my involvement in ICANN started, back in 1998, in fact, together with Kathy Kleiman, we were part of the first Name Council, representing the Non-Commercial Constituency.

RAFIK DAMMAK

Thanks for all those responses and comments. We can maybe elaborate later about efficiency, if it's a matter of more communication and so on. We can have some doubts, but I think the whole point here is how we can improve things, but it's end to

end, as was clarified, and it's also about avoiding being crushed and avoid the pressure.

With that maybe is, being mindful about time, we can move to the question from the Board. So the next, it's about the strategic—I can maybe start first with the Review of Reviews because I think that will be quick. If we go to the question? Okay. Sorry. Yeah, I cannot see.

The question, if we are participating in the Cross-Community Group, the answer is quite simple. We are not because the composition of the Cross-Community Working Group, we have only two representatives from GNSO, and they are not from NCSG. Of course, we get some updates. We interact with Sophie Hey who is one of the co-chairs of the Cross-Community Working Group, but that's kind of the limit of our involvement. We also try to get some observers. I think this is kind of the limitation. I understand that Cross-Community Working Group, they allow more observers, and people can attend the calls and so on. But still, it's kind of barrier here for participation.

In terms of about the proposal, we just got some updates twice during this ICANN meeting. So we are trying to make our position or thoughts about what was proposed. I think we get a sense of the direction and the kind of the format. But maybe what we can highlight, one of our main concerns of folks will be about the structural review part, because historically, it has or it can have impact for NCSG within the GNSO.

Regarding the other question, the views with respect to overall self-assessment for Continuous Improvement Program is something, of course, we can support as we supported what was done before in GNSO's effort. I don't think there is any issue.

And regarding the contemplated assessment of SO/ACs by broader community, I think that's still open. We need to go further in what's proposed, in particular, it's not just if it's the whole community, I think we can understand that. But also, who will do it and what will be the scope and so on. And also, based on previous experience when we had like the GNSO Review or also what for other groups. But to summarize, we are still kind of discussing. We are trying to make sense of what's proposed, and we are aiming to share our input to the Cross-Community Working Group.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Okay. Thank you, Rafik. Leon, would you like to respond?

LEON SANCHEZ

Thank you. Thank you, Chris, and thank you, Rafik. I find it worrisome what you're saying about not being represented because we've had a number of meetings, of course, with different SO/ACs, all of them with membership at the CCG. And what we've been hearing is that however large the group they represent is, they liaise and they interact with them, and they touch base with them, and they exchange points, and they try to build into the process the

views and the points from each of the groups that they represented, the bodies that they are being appointed by.

Also, I've seen the interactions of many observers in the CCG, and I can tell you that whenever they contribute to the efforts of what's being done in the CCG, not only the co-chairs, but also the members who participate in the CCG, we take their views very much into account, and we actually interact with them in a way in which—I mean, formally, they are not members, but they certainly contribute in a meaningful way by making their observations and raising their points in our calls. So, if you feel like whatever mechanism has been established between the GNSO representatives and the NCSG might not be optimal for raising your voice and showing your thoughts, I would definitely encourage you, or whomever wants to contribute to this effort that's an observer, to definitely join as such, because, again, the voices of the observers are being heard and are being taken into account. So, by all means, I encourage you and the NCSG to take this step forward and help us build the next iteration of the reviews.

RAFIK DAMMAK

Okay. Yeah, maybe I was not clear. What I said is we are not formally represented there. It's for the whole GNSO. That's what I meant here. And also, that we have some reports, I think, they share for all stakeholder group and constituency, and we had interaction with particularly Sophie. So I'm not saying we didn't have. Is it sufficient or not? That's one question we can discuss.

The other point here also, I acknowledge that there is this proximity for observer, and this is also from our side. We tried to identify who can join and to participate and to observe since Dublin. So we start from there. There was that opportunity that was communication that people can join, and then we tried, but it's not the same. Still how to find observer is not to have formal representation. Maybe it can be different in the future. We are also learning, and we are trying to step up, knowing that it's we have short timeline or timeframe since they will have maybe proposal by civil. But that's just we sharing the situation. Again, the representatives, they are doing their best, but still it's not necessarily optimal from our perspective or how we can see participation there.

LEON SANCHEZ

Thanks, Rafik. And yes, I can attest to the work that both Sophie and Osvaldo are doing, and I think they're doing a great job. So that's why even pop the question to me as for the representation that you feel you're having. Thank you.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

I think we have only five minutes left, so we might move to the other question. I think the earlier discussion about resilience in the multistakeholder model certainly fits into this. But I think there's also some other points that CSG wanted to raise.

RAFIK DAMMAK

Okay. Let me check if anyone wants to speak about this. Farzaneh, maybe, just to present.

FARZANEH BADI

I just want to quickly say that, from the Board's strategy, we are not living in a moment of peace. There are geopolitical pressure and conflict and wars and states-imposed shutdowns. I have been having difficulties talk to my family back in Iran. And DNS as a vital infrastructure for connectivity, I think the Board can have a very meaningful role and explicitly account for the population that cannot access the DNS, and also come up with plans and strategies on how to make the DNS and whatever is within the mandate of ICANN to make it more resilient. Nowadays we cannot ignore one region and act upon other wars that happen in other regions. We have to equally pay attention to what is going on around us. Also, we cannot leave people behind. The access to DNS is one of the most important. And of course, you know that we care about human rights. We want it to be in the strategy plan and work done, but that's about it.

TRIPTI SINHA

Farzaneh, I just wanted to say yes, we agree. We are in very difficult and complex times. And ICANN is always looking to ensure that the DNS system is resilient for all peoples of the world. But as you know, there are so many different components to the Internet. There numerous dependencies, and unfortunately, we all rely on each other, and systems fail. And, of course, human nature comes

in and does what it does. But your point is well taken, and I understand the situation we're all in. It's very complex. Thank you for your comment.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Thank you for that, Tripti. Amitabh, please.

AMITABH SINGHAL

Thank you, Farzaneh, for your comments. And I think, as Tripti rightly reported, we are in alignment with your thoughts in terms of resiliency that we need to be working on. But I also want to, at this point of time, say that the discussion around enhancing agility in the PDP process that we talked about was a very timely one, and we have been discussing this, but at the same time, I want to make you aware and you already would be aware of the fact that we have a five-year Strategic Plan, FY26-30, and we have completed one year of the adoption of the plan, and we have started the review process for the Strategic Plan, which has components which directly talk to the issues that have been talked about today, which includes enhancing the agility and effectiveness of the policy and advise development processes, number one. Number two, it is about inclusivity, as Farzaneh talked about, bringing in more and more stakeholders into the process, into the fold, and extending service and promoting the DNS services to people who have not yet had the opportunity.

To that effect, the Strategic Plan talks about enhancing the multistakeholder model that we have, which is successful, but we need to keep promoting it. There's a lot of work to be done there. I would encourage you, as the constituency, the NCSG, to provide us inputs. We are in the process of collecting inputs to see if we are on the right track or we need to do something better with the plan. Do we need to relook at the plan? Some of these components that can help us achieve and deliver on the missions that we have taken upon ourselves to do. Thank you.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Thank you, Amitabh. Looking around for any final comments on this. I think we're about to hit our time limit. Farzaneh, any final comments from you on this issue?

FARZANEH BADI

Actually, Bruna says something that is very important, and I'm going to read it. ICANN should start looking towards other places besides US and the EU, and have a holistic approach when it comes to dealing with, and leave no one behind in a way that we protect our human rights, we protect their access, and there will be security and stability. Thank you.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Okay. Thank you very much. We're at the 5:30. So, Rafik and to all, thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK

Thanks, Chris, and thanks for the Board member for this interaction. I know some of questions are little bit hard, but I think that the nature of this dialogue to exchange, to give you our thoughts and to hear from you, and hopefully, I hope that since this is the last session you have with all stakeholders, it will be more memorable for you. But just a hope. Thanks.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Memorable, no doubt. Tripti, I'll hand it back to you.

TRIPTI SINHA

Thank you, Rafik, and thank you, everyone, for this good conversation. Indeed, it is a memorable one. This meeting is now adjourned and off to whatever your evening activities are. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]